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# 1 Introduction

Annex 2 to the Summary of Conclusions of the twenty-first meeting of the Radiocommunication Advisory Group (see Administrative Circular CA/215) summarizes the discussions that occurred on possible restructuring and consequential revisions to Resolution ITU R 1-6. The RAG also decided to establish a Correspondence Group on this issue.

This document reports on the activities of the Correspondence Group, notably by analysing the input contributions received from Japan and the Chairman of Study Group 5, as well as other comments and suggestions received by the Chairman. This report is structured in four sub-parts. Section 2 deals with the processes of Adoption and/or Approval of Questions, Decisions, Reports, Handbooks and Opinions, which seem to be a more substantial matter arising from the attempt to restructure the Resolution. Section 3 gathers a number of other proposals on Resolution ITU-R 1, which, even substantial, seem to have a more limited impact. Section 4 mentions some issues that were discussed during the Correspondence activities but have not resulted in any proposed changes to Resolution ITU-R 1. Section 5 suggests some next steps in order for the Radiocommunication Assembly to succeed in restructuring Resolution ITU-R 1.

Finally, attachments contain the possible new version of Resolution ITU-R 1 as well as summary tables to better understand the scope of the restructuring.

# 2 Adoption and/or approval of Questions, Decisions, Reports, Handbooks and Opinions

## 2.1 Adoption and approval of Questions

Before the 2012 Radiocommunication Assembly (RA-12), Resolution ITU-R 1-5 allowed a Study Group to adopt an ITU-R Question at the Study Group meeting, without any condition regarding the prior availability of the document:

“**3.4** Other new or revised Questions, proposed within Study Groups, may be adopted by a Study Group and approved:

– by the Radiocommunication Assembly (see Resolution ITU‑R 5);

– by consultation in the interval between Radiocommunication Assemblies, after adoption by a Study Group.

The process for approval by consultation shall be the same as that used for Recommendations in § 10.4.” (Extract from Resolution ITU-R 1-5)

On this issue, RA-12 however modified Resolution ITU-R 1 by referring to the adoption process contained in § 10.2, presumably to clarify the details of such a process:

“3.1.2 New or revised Questions, proposed within Study Groups, may be adopted by a Study Group according to the same process as contained in § 10.2, and approved:

– by the Radiocommunication Assembly (see Resolution ITU‑R 5);

– by consultation in the interval between Radiocommunication Assemblies, after adoption by a Study Group.

 The process for approval by consultation shall be the same as that used for Recommendations in § 10.4.” (Extract from Resolution ITU-R 1-6)

However, this link with § 10.2 implies that a Study Group may consider and adopt draft new or revised Questions “when the draft texts have been prepared sufficiently far in advance of the Study Group meeting so that the draft texts will have been available in electronic form at least four weeks prior to the start of the Study Group meeting” (see § 10.2.2.2 of Resolution ITU-R 1-6). Otherwise an adoption by correspondence has to be sought followed by a subsequent, separate approval by correspondence (see § 10.4).

In order to partially remedy to this situation, the 2014 meeting of RAG advised the Director that the PSAA procedure could be applied for the adoption and approval of Questions pending the revision of Resolution 1-6 at the RA to address this aspect. RAG also noted that “as an alternative to the use of PSAA for ITU-R Questions, the possible adoption of Questions at any Study Group meeting for subsequent approval by correspondence should also be considered, noting that this was the normal practice before RA-12.”

The Study Group 5 Chairman noted that “it may not be necessary for the adoption procedures for Questions to be aligned in all the aspects with Recommendations. Furthermore, if adoption at the Study Group meeting may be possible regardless of the timing of the availability of their draft texts, the procedures for Questions addressed in Section 12 could drastically be simplified.”

It is therefore proposed to **revert to the practice that was in force before 2012**.

In order to implement such an approach and as suggested by the Study Group 5 Chairman, the following changes are made to the current draft Resolution contained in Document RAG14‑01/21(Rev.1):

– Suppression of Sections 12.2.2.3 (Procedure for adoption by correspondence) and 12.2.4 (PSAA application) as well as § 12.2.2.2.1 (prior circulation of the draft Questions to which the adoption are sought)

– Revision of §§ 12.2.1.1 (to eliminate PSAA aspect), 12.2.2.2.2 (to modify the text towards so that all the draft Questions could be adopted at the Study Group meeting.), 12.2.3.3 (to eliminate PSAA aspect), 12.2.3.5.1 (to make consequential changes) and 12.3.2 (to make consequential changes)

## 2.2 Approval of Reports

The 2014 meeting of RAG recognized that, “since Resolution ITU-R 1-6 does not contain explicit detailed provisions for the approval of Decisions, Reports, Handbooks and Opinions, the General Rules of Conferences, Assemblies and Meetings of the Union apply by default, which means that approval is obtained via a simple majority. Considering the current ITU-R practice, the Rapporteur drafted provisions proposing methods based on the absence of opposition for Reports and on consensus for other documents. This should however be further reviewed and discussed, noting that an alternative could be to explicitly mention in Resolution ITU-R 1 the use of simple majority as a method for approval of Decisions, Reports, Handbooks and Opinions.”

Among the four types of documents, it seems that most comments focus on Reports. Therefore this section specifically deals with ITU-R Reports, whereas Decisions, Handbooks and Opinions are addressed in section 2.3.

### 2.2.1 Approval process of Reports

Following the last RAG meeting and subsequent correspondence activities, three options can be identified for the approval of ITU-R Reports:

– Option 1 (based on the General Rules of Conferences, Assemblies and Meetings of the Union, which apply by default): Approval via a simple majority

 While this is the default process, it has been pointed out that the Article 21 of the General Rules related to “Voting” refers to “delegations present and voting”, which may imply that their credentials have been verified in order to determine that the delegations have the right to vote. Considering that Study Group meetings often last one or two days, no such verification can be performed during these meetings, which may invalidate the recourse to the majority.

 However, the so-called “voting” procedure for approving the Report could simply be a show of hands of delegations present at the Study Group meetings (see No. 123 of the General Rules for a similar approach). This approach would avoid any verification of credentials but would not guarantee that the delegations have the right to make such a choice.

– Option 2 (presented in 2014 RAG meeting by the Rapporteur): Approval based on the absence of opposition

 This process avoids the definition of majority and verification of any rights from delegations attending the Study Group meeting.

 As noted by the SG 5 Chairman, this condition however is almost identical to the one used for the adoption of draft Recommendations. Similarly, if, as an alternative wording, a method based on “consensus” would be used for the approval of draft Reports, which may be more in line with the current ITU-R practice, it should be noted that there is no clear definition of “consensus” in ITU and that it would be difficult to reach an agreed definition.

– Option 3 (presented by SG5 Chairman): Approval by correspondence if no consensus is reached at the Study Group meeting

 To clarify and facilitate the approval process for Reports, the following approach may be considered: “If consensus for the approval is not achieved at the SG meeting, the draft Report may be sent for approval by consultation of the Member States by correspondence.”

 The above action should be initiated only if it was not possible to obtain the approval of draft Reports after every effort at the meeting. In this method, the principles for the relevant conditions specified for draft Recommendations may also apply to complete the approval procedure for the draft Reports.

Choosing between these options or possible other alternatives exceed the remit of the Correspondence Group and **administrations are therefore invited to make proposals to the Radiocommunication Assembly for determining the most appropriate process for approving Reports. In the meantime, the proposed revised Resolution ITU-R 1 keeps a placeholder for the approval process of Reports**.

### 2.2.2 Treatment of objection/reservation of administrations to the approval of Reports

The Chairman of Study Group 5 indicated that, “in relation to the approval process for Reports, on some occasions Study Group meetings have included individual administration’s statements of objection (or reservation) in the text of a Report, either as a footnote or in the body of the text.

Regarding this treatment, the following points need to be taken into account:

– ITU-R Reports are public documents with contents agreed by the Member States;

– A statement of objection from an administration is an individual view that is not endorsed by other Member States;

– It may be misleading for the public to include such statements in the text of the Report.”

Therefore, the SG 5 Chairman suggested further adding a sentence to address this matter: “When there is an objection (or reservation) to a draft Report submitted to the Study Group meeting for approval, any statements of objection (or reservation) to the approval of a Report should be included in the Summary Record of the relevant Study Group meeting, and, if necessary, a reference to the statement may be included in a footnote of the Report.”

It is proposed **to include this proposal in the section dealing with the approval process of Reports**.

## 2.3 Approval of Decisions, Handbooks and Opinions

Decisions, Handbooks and Opinions seem to attract less interest regarding their approval process, which should however also be decided. In view of the discussion contained in Section 2.2 above, **administrations are invited to study the three proposed options regarding the approval process of Reports and decide at the Radiocommunication Assembly whether they may be applicable to Decisions, Handbooks and Opinions. In the meantime, the proposed revised Resolution ITU-R 1 keeps a placeholder for the approval process of Reports.**

# 3 Other proposals

This section lists various proposals that have been received during the work of the correspondence group.

## 3.1 Meetings of Study Group Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen

| Comment or proposal | Proposed action | Proposed change in Resolution ITU-R 1 |
| --- | --- | --- |
| It was proposed to hold a CVC meeting after each Radiocommunication Assembly for organizing the work of the Sector and distributing responsibilities on studies in response to ITU-R Resolutions between Study Groups.SG 5 Chairman: Since its 19th meeting in 2012, the RAG has monitored the progress on the implementation of the studies requested by ITU-R Resolutions and noted the reports from Study Group Chairmen in this regard. In order to more efficiently facilitate those studies identified in ITU-R Resolutions, it is proposed to explicitly mention in ITU-R Resolution 1 that the specific study items identified in ITU-R Resolutions should be allocated to appropriate Study Groups at the first CVC meeting (Study Group Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen meeting) in each study period. | To insert a text for convening the CVC after each RA. | Meetings of Study Group Chairmen and Vice-ChairmenAfter each Radiocommunication Assembly, as well as when the need arises, the Director will call a meeting of the Chairmen and Vice Chairmen of Study Groups and may invite Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen of Working Parties and other subordinate groups. At the discretion of the Director, other experts may be invited on an *ex-officio* basis. The purpose of the meeting is to ensure the most effective conduct and coordination of the work of the Study Groups, in particular regarding studies in response to relevant ITU-R Resolutions, with the view to avoid duplication of work between several Study Groups. The Director shall serve as Chairman of this meeting. If appropriate, such meetings could be held by electronic means, such as telephone or video conferences or using the Internet.  |
| SG5 Chairman: According to 1.1.1, the text states that a one-day face-to-face meeting every two years shall be organized preceding a RAG meeting. However, this request has not recently been implemented.It is, therefore, suggested to revise the text to reflect the reality, unless the RAG advises the Director to strongly implement this provision as it is. | To suppress the requirement for a one-day face-to-face meeting every two years.  |

## 3.2 Alignment of time periods for the availability of draft Recommendations

| Comment or proposal | Proposed action | Proposed change in Resolution ITU-R 1 |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Time periods mentioned in §§ 13.2.2.2.1 (two months to inform about planned adoption of a Recommendation) and 13.2.2.2.2 (four weeks to make the draft Recommendation available) could be aligned. SG5 Chairman: The two time periods does not necessarily need to be aligned. As defined in § 13.2.2.2.1, “two months” is a time limit to inform membership of explicit intention of the Study Group to seek adoption of the draft Recommendations already developed when announcing the convening of the Study Group meeting. In addition to these planned adoption, a Study Group meeting is allowed to consider toward adoption more draft Recommendations, which have been prepared by its subordinate WP meetings after the announcement of the Study Group meeting but sufficiently in advance of that meeting. In § 13.2.2.2.2, “four weeks” is defined as a criterion for this purpose. For the “two months” criterion, it should be noted that, according to the “Guidelines for the working methods”, Study Group meetings need to be announced at least “three months” beforehand. Therefore, the alignment of “two months” and “three months” both intended for the announcement of convening the Study Group meeting may be required.Furthermore, another time period “six weeks” is mentioned in 3.1.10 in relation to publication of a draft agenda for the meeting. This period needs to be aligned to one of them (two months or three months) since the draft agenda shall be included in the Circular letter announcing the convening of the meeting. | To keep the distinction between the two months to inform about planned adoption of a Recommendation and the four weeks to make the draft Recommendation available. To align § 3.1.10 with the two-month period together with a reference to the Administrative Circular.The Director may be advised by RAG to align the guidelines to the two-month period. | 3.1.10 Study Groups shall consider at their meetings, the draft Recommendations, Reports, progress reports and other texts prepared by Task Groups and Working Parties, as well as contributions submitted by Rapporteurs and/or Rapporteur Groups established by the same Study Group. To facilitate participation, a draft agenda shall be published in the Administrative Circular announcing the meeting, at latest, two months in advance of each meeting, indicating, to the extent possible, specific days for consideration of different topics  |
| SG5 Chairman: 3.4 The availability and substance of the draft agenda for meetings of Study Groups and Working PartiesThe provisions 3.1.10 and 3.1.14 deal with this issue. (…) A time period of “six weeks in advance” is mentioned in 3.1.10 for the publication of a draft agenda for the study group meeting. If the above publication is made in Administrative Circular announcing the meeting of the Study Group, the time period needs to be aligned to the timing for the convening of the study group meeting as specified in 13.2.2.2.1 (and also to the same requirements in “Guidelines for the working methods”).For the moment, a time period of “two months” is adopted for both provisions (3.1.10 and 3.1.14) and the texts are amended accordingly. | See the above row for § 3.1.10. In § 3.1.14, to insert the word “draft” before agenda but not to mandate any time limit for its publication in order to keep flexibility at the level of subordinate groups.  | 3.1.14 The draft agenda for Working Party and Task Group meetings, which are immediately followed by a Study Group meeting, should indicate as specifically as possible the topics to be addressed, and should indicate where it is anticipated that draft Recommendations are to be considered. |

## 3.3 Joint Groups

| Comment or proposal | Proposed action | Proposed change in Resolution ITU-R 1 |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Japan: 2.1 Establishment of Joint Task Group (JTG)In the recent practice in ITU-R, a Joint Task Group (JTG) could be established by the Decision of the first session of CPM with terms of reference to carry out studies for preparation of the next Conference. Therefore, in addition to JTGs proposed and established by the relevant Study Groups as specified in 3.2.5, a new provision 3.2.5bis is proposed. | To insert a sentence indicating the possibility for CPM to establish JTG at the end of § 3.2.5. | 3.2.5 When necessary, to bring together inputs that cover multiple Study Groups, or to study Questions or topics requiring the participation of experts from more than one Study Group, Joint Working Parties (JWP) or Joint Task Groups (JTG) may be established by the Study Groups as proposed by the relevant Study Group Chairmen. A Joint Task Group may also be established by the decision of the first session of CPM, in agreement with the relevant Study Group Chairmen, to carry out studies in preparation for the next WRC, as specified in Resolution ITU-R 2. When Joint Working Parties or Joint Task Groups are disbanded, the Study Groups that established them shall be responsible to maintain the documentation that was developed by them. |
| It has also been pointed out that Resolution 1 does not contain any procedure by which Recommendations and Reports developed by Joint Task Groups or Joint Working Parties should be maintained, when those joint bodies are disbanded.  | To insert a provision in § 3.2.5 explaining that, when a joint body is disbanded, the responsibility to maintain Recommendations or Reports that were developed by them is transferred to the parent Study Groups. |
| Procedures for documents developed by joint groups like Joint Task Groups or Joint Rapporteur Groups should be considered and included in Resolution ITU-R 1. SG5 Chairman: In this regards, § 13.2.1.4 is revised to apply the necessary procedures equally to all the relevant Study Group meetings. § 14.2 is also updated for Reports. | To insert a provision indicating that all parent Study Groups have to adopt a Recommendation developed by a joint group, whereas the approval process may be performed once at the end. To insert a provision indicating that all parent Study Groups have to approve a Report developed by a joint group.Note: cases of Recommendation or Reports falling within the scope of more than one Study Group without being developed by joint groups will continue to be dealt by consultation between the Study Group Chairmen.  | 14.2.1.4 Where a draft Recommendation (or revision) falls, exceptionally, within the scope of more than one Study Group, the Chairman of the Study Group proposing the approval should consult and take into account the views of all the other Study Group Chairmen concerned before proceeding with the procedures below. Where a draft Recommendation (or revision) has been developed by a Joint Working Party or a Joint Task Groups (see § 3.2.5), the procedures for adoption specified in section 14.2.2 shall be applied by all the relevant Study Groups. Once adoption has been reached, the procedures for approval specified in section 14.2.3 shall be applied only once. 14.2.2 New or revised Reports developed jointly by more than one Study Group shall be approved by all the relevant Study Groups. |

## 3.4 Link with Resolution ITU-R 6

| Comment or proposal | Proposed action | Proposed change in Resolution ITU-R 1 |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Based on the work previously carried out by RAG and successfully concluded on Resolution ITU-R 6 and the working methods relevant to Intersector Rapporteur Groups, it should be noted that, if the Radiocommunication Assembly approves the proposed revision to Resolution ITU-R 6, it would be useful for Resolution 1 to contain some information on Intersector Rapporteur Groups and points the reader to Resolution 6. | To reflect the possibility to set up Intersector Rapporteur Groups, through the mention of such groups in new Section 8.1.3 dealing with Intersector Groups. | **8.1.3 Intersector Groups**In specific instances, complementary work on certain topics may be conducted by Study Groups in the Radiocommunication Sector, as well as in the Telecommunication Standardization Sector, and the Telecommunication Development Sector. In such circumstances, it may be agreed between the two Sectors or among the three Sectors to establish an Intersector Coordination Group (ICG) or an Intersector Rapporteur Group (IRG). For details on these groups, see Resolutions ITU‑R 6 and ITU‑R 7. |

## 3.5 Coordination Committee for Vocabulary

| Comment or proposal | Proposed action | Proposed change in Resolution ITU-R 1 |
| --- | --- | --- |
| CCV should be included in § 9.3.1 (contributions and documentation) because this provision for Study Group is becoming relevant for the CCV also. SG5 Chairman: This proposal is editorially reflected in § 9.3.1. | To include CCV in § 10.3.1. | 10.3.1 For meetings of all Study Groups, the Coordination Committee for Vocabulary and their subordinate groups (Working Parties, Task Groups, etc.), the following deadlines apply for the submission of contributions: |

## 3.6 Definition of ITU-R Decisions

| Comment or proposal | Proposed action | Proposed change in Resolution ITU-R 1 |
| --- | --- | --- |
| The current definition of ITU-R Decisions (see new provision 11.1) should be reviewed and clarified.  | No specific proposal has been received.  | - |

## 3.7 Common format for ITU-R Recommendations

| Comment or proposal | Proposed action | Proposed change in Resolution ITU-R 1 |
| --- | --- | --- |
| The common format for ITU-R Recommendations developed by RAG should be mentioned in some way in Resolution ITU-R 1, while not including it in the Resolution itself in order for the RAG to keep flexibility about possible improvements of this common format in the future. SG5 Chairman: The direction is agreeable. For the above purpose, it is suggested to add a provision which mentions that the current common format is included in “Guidelines for the working methods”.Japan: Japan is of the view that the above comment is agreeable. Therefore, a new provision 8.1.5 is proposed, which suggests that the current common format should be included in “Guidelines for the working methods”. | To insert in new § 8.2.1 a reference to the inclusion of the common format for ITU-R Recommendations in the guidelines (Note: since there was a desire from RAG to keep flexibility, it is suggested to include the reference to the common format in the section related to the Director’s guidelines instead of Part 2 related to the official Documentation).  | **8.2**  **Director’s Guidelines** 8.2.1 As a complement to this Resolution, it is the duty of the Director to periodically issue updated versions of guidelines on the working methods and procedures within the Radiocommunication Bureau (BR) which may affect the work of Study Groups and their subordinate groups (see *noting*.) The guidelines need also to include matters relating to the provision of meetings and correspondence groups, as well as aspects concerning documentation. In particular, the guidelines contain the common format for ITU-R Recommendations developed by RAG |

## 3.8 Editorial revision of Questions and Recommendations

| Comment or proposal | Proposed action | Proposed change in Resolution ITU-R 1 |
| --- | --- | --- |
| It was suggested that the paragraph related to the need of editorial revision of Questions and Recommendations aiming at removing of “S” from referenced RR provisions is not necessary to be explicitly inserted any longer in Resolution ITU‑R 1. It should be noted that RAG decided to request the BR to perform once for all such editorial revision in all Recommendations. Other editorial revisions would continue to follow the procedures of Resolution ITU-R 1. SG5 Chairman: The provision for removing of “S” from referenced RR provisions is no more necessary. | To suppress the specific provision for removing of “S” from referenced RR provisions. | – renumbering of Radio Regulation provisions[[1]](#footnote-1)6, provided the Radio Regulation provision text is not changed; |

## 3.9 Link with Resolutions ITU-R 43 (Rights of Associates) and ITU-R 63 (Admission of academia, universities and their associated research establishments to participate in the work of ITU-R)

| Comment or proposal | Proposed action | Proposed change in Resolution ITU-R 1 |
| --- | --- | --- |
| It has been noted that a new delegate that represents an Associate or an Academia might expect to find guidance in Resolution 1 on his rights to participate in a meeting, e.g. to chair a drafting group or to become a Rapporteur, etc. This information already appears in Resolutions 43 and 63 respectively. | To insert in Resolution ITU-R 1 a cross-reference to Resolution ITU-R 43 (Note: such a reference already exists for Resolution ITU‑R 63, see footnote 3 to new § 3.2.2). | 3.2.10 Participation in the work of the Rapporteur, Joint Rapporteur and Correspondence Groups of the Study Groups is open to representatives of Member States, Sector Members, Associates4 and Academia. Participation in the work of the Rapporteur and Correspondence Groups of RAG is open to representatives of Member States, representatives of Sector Members, and to Chairmen of the Study Groups. Any views expressed and documentation submitted to these groups should indicate the Member State, Sector Member, Associate or Academia, as appropriate, making the submission.4 For the rights of Associates, see Resolution ITU-R 43. |

## 3.10 Report to the next WRC on the progress of the ITU-R studies in response to the request made by the previous Conferences

| Comment or proposal | Proposed action | Proposed change in Resolution ITU-R 1 |
| --- | --- | --- |
| SG 5 Chairman: The provision 2.1.4 discusses this issue as one of the actions to be taken by the Radiocommunication Assembly. The progress report should refer to the ITU-R studies not related to the agenda items for the next WRC (immediately after the RA), which is included in the CPM Report, but for other studies for future Conferences. It is not clear how such a report is developed. Therefore, possible involvement of the relevant Study Group Chairmen on this matter needs to be mentioned, requesting them to report the progress of these studies as appropriate. | To insert additional clarifications on the expected actions from RA.  | 2.1.4 Based on the reports from the relevant Study Group Chairmen, as appropriate, the Radiocommunication Assembly shall report to the next World Radiocommunication Conference on the progress in matters that may be included in agendas of future Radiocommunication Conferences as well as on the progress of ITU‑R studies in response to requests made by previous Radiocommunication Conferences. |

## 3.11 Questions and Resolutions for which no input contribution has been received

| Comment or proposal | Proposed action | Proposed change in Resolution ITU-R 1 |
| --- | --- | --- |
| SG 5 Chairman: One of the item in § 9.1 (Preparatory documentation for RA) discusses this issue for both Questions and Resolutions equally. It is requested for Study Groups to provide an explanation to maintain such Resolutions for which no input has been received for the period mentioned in the relevant item in 2.1.1. However, it is difficult for Study Group Chairmen to propose their suppression or provide a reason to retain them when they did not receive inputs. Therefore, it is suggested to remove “Resolutions” from this item. The reasons are as follows:- There is no mechanism to identify which Study Group is responsible to conduct the studies requested in ITU-R Resolutions except for cases where the study is clearly within the scope of a specific Study Group;- The relevant item in 2.1.1 which reads “delete any Questions…” does not refer to Resolutions at all. | Not to make any change in answer to this comment following the proposal to hold a CVC meeting after each RA, notably to decide which Study Group is responsible to conduct the studies requested in ITU-R Resolutions (see section 3.1 above). | - |

**3.12 Alignment with current practices**

| Comment or proposal | Proposed action | Proposed change in Resolution ITU-R 1 |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Japan: 2.2 General principles of Documentation in § 8In section 8, the term “texts” seems to be used for ITU-R documents, i.e. Resolutions, Decisions, Questions, Recommendations, Reports, Handbooks and Opinions defined in § 10 to 16. This point should be clarified and not intended to include “contributions” defined in § 9.3, which are not concerned with “publication” or “approval” issues as specified in some provisions in § 8.For this purpose additional text is proposed at the beginning of § 8. Furthermore, small revisions are proposed in 8.1.1 and 8.1.3 to clarify the text. | To insert the clarification on the word “texts” in new Section 9. To add that, in cases of Recommendations and Reports, the number includes a Series designator. It is suggested not to add a restriction to Recommendations and Reports in new section 9.1.1 “Texts should be as brief as possible, taking account of the necessary content, and should relate directly to the Question/topic or part of the Question/topic being studied” because the provision deals with Questions and topics. While Questions may be relevant for Recommendations and Reports only, “topic” is more general and may be relevant to other ITU-R documentation.  | **9 General Principles**In the following sections 9.1 and 9.2, “texts” is used for ITU-R Resolutions, Decisions, Questions, Recommendations, Reports, Handbooks and Opinions, as defined in § 11 to § 17. (…)9.1.3 Texts shall be presented showing their number (including, for Recommendations and Reports, their series), their title and an indication of the year of their initial approval, and, where appropriate, the year of approval of any revisions. |
| Japan: 2.4 Treatment of CPM Report in Resolution ITU-R 1 under the section for ITU-R ReportsIn § 14.1, two provisions (14.1.1 and 14.1.2) provide definitions of ITU-R Report and CPM Report, respectively. However, taking into account the different nature of CPM Report for which the approval/suppression procedures stated in the following sections cannot be applied, it is proposed to remove 14.1.2 entirely and refer its definition to Resolution ITU‑R 2, as required.If there is a view that the definition of CPM Report should be retained as it is, the following text shall be added in the end of 14.1: “The approval/suppression procedures for Reports specified in 14.2 and 14.3 shall not be applied to CPM Report defined in 14.1.2.” | To suppress the mention of CPM Report in the section dealing with ITU-R Reports. It should also be noted that the CPM Report is already covered by *resolves* 2 of Resolution ITU-R 2-6.  | **15.1 Definition**15.1.1 A technical, operational or procedural statement, prepared by a Study Group on a given subject related to a current Question or the results of studies referred to in § 3.1.2; |
| SG 5 Chairman: 3.5 Review of the text in 3.1.15 (Director’s responsibility)Some changes in Section 3.1.15 are proposed based on a view of the BR to align this section with current practice and to take into account decisions of the recent Plenipotentiary Conference. | To insert the proposals from SG5 Chairman with some editorial amendments. | 3.1.15 The Director shall issue, in electronic form, at regular intervals, information that will include:– an invitation to participate in the work of the Study Groups for the next meeting;– information on electronic access to relevant documentation;– a schedule of meetings with updates, as appropriate;– any other information that could be of assistance to the membership. |
| SG 5 Chairman: 3.7 Refinement of the text in § 9.2It is suggested to editorially refine the text in § 9.2 without changing the substance. | To insert the proposals from SG5 Chairman with some editorial amendments.  | **10.2 Preparatory documentation for Radiocommunication Study Groups**Preparatory documentation shall include:– any directives issued by the Radiocommunication Assembly with respect to the Study Group, including this Resolution;– draft Recommendations and other texts (as defined in § 11 to § 17) prepared by Task Groups or Working Parties;– Chairman’s reports from each Task Group, Working Party and Rapporteur Group, summarizing the progress and conclusions of any work carried out by the group since the previous meeting and the work to be accomplished at the next meeting (these reports may also include considerations about the procedure to be followed for adoption and approval of the draft Recommendations to be considered by the meeting (see § 14));– the contributions to be considered at the meeting;– documentation prepared by the Bureau, particularly of an organizational or procedural nature, for clarification purposes or in response to Study Group requests;– the summary record of the preceding meeting;– an outline agenda indicating: draft Recommendations to be considered, draft Questions to be considered, reports from Task Groups and Working Parties to be received, and draft Decisions, draft Opinions, draft Handbooks and draft Reports to be approved.  |
| It has been noted that new § 3.2.11 (i.e. § 2.19 in the current Resolution ITU-R 1-6) on the establishment of Editorial groups by Study Groups is not aligned with the current practice of the Study Groups for vocabulary issues (i.e. to nominate liaison Rapporteur to CCV). | To amend § 3.2.11 to insert the possibility of nominating liaison Rapporteur to CCV to handle vocabulary issues at SG level. | 3.2.11 Each Study Group may set up an Editorial Group to ensure that the technical vocabulary and the grammar in the approved texts are correct. In that case, it would also ensure that the approved texts are aligned and have the same meaning in the six languages of ITU and are easily comprehensible to all users. The work of an Editorial Group is conducted by correspondence. The agreed texts are provided by BR to the designated members of the Editorial Group as and when they become available in the official languages. As an alternative, Study Group may nominate liaison Rapporteurs to the CCV; such Rapporteurs will perform, in consultation with the CCV, the same tasks as the Editorial Group.  |
|  | To include the CCV in the paragraph dedicated to Liaison Rapporteurs. | **8.1.2 Liaison Rapporteurs**Coordination between Study Groups may be ensured by the appointment of Study Group Liaison Rapporteurs to participate in the work of the other Study Groups, the Coordination Committee for Vocabulary or relevant groups of the other two Sectors. |
| Resolution ITU-R 1-6 states in § 10.1.3 that “Approval may only be sought for a draft new or revised Recommendation within the Study Group’s mandate as defined by the Questions allocated to it in accordance with Nos. 129 and 149 of the Convention, or by topics. Approval may however also be sought for revision of an existing Recommendation within the Study Group’s mandate for which no current Question exists.” The element of uncertainty is in the meaning of the term “topics”. That term may refer to the “scope” of a Study Group as defined in Resolution 5-6, or it may refer to the “topics identified in resolutions and recommendations of world radiocommunication conferences” as per No. 149A of the Convention. | To clarify that approval may be sought for Recommendations dealing with topics within the scope of a Study Group, as defined in new § 3.1.2.  | 14.2.1.3 Approval may only be sought for a draft new or revised Recommendation within the Study Group’s mandate as defined by the Questions allocated to it in accordance with Nos. 129 and 149 of the Convention or by topics within the scope of Study Group (see § 3.1.2). Approval may however also be sought for revision of an existing Recommendation within the Study Group’s mandate for which no current Question exists. |
| It has been noted that § 2.1.1 does not mention that the RA normally approve draft Recommendations following a work within the Study Groups.  | To amend § 2.1.1 to clarify that draft Recommendations are submitted to the RA by Study Groups.  | – consider and approve draft Recommendations proposed by the Study Groups, and any other documents within its scope, or make arrangements for the delegation of the consideration and approval of draft Recommendations and other documents to the Study Groups, as set out elsewhere in this Resolution or in other ITU‑R Resolutions, as appropriate;  |
| § 2.1.1 does not mention one of the tasks of RA with regards to WRC, i.e. to prepare a list of the revisions to the ITU-R Recommendations that are incorporated by reference. | To add this task in § 2.1.1.  | – communicate to the following WRC a list of the ITU‑R Recommendations containing text incorporated by reference in the Radio Regulations which have been revised and approved during the previous study period. |
| It has been noted that the use of electronic means is also available to groups like Rapporteur groups or Correspondence Groups.  | To amend § 3.1.6 to be as general as possible. | 3.1.6 Electronic means of communication shall be used as far as possible to facilitate the work of Study Groups, Working Parties, Task Groups and other subordinate groups, both during and between their respective meetings. |

## 3.13 Matters related to Resolution structure

| Comment or proposal | Proposed action | Proposed change in Resolution ITU-R 1 |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Annex 1 could begin with a preamble giving a general explanation of the ITU-R and its work.  | To insert an introductory text at the beginning of Part 1.  | The proposed text is based on Article 12 of the Constitution. See Attachment 3.  |
| A Table of Contents should be inserted at the beginning of Annex 1.  | To insert a Table of Contents | See Attachment 3. |
| Section 1 “General considerations” of Part 1 of Annex 1 should be moved at the end of this Part and retitled “Other considerations”.  | Section 1 “General considerations” moved in Section 8 “Other considerations”.  | See Attachment 3 |
| SG 5 Chairman: This comment is basically agreeable. The provision 1.2.3, however, could be transferred to 9.3 in Part 2, since it is closely related to requirements for “contributions”. | Previous provision 1.2.3 (§ 8.2 of Resolution ITU-R 1-6) is moved to Section 10.3 “Contributions to Radiocommunication Study Group studies” into §§ 10.3.2-10.3.5. | 10.3.2 Contributions shall be provided to the Director electronically, with some exceptions for developing countries unable to do so. The Director may return a document that does not comply with the guidelines, for it to be brought into line.10.3.3 Contributions should be sent to the Chairman and Vice‑Chairmen, if any, of the group concerned as well as to the Chairman and Vice‑Chairmen of the Study Group.10.3.4 Each contribution should clearly indicate the Question, Resolution or topic and the group (e.g. Study Group, Task Group, Working Party) for which it is intended, and be accompanied by the details of a contact person as may be needed to clarify the contribution.10.3.5 Contributions should be limited in length (if possible, less than ten pages) and be prepared using standard word-processing software, without using any auto-formatting facility; modifications to existing text should be indicated by means of revision marks (using “Track Changes”). |
| SG 5 Chairman: 3.2 Topics to be carried forward to the next study periodIn provision 2.1.1, footnote 2, currently associated with “existing and new Questions”, would be more appropriately put on the item “topics to be carried forward”, since the text under the footnote discusses a condition for a study initiated without a Question.This footnote may provide a solution to the point addressed in Document RAG14‑1/11 (the criteria between "studies with Questions" and "studies without Questions), implicitly defining that the studies without Questions should be short-term and be completed within one study period. | To move footnote 2 from “existing and new Questions” to “topics to be carried forward”.Footnote 2 remains unchanged.  | – approve, taking into account the priority, urgency and time-scale for the completion of the studies and the financial implications, the programme of work[[2]](#footnote-2)1 (see Resolution ITU‑R 5) arising from the review of:  – existing and new Questions; – existing and new ITU‑R Resolutions, and – topics to be carried forward to the next study period[[3]](#footnote-4)2, as identified in the Study Group Chairmen Reports to the Radiocommunication Assembly; |
| New provision 3.1.4 may be better placed in section 3.2. SG 5 Chairman: The provision 3.1.4, as well as 3.1.5, specifying a basic function of Study Group is better placed in the original position. | No change is proposed. | - |
| New provisions 3.1.5 and 3.1.8 mention certain sub-groups of Study Groups that are defined only later in section 3.2. These provisions should therefore be reworded. SG 5 Chairman: The phrase “defined in § 3.2” may be inserted. | To insert “(defined in § 3.2)” in §§ 3.1.5 and 3.1.8.§ 3.1.5 should also be amended to include Joint Task Groups.  | 3.1.5 When Working Parties, Task Groups or Joint Task Groups (defined in § 3.2) are assigned preparatory studies on matters to be considered by World or Regional Radiocommunication Conferences (see Resolution ITU‑R 2), the work should be coordinated by the relevant Study Groups, Working Parties and Task Groups. The final reports of the Working Parties, Task Groups or Joint Task Groups may be submitted directly to the Conference Preparatory Meeting (CPM) process, normally at the meeting called to consolidate Study Group texts into the draft CPM Report, or exceptionally via the relevant Study Group.3.1.8 Matters of substance, within the scope of a Study Group, may only be considered within Study Groups, Working Parties, Joint Working Parties, Task Groups, Joint Task Groups, Rapporteur Groups, Joint Rapporteur Groups and Correspondence Groups (defined in § 3.2). |
| New provision 3.1.16 may be better placed in sections 12.2 or 12.3 related to the adoption and approval of ITU-R Questions. SG 5 Chairman: The provision 3.1.16 does not directly deal with the adoption/approval procedures of Questions but specifies responsibility of Study Group on Questions. Therefore, it is better placed in the original position. | No change is proposed. | - |
| Concerning the title of New section 5, it was noted that CPM may not be relevant for Regional Radiocommunication Conferences (RRC) since RA-07 has deleted references to RRC from Resolution ITU-R 2.  | The title of Section 4 of Resolution ITU-R 1-6 is “Preparations for World and Regional Radiocommunication Conferences”. It is therefore proposed to suppress the reference to CPM in the title of New section 5. | **5 Preparations for World and Regional Radiocommunication Conferences** |
| Title of section 13.2.2.1 “Principles for the adoption of a new or revised Recommendation” could be reworded to “General considerations on the adoption of a new or revised Recommendation”.SG 5 Chairman: It is acceptable, but it should be noted that the phrase “General considerations” is also used in 13.2.1.  | To reword the title of section 14.2.2.1 “Principles for the adoption of a new or revised Recommendation” into “Main elements regarding the adoption of a new or revised Recommendation”.Note: a similar change is made for Questions.  | **14.2.2.1 Main elements regarding the adoption of a new or revised Recommendation**  |

# 4 Other issues

This section deals with remarks received informal consultations about the correspondence group activities. They are however not included in the proposed draft revision to Resolution ITU-R 1.

A frequent question at the level of Working Parties deals with the status of documents titled “working document towards…”, “preliminary draft…”, “draft…”. Questions often arise whether there are some rules for changing the title of a document from one status to another. It should be commonly understood that these titles do not imply any official status but are indications of the work progress for the membership following the activities of a Working Party. Working Parties are naturally free to change these titles according to the wish of the participants, based on the maturity of the work. Resolution ITU-R 1 may not be the appropriate place to deal with such issues, which concern the internal management of Working Parties but the Director may wish to include some explanations in its guidelines.

Another remark concerns the newcomers in the ITU-R Sector. While an introduction in Part 1 of Annex 1 has been added to broadly explain the role of the Sector and a number of cross-references have been inserted throughout Resolution ITU-R 1 in order to provide as explanations as possible, it should be noted that the Counsellor, an essential element of the work of Study Groups and subordinate entities, is not even named in Resolution ITU-R 1. The presence and roles of the Counsellor could however by presented in the Director’s guidelines, if the Director so wishes.

# 5 Next steps

## 5.1 Consequential modifications in other Resolutions

The modifications in the structure of Resolution 1 imply some consequential modifications to Resolutions ITU-R 5, 43 and 63:

*– resolves* 1 of Resolution ITU-R 5: replace “studies, within the scope of the Study Group, that will be carried out in accordance with § 3.3 of Resolution ITU‑R 1” by “studies, within the scope of the Study Group, that will be carried out in accordance with § 3.1.2 of Resolution ITU‑R 1”

*– resolves* 4 of Resolution ITU-R 5: replace “for the deletion of Questions, where the study has been completed, where no contributions are expected within the next study period, or, in accordance with Resolution ITU‑R 1, § 1.7, where no contributions have been made; such Questions shall be identified as category D” by “for the deletion of Questions, where the study has been completed, where no contributions are expected within the next study period, or, in accordance with Resolution ITU‑R 1, § 4.1, where no contributions have been made; such Questions shall be identified as category D”.

*– resolves* 5 of Resolution ITU-R 43: replace “that an Associate may serve as Rapporteur (see § 2.11 of Resolution ITU‑R 1), within the selected Study Group, except for liaison activities which are to be handled separately” by “that an Associate may serve as Rapporteur (see § 3.2.6 of Resolution ITU‑R 1), within the selected Study Group, except for liaison activities which are to be handled separately”. It should be noted that the reference is outdated even in the current version of Resolutions 1 and 43. The reference was inserted in 2000 but never updated since.

*– resolves* 3 of Resolution ITU-R 63: replace “that a representative of academia, universities and their associated research establishments may serve as Rapporteur (see § 2.13 of Resolution ITU‑R 1)” by “that a representative of academia, universities and their associated research establishments may serve as Rapporteur (see § 3.2.6 of Resolution ITU‑R 1)”.

## 5.2 Suggested inclusion of the proposed new structure in the Report to RA-15

The Chairman of the Correspondence Group suggests that, following discussions during the 2015 meeting of RAG and subject to concurrence by attending administrations, **the proposed new structure be included in the report of the RAG Chairman to the Radiocommunication Assembly** together with a recommendation that Administrations use it for their proposals on Resolution ITU-R 1.

In addition, the issue related to the approval process of Decisions, Reports, Handbooks and Opinions should be highlighted and Administrations should be encouraged to submit proposals in this regard to the Radiocommunication Assembly.
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1. 6 The Radiocommunication Bureau should be consulted in this respect. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. 1 RAG should consider and recommend modifications to the programme of work in accordance with Resolution ITU‑R 52. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. 2 Where a study initiated without a Question is expected to continue beyond the date of the next Radiocommunication Assembly, an appropriate Question should be drafted for approval by the Assembly. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)