

Agenda Item:

Source: **Nokia**

Title: Proposal to clarify Email approval

Document for: Discussion and basis for approval

It seems that S1 is going to work on constantly faster and faster pace, and thus not all decisions can be made during meetings. Email approval of Specs, CRs and WIDs by correspondence had been used when needed. However, procedures for email approval have not been very clear and thus Nokia proposes some rules for email approval. These procedures should be used at both SMG1 and S1.

Proposed procedure for email approval:

1. Email approval should be agreed usually at plenary meeting. If this is not possible, there shall be a clear mail from the Chairman indicating that there will be a email approval. Target and timeframe need to be clearly indicated.
2. During comment period there shall be clear message stating what is the status of each open item. It's proposed to have a weekly (?) summary on mail about status with following content:
 - List of open items
 - Responsible delegate
 - Time left for comments
 - Current work versions of documents
 - Status (Debate ongoing, Agreed, Postponed,...).

Status mail may be prepared by the Chairman, Secretary or Rapporteur. Responsible for status reporting shall be nominated at agreement to have email approval (i.e. at point 1.).

Status reporting is felt important e.g. because sometimes mails will get lost.

1. When decision is made (Agreed, not agreed, postponed,..) the Chairman shall send clear notification what has been agreed.

Between stage 1 and stage 3 there must be at least two weeks (and one status report).

If agreed chairman responsibility of email approval could be given to vice-chair.

Further, it is proposed that the S1 plenary status report from chairman, would be emailed to WG mailing list one week before plenary for checking.

If these procedures are agreed at S1, these should be forwarded to WOME for 01.00.