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This document offers proposals to facilitate the work of ITU-R Study Groups for consideration by the RAG.

# 1 Procedure for purely editorial amendments or correction of ITU-R texts

Resolution ITU-R 1-7 stipulates procedures for editorial amendments of ITU-R Questions and Recommendations. When minor, purely editorial amendments or correction of evident oversights or inconsistencies in the text are necessary during the adoption and approval process, the Director may correct these with the agreement of the Chairman of the relevant Study Group(s) as per §§ A2.5.2.3.6, A2.6.2.1.6 and A2.6.2.3.6.

However, when evident oversights or inconsistencies are found after the adoption and approval, the due process required is to editorially amend them as per §§ A2.5.2.4 and A2.6.2.5 for Questions and Recommendations, respectively. If the same or similar procedure as stipulated in §§ A2.5.2.3.6, A2.6.2.1.6 and A2.6.2.3.6 could also be applied for such purely editorial amendments or corrections, the work of Study Groups would become more efficient.

Japan would like to raise this issue for consideration by the RAG although this may be a matter to be dealt by the Assembly.

# 2 Identification of editorially updated ITU-R texts

When an ITU-R Question or Recommendation has been editorially updated, a footnote is added stating “Radiocommunication Study Group (*nomenclature of Study Group to be inserted as appropriate*) made editorial amendments to this Question in the year (*insert year in which amendments have been made*) in accordance with Resolution ITU-R 1” or “Radiocommunication Study Group (*nomenclature of Study Group to be inserted as appropriate*) made editorial amendments to this Recommendation in the year (*insert year in which amendments have been made*) in accordance with Resolution ITU-R 1” as per §§ A2.5.2.4.2 and A2.6.2.5.2 for Questions and Recommendations, respectively. Since editorial amendments are not regarded as revisions, the version and file name remain unchanged. (Note: Procedures for editorial amendments of ITU-R Reports, Handbooks and Opinions are not given in Resolution ITU-R 1-7.)

This leads to possible confusion to users/readers of ITU-R texts. Depending on the timing, texts with different content, albeit with differences of only an editorial nature, may have been acquired that were distributed using the same filename and indicated to be the same version. In some cases, it is even possible that editorial corrections that are purely correction of typos or oversights may lead to different implementations of the Recommendation.

Such confusion and risk could be avoided if identification and indication were to be made explicitly to editorially updated ITU-R texts by adding a suffix to the version number. For example, first, second, and third editorial updates to bear “a”, “b”, and “c”, respectively, such that Rec. ITU-R BT.2100‑1b would mean the second editorial update to Rec. ITU-R BT.2100-1. This would help readers know which exact version they are referring to.

Japan proposes that the RAG consider such practice for implementation by the BR.

# 3 Mailing lists for Rapporteur Groups and Correspondence Groups

Mailing lists are a useful tool to facilitate the work of groups established in ITU-R including Rapporteur Groups and Correspondence Groups. If the subject field of emails circulated through the mailing lists were to automatically indicate the name of the group and the sequence number of the message in the mailing list, this would facilitate the group members being able to easily identify the relevant email messages.

Japan proposes that the RAG consider such practice for implementation by the BR.

# 4 Inclusion of informative materials in ITU-R Recommendations

Japan submitted proposals to a previous RAG meeting seeking to clarify the status and usage of notes and footnotes as well as Annexes and Attachments contained in an ITU-R Recommendation by modifying “the format of ITU-R Recommendations.” Japan recognizes that the RAG does not see a need to modify the format of ITU-R Recommendations since no difficulties have been encountered with the current format of ITU-R Recommendations.

In relation to this matter, Japan has noted the following stipulations in Resolution ITU-R 1-7:

*A2.1.1.4 Annexes, Attachments, and Appendices to any of these texts should be considered equivalent in status, unless otherwise specified.*

*A2.6.1, NOTE 5 – References to ITU-R Reports in a Recommendation are of an informative nature.*

Japan considers that these imply that an ITU-R Recommendation may contain elements of non-normative or informative nature, and that in such cases clear indications are required of their status. Japan would appreciate any guidance from the RAG on this interpretation.
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