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| **Abstract:** | This TD provides the rapporteur's analysis of the changes suggested in [C95](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-C-0095/en). Revision 1 of this TD is the result of the discussion in the RG-WM session held on Tuesday 30 July 2024. |

**Action**: TSAG is invited to use this document to aid the discussion of contribution C95.

Revision 1 of this TD is the result of the discussion in the RG-WM session held on Tuesday 30 July 2024.

Excerpt of [Recommendation ITU-T A.8](https://www.itu.int/rec/T-REC-A.8-202401-I):

|  |
| --- |
| 4 Last call and additional review[…]**4.4.2** If comments, other than those indicating typographical errors, are received by the end of the last call, the study group chair, in consultation with TSB, makes the judgement whether:a) a planned study group meeting is sufficiently close to consider the draft Recommendation for approval, in which case the procedures in clause 4.6 regarding approval at a study group meeting are applied; orb) to save time and/or because of the nature and maturity of the work, comment resolution should be initiated under the direction of the study group chair. This will be accomplished by appropriate study group experts, via electronic correspondence (using the Question, or study group, e-mail reflector) or at meetings. The objective is to develop a stable revised draft, including the disposition of all submitted comments (see clause 4.4.3). If so requested, comments submitters should, normally within six weeks, confirm the resolution of their comments, otherwise the study group chair may consider that the comment resolution is agreeable to all. Revised, edited draft text is prepared, as appropriate, and the procedures beginning in clause 4.4.4 are applied.**4.4.3** If comments, other than those indicating typographical errors, are received by the end of the last call process, the rapporteur, with the assistance of the editor, shall, normally within two weeks of the end of the last call, compile all such comments in a single document, for example in the form of a table (see Annex A), to be used as the basis for completion of the comment resolution process.**4.4.4** After comment resolution is completed, and the revised and edited draft text is made available, the study group chair, in consultation with TSB, makes the judgement whether:a) a planned study group meeting is sufficiently close to consider the draft Recommendation for approval, in which case the procedures in clause 4.6 are applied; orb) to save time and/or because of the nature and maturity of the work, an additional review should be initiated, in which case the procedures in clause 4.5 are applied; orc) a new normative reference has been added to a referenced organization that is not already qualified according to the criteria in Recommendation ITU‑T A.5, Annex B, in which case the procedures in clause 4.6 are applied.**4.5** The additional review encompasses a three-week period and will be announced by the Director. The text (including any revisions as a result of comment resolution) of the draft Recommendation in a final edited form and comments from the last call with their resolution compiled in a single document (for example in the form of a table as suggested in Annex A) must be made available to TSB at the time that the Director makes the announcement of the additional review. Reference shall be provided to the documentation where the text of the draft Recommendation and last call comments to be considered may be found.NOTE – If a new normative reference has been added as a result of comment resolution, a reference to the ITU-T A.5 justification is included in the comment resolution (see Recommendation ITU-T A.5, clause 6.4).**4.5.1** If no comments, other than those indicating typographical errors (misspelling, syntactical and punctuation mistakes, etc.), are received by the end of the additional review, the Recommendation is considered as approved, and the typographical errors are corrected by TSB.**4.5.2** If comments other than those indicating typographical errors, are received by the end of the additional review, then the procedures in clause 4.6 regarding approval at a study group meeting are applied.NOTE – This covers the case where a new normative reference is added as a result of resolution of comments submitted during an AAP additional review, or concerns were expressed about a new normative reference added as a result of resolution of comments submitted during an AAP last call.**4.6** The Director shall explicitly announce the intention to approve the draft Recommendation at least three weeks prior to the study group meeting. The Director shall include the specific intent of the proposal in summarized form. Reference shall be provided to the documentation where the draft text and comments from the last call (and additional review, if relevant) may be found. The text (including any revisions as a result of comment resolution) of the draft Recommendation in a final edited form, and a single document compiling comments from the last call (or additional review) and their resolution (for example in the form of a table as suggested in Annex A) must be made available to TSB at the time that the Director makes the announcement. The edited text of the draft Recommendation from the additional review (or last call if there is no additional review) is submitted for approval by the study group meeting in accordance with clause 5. |
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