

---

<b>Question(s):</b>	<b>Meeting, date:</b>	Kampala, Uganda, 23-25 June 2014
<b>Study Group:</b>	<b>Working Party:</b>	<b>Intended type of document (R-C-TD):</b>
<b>Source:</b>	TSB	
<b>Title:</b>	Summary of TAP comments received on draft Recommendation ITU-T B.100	
<b>Contact:</b>	TSB	Tel: +41 22 730 6356/5591 Fax: +41 22 730 5853 Email: tsbworkshops@itu.int
<b>Contact:</b>		Tel: Fax: Email:

---

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

## ABSTRACT

This document contains information on TAP activities related to draft new Recommendation ITU-T B.100 with questions on how to proceed under provisions of Resolution 1, clause 9 on TAP.

### 1. Consultation of the Member States

Draft new Recommendation ITU-T B.100 was DETERMINED by Study Group 20 on 10 May 2013. The TSB Director ANNOUNCED the intention to apply the procedure described in Resolution 1, Section 9 (WTSA-2012) and to seek approval of draft new Recommendation ITU-T B.100 at the next meeting of SG20 on 10 January 2014.

The Member States were REQUESTED to inform the TSB Director if they assigned authority to SG20 that this draft new Recommendation should be considered for approval at the SG meeting. Further, should any Member States be of the opinion that consideration for approval should not proceed, they should advise their reasons for disapproving and indicate the possible changes that would facilitate further consideration and approval of the draft new Recommendation.

The following responses from the CONSULTATION of Member States were received:

6 Member States agreed to assign authority to SG20

3 Member State did not agree to assign authority to SG20

1 Member State agreed to assign authority to SG20 and also noted that, in its opinion, Recommendation ITU-T B.100 has policy and regulatory implications

**Question:** Can SG20 consider approval of B.100?

### 2. Contributions to the meeting of SG20

Several contributions were received from Member States, Sector Members and Associates of SG20 proposing changes to draft new Recommendation ITU-T B.100. Liaisons from other study groups were also received objecting to approval of B.100 unless specified changes were made to the text.

**Question:** Can SG20 consider these contributions if the Director has already announced the intention to seek approval of the DETERMINED text at the SG20 meeting?

### 3. Study Group DECISION meeting

At the SG DECISION meeting, additional discussions were held, considering the DETERMINED text and subsequent input contributions. The SG prepared revised text for consideration of the SG20 Plenary session. Fill in the right-hand column with a possible course of action that can be taken by SG20, by the Chairman of the SG and/or by the TSB, to continue the approval process, or to stop the approval process.

	Situation	Possible course of action (e.g., continue process, stop process, approve, not approve)
1	10 typographical errors were corrected by the SG.	
2	An inconsistency between the text and a summary table of values was identified. There was consensus that the text was correct. The table was appropriately amended.	
3	A Member State claims the revised text has policy implications but that MS does not object to approval.	
4	Several parameter values were changed, based on input contributions and further discussion by the SG.	
5	Text on a new subject, not considered before, was created during the meeting.	
6	3 Sector Members object to approval of the draft Recommendation.	
7	A representative from the Geneva Mission of a Member State that has never participated in any work on draft Recommendation ITU-T B.100 comes to the SG20 plenary and objects to approval.	
8	A Member State is not sure of its position and is not prepared to allow approval at this meeting. What can the SG do so the approval process does not reject approval of the Recommendation?	
9	The Chairman of SG20 requests the MSs present to indicate if there is any opposition to approval. No MS voices objection.	