**Notes from 2 March Participation and Legal Ad-Hoc Group Meeting**

The Meeting was convened at 13:00 UTC by Andrew Kurtzman and Enrico Scarrone.

Nineteen participants attended the meeting.

1. **Legal Aspects of Participation (**Participation Categories, Voting, IPR related issues**)**

Regarding the voting issue, it was encouraged that emails be exchanged on this issue. There is a need to review various scenarios, and identification of voting situations may help with the decision making on this issue. Andy and Tom took an assignment to look at this based on case by case scenarios.

It was again stressed that voting is rare except in cases of elections and the group works in a consensus manner. It was agreed that this way of working should be included as a preamble in the Founding Agreement and Enrico took an assignment to draft this preamble.

1. **Structure of Founding Documents/Agreement**

The draft founding agreement was reviewed section by section.

There was discussion on the Founding Agreement and if it only applied for Type 1 Partners or Type 1 and Type 2 Partners, and would another type of document, such as an MOU, be needed for Type 2 Partners. The preferred approach was that the Founding Agreement could apply for both types of partners.

Discussion also continued on IPR relative to Type 2 Partners and the need to find a solution for this issue, which could affect the technical privileges of this type of partner.

The group also discussed that Partner Type 1 may include founding SDOs and other organizations that decide to join.

Tom agreed to draft a preamble to the section related to the Partners of the Agreement.

There was a suggestion that another word should be used regarding members rather than the word “endorsed”, to imply that a member was bound by the IPR policy of an organization. It was also mentioned that if a member is an association, the same IPR issue as being addressed for a Type 2 Partner exists. Francisco took an assignment to clarify how member based organizations are treated in oneM2M.

There was also a suggestion to combine the Partner and Definition sections.

Enrico will provide a clean version of the draft agreement. Review of this document will continue at the next meeting.

1. **Level of Secretariat Services**

**20120228\_03\_oneM2M Secretariat Functions (**carried over from 28 Feb meeting**)**

No discussion due to lack of time. However it was agreed that it is imperative to discuss this issue in regard to support of oneM2M. Hence, Secretariat Functions will be the first item discussed for the next meeting, followed by the Funding issue.

1. **Funding**

**20120228\_04\_Initial Cost Sharing Principle of the oneM2M Secretariat Functions (**carried over from 28 Feb meeting**)**

No discussion due to lack of time.

1. **Draft Working Procedures Document**

A draft of a Working Procedures Document was distributed to the group for review and comments.

1. **Next Meeting**

**7 March 2012 at 13:00 UTC**