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# Introduction

At the Berlin meeting of 2011-12-15/16, the discussions regarding participation resulted in:  
 M2MCons03\_25\_Categories\_of\_Partners\_and\_Members

At our last meeting of 2012-01-05, two inputs were received with proposed amendments to the output of the Berlin meeting: one from ETSI and one from TIA. These documents were modified during the meeting and the revised versions distributed with the draft meeting report.

In the embedded document we have attempted to:

* highlight the differences between the two views to aid discussion. The differences are presented as tracked changes by a user ETSI
* propose changes to arrive at a single simplified view, presented as tracked changes by user TIA.
* provided a clean version of the table if all our proposals are accepted, including consequential edits.



# Discussion

## Funding

### Financial Resources

We suggest that the addition of †3 addresses the issue of Company Type 1 Funding, and cell I:12 should remain as presented. In addition, Note 9 may be deleted.

### Human Resources

We suggest that the issue of providing resources *in kind* may be addressed on a case-by-case basis within the Steering Committee. Consequently we proposed deletion of row 13.

## Work

### Technical Contributions

We propose that cell E:04 should read “N.” The interests of Partner 1 are represented by the category Company 1.

We propose that cell F:04 should read “N” since the interests of Partner 2 are represented by the category Company 2. See also the discussion under Affiliation.

Should the category Partner 3 survive (see discussion under Partner 3 below) then we propose the cell G:04 should read “N.”

### Technical Voting

We propose that cell E:05 should read “N.” The interests of Partner 1 are represented by the category Company 1.

We propose that cell F:05 should read “N” since the interests of Partner 2 are represented by the category Company 2. See also the discussion under Affiliation.

Should the category Partner 3 survive (see discussion under Partner 3 below) then we propose the cell G:05 should read “N.”

## IPR

Companies gain access to this joint collaboration via a Partner, and in particular gain access to participation and voting privileges in the Technical Committees. In principle, any Company that gains voting privileges should be bound by a compatible IPR policy. The Company is bound by the IPR policy of the Partner by which the Company gains access. The IPR policy of Company is not relevant, so cells I:06 thru K:07 should read “n.a.”

Companies gaining access to this joint collaboration via a Partner 4 do not gain voting rights, and consequently cells H:06 and H07 should read “N”.

We propose that the table may be simplified by combining rows 06 and 07, and by combining the text in cells D:06 and D:07. The distinction between the two rows can be resolved at the Steering Committee. Cells E:06 thru G:06 should then read “Y.”

## Transpose

We propose that cell F:11 read “N” since that identifies a distinction between Partner 1 and Partner 2.

## Partner 3

As currently described, Partner 3 grants all the rights of a Partner 1 or Partner 2, but none of the responsibilities. For example, the Partner 3 category allows an organization that would otherwise be eligible for Partner 1 to gain all the rights of Partner 1 with no responsibilities under *Transpose* in the table. We understand that Partner 3 category is intended to provide for membership for an organization that has ongoing standards program in the area of interest, is interested in joining the collaboration, but has ongoing commitment to, for example, maintain and support its publications.

We propose that the addition †6 obviates the need for Partner 3, and column G can be deleted. There would be consequential edits to, for example, cell D:16.

## Affiliation

We support the proposal that cells E:14 thru H:14 should read “n.a.” Further cells E:15 thru H:15 should also read “n.a.”

The distinction between a Company 1 and Company 2 is that Company 1 joins via membership in a Partner 1, and Company 2 joins via membership in Partner 2 or 3. If our proposal to delete category Partner 3 is accepted, then Company 2 joins via membership in Partner 2. Since in our proposal, Company 1 and Company 2 have the same access to both the Steering Committee and the Technical Committees, we suggest that there is no longer a need to draw distinction and propose to delete column J together with corresponding changes to cells D:14 and I:14 thru K:14.

The distinction between Company 3 and the existing Company 1 and Company 2 is that Company 3 category allows for a company that is not a member of a Partner 1, but is prepared to enter into an affiliation agreement with a Partner in order to gain access to this initiative. This distinction is maintained via a change to cells D:15 and I:15 thru K:15.