



| | | | |
|---------------------|--|---|----|
| Question(s): | Meeting, date: | Rapporteur/Editor tutorial, Gyeonggi, 30-31 October 2012 | |
| Study Group: | Working Party: | Intended type of document (R-C-TD): | TD |
| Source: | Secretariat | | |
| Title: | Summary of AAP comments received on draft Recommendation B.200 | | |
| Contact: | G. Fishman Pearlfisher International USA | Tel: +1 732 778 9572 Fax: +1 732 583 3051 Email: gryfishman@aol.com | |

Please don't change the structure of this table, just insert the necessary information.

ABSTRACT

This document contains information on AAP activities related to draft new Recommendation B.200 with questions on how to proceed under provisions of Recommendation A.8 on AAP.

1. Last Call

Draft new Recommendation B.200 was CONSENTED by a Working Party on 16 March 2012. The AAP ANNOUNCEMENT of 1 April 2012 announced the Last Call period for B.200. Last Call begins on 1 April and ends on 29 April 2012.

The following Last Call comments were received. What course of action can be taken and who takes the action during Last Call Judgment?

| | Situation | Possible course of action |
|---|---|---------------------------|
| 1 | 10 typographical errors are identified and corrections are submitted by an Associate. | |
| 2 | An inconsistency between the text and a summary table of values is identified. Reference to previous meeting reports shows that the value in the text had been agreed. A corrected table is submitted. | |
| 3 | 3 Sector Members object to consideration of approval of the draft Recommendation. No reasons are given. | |
| 4 | Several parameter values are noted for further discussion and, with rationale, new values are submitted. | |
| 5 | Text on a new subject not previously part of the scope of draft B.200 is submitted by a MS. | |
| 6 | The commenter notes that the Summary of the Recommendation has not been updated from an earlier draft, and proposes a revised Summary. | |
| 7 | A MS claims that draft B.200 has policy implications and must be moved to TAP. | |
| 8 | After addressing comments from Last Call, the date is 20 September. SG 20 will meet starting on 30 October. Should there be Additional Review or send the draft Rec B.200 and comments to the SG20 meeting? (See Rec A.8, §4.6) | |

2. Additional Review

Based on comments in Last Call and subsequent discussions in a comment resolution process initiated by the SG20 Chairman, revised text is posted for Additional Review on 1 July. What course of action can be taken and who takes the action during Additional Review Judgment?

| | Situation | Possible course of action |
|---|---|---------------------------|
| 1 | An Associate submits comments and proposed revisions to the AR text. | |
| 2 | A SM identifies changes that were introduced in the new AR text causes conflict with other text in draft Rec B.200. The SM proposes changes to that other text to agree with the changes that were made for AR. | |
| 3 | A MS provides comments and proposes amended text that it claims provides only editorial improvement without changing the meaning. | |
| 4 | The same MS as before claims that draft B.200 has policy implications and must be moved to TAP. | |

3. Study Group meeting

Draft Recommendation B.200 and a report on the comment resolution process from LC and AR are provided to the meeting of SG20. What possible course of action that can be taken?

| | Situation | Possible course of action |
|---|---|---------------------------|
| 1 | 10 typographical errors were corrected by the SG. | |
| 2 | An inconsistency between the text and a summary table of values was corrected. There is consensus that the text was correct. | |
| 3 | A MS claims the final revised text has policy implications; that MS does not object to approval. | |
| 4 | Several parameter values were changed, based on input contributions and agreement by the SG. An Associate objects to this change. | |
| 5 | At the plenary of SG20, 5 participants object to approval of the draft Recommendation. | |
| 6 | The Chairman of SG20 requests only the MSs present to indicate if there is any opposition to approval. One MS says that it has a concern which it does not want to be ignored but the MS does not object to approval of B.200 | |
| 7 | The Chairman of SG20 requests only the MSs present to indicate if there is any opposition to approval. Two MSs voice objection. | |
| 8 | The Chairman of SG20 requests only the MSs present to indicate if there is any opposition to approval. A MS states that itself and 4 other MSs from its region object to approval. | |
| 9 | The Chairman of SG20 requests only the MSs present to indicate if there is any opposition to approval. One MS voices objection. | |

