|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATION UNION  **TELECOMMUNICATION STANDARDIZATION SECTOR**  STUDY PERIOD 2022-2024 | | | | TSAG-TD517R1 |
| TSAG |
| Original: English |
| **Question(s):** | | RG-WM | | | Geneva, 29 July – 2 August 2024 |
| **TD** | | | | | |
| **Source:** | | Rapporteur, TSAG Rapporteur group on working methods | | | |
| **Title:** | | Draft Report of the meeting of RG-WM "Working methods" (Geneva, 30, 31 July and 1 August 2024) | | | |
| **Contact:** | | | Olivier Dubuisson Orange France | E-mail: [olivier.dubuisson@orange.com](mailto:olivier.dubuisson@orange.com) | |
| **Contact:** | | | Stefano Polidori TSB; Secretary RG-WM | E-mail: [stefano.polidori@itu.int](mailto:stefano.polidori@itu.int) | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Abstract:** | This TD provides the draft report for the RG-WM sessions (30, 31 July and 1 August 2024) during the TSAG plenary meeting. |

**Action required**: TSAG/WP1 is invited to consider the following actions and to approve this report from RG-WM.

|  |
| --- |
| **Actions for WP1:**   * **Action 1: \_\_\_** * **Action 2: \_\_\_**   NOTE: this section related to actions will be compiled in the last version of this report, before submitting to Working Party 1. |

**TUESDAY, 30 July 2024**

**1 Opening and welcome**

The meeting was chaired by Mr Olivier Dubuisson, Rapporteur of TSAG RG-WM, with the assistance of Mr Stefano Polidori, TSB Counsellor.

The meeting opened on 30 July at 11:15. The Rapporteur welcomed the participants and mentioned that, with regard to the agenda found in TD516R1, the documents between parentheses "(…)" were not meant to be presented but the meeting would do so if requested. Also, the Rapporteur mentioned that in some cases, detailed discussion will occur during ad hoc group sessions or future interim rapporteur group meetings. The Rapporteur also encouraged all delegates to give short intervention and respect a maximum time of two minutes when taking the floor.

The following documents were noted by the meeting:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1.1 | TSB: TSAG interactive remote participation guidelines – Zoom Multilingual | ([TD492](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0492)) | To be considered by remote participants. |
| 1.2 | Supplement 4 to the ITU-T A-series "Supplement on guidelines for remote participation" | ([A Suppl.4](https://www.itu.int/ITU-T/recommendations/rec.aspx?rec=15253)) | To be considered by remote participants. |

**2 Agenda**

The agenda of the RG-WM meeting was adopted as found in TD516R1 with no changes. Mr Philip Rushton confirmed that he will brief RG-WM, when it is planned on this agenda, on results from Council in relation to electronic working methods.

**3 Progress report of interim rapporteur group meetings**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3.1 | Rapporteur, TSAG RG-WM: Progress report from interim TSAG RG-WM meetings | ([TD527](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0527)R1) | RG-WM is invited to **note** this report (including the RGM reports that it references) which has been approved by the WP1 opening plenary.  *Each result will be addressed under the corresponding item of this agenda.* |

The Rapporteur reminded that TD527R1 is the progress report of RG-WM to TSAG and details the advancement of the work pertaining to RG-WM since the latest plenary meeting of TSAG (January 2024).

RG-WM was very proactive and held six interim rapporteur group meetings as reported below. The report of each meeting is also linked in the progress report:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **RG-WM e-meeting** | **Terms of reference** | **Meeting report** |
| 21 Feb 2024 | Draft ITU-T A.RA | [DOC3 (240221)](https://extranet.itu.int/meetings/ITU-T/T22-TSAGRGM/RGWM-240221/DOCs/T22-TSAGRGM-RGWM-240221-DOC-0003.docx) |
| 13 Mar 2024 | Draft A.SupplSGA | [DOC5 (240313)](https://extranet.itu.int/meetings/ITU-T/T22-TSAGRGM/RGWM-240313/DOCs/T22-TSAGRGM-RGWM-240313-DOC-0005.docx) |
| 3 Apr 2024 | Draft ITU-T A.1-rev | [DOC5 (240403)](https://extranet.itu.int/meetings/ITU-T/T22-TSAGRGM/RGWM-240403/DOCs/T22-TSAGRGM-RGWM-240403-DOC-0005.docx) |
| 26 Apr 2024 | Draft ITU-T A.RA | [DOC5 (240403)](https://extranet.itu.int/meetings/ITU-T/T22-TSAGRGM/RGWM-240403/DOCs/T22-TSAGRGM-RGWM-240403-DOC-0005.docx) |
| 14 May 2024 | Draft A.SupplSGA; draft ITU-T A.1-rev | [DOC6 (240514)](https://extranet.itu.int/meetings/ITU-T/T22-TSAGRGM/RGWM-240514/DOCs/T22-TSAGRGM-RGWM-240514-DOC-0006.docx) |
| 2 July 2024 | A Suppl.4; draft A.SupplSGA; draft ITU-T A.1-rev. | [DOC9 (240702)](https://extranet.itu.int/meetings/ITU-T/T22-TSAGRGM/RGWM-240702/DOCs/T22-TSAGRGM-RGWM-240702-DOC-0009.docx) |

The RG-WM noted the progress report (including the RGM reports that it references) which has been approved by the WP1 opening plenary. Each result will be addressed under the corresponding item of this agenda.

**4** [**Rec. ITU-T A.8**](https://www.itu.int/ITU-T/A.8) **"Alternative approval process for new and revised ITU-T Recommendations"**

The following contribution and related TD were discussed:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4.1 | Korea (Rep. of): Proposed modification to Rec. ITU-T A.8 | [C95](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-C-0095/en) | This contribution proposes to facilitate the review process and Recommendation approval by emphasizing the role and responsibilities of the AAP comment submitter aligning those with the responsibilities of the editor and rapporteur.  For discussion. |
| 4.2 | Rapporteur, RG-WM: Document to support the discussion of C95 on Rec. ITU‑T A.8 | [TD628](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0628/en) | This TD provides the rapporteur's analysis of the changes suggested in [C95](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-C-0095/en).  For discussion. |

Korea presented [C95](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-C-0095/en), which was seconded by China Telecom. It proposes to amend Recommendation ITU-T A.8 to facilitate the review process and Recommendation approval by emphasizing the role and responsibilities of the AAP comment submitter aligning those with the responsibilities of the Editor of the Recommendation and relevant Rapporteur.

The Rapporteur presented [TD628](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-240122-TD-GEN-0444/en) which pointed out that in ITU-T A.8 the resolution of comments is done under the direction of the SG chair. The Rapporteur also mentioned that the resolution of comments is currently resolved by the various study groups in multiple ways, which may depend on the culture and best practices of the different study groups. In general we are aware that in most cases the comment resolution is resolved by using electronic means (e.g., via emails), or at meetings (e.g., e-meetings or physical meetings). Also, the comment resolution is held under the direction of the SG chair, as stipulated by ITU-T A.8, who may delegate it to the Rapporteur or the Editor.

Some members expressed views that no changes are needed to clarify the comment resolution process in ITU-T A.8. Other members expressed views that if confirmation is requested to confirm a disposition of comments by a certain deadline, then 2 weeks may not be enough and perhaps 6 weeks may be more appropriated. Some members proposed to have a consistent way to address comment resolution, e.g., standardizing a way to use email reflectors or SharePoint systems of the SGs for communications related to comment resolution.

It was noted that the current in-force text of ITU-T A.8 does not forbid the chair of a SG to consider any option as suggested in C95 or by the various comments expressed.

The SG15 chair informed that SG15 has agreed on a set of guidelines on how to follow up on the comment resolution. In SG15 guidelines, only 5 business days is used to provide a final OK on the agreed disposition of comments.

The meeting agreed to submit a liaison statement to all SGs to gather information on the current way comment resolution is being addressed by the various study groups and collect feedback on this issue.

TD628 will be revised to include some editing agreed during the RG-WM session.

* **Action:**
* **RG-WM agreed to propose to Working Party 1 to issue a liaison statement to all study groups (found in** [**TD669**](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0669/en)**) to gather information on the current way comment resolution is being addressed by the various study groups.**

**5** [**Rec. ITU-T A.25**](https://www.itu.int/itu-t/recommendations/rec.aspx?rec=A.25) **"Generic procedures for incorporating text between ITU-T and other organizations"**

The following contribution was considered:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5.1 | Russian Federation: Further improvement to Rec. ITU-T A.25 Amd.1 proposals | [C101](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-C-0101/en) | This contribution proposes to review the usage of marks, based on TSAG and SG meetings in the last study period, and draft an amendment to Rec. ITU-T A.25.  For **discussion**. |

[C101](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-C-0101/en) was seconded by Belarus, China and Iran. It proposes to develop an amendment to Recommendation ITU-T A.25 clarifying the usage of marks in an external standard to be incorporated (transposed) as an ITU-T Recommendation. In a nutshell, the proposal is to request that the A.25 justification contains a list of all marks used in the external standard.

Some members proposed that any change to ITU-T A.25 in relation to IPR should be consulted with the TSB Director’s IPR ad hoc group. Russia does not believe that their proposal has legal implications, so they do not consider useful to discuss it in the framework of the TSB Director’s IPR ad hoc group. On the contrary, in their view, these proposed updates to ITU-T A.25 could be decided by TSAG without further consultation, noting that Russia do not foresee changes in the current IPR guidelines, which are still applicable. The main reason why the list of marks should be comprehensive lies to the fact that it is up to the membership to decide whether the listed marks pose any issue. Some members also agree that clarifying the list of used marks could be useful. Others believe that providing the list of marks is not needed as these would be visible within the text provided for incorporation.

RG-WM considered that it may be too early to revise or amend ITU-T A.25 considering that it was recently revised. Moreover, there was no consensus that there is a problem to solve and that the list of marks is needed. It was agreed to include this issue (C101) in the living list of RG-WM (TD601R4). It was also agreed that the co-rapporteurs of the TSB Director's IPR ad hoc group will recommend to the TSB Director to consult the IPR ad hoc group electronically on this matter.

* **Action:**
* **RG-WM agreed to include C101 (use of marks in incorporated texts according to ITU‑T A.25) in the RG-WM living list (TD601R4) for further consideration.**
* **RG-WM agreed that the co-rapporteurs of the TSB Director's IPR ad hoc group recommend to the TSB Director to consult the IPR ad hoc group electronically on the issue proposed in** [**C101**](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-C-0101/en)**.**

NOTE – The planned agenda item on **“**[**Author's Guide**](https://www.itu.int/oth/T0A0F000004/en) **for drafting ITU-T Recommendations”** could not be discussed for lack of time and was postponed to the next session of RG-WM.

**WEDNESDAY, 31 July 2024**

**6 Opening and welcome**

The second session of RG-WM was chaired by Mr Olivier Dubuisson, Rapporteur of TSAG RG-WM, with the assistance of Mr Stefano Polidori, TSB Counsellor.

The meeting opened on 31 July at 11:15. The Rapporteur welcomed the participants and mentioned that a revised agenda is available in TD516R2. The revised agenda was approved with no change.

The Rapporteur mentioned that the ad hoc meeting on A.SupplSGA agreed that additional informal consultation is needed on the topic and the results will be reported on Thursday. Anyone interested can contact China Telecom. The preliminary results from the ad hoc was posted as [TD541R2](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0541/en). A further revision of this document is expected as result of the informal consultation and will be posted as [TD541R3](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0541/en).

Also, the result of the previous ad hoc group on Rec. ITU-T A.1 is made available as [TD600R2](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0600/en) and will be reviewed also on Thursday.

The chair informed that the draft report including the results from the 1st RG-WM session is available as [TD517](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0517) and comments could be sent by email to the Rapporteur or the Secretary.

**7** [**Author's Guide**](https://www.itu.int/oth/T0A0F000004/en) **for drafting ITU-T Recommendations**

The following documents were considered:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7.1 | ITU-T Study Group 2: LS/i on using the term "In force" instead of indicating the actual date of approval of the Recommendations in clause 2 references | ([TD566](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0566)) | This Liaison Statement seeks clarification from TSAG regarding the use of the term "in force" in place of an actual approval date for normative references to ITU-T Recommendations.  For **discussion** (see [TD626R1](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0626/en)). |
| 7.2 | ITU-T Study Group 5: LS/r on using the term "In force" instead of indicating the actual date of approval of the Recommendations in clause 2 references | ([TD609](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0609/en)) | SG5 is of the opinion that generally it is important to maintain the publication date in the Recs in clause 2 on references, because it is important to keep track of the date of the Recommendation used when referencing it in the SG5 standards.  The document listed in references are normally used as technical references that can change during years giving problem on the application of a new Recommendation version, for example changing measurement methodology.  For **information**. *(This has been captured in* [*TD626R1*](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0626/en)*.)* |
| 7.3 | ITU-T Study Group 9: Discussion on using the term "In force" instead of indicating the actual date of approval of the Recommendations in clause 2 references | ([SG9-TD700](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-SG09-240509-TD-GEN-0700/en)) | SG9 has not achieved a consensus on this topic yet and would rely on TSAG's decision. While discussing this liaison statement, Q10/9 made some comments captured in their meeting report.  For **information**. |
| 7.4 | ITU-T Study Group 11: LS/r on using the term "In force" instead of indicating the actual date of approval of the Recommendations in clause 2 references | ([SG11-TD1097](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-SG11-240501-TD-GEN-1097/en)) | The practice of SG11 is that when indicating references to other Recs/ Resolutions, it indicates the date (year) when the referenced Rec./Resolution was approved after the title of the Rec./Resolution.  From SG11’s perspective, for ease of reference, it is more appropriate to indicate the approval date of the version of a referenced Recommendation/Resolution.  For **information**. *(This has been captured in* [*TD626R1*](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0626/en)*.)* |
| 7.5 | ITU-T Study Group 15: LS/r on using the term "In force" instead of indicating the actual date of approval of the Recommendations in clause 2 references | ([TD653](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0653/en)) | ITU-T SG15 strongly rejects the use of "in force" instead of indicating the actual date of approval of the Recommendations in clause 2 references.  For **information**. *(This has been captured in* [*TD626R1*](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0626/en)*.)* |
| 7.6 | ITU-T Study Group 16: LS/r on using the term "In force" instead of indicating the actual date of approval of the Recommendations in clause 2 references | ([TD616](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0616/en)) | Most of the 38 texts using the "in force" approach were developed collaboratively with ISO/IEC (video and image compression standards) or with the Continua consortium, and reflect practice in the originating SDOs.  In many cases, the generic reference (e.g., Unicode in ISO/IEC 10646) is justified to minimize the need for text maintenance when details of its application do not impact the ITU-T Recommendation.  SG16 supports the current practice of defining a specific date of approval for a referenced text, so that specific clause references could always be resolved by readers of the Recommendation. Otherwise, SG16 suggests including the date of the reference at the time the Recommendation is issued, with an indication that future editions would be applicable.For **information**. *(This has been captured in* [*TD626R1*](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0626/en)*.)* |
| 7.7 | ITU-T Study Group 20: LS/r on using the term "In force" instead of indicating the actual date of approval of the Recommendations in clause 2 references | ([TD648](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0648/en)) | The practice of SG20 is to use the date of the latest version of any Rec. listed in clause 2 references.  For **information**. *(This has been captured in* [*TD626R1*](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0626/en)*.)* |
| 7.8 | Rapporteur, TSAG RG-WM: Document to support the discussion of TD566 on using the term "in-force" instead of a date in normative references | [TD626R1](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0626/en) | This TD gathers information to aid discussion of [TD566](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0566) (LS from SG2).  For **discussion**. |

[TD566](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0566) is a Liaison Statement from SG2 that seeks clarification from TSAG regarding the use of the term "in force" in place of an actual approval date for normative references to ITU-T Recommendations.

NOTE – The SG2 chair informed that eventually SG2 acted upon this issue by determining the Recommendation in question with using the actual date (instead of using "in force") in the referenced documents. Consequently, item 8 in TD626R1 is deleted as found in [TD626R2](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0626/en).

[TD626R1](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0626/en) gathers information to aid discussion of TD566 (LS from SG2). It includes content provided as reply liaison statements from other study groups and other views.

Considering that:

* most study groups prefer to stay with the current (date of approval) approach;
* the current approach already covers the "(YYYY or later edition)" approach because the [Author's guide for drafting ITU-T Recommendations](https://www.itu.int/oth/T0A0F000004/en) encourages users of the Recommendation "*to investigate the possibility of applying the most recent edition of the Recommendations and other references listed*";
* the "(in force)" approach could break cross-references or create technical incompatibility if a referenced standard evolves whereas the date approach informs implementers that the Recommendation was compatible with the referenced standards at the time of publication;

the meeting agreed:

1. to use the current (date of approval) approach without updating the [Author's guide for drafting ITU-T Recommendations](https://www.itu.int/oth/T0A0F000004/en).
2. in the exceptional cases, e.g. of a common text with ISO/IEC JTC 1 (see Recommendation ITU‑T A.23) or an incorporation of text from another standards development organization (see Recommendation ITU-T A.25), and if there is a strong and justified need to reflect current practice in the originating SDO, the "(in force)" approach could be tolerated. In this case, the need should be documented in the meeting report of the Question for further approval by the study group or working party, as appropriate.

* **Actions:**
* **WP1 is invited to approve the following agreement regarding the use of the term "in force" in place of an actual approval date for normative references in clause 2 of ITU-T Recommendations:**

1. ***It is agreed to use the current (date of approval) approach without updating the*** [***Author's guide for drafting ITU-T Recommendations***](https://www.itu.int/oth/T0A0F000004/en)***.***
2. ***It is agreed that in the exceptional cases, e.g. of a common text with ISO/IEC JTC 1 (see Recommendation ITU T A.23) or an incorporation of text from another standards development organization (see Recommendation ITU-T A.25), and if there is a strong and justified need to reflect current practice in the originating SDO, the "(in force)" approach could be tolerated. In this case, the need should be documented in the meeting report of the Question for further approval by the study group or working party, as appropriate.***

* **RG-WM agreed to propose to Working Party 1 to issue a liaison statement to inform all study groups on the decision regarding the use of the term "in force" in place of an actual approval “date” for normative references to ITU-T Recommendations. The liaison statement is found in** [**TD675**](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0675/en)**.**

**8** [**Rec. ITU-T A.23**](https://www.itu.int/ITU-T/A.23) **"Collaboration with the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) and the International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC) on information technology"**

The following documents were considered:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 8.1 | Korea (Republic of): Need for defining criteria for selecting revision or amendment in ITU‑T | [C92](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-C-0092/en) | This contribution requests clarification on possible issues that may arise when revising/amending a common text between ITU‑T and ISO/IEC JTC 1, and to define criteria for selecting between a revision or an amendment in ITU-T.  *Rapporteur's note: An attempt to define the term "revision" has been made in revised Rec. ITU-T A.1 (see* [*TD600R1*](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0600/en)*).*  For **discussion**. |

[C92](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-C-0092/en) was presented by Korea. This contribution requests clarification on possible issues that may arise when revising/amending a common text between ITU‑T and ISO/IEC JTC 1, and to define criteria for selecting between a revision or an amendment in ITU-T.

The Rapporteur informed that the ad hoc group on ITU-T A.1 has developed a definition of the term "Revision (of an ITU-T Recommendation)". Also, editorial clarifications were included in the definition of "Amendment".

TSB clarified that amendments, corrigenda and revisions of texts developed jointly with ISO/IEC JTC 1 under the provisions of Rec. ITU-T A.23, Annex A, follow the same approach in ITU-T, ISO and IEC:

1. ITU-T publishes amendments and corrigenda in full (integrated) text for ITU-T-only Recommendations. The amended text is shown in revision marked version.
2. In case of amendments or corrigenda to common texts with ISO/IEC JTC 1, the delta approach is used, i.e., only the portion of the text that is amended is published and the changes are clearly indicated.
3. In case of twin texts (i.e., technically aligned but published separately by each organization), the practice in ITU-T may vary, depending on how frequently new editions are prepared. Therefore both the previous cases 1 or 2 may be applied.
4. Revisions of existing common texts and twin texts are published as full (integrated) texts in new editions (without revision marks), which integrate inter alia all previously approved amendments and corrigenda.
5. As for ITU-only texts, the document history on the cover page material indicates new editions as major version numbers (e.g. 2.0) and amendments/‌corrigenda as minor version numbers (e.g. 2.1, 2.2, etc.).

In conclusion, there are no inconsistencies to address. The SG17 chair was of the same understanding. Accordingly, RG-WM can continue with developing a definition of the term "revision" in ITU-T A.1.

* **Action:**
* **RG-WM agreed to propose to WP1 to issue a liaison statement to inform all study groups on the current publication process of amendments, corrigenda and revisions to ITU-T Recommendations | ISO/IEC JTC 1 international standards in both ITU-T and ISO/IEC JTC 1. The liaison statement is found in** [**TD674**](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0674/en)**.**

The following document was noted:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 8.2 | Liaison officer to ISO/IEC JTC 1: Report of the ISO/IEC JTC 1 Plenary (Darwin, Australia, May 2024) | ([TD640](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0640/en)) | See Resolution 13 "Reconstitution of Ad Hoc Group 7, Supplement Alignment": The ISO/IEC Joint Directives Maintenance Team (JDMT) is working on the alignment of Supplements to the ISO and IEC Directives. The result should be considered in the future update of Rec. ITU-T A.23 | ISO/IEC JTC 1 Standing Document 3.  For **information**. |

**9 Draft new Recommendation ITU-T A.RA "Appointment and operations of registration authorities"**

The following documents were noted:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 9.1 | Rapporteur, TSAG RG-WM: Draft new Recommendation ITU-T A.RA "Appointment and operations of registration authorities" | ([[TD571](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0571/en)R1](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0571/en)) | This is the latest draft based on discussions at the 21 Feb 2024 and 26 Apr 2024 rapporteur group meetings. It also includes changes suggested in a contribution to the RG-WM rapporteur meeting held on 2 July 2024.  For **discussion** at an interim rapporteur group meeting (see [agenda item 20](#Suggested_RGMs)). |
| 9.2 | ITU-T SG2: LS/r on further review of draft Rec. ITU-T A.RA (reply to TSAG-LS37) | ([TD565](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0565/en)) | This liaison statement replies to TSAG’s request to consider further the amended text of draft Rec. ITU-T A.RA. It raises issues that **require clarification**.  *Note: Comments have been included in* [*TD571R1*](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0571/en) *for further discussion.* |
| 9.3 | ITU-T SG11: LS/i progress of SG11 on work item ITU-T Q.TSCA | ([TD584](mailto:https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0584/en)) | ITU-T SG11 continues close collaboration with ITU-T SG17 and ITU-T SG2 on the "Requirements for issuing end-entity and certification authority public-key certificates for enabling trustable signalling interconnection between network entities in support of existing and emerging networks".  For **information**. |
| 9.4 | ITU-T SG2: LS/r on new work item ITU-T Q.TSCA (reply to SG11-LS156) | ([TD605](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0605/en)) | Building upon the exchange of liaison statements, Q1/2 has established a new work item on draft new Recommendation ITU-T E.RAA4Q.TSCA "Registration authority assignment criteria to issue digital public certificates for use by Q.TSCA".  For **information**. |

The Rapporteur briefly informed on the latest developments on this issue. It was agreed to discuss this issue at two rapporteur group e-meeting on 21 Jan 2025, 12:00-15:00 Geneva time and 18 Feb 2025, 12:00-15:00 Geneva time.

**10 Electronic working methods (EWM)**, co-led with the Associate Rapporteur on remote participation and electronic working methods

The following documents were noted:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 10.1 | Director, TSB: Electronic working methods services and database applications report | [TD498](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0498) | This TD describes actions taken since the last January 2024 TSAG meeting to improve electronic working methods and tools for the membership.  For **information**. |
| 10.2 | Director, TSB: Electronic working methods (EWM): MyWorkspace improved fenefits for users | [TD658](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0658/en) | This document describes actions taken since the last TSAG January 2024 meeting to improve electronic working methods and tools for the membership.  For **information**. |
| 10.3 | ISCG, Chair: Report of the Inter-Sector Coordination Group on issues of mutual interest | ([TD623](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0623/en)) | See clause 2.3.3 "Virtual meetings / Remote participation".  For **information**. |
| 10.5 | Liaison officer to ISO/IEC JTC 1: Report of the ISO/IEC JTC 1 Plenary (Darwin, Australia, May 2024) | ([TD640](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0640/en)) | See Resolution 16 "Use of AI bots and recording tools during meetings".  For **information** in relation to Supplement 4 to the A-series. |

The following document was considered:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 10.4 | Report by the Secretary-General: Remote participation in line with the implementation of Resolution 167 (Rev. Bucharest, 2022) | ([Council-C24/61](https://www.itu.int/md/S24-CL-C-0061/en)) | This document provides a report on the status and role of participants in physical meetings with remote participation and in fully virtual meetings at ITU.  For **information**. |

The Associate Rapporteur reported that the Council has discussed the rights of remote participants at meetings with physical participation including remote participation. Many issues were clarified by Council, including the fact that chairs should always be physically present. Also, remote participants do not have rights to vote or raise point of orders, etc. Participants were invited to read the [Council Document C24/61](https://www.itu.int/md/S24-CL-C-0061/en) for more details.

Council decisions were noted. A Rapporteur group meeting of RG-WM is proposed on 4 March to possibly update A-series Supplement 4 in case contributions are received.

The Russian Federation requested TSB to report to next TSAG on the status of solving long-standing problems with the sync tool. TSB confirmed they will do so.

**11 Development of standards that are machine applicable, readable and transferable (also known as SMART standards) in ITU-T**

The following documents were noted:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 11.1 | ITU-T Study Group 17: LS/i on utilization of tools to produce Recommendations | [TD557](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0557/en) | SG17 is asking the following questions to RG-WM:   * What are the current requirements, limits and constraints of using of tools like metanorma, liquid and GitHub?  *Rapporteur's note: See* [*TD627*](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0627)*.* * Could RG-WM discuss how to address the following questions (e.g., engage TSB, call for contributions):   + Are there other SDOs using such tools? (SG17 identified IETF, ISO and [Owaspai](https://owaspai.org/))   + In particular, what is the status of the ISO SMART standards project? *Rapporteur's note: See* [*TD602*](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0602)*.*   + Is it possible to build an inventory of such tools across a relevant amount of SDOs?   For **discussion**, *including**at an interim rapporteur group meeting (see* [*agenda item 20*](#Suggested_RGMs)*)*. |
| 11.2 | Rapporteur, TSAG RG-WM: Living list | ([TD601R1](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0601)) | [WTSA-20 Proceedings](https://www.itu.int/pub/T-REG-LIV.1-2022/en) (V-2.2 – Committee 3, clause 2.2.2): Draft new Resolution [ECP‑3] – Development of standards that are machine applicable, readable and transferable (SMART) in ITU-T  [EUR/38A35/1](https://www.itu.int/md/dologin_md.asp?lang=en&id=T17-WTSA.20-C-0038!A35-L1!MSW-E) proposed a new Resolution to ask ITU-T to support the development of technical SMART standards, including working with other international SDOs to develop common architectures and protocols for SMART standards.  Participants raised interests and questions on this new subject of SMART standards, and it was felt that such innovative work should be trialled out by study groups first before WTSA takes any resolution. The meeting noted that lack of WTSA Resolution does not mean lack of permission for ITU-T to consider defining new methodologies or developing machine readable standards and concluded that no need to adopt this proposed new Resolution.  For **information**. |
| 11.3 | ITU-T Study Group 2: LS/r on utilisation of tools to produce Recommendations (reply to SG17-LS108) | ([[TD](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0577/en)606](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0606/en)) | SG2 does not currently use tools such as Metanorma, Liquid and GitHub/GitLab.  But when developing management interface Recs, Q7/2 uses some tools to check the syntax to ensure that the interface definitions are implementable (e.g., Axis to check web services interfaces; Swagger to check YAML/JSON-based RESTful interfaces).  SG2 is open to exploring the use of these collaborative tools for developing Recommendations.  SG2 suggests that TSAG may provide guidance for using such tools for all study groups, including possible IPR issues, and may also provide some facilities for all relevant study groups to use in the future.  For example, providing a database of implementable interface definition source codes associated with specific Recs. (*Rapporteur's note: This is* [*already available*](https://www.itu.int/ITU-T/recommendations/fl.aspx)*.)*  For **information**. |
| 11.4 | ITU-T Study Group 11: LS/r on utilisation of tools to produce Recommendations (reply to SG17-LS108) | ([TD577](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0577/en)) | SG11 doesn’t use tools such as Metanorma, Liquid and GitHub/GitLab. However, collaborative tools for developing Recommendations will be very helpful for SG11 work on implementation, especially on the signalling and protocol related Recommendations.  For **information**. |
| 11.5 | ITU-T Study Group 12: LS/r on utilisation of tools to produce Recommendations (reply to SG17-LS108) | ([TD567](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0567/en)) | Since 2017, SG12 is using GitHub for open source development in relation with Rec. ITU-T G.191.  The Microsoft Word-centric nature of the ITU‑T standards development process and strong reliance on track changes features appear to be incompatible with the Metanorma tool.  For **information**. |
| 11.6 | ITU-T Study Group 16: LS/r on utilisation of tools to produce Recommendations (reply to SG17-LS108) | ([TD573](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0573/en)) | SG16 does not currently use tools such as Metanorma, Liquid and GitHub to aid in the development of Recommendations on video coding.  For **information**. |
| 11.7 | ITU-T Study Group 20: LS/r on utilisation of tools to produce Recommendations (reply to SG17-LS108) | ([TD647](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0647/en)) | Currently, SG20 does not use tools such as relevant open-source platforms to support the development of Recommendations.  For **information**. |
| 11.8 | Rapporteur, TSAG RG-WM: Update on the ISO/IEC joint SMART project (in relation to TD557) | ([TD602](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0602)) | This TD provides information about the ISO/IEC joint SMART project. SMART refers to the formats, processes, and tools necessary for a user (human and technology-based) to interact with standards.  For **information**. |
| 11.9 | Rapporteur, TSAG RG-WM: Additional information to support the discussion of TD557 | ([TD627](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0627/en)) | This TD provides information gathered by the RG-WM Rapporteur to support the discussion of TD557.  For **information**. |

[TD557](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0557/en) was presented by the SG17 chair.

After some discussion, it was agreed to discuss this issue at a rapporteur group e-meeting on 18 Feb 2025, 12:00-15:00 Geneva time. Also, it was agreed to issue a liaison statement to all SGs so that experts on this topic will be aware of the meeting and may plan to join. It was agreed that the RG-WM Counsellor would also liaise with JCA-AHF secretariat with the purpose to send the invitation also to the JCA-AHF mailing-list.

* **Actions:**
* **RG-WM agreed to propose to WP1 to issue a liaison statement to inform all SGs on the agreed interim RGM of RG-WM on 18 February 2024 to discuss standards that are machine applicable, readable and transferable, so that experts would be able to join. The liaison statement is found in** [**TD676**](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0676/en)**.**

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_