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oneM2M Notice

The document to which this cover statement is attached is submitted to oneM2M. Participation in, or attendance at, any activity of oneM2M, constitutes acceptance of and agreement to be bound by terms of the Working Procedures and the Partnership Agreement, including the Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) Principles Governing oneM2M Work found in Annex 1 of the Partnership Agreement.

1 Opening

* 1. Welcome

Roland Hechwartner, Deutsche Telekom, the TP Chair, opened the 69.1 oneM2M Technical Plenary. He thanked those present for attending. He also introduced the TP leadership team.

Roland also advised the delegates to read the legal notices on the cover page of the agenda as well as the statement regarding engagement with companies added to the U.S Export Administration Regulations entity list in oneM2M activities. This may be found on the oneM2M external website: <http://www.onem2m.org/about-onem2m/intellectual-property-rights#EAR>.

* 1. Meeting logistics

Invited guests

thanked Cristina Bueti from the ITU-T SG20 and Jun Seob Lee from ETRI for attending the meeting in order to give oneM2M some guidance on the transposition process.

**1.3 Meeting objectives**

* Clarification of actions/documents for the transposition of oneM2M TSs to ITU-T SG20, as required by ITU-T.
* Agree on next steps
  + Clarification by oneM2M: Which oneM2M Releases and which TSs of the release?
  + Clarification of resources needed by oneM2M partners and/or members

check resources required with resources available

derive potentially timeline and action plan (oneM2M)

2 Review & agreement of agenda

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| TP-2025-0035 | Agenda TP69.1 | Roland Hechwartner, TP Chair |

**TP-2025-0035 was AGREED**

3 Review & agreement of previous minutes

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| TP-2025-0034 | Minutes TP69 | Karen Hughes, ETSI |

On agreement by correspondence

4 Consideration of input documents / items for discussion / action

|  |
| --- |
| Clarification of actions/documents for the transposition of oneM2M TSs to ITU-T SG20, as required by ITU-T. |

Cristina went through the steps needed from the ITU-T side before the oneM2M specifications can be transposed:

1. A liaison statement should be sent to the ITU-T explaining that oneM2M would like to transpose a series of specs into ITU-T recommendations.
   1. This LS should be accompanied by:
      1. the list of specs to be transposed
      2. the correct forms filled in
      3. The specs submitted should already be in the ITU-T template
2. The LS will be discussed in the Study Group 20 meeting.
   1. If there is agreement in the room then the Rapporteur (Chair) will record the agreement.
3. Once the transposition has been agreed, the A.1 template will need to be filled in
   1. If the TS is a revision to an already existing standard, the ITU-T will retrieve the A.1 template that was used for that TS and it will need to be updated by oneM2M and approved again.
      1. the word documents can be downloaded from the ITU-T website and updated using change marks.
   2. If a new TS, not previously shared with the ITU-T is submitted, a new A.1 template will need to be filled in. This will then be included in the ITU-T work programme.
   3. The SG will decide whether the TS falls under Consent or Determination
   4. All comments will be captured and sent to oneM2M via LS.

It was suggested that common members who participate in both oneM2M and SG20 should submit the TSs as a contribution to show that the members of SG 20 have support for this transposition.

Cristina also explained that participation of oneM2M members would be welcome in the SG20 meetings and invitations from the SG20 Chair could be issued.

Roland thanked Cristina for her clear explanation of the process.

It was noted that to help with the previous transposition process, 2 oneM2M Liaison Officers had been appointed. These two people are no longer active in either organization.

It was thought that it would be beneficial to identify someone who participated in both groups to take this role again. This role is important it is key to designate someone who is familiar with both processes, this appointment would be a good first step.

**Action TP 69.1**: A oneM2M participant is requested to volunteer to take the role of oneM2M LS Officer.

It was felt that oneM2M needs to clarify exactly which TSs should be transposed and a timeline for this discussion needs to be defined. It was agreed that the TP would provide a clearer plan following TP 70 in June.

The need for sufficient resources was reiterated.

There are 18 TSs already transposed so support for at least these 18 is needed. The volunteers will need to update the ITU-T specifications and attend the meetings as well as deal with any comments received. This does not take into account any new TSs that we may want to add to the list.

The timeline for the last time was explained:

* September 2017: TSs submitted
* March 2018: 16 TSs transposed (6 months)
* June 2018: 1 TS transposed (9 months)
* 2023: 1 TS transposed (6 years)

Questions raised on the different types of approval and how long each one takes. It was clarified that there are two types of approval:

* Traditional Approval Process (TAP)
* Alternative Approval Process (AAP)

The quickest is AAP

* TS is submitted and if there is agreement from SG20 to transpose it as it is presented, it is consented.
* It will be posted for comments for 4 weeks
* If no comments, it is approved
* If there are comments then the Rapporteur and the Editor will review the comments and meet online to address them.
* The TS is then sent back to the SG for agreement.

The other option is TAP

* This is usually when there is content related to policy and regulatory matters
* If determined, the result is made between one meeting and another.
* On the last day of the F2F meeting the members agree that this TS can be transposed into an ITU-T recommendation as it was submitted
* Consultation is launched one week after the meeting ends and members are requested to respond to that consultation
* The results are presented during the next SG meeting

If the TAP process is needed and is started during the September meeting, then final approval will take place during the first 6 months of 2026

It was pointed out that the first time we carried out this process, only 2 went through the TAP process TS-0002 and TS-0003. The critical questions that had to be addressed in these two TSs have been answered and it was felt that they would probably go through the AAP process next time around.

The rest went through AAP.

It was felt that, as we have already collaborated together on this work, the teething problems of the past should no longer apply and we now have a good understanding of how to work together.

It was suggested that between now and the next SG20 meeting in September, a decision should be made on how to move forward.

It was also suggested that a joint online meeting where the specs can be presented should be organized. Of course, no decision can be made at that meeting but it would be good to have any concerns raised to give advance warning if needed.

It was reiterated that this has not yet been agreed, and the TP need to know if this is something that we really want or need.

Some concerns raised over having the same standard being published by 2 SDOs and it was felt that it could be confusing, especially as they are no longer the same versions and the structure of the specs is not the same.

Cristina confirmed that ITU-T SG5 and ETSI have developed technically aligned standards together for more than 15 years and having the published by both groups has never posed a problem.

It was felt that this process is very resource intensive and we still have no volunteers to carry out the work. It can not be carried out by oneM2M as an organization, it needs to be done by member companies. However, to date, no one has officially stepped forward to offer to do the work

The issue of referencing the oneM2M specifications rather than this copy-paste process would be a much better and less labour intensive option. It is more transparent and requires only one set of documents. This should be discussed with all the oneM2M Partners. It is unclear if ITU-T offer this approach.

Roland thanked Cristina and Jun Seob for their very valuable input and they both left the call.

|  |
| --- |
| Agree on next steps |

During the next joint call, if one is needed, oneM2M will need to bring an initial set of specifications.

The LS to the ITU-T will be prepared during TP 70. There is a short timeframe for this as the deadline for contributions may be in August.

1. Whether or not we do this again, and if yes, when do we start the process, needs to be decided at TP level – this will be decided at TP 70
2. Companies/ Partners in favour of this must now provide input contributions stating which specs they would like to see transposed.
3. Discussion on who will take the role of LS Officer needs to take place and a decision should be made by TP 70
4. Confirmation of who will volunteer to do the work must be made by TP 70. if the resources are not in place, then we should not start the work. They must be available to do this work for at least 12 months

Questions raised on how the decision or vote will take place. It was confirmed that this has not been decided yet. If there is a sustained objection from several members, a vote may be needed. This is to be determined. There was no objection during the last TP which is why this discussion is still ongoing. Each Partner should also inform the TP if they support this transposition process or not. It would be highly appreciated if the partners could restart the discussion on a referencing model with the ITU-T , this could be very welcome and may solve some of the problems.

Two transposition scenarios where discussed:

Scenario 1 – submit all TSs at once

or

Scenario 2 – submit just the revisions of those already transposed

All of this really does depend on having the volunteers and resources available.

Main point for today was to clarify the main steps needed to go forward with this and this has been achieved.

9 Any other business

There was no other business to discuss.

15 Closure of meeting

Roland thanked everyone for joining the meeting and closed the call.