

## **Recommendation A.1**

### **WORK METHODS FOR STUDY GROUPS OF THE ITU TELECOMMUNICATION STANDARDIZATION SECTOR (ITU-T)**

*(Geneva, 1956 and 1958; New Delhi, 1960; Geneva, 1964; Mar del Plata, 1968; Geneva, 1972, 1976 and 1980; Malaga-Torremolinos, 1984; Melbourne, 1988; Helsinki, 1993; Geneva, 1996)*

#### **1 Study Groups and other groups**

##### **1.1 Frequency of meetings**

**1.1.1** Study Groups are required to meet to facilitate the approval of Recommendations under the terms of Section 8 of Resolution 1. Such meetings shall only be held with the approval of the Director of the TSB, and with due consideration of the physical and budgetary capabilities of the ITU-T. To minimize the number of meetings required, every effort should be made to resolve questions by correspondence [No. 245 of the Convention (Geneva 1992)].

**1.1.2** In the establishment of the work programme, the timetable of meetings must take into account the time required for participating bodies (Administrations and other duly authorized entities) to react and prepare contributions. Meetings should not be held more frequently than is necessary to make effective progress and should take into account the TSB's capabilities to provide the necessary documentation. A meeting scheduled so that its separation from a preceding meeting, upon which it depends, is less than six to eight months may incur the possibility of full documentation from the previous meeting not being available.

**1.1.3** Meetings of Study Groups having common interests or dealing with problems possessing affinities should, if possible, be arranged so as to enable participating bodies to send one delegate or representative to cover several meetings. As far as possible, the arrangement chosen should enable the Study Groups meeting during the period to exchange any information they may require without delay. Furthermore, it should enable specialists from all over the world in the same or related subjects to have direct contacts with each other of benefit to their organizations. It should likewise enable the specialists concerned to avoid leaving their home countries too often.

**1.1.4** The timetable of meetings shall be prepared and communicated to participating bodies well in advance (one year), to give time to study problems and submit contributions within the prescribed time-limits and to give the TSB time to distribute the contributions. In this way, Study Group Chairmen and delegates will be given the opportunity to consider the contributions in advance, thus helping to make meetings more efficient and reduce their length. A Study Group Chairman, in conjunction with the Director, may schedule short additional Study Group or Working Party meetings for the purpose of making the determination or decision, as appropriate, on a draft new or revised Recommendation.

**1.1.5** Subject to physical and budgetary limitations, Study Groups should be encouraged to schedule interregnum meetings, including their Working Parties, Joint Working Parties or Rapporteur Groups, to conduct ongoing activities within their mandate (2.1.1 of Resolution 1) in the time period between their last meetings before the WTSC and the first meetings after the WTSC, in consultation with the Director of the TSB. Such ongoing activities shall be listed in the report of the last meeting before the WTSC.

## **1.2 Coordination of work**

**1.2.1** A Joint Coordination Group may be formed to coordinate work relating to more than one Study Group. Its primary role is to harmonize planned work effort in terms of subject matter, time-frames for meetings and publication goals (see clause 2).

## **1.3 Preparation of studies and meetings**

**1.3.1** At the beginning of each study period, an organization proposal and an action plan for the study period shall be prepared by each Study Group Chairman with the help of the TSB. The plan should take into account any priorities and coordination arrangements, recommended by the TSAG or decided by the WTSC.

How the proposed action plan is implemented will depend upon the contributions received from the members of the ITU-T and the views expressed by participants in the meetings.

**1.3.2** A Collective Letter with an agenda of the meeting, a draft work plan and a listing of the Questions or proposals under the general areas of responsibility to be examined, shall be prepared by the TSB with the help of the Chairman.

The work plan should state which items are to be studied on each day, but it must be regarded as subject to change in the light of the rate at which work proceeds. Chairmen should try to follow it as far as possible.

This Collective Letter should be received by bodies participating in the activities of particular ITU-T Study Groups, as far as practicable, two months before the beginning of the meeting. The Collective-letter shall include a registration form for these bodies to indicate participation in the meeting. This registration form should be returned to the TSB so that it is received one month before the start of the meeting. The registration form should indicate the names of the expected participants. In the event that names cannot be provided, the expected number of participants should be indicated. Such information will facilitate the registration process and the timely preparation of registration materials. Individuals who attend the meeting without pre-registration may experience a delay in receiving their documents.

If the meeting in question has not been previously planned and scheduled or if an approval of Recommendations is intended to be initiated, a Circular should be received at least three months before the meeting.

**1.3.3** If an insufficient number of contributions or notification of delayed contributions has been submitted, no meeting should be held. The decision whether to cancel a meeting or not shall be taken by the Director of the TSB, in agreement with the Chairman of the Study Group or Working Party concerned.

## **1.4 Conduct of meetings**

**1.4.1** The Chairman shall direct the debates during the meeting, with the assistance of the TSB.

**1.4.2** The Chairman is authorized to decide that there shall be no discussion on Questions on which insufficient contributions have been received.

**1.4.3** Questions which have not elicited any contributions should not be placed on the final agenda of the meeting, and according to provisions of 7.4.2 of Resolution 1 may be deleted if no contributions have been received for the previous two Study Group meetings.

**1.4.4** Study Groups and Working Parties may set up working teams (which should be as small as possible and are subject to the normal rules of the Study Group or Working Party) during their meetings, to study Questions allocated to those Study Groups and Working Parties.

**1.4.5** The following information shall be included in liaison statements prepared at Study Group, Working Party, or Rapporteur Group meetings:

- List the appropriate Question numbers of the originating and destination Study Groups.
- Identify the Study Group or Working Party or Rapporteur Group meeting at which prepared.
- Include a concise title appropriate to the subject matter. If this is in reply to a liaison statement, make this clear, e.g., "Reply to liaison statement from (*source and date*) concerning ...".
- Identify the Study Group(s) and Working Party(s) (*if known*) or other standards organizations to which it has been sent. (*Liaison statement can be sent to more than one organization*).
- Indicate the level of approval, e.g., Study Group or Working Party, or state that the liaison statement has been agreed at a Rapporteur Group meeting.
- Indicate if the liaison statement is sent for action *or* comment *or* information. (*If sent to more than one organization, indicate this for each one.*)
- If action is requested, indicate the date by which a reply is required.
- Include the name and address of the contact person.

The text of the liaison statement should be concise and clear using a minimum of jargon.

An example of the information required in a liaison statement is shown in Figure 1.1.

QUESTIONS:	45/15, 3/4, 8/ITU-R SG 11	
SOURCE:	ITU-T SG 15, Rapporteur Group for Q.45/15 (London, 2-6 October 1997)	
TITLE:	Object Identifier Registration - Reply to liaison statement from WP 5/4 (Geneva, 5-9 February 1997)	
<hr/> <b>LIAISON STATEMENT</b>		
TO:	ITU-T SG 4 - WP 5/4, ITU-R SG 11, ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 6	
APPROVAL:	Agreed to at the Rapporteur Group meeting	
FOR:	WP 5/4 for action; others for information	
DEADLINE:	Deadline for reply - 22 January 1998	
CONTACT:	John Jones, Rapporteur for Q.45/15 ABC Company Anytown, CA USA	Tel: +1 576 980 9987 Fax: +1 576 980 9956 email: jj@abcco.com

**Figure 1.1 – Example of the information required in a liaison statement**

**1.4.6** Liaison statements should be forwarded to the appropriate destinations as soon after the meeting as possible. Copies of all liaison statements should also be sent to the Chairmen of the involved Study Groups and Working Parties and to the TSB, for information.

**1.4.7** For projects involving more than one Study Group, baseline documents may be prepared in order to provide the basis for coordinated study among the various Study Groups. The term "baseline document" refers to a document which contains the elements of common agreement at a given point in time.

**1.4.8** Chairmen will ask, at the beginning of each meeting, whether anyone has knowledge of patents, the use of which may be required to implement the Recommendation being considered. The fact that the question was asked will be recorded in the Working Party or Study Group meeting report, along with any affirmative responses.

## **1.5 Preparation of reports of Study Groups, Working Parties or Joint Working Parties, Recommendations and new Questions**

**1.5.1** A report on the work done during a meeting of a Study Group, Working Party or Joint Working Party shall be prepared by the TSB. Reports of meetings not attended by the TSB should be prepared under the responsibility of the Chairman of the meeting. This report should set out the results of the meeting and the agreements reached in a condensed form and should identify the points left to the next meeting for further study. The number of annexes to the report should be kept to a strict minimum by means of cross-references to contributions, reports, etc., and references to material in the documentation of a Study Group or Working Party. It would be desirable to have a concise summary of delayed contributions (or equivalent) considered by the meeting.

The report should consist of two parts:

- Part I – Organization of work, references to and possible summary of contributions and/or documents issued during a meeting, main results, directive for future work, planned meetings of Working Parties, Sub-Working Parties and Rapporteur groups, and condensed liaison statements endorsed at the Study Group or Working Party level
- Part II – Draft Recommendations or modified Recommendations accepted by the meeting as mature.

**1.5.2** To assist the TSB in this task, the Study Group or Working Party may arrange for delegates to draft some parts of the report. The TSB should coordinate this drafting work. If necessary, the meeting will set up an editorial group to improve the texts of draft Recommendations in the three working languages.

**1.5.3** If possible, the report shall be submitted for approval before the end of the meeting; otherwise it shall be submitted to the Chairman of the meeting for approval.

**1.5.4** When existing and already translated ITU-T texts have been used for some parts of the report, a copy of the report annotated with references to the original sources should also be sent to the TSB. If the report contains ITU-T figures, the ITU-T reference number should not be deleted even if the figure has been modified.

**1.5.5** Individual reports of meetings should be accessible online to appropriate users as soon as electronic versions of these documents are available to the TSB.

**1.5.6** ITU-T participating bodies are authorized to transmit Study Group or Working Party reports and documents to any experts they consider it expedient to consult, except where the Study Group or Working Party concerned has specifically decided that its report, or a document, is to be treated as confidential.

**1.5.7** The report of a Study Group's first meeting in the study period shall include a list of all the Rapporteurs appointed. This list shall be updated, as required, in subsequent reports.

## **2 Study Group management**

### **2.1 Study Group Structure and Distribution of Work**

**2.1.1** Study Group Chairmen shall be responsible for the establishment of an appropriate structure for the distribution of work, the selection of an appropriate team of Working Party Chairmen and shall take into account the advice provided by the members of the Study Group as well as the proven competence, both technical and managerial, of the candidates.

**2.1.2** A Study Group may entrust a Question, a group of Questions or the maintenance of some existing Recommendations within its general area of responsibility to a Working Party.

**2.1.3** Where the scope of the work is considerable, a Study Group may decide to further divide the tasks assigned to a Working Party to Sub-Working Parties.

**2.1.4** Working Parties and Sub-Working Parties should be set up only after thorough consideration of the Questions. Proliferation of Working Parties, Sub-Working Parties or any other subgroups should be avoided.

**2.1.5** A Study Group may exceptionally, by agreement with other relevant Study Group(s) and taking account of any advice from the TSAG and the Director, entrust a Joint Working Party with Questions or parts of Questions of common interest to the Study Groups concerned. This Study Group shall act as the Lead Study Group for the Joint Working Party and shall coordinate and have responsibility for the work concerned. The contributions used as a basis for discussion in the Joint Working Party shall be sent exclusively to those registered in the Joint Working Party. Only the reports shall be sent to all participating bodies of the Study Groups concerned.

### **2.2 Joint Coordination Groups**

**2.2.1** When a broad subject is studied in more than one Study Group, it may require coordination of planned work effort in terms of subject matter, time-frames for meetings and publication goals. When such a broad study can profit from such coordination, it may be accomplished by the establishment of a Joint Coordination Group in consultation with the TSAG. Joint Coordination Groups should be considered only if other, less formal, mechanisms, e.g. a joint meeting of Rapporteurs and/or Working Party Chairmen, have been considered and were not deemed to be effective. The work itself will be conducted in the relevant Study Groups and the results subject to the normal approval processes within each Study Group. The Joint Coordination Group may identify technical problems but will not perform technical studies nor write Recommendations.

**2.2.2** Any Study Group may propose a joint coordination effort, seek approval to act as the Lead Study Group and provide one of its Working Party Chairmen, or exceptionally, one of its Rapporteurs, as the Chairman of the Joint Coordination Group. Any Study Group may also propose that another Study Group take the Lead Study Group role with a liaison message to that Study Group copied to the Director of the TSB, the Chairman of TSAG and the Chairman of that Study Group.

**2.2.3** The proposal to establish a Joint Coordination Group and take the responsibility of Lead Study Group should first be discussed informally among the relevant Chairmen to seek agreement, and then be approved by consensus at a meeting of the Study Group which proposes to take the lead. The TSAG should be so advised by such Study Group to permit the TSAG to monitor such work programme activities and carry out its advisory role.

**2.2.4** The TSAG may also propose a Joint Coordination Group and recommend that a particular Study Group Chairman assume the lead.

**2.2.5** A Joint Coordination Group shall also coordinate with bodies outside the ITU-T concerning the programme effort. Its Chairman, or someone the Chairman designates, shall act as the point of contact concerning the activities of the Joint Coordination Group to supplement Resolution 1 (Geneva, 1996) and Resolution 7 (Geneva, 1996) as well as the A-Series Recommendations concerning cooperation and collaboration with other bodies. For subjects studied also in the Radiocommunication Sector, the JCG should invite and encourage participation by members of that Sector.

**2.2.6** The role of a Joint Coordination Group does not confer any authority upon its members not already provided by the Study Groups involved. A Joint Coordination Group may in exceptional circumstances recommend to the TSAG the reallocation of relevant Questions for involved Study Groups. The decision to make such a recommendation shall be approved by consensus at a Joint Coordination Group meeting to which the relevant Study Group Chairmen must be invited.

**2.2.7** Joint Coordination Groups are open, but (to restrict their size) should, in principle, be limited to designated representatives from the various Study Groups which are responsible for following up actions from the Joint Coordination Group activities within their Study Groups. Others may also attend. All participants should confine contributions to the purpose of the Joint Coordination Group and not discuss technical issues, which are outside the scope of the coordination activity of the Group.

**2.2.8** The initial meeting of a Joint Coordination Group in a study period should be announced in a Collective Letter of the Lead Study Group. Joint Coordination Groups should work primarily by correspondence.

**2.2.9** Meetings should be convened by the Chairman of the Joint Coordination Group.

**2.2.10** Inputs to the work of a Joint Coordination Group should be sent to the Joint Coordination Group Chairman, the Director of the TSB and the relevant, affected Study Group representatives. Procedures for the distribution of materials for work conducted via a correspondence group shall be determined by the Joint Coordination Group.

**2.2.11** Joint Coordination Groups should submit proposals to Study Groups to achieve alignment in the development of related Recommendations by the respective Study Groups.

**2.2.12** Joint Coordination Group reports are issued after each meeting and will be included in the Report series of the Lead Study Group. The TSAG may monitor Joint Coordination Group activities through these reports.

**2.2.13** The TSB will provide support for a Joint Coordination Group, within available resource limits, at the request of the Lead Study Group Chairman.

**2.2.14** A Joint Coordination Group may be terminated at any time. A proposal to do so, including adequate reasons, may be submitted by any Study Group involved or by the TSAG. The Chairman of the Lead Study Group should first informally discuss this proposal among the relevant Chairmen to inform them of the proposal and to seek their views. The decision shall be made by the Lead Study Group, taking into consideration a report of the Joint Coordination Group itself. Termination must be agreed by consensus at a meeting of the Lead Study Group. The TSAG should be advised of any decision resulting from the discussion in that meeting.

## **2.3 The roles of Rapporteurs**

**2.3.1** The Chairmen of Study Groups and Working Parties (including Joint Working Parties) are encouraged to make most effective use of the limited resources available by delegating responsibility to Rapporteurs for the detailed study of individual Questions or small groups of related Questions, parts of Questions, terminology, or amendment of existing Recommendations. Review and approval of the results resides with the Study Group or Working Party.

**2.3.2** Liaison between ITU-T Study Groups or with other organizations can be facilitated by the Rapporteurs or by the appointment of Liaison Rapporteurs.

**2.3.3** The following guidelines should be used as a basis within each Study Group or Working Party to define the roles of Rapporteurs, Associate Rapporteurs and Liaison Rapporteurs; however, they may be adjusted following careful deliberation of the need for change and with the approval of the relevant Study Group or Working Party.

**2.3.3.1** Specific persons should be appointed as Rapporteurs to be responsible for progressing the study of those Questions, or specific study topics, that are felt to be likely to benefit from such appointments. The same person may be appointed as the Rapporteur for more than one Question, or topic, particularly if the Questions, parts of Questions, terminology, or amendment of existing Recommendations concerned are closely related.

**2.3.3.2** Rapporteurs may be appointed (and their appointments may be terminated) at any time with the agreement of the competent Working Party, or of the Study Group, where the Question(s) are not allocated to a Working Party. The term of the appointment relates to the work needing to be done rather than to the interval between WTSCs. If the related Question is modified by the WTSC, for continuity purposes the Rapporteur may, at the discretion of the new Study Group Chairman, continue to progress the relevant work until the next meeting of the Study Group.

**2.3.3.3** Where the work requires it, a Rapporteur may propose the appointment of one or more Associate Rapporteurs or Liaison Rapporteurs, whose appointments should then be endorsed by the relevant Working Party (or Study Group). Again these appointments may be made or terminated at any time in accordance with the work requirements. An Associate Rapporteur assists the Rapporteur, either in general or to deal with a particular point or area of study in a Question. A Liaison Rapporteur assists the Rapporteur by ensuring there is effective liaison with other groups, by attending meetings of other designated groups to advise and assist in an official capacity, by correspondence with such groups or by any other means considered appropriate by the Rapporteur. In the event that a Liaison Rapporteur is not appointed, the responsibility to ensure effective liaison resides with the Rapporteur.

**2.3.3.4** Rapporteurs, and their Associate and Liaison Rapporteurs, play an indispensable role in coordinating increasingly detailed and often highly technical study. Consequently, their appointment should be primarily based on their expertise in the subject to be studied.

**2.3.3.5** As a general principle, work by correspondence (including electronic messaging and telephone communications) is preferred and the number of meetings should be kept to a strict minimum, consistent with the scale and milestones agreed by the parent group. Where possible, meetings in related areas of study or within a work area being managed by a JCG, should be coordinated. In any case this work should proceed in a continuous fashion between meetings of the parent group.

**2.3.3.6** The Rapporteur's responsibilities are:

- to coordinate the detailed study in accordance with guidelines established at Working Party (or Study Group) level;

- to the extent authorized by the Study Group, to act as a contact point and source of expertise for the allocated study topic with other ITU-T and Radiocommunication Sector Study Groups, other Rapporteurs, other international organizations and other standards organizations (where appropriate) and the TSB;
- to adopt methods of work (correspondence including the use of the TSB EDH system, meetings of experts, etc.) as considered appropriate for the task;
- in consultation with the collaborators for the study topic, to establish a work programme, which should be approved and reviewed periodically by the parent group and which lists the tasks to be done, the results anticipated (e.g. titles of possible draft Recommendations), liaison required with other groups and specific milestones, including proposed meetings, for each stage of the work to be completed (see Appendix I for model format);
- to ensure that the parent Working Party (or Study Group) is kept well informed of the progress of the study, particularly of work proceeding by correspondence or otherwise outside of the normal Study Group and Working Party meetings;
- in particular, to submit a progress report to each of the parent group's meetings (see suggested format in Appendix II), where possible this report should be submitted as a white Contribution when substantial progress has been made and where draft new or revised Recommendations are concerned; however, where little or no progress has been made, or the relative timing of meetings requires it, the report may take the form of a Temporary Document available on the first day of the meeting;
- to give the parent Working Party or Study Group and the TSB adequate advance notice of the intention to hold any meetings of experts (see 2.3.3.10 below) particularly where such meetings are not included in the original programme of work;
- to establish a group of active "collaborators" from the Working Party (or Study Group) where appropriate, with an updated list of those collaborators being given to the TSB at each Working Party meeting;
- to delegate the relevant functions from the list above to Associate Rapporteurs and/or Liaison Rapporteurs as necessary.

**2.3.3.7** The basic goal of each Rapporteur is to assist the Study Group or Working Party in developing new and revised Recommendations to meet changing requirements in telecommunication techniques and services. However, it must be clearly understood that Rapporteurs should not feel under any obligation to produce such texts unless a thorough study of the Question reveals a clear need for them. If it turns out that this is not the case, the work should be concluded with a simple report to the parent group establishing that fact.

**2.3.3.8** Rapporteurs are responsible for the quality of their texts, submitted by the Study Group for publication. They shall be involved in the final review of that text prior to it being submitted to the publication process. This responsibility extends only to text in the original language and should take into account applicable time constraints. (See Resolution 3 on Publication of ITU-T Recommendations.)

**2.3.3.9** Rapporteurs should normally base any draft new or substantially revised Recommendations on written contribution(s) from ITU-T members.

**2.3.3.10** In conjunction with their work planning, Rapporteurs must give advance notice of any meetings they arrange, not only to the collaborators on their Question or project, but also to the Study Group (see 2.3.3.11). The TSB is not required to circulate convening letters for meetings below Working Party level.



**2.3.3.11** The intention to hold meetings should be agreed in principle and publicized with as much notice as possible (normally at least two months) at Study Group or Working Party meetings (for inclusion in their reports) and via the TIES system, for example. Confirmation of the date and place of any meeting should be provided to the collaborators (and any other ITU-T members who have indicated an interest in attending or submitting a contribution to the meeting), to the relevant Working Party Chairman and to the TSB at least three weeks prior to the meeting.

**2.3.3.12** Rapporteurs should prepare a meeting report for each Rapporteur meeting held and submit it as a white Contribution, or if the relative timing requires it as a Temporary Document, to the next Study Group or Working Party meeting. This report should include the date, venue and Chairman, an attendance list with affiliations, the agenda of the meeting, a summary of technical inputs, a summary of results and the liaison statements sent to other organizations.

**2.3.3.13** Rapporteur meetings as such, should not be held during Working Party or Study Group meetings. However, Rapporteurs may be called upon to chair those portions of Working Party or Study Group meetings that deal with their particular area of expertise. In these cases Rapporteurs must recognize that the rules of the Working Party and Study Group meetings then apply and the more relaxed rules described above, particularly those that relate to document approvals and submission deadlines, would not apply.

**2.3.3.14** The parent Working Party (or Study Group) must define clear terms of reference for each Rapporteur. The general direction to be followed in the study should be discussed, reviewed as necessary and agreed periodically by the parent group.

## **Appendix I**

(to Section 2, Recommendation A.1)

### **Rapporteur proposed work programme format**

The following format is recommended for a work programme proposed by a Rapporteur in accordance with 2.3.3.6:

- a) parent group and known scheduled meeting dates of parent group;
- b) starting point and goal including references to existing documents;
- c) anticipated results in terms of possible draft new or revised Recommendations (list titles or provide descriptions);
- d) specific tasks involved and milestone schedules;
- e) liaison required with other Groups and schedules for transmitting liaisons and receiving replies;
- f) proposed Rapporteur meetings, if any, for each stage of the work to be completed.

## **Appendix II**

(to Section 2, Recommendation A.1)

### **Rapporteur Progress Report format**

The following format is recommended for the Progress Reports of Rapporteurs to enable a maximum transfer of information to all concerned:

- a) brief summary of contents of report;
- b) conclusions or Recommendations sought to be endorsed;

- c) status of work with reference to work plan including baseline document if available;
- d) draft new or draft revised Recommendations;
- e) draft liaison in response to or requesting action by other Study Groups or organizations;
- f) reference to normal or delayed contributions considered part of assigned study and summary of contributions considered at Rapporteur group meetings (see Note);
- g) reference to submissions attributed to collaborators of other organizations;
- h) major issues remaining for resolution and draft agenda of future approved meeting, if any;
- i) list of attendees at all meetings held since last progress report.

A Progress Report shall not be used as a vehicle to violate the rules concerning the submission of contributions that are inappropriate to the assigned study task.

NOTE – The Progress Report may make reference to the meeting reports (see 2.3.3.12) in order to avoid duplication of information.

### **3 Submission and processing of contributions**

#### **3.1 Submission of contributions**

**3.1.1** Administrations and other duly authorized entities registered with a Study Group or other Group and the Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen of Study Groups and Working Parties should submit their contributions to current studies in accordance with guidance from the Director of the TSB (see Recommendation A.2, clause 2).

**3.1.2** These contributions shall contain comments or results of experiments and proposals designed to further the studies to which they relate.

**3.1.3** Contributors are reminded, when submitting contributions, that the requirements for early disclosure of patent information, as contained in the statement on TSB patent policy (see Appendix I of Resolution 1), apply.

**3.1.4** Material such as text, diagrams, etc., submitted as a contribution to the work of the ITU-T is presumed by ITU to have no restrictions in order to permit the normal distribution of this material for discussions within the appropriate groups and possible use, in whole or in part, in any resulting ITU-T Recommendations which are published. By submitting a contribution to the ITU-T, authors acknowledge this condition of submission. In addition, authors may state any specific conditions on other uses of their contribution.

#### **3.2 Processing of contributions**

**3.2.1** Contributions received at least two months before a meeting shall be published in the normal way and the abstracts posted on the appropriate EDH bulletin board. As far as possible, the Director shall group the contributions received Question by Question, have the necessary translations made and send them to participants in the working language they desire, before the date laid down for the opening of the Study Group or Working Party meeting which has the Question or Recommendation concerned on its agenda.

**3.2.2** If a Chairman, in agreement with the participants of his Study Group (or Working Party), states that his Study Group (or Working Party) is willing to use documents in the original working language, the Director shall send out the documents, grouped as specified in 3.2.1 above, without having them translated.

**3.2.3** Contributions received by the Director less than two months but not less than seven working days before the date set for the opening of a meeting cannot be handled under the procedure outlined in 3.2.1 above and shall be published as "delayed contributions" in the form in which they are received, in their original language only and (where applicable) in the second working language into which they have been translated by the sender. They shall be distributed at the beginning of the meeting only to the concerned participants present. If these delayed contributions contain draft amendments to Recommendations or draft new Recommendations, and if they are received by the Director one month before the date of the meeting, they shall be translated for distribution at the beginning of the meeting.

The abstracts shall also be posted on the appropriate EDH bulletin board.

**3.2.4** As far as possible, participating bodies should advise the TSB about any forthcoming delayed contribution and its contents, at least two months before the meeting.

**3.2.5** Delayed contributions should be available from the TSB at least one full working day before the meeting.

**3.2.6** Contributions received by the Director less than seven working days before the meeting will not appear on the agenda of the meeting, will not be distributed and will be held for the next meeting. Contributions judged to be of extreme importance may be admitted by the Director at shorter notice.

**3.2.7** The Director of the TSB should insist that participating bodies follow the rules established for the presentation, form and timing of documents, set out in Recommendation A.2. A reminder circular should be sent out by the Director whenever appropriate.

**3.2.8** The Director of the TSB, with the agreement of the Study Group Chairman, may return to the contributor any document which does not comply with the general directives set out in Recommendation A.2, so that it may be brought into line with those directives.

**3.2.9** The TSB shall not reissue delayed contributions as normal contributions, unless otherwise decided by the Study Group or Working Party in cases of special interest and importance. Normal or delayed contributions shall not be included in reports as annexes.

**3.2.10** Some contributions of general (and not merely incidental) interest which may, for example, be of some scientific importance (e.g. measurement results), although received too late to be distributed before a meeting and therefore issued as delayed contributions, might exceptionally be distributed later as contributions.

**3.2.11** Contributions should, as far as possible, be submitted to a single Study Group. If, however, a participating body submits a contribution which it believes is of interest to several Study Groups, it should identify the Study Group primarily concerned; a single sheet giving the title of the contribution, its source and a summary of its contents will be issued to the other Study Groups. This single sheet will be numbered in the series of contributions of each Study Group to which it is issued.

**3.2.12** Contributions addressed to interregnum meetings of Study Groups or Working Parties shall be treated in all aspects as those for normal meetings.

### **3.3 Temporary documents**

**3.3.1** Extracts from reports of other Study Group meetings or from reports of Chairmen, Rapporteurs or Drafting Groups received less than two months before the meeting shall be published as temporary documents and distributed during the meeting to participants.

**3.3.2** Temporary documents noted in 3.3.1 above should be available, to the extent possible, one full working day before the start of the meeting.

**3.3.3** Temporary documents containing extracts from reports of other Study Group or Working Party meetings shall not be reissued by the TSB as normal contributions, since they have usually served their purpose at the meeting and some relevant parts may already have been included in the report of the meeting.

**3.3.4** Temporary documents may be produced during the meeting.

#### **3.4 Electronic access**

**3.4.1** Input documents (e.g., contributions, temporary documents and liaison statements) should be accessible online to appropriate users as soon as electronic versions of these documents are available to the TSB.