

Voting Rights - Analysis 1 - Version 0.0.1

PCG

This documents captures comments on voting rights proposals. Please provide comments on the discussion topics below by 2021-11-21 17:00 CET.

1 Solution Preferences

Indicate what your preferred and acceptable solutions are. If the solution is dependent on whether it is Annex I or not, you can also indicate that: #6(I) = Solution #6 if in Annex I, #6(B) = Solution #6 if in the body of the WPs, #6 = Solution #6 and it doesn't matter where it is placed. Note: acceptable means you can live with it even if you don't necessarily like it.

Feedback Form 1: Indicate preferred and acceptable solutions

1 – BT plc

BT's preferred solution is to use the check-in mechanism, solution 6, for the time until Annex I is rescinded. If we ultimately move to a more mixed-mode of operation we need a much bigger change perhaps with the removal of Annex I and a more root-and-branch analysis of how meetings should be conducted, changing status of e-meetings from ad-hoc to something else. It makes sense for the community to continue to require commitment from members in order to obtain voting rights, But the simplest solution is to keep the rules as they are but allow check-in for major meetings that replace face to face meetings, and continue with the existing voting rights rules (gain on 2nd attendance, lose after 3 skipped attendances). BT would propose to start this on a given date and not do any retrospective analysis for gain or loss of voting rights, so voting rights gain or loss would be based only on those meetings where check-in is provided. We believe that this is the simplest solution and one that can be easily implemented and understood by the community. We could also live with solution 7 (check in instructions only provided on a call) or solution 10 (Temporary assigned by PCG) but these would be complicated to set up. We believe that all other solutions are either too complicated or do not take into account some level of commitment to 3GPP.

2 – Guangdong OPPO Mobile Telecom.

Preferred solution #6(I) with slight modification i.e. at least one check in is sufficient

Acceptable solution #7(I) with slight modification i.e. at least one check in with right code is sufficient

3 – HuaWei Technologies Co.

Our view is that it is critical to ensure the commitment of IMs to 3GPP. We think none of the proposed e-meeting voting right accrual mechanisms on the table can sufficiently match the level of commitment from IMs by sending delegates to physical meetings. Thus we think a combination of several mechanisms is needed. In addition, taking into account the PCG guidance and considering the required MCC work, we feel a **combination of following elements** may get us somewhere close to (but still not quite similar to) the level of commitment by IMs for physical meetings.

- **Element 1:** line 6 “Voting rights accrued by checking in”, and
- **Element 2:** line 7 “Voting rights accrued by checking in with a code provided on a conference call”, and

- **Element 3:** Increase the number of continuous e-meeting attendance (e.g. to 6) to gain voting rights and reduce the number of continuous e-meeting absence (e.g. to 1) to lose voting rights, and
- **Element 4:** line 10 “PCG grants temporary rights per organisation by application from that organisation”,

With such a combination, the IMs fulfilling elements 1/2/3 shall be reviewed by PCG, and PCG gives the final “yes/no” answer on whether the IMs gain the voting rights.

As we commented earlier, our view is that the e-meeting voting right accrual mechanism is **only applicable when Annex I is activated**.

4 – Nokia Germany

We agree with many of the fundamental comments raised by Huawei above.

We also believe solution 6 is a simple and acceptable method for recording presence in E-meetings for the purposes of gaining voting rights. However, in itself this method is insufficient.

An expanded voting rights accrual and maintenance mechanism (from the current F2F-based mechanism) is needed to take into account E-meeting presence. We believe E-meeting presence is substantially inferior compared to F2F presence (in terms of proving commitment), hence E-meeting presence shall be weighted lower than F2F presence.

An open and transparent checking of newly acquired voting rights in PCG is a good mechanism to ensure continued integrity of the 3GPP voting lists. A simple process should be developed for this.

We also agree that the expanded voting rights accrual and maintenance mechanism would need to go to Annex I. We will always have the option later to move this mechanism to the main body of the WP if so desired.

5 – Samsung R&D Institute UK

Samsung believes #6(I) is a basic means to support check in, though this sets the bar low. Thus, we support the development of on-line check-in as well, during a meeting CC as per #7(I). Checking in during a meeting session after all is the means used to establish meeting attendance in face to face meetings. It is also advisable to capture changes to the voting list and send these to PCG for approval, #10(I).

6 – Apple France

Apple prefers a simple solution and therefore is in favour of solution 6 (Voting rights accrued by checking in). This is a familiar procedure to delegates and is aligned to how things work in a face-to-face meeting. We also prefer this solution to be applicable only when Annex I is activated.

7 – VODAFONE Group Plc

The existing 3GPP F2F voting rights appear to have served 3GPP adequately over the last 20 years so we would like to adopt a solution that is closely aligned with what we see as their ethos: namely a reasonable commitment to, and engagement in, 3GPP’s work. Hence options 2 (ETSI), 3, 11,(ATIS) are not preferred, while options 7 (check in code) and 8 (attend call) seem to be the most appropriate. In an ”electronic world” option 6 (and 13 and 14) feel too similar to option 9 (registration), so we would prefer something that shows more commitment.

As I hope that we will soon (a mere 8 months now :-)) return to face to face meetings, this ought to be a temporary issue, so option 10 ”application to PCG” is also very attractive - and it avoids any ”tool development” by MCC.

Option 12 (probing) would NOT be acceptable, as we have never had to attend every hour/minute of every meeting - and, for example, in which of the 3 parallel RAN 1 web sessions would the probe be sent?

Options 4 (contribution) and 5 (email) are just likely to lead to useless meeting load, and also bad for companies/organisations that attend our meetings to understand and/or use our standards.

A couple of companies have mentioned the 'algorithm' for gaining and losing voting rights: this does seem worthy of further study (e.g. we should not miss an e-meeting due to being unable to get a visa for travel)!

8 – Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software

The current bar to attain voting rights at f2f meetings requires a level of commitment to specific working groups including meeting registration and attendance. Clearly through use of online meetings, attendance is not an attainable commitment factor. Our preference to address accrual of voting rights for online meetings going forward from the solutions analysed below is as follows.

Solution #6, preferred based on simplicity and familiarity. Provides good correlation to existing f2f procedures, although with a lower attendance requirement. During activation of Annex I this lower attainment level may be acceptable due to limited time before f2f resumes? Should be simple to implement as similar to existing procedure.

very closely followed by Solution #7 if stronger attainment for attendance is preferred or anticipated duration for continuation of online meetings is longer [than a year?]. Similar to solution #6 but adds extra aspect to capture registered delegate attendance. Slightly more complex than soln#6 with small additional step.

We think the above should be adopted when annex I is implemented, but may be also acceptable if some hybrid online/f2f meeting organisation is adopted going forwards although some aspect weighting may be necessary in this future scenario.

However, if the adoption of the final solution by 3GPP takes too much time and an up to date voting list is required in a more immediate time frame then application of a retrospective mechanism to establish a temporary (but more accurate than current) voting list should be supported. This could be done through use of a review of past [2021?] meeting registration lists, e.g. retrospective application of Solution#9.

It is noted that applying a retrospective assessment to the actual registration list may closely reflect IMs interested in a group as no voting rights were expected.

9 – T-Mobile Austria GmbH

Deutsche Telekom is still of the opinion that the simplest thing of gaining voting rights is the proposed line 3 (solution #3), i.e. every 3GPP member shall have voting rights regardless of physical presence, virtual physical presence (like it is done in collocated meetings) or e-meeting. one can expect a short transition period, where everybody is trying to vote everywhere, but this will balance out over time. All other solution proposals at the end are never exactly representing the attendance nor the amount of eligible votes, especially also the current regime for f2f meetings is at the end not reflecting actual attendance (voting rights pile up with changing 'organization represented'). Solution #3 is the most fair and simple way to represent voting rights, easy and fast to implement.

All other solutions will take a lot of time on discussions and agreeing on implementation options, fighting over wording of the text to describe the solution and in some cases even tools to be generated, until the need for a solution is gone again.

10 – Qualcomm Incorporated

Qualcomm believes that solution#6(I) is a simple and acceptable starting point. We do, however, agree with others that the bar for recording presence at e-meetings is rather low and does not reflect the same level of commitment from IMs as sending delegates to physical meetings. Perhaps other techniques, such as a nominal fee per e-meeting attendee (similar to what is done in IETF and IEEE) or a “click-through” disclaimer, may raise the bar slightly. As for the check-in period, a straightforward solution is to limit it to the duration of the officially scheduled online (GTW) session(s).

We also agree that a simple oversee by PCG of newly acquired voting rights is fine for transparency.

Finally, we believe any changes to the WP as a result of this analysis should be done in the existing Annex I, for the time being.

11 – ZTE Corporation

(1) As mentioned by HuaWei, We understand it is critical to ensure the commitment of IMs to 3GPP. So we have to keep in mind that our objective is to come up with a mechanism which can reflect IMs’ commitment and accrue voting rights instead of seeking simplest solutions. With such objective in mind, we understand solutions in which the voting rights can be accrued by simply clicking a button/link would not be acceptable to us.

The following solutions would be preferred from our side as IMs’ commitment can be fully reflected:

–Solution#4 (Contribution) with modification - Voting rights accrued for at least one contribution sourced or co-sourced by an IM, and only contributions treated or agreed count.

–Solution#7 (Check In Code) with modification- Voting rights accrued by checking in with a code provided on a conference call, Such checking in with a code within a certain time duration, 30 minutes or one hour, which can be declared before the conference call or by the chair during the conference call.

–Solution#8 (Attend Call) with modification- Voting rights accrued by attending at least one conference call, there can be some pause during the GTW session, e.g. 5-10 minutes, and the chair can declare it is time for attendance confirmation and a short break for everyone, which will not distract delegate’s attention but allow time for delegates to take some rest and continue the discussion in a better state.

(2) It is also fine if we would like to have combination of the above solutions or have solution #10 as the final check point in addition to any of the above solutions or solution combinations.

(3) Also to emphasize that the e-meeting voting right accrual mechanism is only applicable when Annex I is activated.

12 – NOVAMINT

First, we would like to outline several points

- We believe the fact to subscribe to 3GPP is already a **huge commitment** of IMs to 3GPP especially for many companies for which telecom is not the core business (and standardisation is far away from their priorities) and we should welcome them and even encourage them to be more active not finding ways to restrict their involvement.

- Many new comers in 3GPP in particular verticals have interests in several 3GPP groups but may not be able to have the resources to follow all these groups though they have other ways to show their interests (co-signing contributions, participating to workshop in or out of 3GPP...).
- Linking commitment of IMs to 3GPP solely to the participation to meetings will only favour more and more big companies who will have the resources to be involved everywhere – real standardization will be losing on the long run.
- We do not believe for one second that if you have voting rights everywhere, you will exercise it and that you will exercise this right for a group for which you have no interest or you do not know anything about. Even, currently with e-meeting and e-vote, you need a strong effort from a delegate to vote (needs to cast the vote at the right time, to follow the results, to be involved in the different rounds...) so the delegate who is voting is motivated and knows why he or she is voting for. And no one is going to do the effort to vote for a group for which there no interest. Actually, even when the delegate is not very involved in a group, it is often an opportunity for candidates to an election to discuss and exchange with this delegate and share their views. It is a formidable opportunity to trigger the involvement of an IM in such a group and emulate a more global apprehension of what is 3GPP as a whole and to be motivated to make 3GPP successful and its solutions deployed in real life (not the standardization for the sake of standardization).

3GPP including in its in voting rights needs to embrace the transformation of the telecom world and allow a fair representation of all the companies whatever their size and with a clear representation of the whole value chain.

Therefore, we believe that the fairest approach and our favourite solution is that all companies have the voting rights for the whole 3GPP and they need to register to the group(s) they want to exercise those rights and basically have an interest in.

2 Candidate Solutions

Provide comments on the proposed solutions. The solution numbering is the same as the excel sheet

Solution#2 (ETSI) - Voting rights accrued via email list subscription

Detailed Description: Each IM has a Point of Contact (PoC). If that PoC is on the main email list for a group, the the IM has voting rights for that group. If the PoC forgets to renew and drops off the list, the IM loses voting rights (note that PoC is used since e-mail addresses are not associated with IMs)

Variation/Options: Provide a mechansim for registering e-mail addresses as associated with a given IM.

Feedback Form 2: Comments on Solution #2 (ETSI)

1 – BT plc

Complicated to implement and quite a large change for the community to understand. Not favoured.

2 – Guangdong OPPO Mobile Telecom.

The bar is too low since it can be done in few minutes and last for long period and can't reflect the attendance of a meeting properly

3 – T-Mobile USA Inc.

T-Mobile USA thinks is a complicated method to determine participation and is not appropriate to the given problem that is trying to be solved.

4 – Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software

Not preferred. A PoC may alternate between different IM entities for different meetings of the same group in order to acquire and maintain each IM entity with voting rights in successive meetings. Complicated to implement and not directly relevant to meeting participation

5 – Samsung R&D Institute UK

The bar is too low. This would also have the unintended side effect of (artificially) substantially increasing the number email list subscription participants for several / all groups. In the past large numbers of participants on mailing lists has led to server performance problems. This is the last thing we need during e-meetings.

6 – ETSI

MCC - complexity analysis of the proposed check-in system:

High Complexity:

An email list subscription is linked to an EOL account which is linked to the hiring company, not the represented company.

We will need to develop a link between the meeting registration list (i.e. represented company, which may change every meeting) and the email list subscription.

MCC - complexity analysis of changes to voting tool:

Low complexity:

Adaptation of voting tool to take into account e-meetings and remote attendance.

7 – VODAFONE Group Plc

Bar is much lower than existing process, and, seems complex to administer. Not preferred.

8 – NOVAMINT

Voting to an election is a 3 steps process in general:

- Having the voting rights
- Registering for voting
- Exercising your voting right

For example, in many countries when a young person is reaching the right age, this person has the right to vote but he or she can only exercise this right if he or she is registered (city, county, country...).

So, we believe that all IMs should have the right to vote for the whole 3GPP but that a form of registration would be necessary.

So we believe a process similar to email list subscription should be used but not the email list subscription per se. The issue with the “email list subscription” is that it is linked to delegate of the IM not to the

company itself and we should not force to “subscribe” to those emails in order to have voting rights as you can end up with a tsunami of emails (some delegates who are already registered to several email lists are ending up often in receiving around 300 to 800 emails a day certain week)

We propose that each company registers to a dedicated page its interest in the different groups and implicitly the right to vote to these groups.

Of course, we should not encourage to register/subscribe explicitly to all groups. We would propose to have an email sent for confirming the registration for each group a IM has subscribed to. And similar to “email list subscription”, this could be renewed regularly.

Additionally, we could imagine that if a delegate of an IM is subscribing to an email list then the IM registration to groups page is updated accordingly (we could imagine as well that registration to a meeting will as well do the same).

Such a scheme will create new opportunities as well which will be very valuable for 3GPP. We could imagine that the responsible in the IM for the subscription to the group(s) will be receiving “regular” news on the life of the group. Similar the leadership of such groups could contact the IM about their interest in their group especially for those who are newcomers or are not regularly attending meetings and start to engage the conversation.

Solution#3 (Open) - Voting rights accrued for all IMs

Detailed Description: Voting rights criteria eliminated. Any IM can vote in any group in any vote.

Notes: Used also by ARIB and TTA

Feedback Form 3: Comments on Solution #3 (Open)

1 – BT plc

It’s an easy option but would be a major change for 3GPP where the principle has always been that some level of commitment is required to gain voting rights.

2 – Guangdong OPPO Mobile Telecom.

The bar is too low and can’t reflect the attendance of a meeting properly

3 – T-Mobile USA Inc.

T-Mobile USA is not opposed to this idea. But it is a major shift from 3GPP culture and tradition. Could it lead to more votes and less efforts to achieve consensus? Possibly and that is a concern.

4 – Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software

Easy to implement. Voter may need to be present to vote but does not necessarily indicate any level of interest or participation within group at any other time in order to accrue the voting right.

5 – Samsung R&D Institute UK

The bar is too low. With this approach, there could be reduced willingness to compromise, as it may be possible to achieve one's goals by forcing a technical vote instead. The participants of this vote would be only in small part stakeholders in the actual work of the group.

6 – ETSI

MCC - complexity analysis of the proposed check-in system:

No complexity:

No modification required for the check-in system

MCC - complexity analysis of changes to voting tool:

Low to medium complexity:

Adaptation of voting tool to allow all IMs to vote.

7 – VODAFONE Group Plc

Please see our response to the first question. Not preferred.

If adopted, I would imagine that "horse trading" could ensure that no technical vote would ever exceed the 70% pass criteria.

8 – T-Mobile Austria GmbH

Deutsche Telekom preferred solution.

Easy, fast, in time, almost no tools needed, will level off after initial rush.

9 – NOVAMINT

We believe that all IMs should have the right to vote for the whole 3GPP but that a form of "simple" registration to each group of interest would be necessary.

The 3 issues to address if all IMs have voting right are:

- Quorum
- Proxy for F2F meeting
- Candidacy to election

For the quorum, we believe this is solved by having a formal registration to the groups. Registration may need to be done with a certain time before the meeting where the election will take place (3 months?).

For the proxy for F2F meeting (do not make sense for e-meeting), we can in this case link this to at least a participation to a meeting in the previous 12 months or we can simply suppress the proxy.

For the Candidacy to election, we believe we could link this to at least a participation to a meeting in the previous 12 months' even if it is very unlikely that a candidate not having participate to a group will be ever elected.

Solution#4 (Contribution) - Voting rights accrued for at least one contribution

Detailed Description: If a contribution is submitted to a meeting that is sourced or co-sourced by an IM, then that meeting counts towards voting rights. Note that contributions currently often come from company groups, not individual IMs.

Feedback Form 4: Comments on Solution#4 (Contribution)

<p>1 – BT plc</p> <p>This option is against the mandate given by the PCG. It will encourage "junk" contributions that will only get in the way of progress in 3GPP. This option should be discarded.</p>
<p>2 – Guangdong OPPO Mobile Telecom.</p> <p>A company group could have several IMs in 3GPP. It is possible that one delegate will present a contribution from another IMs of the same company group due to team work. To force submitting a contribution to get voting right could increase the papers of the WGs artificially</p>
<p>3 – T-Mobile USA Inc.</p> <p>T-Mobile USA agrees with BT. Having a requirement to submit contribution will not create quality contributions, it will simply exacerbate the huge problem we have now with so many contribution.</p>
<p>4 – Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software</p> <p>Not preferred. Promotes contribution for the sake of gaining a vote. Multiple IM entities may cosign an individual contribution to claim vote for each entity. Multiple co-signees may create additional tracking or monitoring issues.</p>
<p>5 – ATIS</p> <p>ATIS believes that this solution is incompatible with the guidance from PCG/OP not to encourage undesirable behaviour in 3GPP participants or to give rise to artificial meeting workload.</p>
<p>6 – Samsung R&D Institute UK</p> <p>Samsung agrees with the previous postings 1-5.</p>
<p>7 – ETSI</p> <p><u>MCC - complexity analysis of the proposed check-in system:</u></p> <p>High Complexity: A sourcing company (as it appears in the Tdoc list) is not necessary the same as the represented company of the delegate submitting the contribution. We need to link the delegate's EOL account (i.e. contact person in the tdoc list) to the meeting registration list (i.e. represented company). Also, how do we treat co-sourced contributions ?</p> <p><u>MCC - complexity analysis of changes to voting tool:</u></p> <p>Low complexity: Adaptation of voting tool to take into account e-meetings and remote attendance</p>
<p>8 – VODAFONE Group Plc</p> <p>Not preferred. This will just cause useless work!</p>

9 – T-Mobile Austria GmbH

Deutsche Telekom: This will lead to a lot of dummy contributions in already overloaded meetings. COuld be fine for KPI driven companies, but disturbs the delegates and the progress of meetings.

10 – ZTE Corporation

To reflect companies' commitment and also avoid unnecessary contributions, we would prefer to have only contributions **treated or agreed** to be counted to accrue voting rights.

11 – NOVAMINT

It is important to recognize that IMs are committed by other way than participating effectively to a meeting in particular by co-signing contributions.

However, we believe it is not practical to link voting rights to contributions and may lead to unwanted output such as forcing to have contribution and it is not the only way to show involvement.

Anyway, you could have some companies actively participating to a meeting which are not necessary providing a contribution and the contributions may not be even treated (which should not be translated in no voting rights)

Solution#5 (Email) - Voting rights accrued for at least one email

Detailed Description: If an email is submitted on the mail e-mail list of a group then the current or upcoming meeting counts towards voting rights for that IM. Note that currently e-mails are not tied to IMs.

Variations/Options: E-mail might need to explicitly state what IM they are coming from. Should this also include auxiliary e-mail lists? An alternative is to provide a mechansim for registering e-mail addresses as associated with a given IM

Feedback Form 5: Comments on Solution#5 (Email)

1 – BT plc

This option is against the mandate given by the PCG. It will encourage "junk" emails that will only get in the way of progress in 3GPP. This option should be discarded.

2 – Guangdong OPPO Mobile Telecom.

Firstly one IM can join email discussion only if he has registered the reflector of that WG i.e. even without registration to that meeting. In addition there are tons of email discussions during emeeting. We doubt its technically feasibility

3 – T-Mobile USA Inc.

Again T-Mobile USA does not think this is an appropriate way to gauge ones participation in a WG. It will only increase the voluminous email traffic.

4 – Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software

similar to solution #4 but may promote unnecessary or junk emails purely to accrue voting rights. Also similar problem to Solution #2, in that individual email may not be tied to one IM entity so additional complexity likely in order to maintain accurate IM entity tracking and voting qualification.

<p>5 – ATIS</p> <p>ATIS believes that this solution is incompatible with the guidance from PCG/OP not to encourage undesirable behaviour in 3GPP participants or to give rise to artificial meeting workload.</p>
<p>6 – Samsung R&D Institute UK</p> <p>Samsung agrees with the previous postings 1-5 on this question.</p>
<p>7 – ETSI</p> <p><u>MCC - complexity analysis of the proposed check-in system:</u></p> <p>High Complexity: Similar to case 2 (based on email list subscription) with the additional task/complexity of tracking emails sent in an emailing list.</p> <p><u>MCC - complexity analysis of changes to voting tool:</u></p> <p>Low complexity: Adaptation of voting tool to take into account e-meetings and remote attendance</p>
<p>8 – VODAFONE Group Plc</p> <p>Not preferred. This will just cause useless work!</p> <p>Also, linking an email address to an Individual member might not be easy (e.g. for some consultants representing IMs).</p>
<p>9 – ZTE Corporation</p> <p>In some WGs, companies’ comments are mainly uploaded in the draft folder to reduce the amount of emails over the reflector. Solution 5 moves towards the opposite direction and would not be helpful in making progress as we are seeking consensus and would not expect companies not fully involved in the discussion to send emails saying “no” or “objection” only to accrue voting rights.</p>

Solution#6 (Check In) - Voting rights accrued by checking in

Detailed Description: This procedure is similar to the current f2f check-in procedure. The delegate clicks on a link that is provided as part of the registration confirmation. The token is unique to the delegate and must be submitted during the meeting window.

Variations/Options: For f2f meetings the check in window runs from when the meeting starts until it ends. For e-meetings it could be different (e.g., during GTW sessions, include the pre-meeting periods, etc.)

Feedback Form 6: Comments on Solution#6 (Check In)

<p>1 – BT plc</p> <p>BT believes that this is the simplest solution as mentioned in the answer to the first question.</p>
<p>2 – NIST</p> <p>NIST prefers to keep the f2f and e-meeting the same except checking in is allowed remotely instead of doing it in the meeting room via 10.10.10.10</p>

3 – Guangdong OPPO Mobile Telecom.

This is simple solution which mimic F2F meeting properly. we support this solution

4 – T-Mobile USA Inc.

T-Mobile USA believes this to be the best, simplest solution. It would be easy to implement and is inline with how voting rights are obtain in a face to face meeting.

5 – HuaWei Technologies Co.

As we said in "section 1 solution preferences", 6, 7, and 10 should be combined with adapted formula for e-meetings to ensure a certain level of commitments to 3GPP. please refer to that part for our ideas.

6 – Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software

Noted as very similar to existing f2f mechanism, but with reduced attendance commitment. Bar to attain voting rights is relatively low as no meeting participation is guaranteed, but process is familiar and mostly exists already.

As pointed out by NIST ability to submit from remote location would be needed in addition to current mechanism. Token is unique to delegate IM entity as submitted for registration to the meeting and therefore unambiguous. Limited time window would be appropriate for submission of token, e.g. during GTW sessions or other clearly advertised registration window.

Acceptable as tightly aligned with existing mechanism

7 – Nokia Germany

This is a simple and acceptable method for recording presence in E-meetings for the purposes of gaining voting rights. However, in itself this method is insufficient, it needs to be put in holistic context of a revised set of rules for accrual and maintenance of voting rights. Further comments in Clause 4.

8 – Samsung R&D Institute UK

While this approach is similar to checking in at a physical meeting, it does not imply attendance alone. This should be a part of the approach recommended, but alone it is insufficient in that anyone could check in remotely even without any involvement or even 'presence' in the meeting whatsoever.

9 – ETSI

MCC - complexity analysis of the proposed check-in system:

Low complexity (without consideration for the variant/option):

Modification of the current system to support remote checking.

For the variant, the complexity is **medium** as we need to develop a mechanism that allow the TO to open/-close the registration window.

MCC - complexity analysis of changes to voting tool:

Low complexity:

Adaptation to take into account e-meetings and remote attendance

10 – VODAFONE Group Plc

Please see our answer to the first question: this approach seems to be virtually the same as "meeting registration" and it really does not show the level of commitment that "check in" at a F2F meeting required. A better solution is really needed.

11 – NOVAMINT

We believe that the participation/check-in to a meeting should not be the unique way to show commitment to 3GPP. And anyway, at the end, you will not do an extra effort to vote for a group which has no interest for you. So, we believe we should go for simpler and fairer solution such as voting rights for all + registration.

At least, a registration/check-in to a subgroup (i.e. RAN1) should give you the right to vote as well for the main group (i.e. RAN)

Solution#7 (Check In Code) - Voting rights accrued by checking in with a code provided on a conference call.

Detailed Description: A code is provided at the beginning of the meeting. The check in procedure is modified so that in addition to clicking the check-in link, the delegate must also provide the code. This ensures that the delegate is actually attending the meeting (or is in contact with someone who is)

Variations/Options: For f2f meetings, only a single check in is required. It would be possible to have multiple codes (e.g., different codes for different days) and require multiple check ins. Codes could potentially also be provided in NWM or e-mail discussions.

Feedback Form 7: Comments on Solution#7 (Check In Code)

1 – BT plc

BT could live with this solution. It is slightly more complex than solution 6 but would mean a higher bar - more commitment by an IM to the meeting to gain voting rights.

2 – Guangdong OPPO Mobile Telecom.

The solution is a bit complicated than solution 6 but we can accept it.

3 – T-Mobile USA Inc.

Could be complicated, but would be agreeable to T-Mobile USA and secondary approach. Solution 6 is our preferred solution.

4 – HuaWei Technologies Co.

7 should be combined with 6 and 10, please see our comments in "section 1 solution preferences".

5 – Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software

See this as similar to solution#6, but with additional code submission required, using a unique code only available during the meeting which may provide a better indication of meeting participation, although code could be shared to reduce attendance necessity. Use of closely managed submission window live during online call may minimise ability to share outside of meeting participants particularly in some time

zones. Requires both ability to submit presence token remotely (as in Soln#6) plus extra code submission window/step to be implemented.

6 – Samsung R&D Institute UK

A code divulged during the meeting may help improve the degree to which the check in process reflects actual 'presence' in the meeting. This is a modest improvement over Solution #6. Samsung favors this approach, combined with additional measures to 'raise the bar' (e.g. additional final review, as per solution#10.)

7 – ETSI

MCC - complexity analysis of the proposed check-in system:

Medium Complexity:

The current check-in System uses personal tokens to identify the different delegates.

This system needs to be modified to support a combination of meeting unique verification code (i.e. the code provided in the conference call) and user identification (e.g. via EOL login or personal token).

MCC - complexity analysis of changes to voting tool:

Low complexity:

Adaptation to take into account e-meetings and remote attendance

8 – VODAFONE Group Plc

This is similar to attending a F2F meeting> However, the code would need to be available throughout the meeting, not just for the opening session/opening few minutes.

(Active) attendance for one topic is sufficient to gain voting rights in a F2F meeting and the same should apply in an electronic era.

9 – T-Mobile Austria GmbH

Deutsche Telekom: could be feasible, but still needs some process and procedures, and a tool to generate the code and validates this, which might delay implementation.

10 – ZTE Corporation

We understand it is one way to reflect IM commitment by attending the conference call.

But we would like to allow such checking in with a code within a certain time duration, 30 minutes or one hour, which can be declared before the conference call or by the chair during the conference call.

11 – NOVAMINT

more complicated than #6 - to avoid

Solution#8 (Attend Call) - Voting rights accrued by attending conference call

Detailed Description: The participants report from the GTM sessions are correlated with the registration list and the list of participants is derived from the list of registered delegates who are verified as participating according to GTM/GTW.

Variations/Options: GTM participants that cannot be matched to the registration list and informed and given a chance to change their GTM name

Feedback Form 8: Comments on Solution#8 (Attend Call)

1 – BT plc

BT is not in favour of this solution. It is complicated to administer and delegates have not shown willingness to adopt requirements to adopt the naming conventions requested by the existing chairs, also different naming conventions are requested by different chairs, so delegates are already confused which naming convention to use for a particular meeting.

2 – Guangdong OPPO Mobile Telecom.

It is not very clear how can participating GTW session be verified efficiently. If it relies on the list in the GTW session without checking manually that any delegate is online, it seems no difference from solution#6. If it relies on manual checking, then it will waste a lot of meeting time which is not acceptable

3 – T-Mobile USA Inc.

T-Mobile USA believes this is overly complicated, would negatively impact the work that 3GPP staff already has to do and would be prone to errors with no way to adequately state one's case if a mistake were thought to have occurred.

4 – Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software

Not clear how GTM registration credentials can be reliably aligned with meeting registration credentials in terms of delegate registered IM entity. Requires strict alignment between GTM registration and Meeting registration fields which currently appear unrelated. GTM registration does however provide for unique access link per registrant so potentially could harvest a unique and accurate GTM attendance record, but presumably will require further assistance from GTM owner to achieve true attendance record.

Seems complex and requires several new steps to ensure reliability. Not clear that the results, when compared to other schemes presented here justify this additional development and complexity.

5 – Samsung R&D Institute UK

This solution sets the bar for gaining voting rights too low, as joining a conference call is so easy and implies in no way that one is participating in a meeting. Further, as other comments have indicated, the conference tools do not readily provide information to generate an attendance list reliably or easily.

6 – ETSI

MCC - complexity analysis of the proposed check-in system:

High Complexity:

Similar to case 2 (based on email list subscription), where we replace email subscription by the list extracted from GTM/GTW. In other words, we need to create the link between the email list extracted from GTM/GTW and the meeting registration list (i.e. represented companies).

MCC - complexity analysis of changes to voting tool:

Low complexity:

Adaptation to take into account e-meetings and remote attendance

7 – VODAFONE Group Plc

This seems the closest to how F2F meeting rights work, so this would be a good solution (assuming that the GTM/GTW tools can provide reliable attendance lists).

8 – T-Mobile Austria GmbH

Deutsche Telekom: This might not work with e-meetings, which don't have GTM/GTW calls. However, the tools are not reliable enough to correctly represent the attendance list and might not register all users (e.g. phone call).

9 – ZTE Corporation

Acceptable with some modification: There can be some pause during the GTW session, e.g. 5-10 minutes, and the chair can declare it is time for attendance confirmation and a short break for everyone, which will not distract delegate's attention but allow time for delegates to take some rest and continue the discussion in a better state.

10 – NOVAMINT

We believe that the participation to a meeting should not be the unique way to show commitment to 3GPP especially in our digital age. And anyway, at the end, you will not do an extra effort to vote for a group which has no interest for you. So, we believe we should go for simpler and fairer solution such as voting rights for all + registration to groups of interests (not conf call).

At least, a participation to a call of a subgroup (i.e. RAN1) should give you the right to vote as well for the main group (i.e. RAN).

Solution #9 (Registration) - Voting rights accrued by registration

Detailed Description: A delegate is assumed to be participating in the meeting if they have registered for the meeting.

Feedback Form 9: Comments on Solution #9 (Registration)

1 – BT plc

BT could live with this solution but it does not demonstrate much commitment to the project.

2 – Guangdong OPPO Mobile Telecom.

The bar is too low and can't reflect the attendance of a meeting properly

3 – T-Mobile USA Inc.

T-Mobile USA thinks this is not a good way to accrue voting rights as it does not demonstrate that any effort to understand, monitor, or actively engage with the topics in a WG are needed to obtain the right to vote on decisions made in that WG. This could lead to more votes at Plenary levels and reduce the ability to achieve a true consensus of the participants.

4 – Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software

Sets the bar for voting rights attainment fairly low but this bar seems higher than for soln#2 and soln#3. Tracking meeting organisation is required but attendance is not required. Meeting registration can enable individual IM entity interests to be tracked.

If used to retrospectively assess IM interest to WG meetings with some additional weightings e.g. last 3 meetings, this could be usefully employed. Noting that past meeting registration reflects actual interest as

no expectation regarding voting right accrual has been made.

5 – Samsung R&D Institute UK

This solution sets the bar for acquiring voting rights too low. Even in F2F meetings, many register for the meeting and do not show up.

6 – ETSI

MCC - complexity analysis of the proposed check-in system:

No complexity:

No modification required

MCC - complexity analysis of changes to voting tool:

Low complexity:

Adaptation to take into account e-meetings and remote attendance

7 – VODAFONE Group Plc

This seems to set the "commitment to 3GPP" bar at too low a level.

8 – T-Mobile Austria GmbH

Deutsche Telekom: acceptable solution, easy to implement and fast.

9 – NOVAMINT

We believe that the participation to a meeting should not be the unique way to show commitment to 3GPP especially in our digital age. And anyway, at the end, you will not do an extra effort to vote for a group which has no interest for you. So, we believe we should go for simpler and fairer solution such as voting rights for all + registration to groups of interests (not conf call).

However, the solution of registering to a meeting is an acceptable solution as a compromise.

Solution #10 (Temporary) - PCG grants temporary rights per organization by application from that organization

Detailed Description: An IM submits a request to the PCG to be granted temporary voting rights. The PCG grants or denies the request.

Variations/Options: Voting rights could be bestowed for a certain calendar time (e.g., 6 months) or for a certain voting issue or election. Will the PCG have a recommended criteria for granting/denying requests? Will the whole PCG decide or just the PCG leadership or a PCG subgroup?

Feedback Form 10: Comments on Solution #10 (Temporary)

1 – BT plc

This feels workable but would take additional time and effort and perhaps it's not worth it. In addition this would mean that the voting list remains stale with companies who have left 3GPP still having voting rights from 2019. BT can live with this solution.

2 – Guangdong OPPO Mobile Telecom.

PCG eventually will also face same problem we are discussing here. They are not magician :)

3 – T-Mobile USA Inc.

T-Mobile USA: Don't we have this now? If this were a solution, then why has it not already been done? And if it was done, why has not everyone affected by the current circumstances obtained voting rights in the groups in which they have been participating?

4 – HuaWei Technologies Co.

10 should be combined with 6/7, please see our comments in "section1 solution preferences".

5 – Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software

Whilst on the face of it may provide for simple mechanism, it is not clear how to establish consistent and non-controversial guidelines for PCG to make such decisions, e.g. based on what criteria?

Presumably applications would be based on per group per organisational entity basis and have limited application time requiring reapplication for all organisations on an regular basis. Frequency and timing between applications and possible appeal process needs to be considered to establish fair and reliable process.

Possibly too subjective and inconsistent, requiring establishment of criteria and process to implement, and may result in frequent updating of records.

6 – ATIS

With hundreds of companies and many working groups ATIS does not believe this is a scalable solution and may involve a lot of administrative effort for the PCG and IMs. Without objective criteria the PCG will have to make subjective decisions which might be controversial and may lead to inconsistency and accusations of bias.

7 – ETSI

MCC - complexity analysis of the proposed check-in system:

No complexity:

No modification required

MCC - complexity analysis of changes to voting tool:

High Complexity:

Currently voting rights are calculated automatically by the voting tool based on past attendance.

Changes are required to the voting tool, to allow granting voting rights manually based on PCG decision.

8 – Samsung R&D Institute UK

A report on changes of voting lists per group over time to PCG would be useful, especially compared to past voting rights developments (before the pandemic.) This would enable PCG to the result of the decision we take and could enable a form of quality control. In light of this information, PCG can periodically reevaluate whether to enable voting rights in e-meetings at all, or decide to change the approach by which voting rights are acquired.

9 – VODAFONE Group Plc

This is an attractive solution provided that there is some prospect of returning to F2F meetings (and the 3GPP calendar indicates that this prospect does exist), and, provided it is only used for "genuine cases" rather than company groups that "messed up their voting status in November/December 2019".

I've seen emails from a few companies complaining about lost voting rights, and, most of them seemed to have a simple and decent case to present (for example, them having submitted documents that were actually treated in the meeting).

10 – T-Mobile Austria GmbH

Deutsche Telekom: could work, but based on what criteria should the PCG decide on. Will it be consensus based decision, is there room for political maneuvers? Lots of open issues and takes time to implement, also due to the PCG meeting frequency.

11 – ZTE Corporation

The following solutions would be preferred from our side as IMs' commitment can be fully reflected:

–Solution#4 (Contribution) with modification - Voting rights accrued for at least one contribution sourced or co-sourced by an IM, and only contributions treated or agreed count.

–Solution#7 (Check In Code) with modification- Voting rights accrued by checking in with a code provided on a conference call, Such checking in with a code within a certain time duration, 30 minutes or one hour, which can be declared before the conference call or by the chair during the conference call.

–Solution#8 (Attend Call) with modification- Voting rights accrued by attending at least one conference call, there can be some pause during the GTW session, e.g. 5-10 minutes, and the chair can declare it is time for attendance confirmation and a short break for everyone, which will not distract delegate's attention but allow time for delegates to take some rest and continue the discussion in a better state.

It is also fine if we would like to have combination of the above solutions or have solution #10 as the final check point in addition to any of the above solutions or solution combinations.

12 – NOVAMINT

Could work as well a bit like the registration to groups of interests that we proposed in #2. But the rules for admission should be fair, equal for all and communicated explicitly.

Solution#11 (ATIS) - Voting rights based on membership but lost if the member does not vote in an ANSI letter ballot four consecutive times. Regained 21 days after re-application in writing.

Detailed Description: All IMs initially start out with voting rights in all groups. But can lose the voting rights for a group if they do not vote in 4 votes. They can then petition (to the MCC) to have their voting rights reinstated after a waiting period of 21 days.

Variations/Options: Alternative measures of non involvement could be used such as not registering for 2 meetings or missing 2 votes

Feedback Form 11: Comments on Solution#11 (ATIS)

1 – BT plc

This does not feel appropriate for 3GPP, too different and too complex to be worthwhile.

<p>2 – Guangdong OPPO Mobile Telecom.</p> <p>The bar is too low and can't reflect the attendance of a meeting properly</p>
<p>3 – T-Mobile USA Inc.</p> <p>T-Mobile USA: Too complex</p>
<p>4 – ATIS</p> <p>Note that this solution is only submitted as information about the policy in ATIS. ATIS does not advocate this solution for 3GPP.</p>
<p>5 – ETSI</p> <p><u>MCC - complexity analysis of the proposed check-in system:</u></p> <p>No complexity: No modification required to check-in process</p> <p><u>MCC - complexity analysis of changes to voting tool:</u></p> <p>High Complexity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Changes to the voting tool to track past votes and modify the voting rights accordingly. - Add the possibility to reinstate votes manually after receiving written request.
<p>6 – Samsung R&D Institute UK</p> <p>This approach sets too low a criteria to obtain voting rights.</p>
<p>7 – VODAFONE Group Plc</p> <p>This would seem to encourage a voting culture rather than "3GPP consensus". This is not preferred. (But thank you, ATIS, for sharing the information on your process.)</p>
<p>8 – NOVAMINT</p> <p>not preferred due to encouraging voting rather than consensus</p>

Solution#12 (Probe) - Delegates "probed" online periodically to ensure that they are attending the meeting

Detailed Description: A challenge of some form is sent to delegates and they are expected to respond to ensure they are actually attending the meeting

Variations/Options: Is it a general challenge sent to all delegates or are the challenges individualized? How often are the challenges? How long are you given to respond? How many can be missed?

Feedback Form 12: Comments on Solution#12 (Probe)

<p>1 – BT plc</p> <p>This feels very complex and intrusive, much more intrusive than F2F meetings - BT is not in favour of this solution.</p>
--

2 – Guangdong OPPO Mobile Telecom.

we think it is overkilling solution to reflect attendance

3 – T-Mobile USA Inc.

T-Mobile USA: Probing is too intrusive. Not every topic is of interest to every delegate and some may step away from a meeting for personal needs. If a probe were to occur at that time a non-response would not be representative of what is happening for that delegate.

4 – Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software

Very intrusive and raising attendance monitoring to 3GPP online meetings above other delegate work commitments for entire duration of online activity (which may also occur during delegates personal time). Application to multiple parallel sessions for individuals seems to require even greater levels of complexity - not in favour of this approach

5 – ETSI

MCC - complexity analysis of the proposed check-in system:

High Complexity:

We need to develop the "probing" system which we do not have today.

MCC - complexity analysis of changes to voting tool:

Low complexity:

Adaptation to take into account e-meetings and remote attendance

6 – Samsung R&D Institute UK

This approach would force delegates to behave in a way that is far beyond normal and reasonable expectations at a face to face meeting. It is not a reasonable 'solution' to acquiring voting rights at e-meetings.

7 – VODAFONE Group Plc

This is not an acceptable solution. It should be possible for a company to only attend a part of a meeting (especially when many web meetings are held at anti-social hours).

8 – ZTE Corporation

The following solutions with modification can be considered to ensure delegates are attending the meeting:

–Solution#7 (Check In Code) with modification- Voting rights accrued by checking in with a code provided on a conference call, Such checking in with a code within a certain time duration, 30 minutes or one hour, which can be declared before the conference call or by the chair during the conference call.

–Solution#8 (Attend Call) with modification- Voting rights accrued by attending at least one conference call, there can be some pause during the GTW session, e.g. 5-10 minutes, and the chair can declare it is time for attendance confirmation and a short break for everyone, which will not distract delegate's attention but allow time for delegates to take some rest and continue the discussion in a better state.

9 – NOVAMINT

seems to be the "police of attendance" - not at all in favour

Solution#13 (NWM Check in) - Same as (6) but use NWM to provide the check in link to delegates

Detailed Description: A NWM single document is prepared before the meeting that contains individualized check in links for all the registered IMs. The delegates would click on the link for the IM they represent.

Variations/Options: Can a document other than NWM be used?

Feedback Form 13: Comments on Solution#13 (NWM Check in)

<p>1 – BT plc</p> <p>This seems to add complexity but no value. BT is not in favour of this solution.</p>
<p>2 – Guangdong OPPO Mobile Telecom.</p> <p>compared to solution #6 or #7 this add extra job for both MCC and delegates</p>
<p>3 – T-Mobile USA Inc.</p> <p>T-Mobile USA: We see no value in this approach considering there is already a token system in place.</p>
<p>4 – Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software</p> <p>Seems intention is to provide for meeting attendance via only nwm tool.</p> <p>As existing mechanism is still activated by delegate being required to register for meeting this additional link generation within an nwm document seems to add unnecessary complexity. In addition extra safe guards to ensure delegate can only select appropriate IM link are required.</p> <p>Overall adds complexity and work load with no clear benefits over some of the other proposals.</p>
<p>5 – ETSI</p> <p><u>MCC - complexity analysis of the proposed check-in system:</u></p> <p>Medium Complexity: Complexity similar to 7. The current check-in System uses personal tokens to identify the different delegates. The current system need to be modified to support a combination of meeting unique verification code (i.e. the code provided in the conference call) and user identification (e.g. via EOL login or personal token).</p> <p><u>MCC - complexity analysis of changes to voting tool:</u></p> <p>Low complexity: Adaptation to take into account e-meetings and remote attendance</p>
<p>6 – NOVAMINT</p> <p>too complicated and no added value</p>

Solution#14 (NWM List) - Delegates check in by adding a comment to a specific NWM sheet that is just to prove attendance at a meeting

Detailed Description: Delegates must provide a comment in a common NWM document (for a given meeting) to indicate they are present. When making the comment, they must be logged into NWM under the IM they represent.

Feedback Form 14: Comments on Solution#14 (NWM List)

1 – BT plc

Due to the cross-correlation between IM represented and ETSI account this does add a lot of complexity and unsure that it is worth the complexity. BT is not in favour of this solution.

2 – Guangdong OPPO Mobile Telecom.

compared to solution #6 or #7 this add extra job for both MCC and delegates

3 – T-Mobile USA Inc.

T-Mobile USA: Creates an opportunity for errors and increases work load for the staff. Solution 6 is still the best solution.

4 – Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software

Link between delegate nwm registration and IM individual entity needs establishing, although a simple solution may be to have delegate declare in nwm entry the IM he is representing. However solution provides complexity for mcc or nwm admin in order to manage. Not directly linked to other online meeting presence i.e. good for nwm only meeting.

5 – ETSI

MCC - complexity analysis of the proposed check-in system:

High Complexity:

Similar to case 2 (based on email list subscription).

NWM uses EOL accounts (linked to hiring companies) and has no knowledge of the represented company for the meeting. We thus need to link information extracted from NWM the meeting registration list.

MCC - complexity analysis of changes to voting tool:

Low complexity:

Adaptation to take into account e-meetings and remote attendance

6 – ZTE Corporation

The following solutions with modification can be considered to ensure delegates are attending the meeting:

–Solution#7 (Check In Code) with modification- Voting rights accrued by checking in with a code provided on a conference call, Such checking in with a code within a certain time duration, 30 minutes or one hour, which can be declared before the conference call or by the chair during the conference call.

–Solution#8 (Attend Call) with modification- Voting rights accrued by attending at least one conference call, there can be some pause during the GTW session, e.g. 5-10 minutes, and the chair can declare it is time for attendance confirmation and a short break for everyone, which will not distract delegate's attention but allow time for delegates to take some rest and continue the discussion in a better state.

7 – NOVAMINT

same comment as #15

3 Voting Algorithm

Should we adjust the algorithm to grant or lose voting rights? Most of the solutions (with the exception of #11) just provide an alternative way to measure participation that is then plugged into the existing voting rights formula. However, we are not precluded from adjusting the formula. What are the advantages/disadvantages?

The current algorithm for maintaining voting rights is documented in article 35 of the working procedures (https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/Information/Working_Procedures/3GPP_WP.htm#Article_35)

Feedback Form 15: Comments on whether the voting rights algorithm should be adjusted

1 – BT plc

BT preference is to keep the same algorithm for simplicity. The Working Procedures structure assumes we are either in "pandemic mode" or "regular mode". We need changes for "pandemic mode". BT could accept increasing the number of meetings required in succession to keep voting rights as we are talking about e-meetings to some new number; or even to lose voting rights after missing a single meeting. In the end we may have a mixed mode of operation and then we need a new mandate from the PCG and review other items in the working procedures to cope with that so to change now, and then change again when we understand the mixed mode would be messy.

2 – Guangdong OPPO Mobile Telecom.

we think any picked solution will be an alternative to measure participation and hence no further optimization on the voting algorithm is necessary. It is most likely that delegate need attend both e-meeting and F2F meeting when F2F meeting is recovered. if we change the rule to maintain the voting right, then we have to discuss it for 2 cases, one is e-meeting only and one is mixed era. We don't think it is really necessary considering there is no important election will happen in coming couple of years.

3 – T-Mobile USA Inc.

T-Mobile USA: No, don't fix what is not broken.

4 – HuaWei Technologies Co.

In our idea, it is important to ensure a certain level of commitment to 3GPP, therefore as we stated in "section 1", the formula needs to be adapted slightly. As this only applies to e-meetings in Annex I, we believe it is also easy to be plugged as well in Annex I.

5 – Nokia Germany

The current mechanism is simple: a member needs to attend 2 F2F meetings without missing 3 in a row. The member gets voting right at the 2nd meeting attended, and proxy voting rights thereafter - until missing 3 meeting sin a row.

We need to extend this mechanism with E-meetings. E-meeting attendance represents a far lower bar than F2F, and this should be reflected in the expansion of the algorithm.

We would suggest further exploring an expanded algorithm that:

- 1) Requires **4** consecutive E-meeting attendance to gain rights. I.e. the IM could vote at the 4th consecutively attended E-meeting. If an IM misses **1** E-meeting, voting rights are lost.
- 2) Requires **1** F2F and **2** E-meeting consecutive attendances (in any permutation) to gain rights.

Admittedly, we have not analyzed and scrutinized all possible scenarios of the mechanism above. We would suggest to do so in the next phase of this exercise.

6 – Nokia Germany

Slight modification to the proposal above to make it more accurate:

Starting point is the current mechanism: a member needs to attend 2 F2F meetings without missing 3 in a row. The member gets voting right at the 2nd F2F meeting attended, and proxy voting rights thereafter - until missing 3 F2F meetings in a row. We would add to this the following:

- *An IM with 4 consecutive E-meeting attendance gains rights. I.e. the IM could vote at the 4th consecutively attended E-meeting.*
- *If an IM misses 1 E-meeting, voting rights are lost.*
- *An IM with 1 F2F and 2 E-meeting attendances (in any permutation and without missing 1 E-meeting or missing 3 F2F meetings in a row) to gain rights.*
- *E-attendance to use Solutions #6 (check-in)*
- *Proxy rights don't apply in E-meetings*
- *MCC to generate new voting list after each qualifying meeting, and send the delta to the group for information and to PCG for email approval.*
- *This expanded mechanism to be added to Annex I.*

7 – ETSI

MCC:

No estimate of the complexity performed for the case where the voting rights calculation algorithm changes. The complexity would strongly depend on the algorithm.

8 – Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software

we would support continuing with the current algorithm.

9 – VODAFONE Group Plc

The most appropriate algorithm does depend upon how easy/difficult it is to be recognised as attending a meeting. But overall, we think that it is worth analysing this topic.

Note that, if my calculations are correct, we are already in the "6 preceding meeting vote gathering window" for the TSG plenary elections scheduled for March 2023!

Perhaps Nokia could verify if they mean voting rights are lost if "one meeting is missed" or did they mean "more than 1 meeting is missed".

10 – T-Mobile Austria GmbH

Deutsche Telekom: basically solution#3 would also give room for changing the voting algorithm as there is no counting on participation or gaining/losing voting rights. So the solution#3 would work from the start.

11 – ZTE Corporation

We prefer to keep the same algorithm for simplicity.

12 – NOVAMINT

no need to have specific algorithm for #3 or #3 + formal registration to groups

4 Placement of changes in the Working Procedures

This is a discussion of whether we should make the changes to voting rights in Annex I (the restricted travel annex) or in the main body of the working procedures. You are asked to indicate your preferences in question 1, but if you want to add additional argumentation for why either approach is good or bad, please do so here.

Feedback Form 16: Changes in Annex I or in the main body of the Working Procedures

1 – BT plc

The problem we have with voting rights is caused by the pandemic. The Annex I was set up for the pandemic situation. Therefore the easiest solution is to keep the changes to Annex I. Something else will take more careful thought and more time, and should look at making better provision for e-meetings in the main body of the text rather than treating them as ad-hoc meetings. Such a development would take a different mandate from the PCG.

2 – NIST

NIST: The voting eligibility rules for e-meetings should be changed should be changed for all members i.e. eligibility cannot be based on attendance (f2f) more than two years ago. The f2f eligibility rules can be restored once f2f meetings are resumed.

3 – Guangdong OPPO Mobile Telecom.

we prefer to put the solution to update Annex I to reflect this is a temporary solution. PCG can then deactivate it once we come back to F2F era

4 – T-Mobile USA Inc.

T-Mobile USA: Annex I was set up for a short term interruption of normal work methods. We are now in a long phase situation. If e-meetings are to be the exception and not the rule, then placing the voting rights solution in Annex I is appropriate.

5 – HuaWei Technologies Co.

We believe the changes should be put only in Annex I for e-meetings.

6 – Samsung R&D Institute UK

We support making changes only to Annex I for acquiring voting rights at e-meetings.

7 – VODAFONE Group Plc

As the 3GPP calendar indicates a return to F2F meetings from June 2022, it seems appropriate to make these changes only for the pandemic situation (so for Annex I). If there are no F2F meetings in the long term, then the experience we gain from running "Annex I new voting right" procedures can be use to update the main body.

8 – Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software

We think the application of new rules for a temporary active period could be aligned with activation of Annex I and run in conjunction with f2f rules. However we are not sure how we can apply temporary understanding to the current lists which are already significantly out of date and to the disadvantage of new IMs who have significantly actively contributed to REL17 and REL18 feature development.

9 – ZTE Corporation

Only in Annex I for e-meetings.

10 – NOVAMINT

we would prefer a solution working for all types of meeting i.e. #3 + formal registration to the groups IM wants to vote

5 Other

Please add any other issues here. Note that the following issues will be deferred, so we don't need to discuss them here.

- Transition to/from the new voting rights procedures (after we have picked a solution)
- Retroactive application (after we have picked a solution)
- Transition from new voting rights procedures back to existing voting rights procedure [assuming we make the changes as part of Annex I] (when we get ready to deactivate Annex I)
- Specific wording changes to the working procedures (after we have picked a solution)
- Applicability to alternate meeting formats (after MHSB has make a recommendation)
- Timeline (after we have a recommendation)

Feedback Form 17: Other Issues

1 – NIST

NIST: Voting eligibility is mixed using past attendance established by registration (i.e. since 2020) AND including the next meeting with checking in. After that reset to the same running window (n=3 or 4) as for F2F meetings.

2 – NIST

NIST: Making the proposal clearer: Voting eligibility is established based on registration plus check in to e-meetings, and registration plus check in to e-meeting i.e. RAN1#108 where there will be election. Voting eligibility is same for all IM i.e. not different for those who met eligibility based on 2019 f2f. n can be 3 or 4.

3 – Nokia Germany

In terms of applying the new rules there needs to be a clear cut-through point.

We have stale lists from 2019, those lists represent the starting point. Once the new rules come into effect rights are accrued and lost to and from these starting point lists.

4 – VODAFONE Group Plc

The voting rights from the existing (“Nov-Dec 2019”) voting lists should be used as the “initial state” for any new voting rights system.

5 – Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software

The time from when any new mechanism as discussed above can be implemented plus the minimum time until new voting lists can be up to date and based on current attendance needs to be taken into account. Basing any new 3GPP votes on 2 year old lists comes at a significant disadvantage to some IMs who have contributed to REL17 and RE118.

6 – NOVAMINT

the base could be existing voting rights (Dec 2019) + **giving all voting rights to the new comers** who arrived afterwards and who have been deprived of those rights though contributing actively.