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# 1 Summary and background

The TSAG Rapporteur Groupon “Working Methods” met electronically on 20 & 21 October 2020 from 15:00-17:00 CEST (Geneva time), and held follow-up e-meetings on two topics on 8 & 9 December.

The TSAG RG-WM Rapporteur, Mr Stephen Trowbridge (Nokia), chaired the e-meetings with the assistance of Mrs Xiaoya Yang, TSB Counsellor.

TSB remote participation tool [MyMeetings](https://www.itu.int/myworkspace/#/my-workspace/remote_participation) was used for remote participation. There were **85** remote participants, see the list in [Annex](#_Annex_–_List).

At the last TSAG meeting in Geneva, 21-25 September 2020, the RG-WM was authorized to hold at least two interim e-meeting(s) before the next January 2021 TSAG meeting, with the following terms of reference (ref. TSAG-[TD785R1](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T17-TSAG-200921-TD-GEN-0785)):

* **1st e-meeting** on **Tuesday 20 October 2020**:
	+ to finish the RG-WM agenda [TD784R1](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T17-TSAG-200921-TD-GEN-0784) and discuss the rest of the Contributions received and TDs assigned by TSAG (from agenda item 6 to the end of the agenda). Contributions on other topics are not invited for this meeting.
* **2nd e-meeting** on **Wednesday 21 October 2021**:
	+ to discuss Contributions on **any topic** within the remit of RG-WM (as indicated in [TD733](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T17-TSAG-200210-TD-GEN-0733)), in particular, inviting contributions on topics where [TD852R3](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T17-TSAG-200921-TD-GEN-0852) indicates that multiple regions have an interest in modification or suppression.
	+ to authorize (contingent on contributions and consensus to proceed) two kinds of follow-on activities:
		- email correspondence on certain topics, beginning 22 October and ending 30 November.
		- additional e-meetings (topic specific) during the week of **7-11 December 2020** (as many as 4 – avoiding a CEPT meeting on 10 Dec) to review the correspondence reports or consider follow-up contributions on these topics.

For the 21 October e-meeting, contributors should advise whether they wish any contribution submitted to this meeting to be considered, or should submit an update to one of these proposals, or any new proposals within the indicated terms of reference.

Deadline for Contributions to both two e-meetings were set for 14 October 2020 (one week in advance).

In accordance to the terms of reference above, the agenda and input documents to the e-meetings were made available using a SharePoint site as follows:

– 1st e-meeting (20 Oct 2020):

<https://extranet.itu.int/meetings/ITU-T/T17-TSAGRGM/RGWM-201020>

– 2nd e-meeting (21 Oct 2020):

<https://extranet.itu.int/meetings/ITU-T/T17-TSAGRGM/RGWM-201021>

Further details of these TSAG RG-WM meetings, please refer to TSAG RGM SharePoint for: [https://extranet.itu.int/meetings/ITU-T/T17-TSAGRGM/SitePages/Welcome.aspx](https://eur03.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fextranet.itu.int%2Fmeetings%2FITU-T%2FT17-TSAGRGM%2FSitePages%2FWelcome.aspx&data=04%7C01%7Cbexelby%40gsma.com%7Cb0906714935a4fc785e808d874268780%7C72a4ff82fec3469daafbac8276216699%7C0%7C0%7C637387056137549539%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C1000&sdata=DjW4VbiJYCeQUT%2FP21%2F4iH62Weo2yMUCHWWRqO%2BFMJU%3D&reserved=0).

# 2 Summary of discussions on 20 Oct 2020, RG-WM e-meeting

The agenda for the e-meeting, which was made available as [RGWM-DOC1 (201020)](https://extranet.itu.int/meetings/ITU-T/T17-TSAGRGM/RGWM-201020/DOCs/T17-TSAGRGM-RGWM-201020-DOC-0001.docx), was approved with no changes.

The e-meeting discussed the following documents of TSAG:

**Agenda item 6: Recommendation A.7 - Focus groups: Establishment and working procedures**

* [C138](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T17-TSAG-C-0138) (MIIT, China Telecom) - Proposal to revise ITU-T A.7

After TSAG RG-WM RGM July meeting discussion (see report in TSAG-[TD811](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T17-TSAG-200921-TD-GEN-0811)), the contributors revised their proposal and submitted in C138 which proposes to revise ITU-T A.7 by adding working procedures about working group arrangement in a new sub-clause 3.2, instructing expected deliverables in clause 10, and facilitating the evaluation and conversion of deliverables in a new clause 14.

***Discussion:***

Regarding the new text for clause 10, it was felt that the list of various deliverables seems too prescriptive for FG, and it was noted again that the proposal for ‘continuous discussion, adjustment, and refinement of expected deliverables during the lifecycle of the Focus Group’ may contradict existing clause 2.2, which requires that the expected deliverables are defined in the Terms of Reference governing the establishment of the Focus Group.

Regarding new clause 14 on transferring FG deliverables in a parent study group, the contributor clarified that this new proposed clause 14 aims to describe how the parent SG to handle more efficiently FG deliverables, whereas the existing Appendix I of A.7 describes how FG should prepare their deliverables. There was opposition to this proposal, as it appeared to bypass the need for the parent SG to reach consensus regarding actions taken with regard to FG deliverables, particularly related to establishment of new work items.

* [C151](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T17-TSAG-C-0151) (RTFM) - Review of ITU-T Focus Groups

C151 is from RTFM, an ITU-T sector member from UK, but it is not from Member State UK. The contributor noted FG NET-2030 had not sent many laison statements as necessary in C151 and added in his introduction of C151 to this meeting that FG QIT4N was extended by TSAG Sept 2020 meeting for one more year without much discussion on the justification of this extension. In conclusion C151 proposes TSAG to conduct a review into the oversight mechanisms for ITU-T Focus Groups, and suggests that possible oversight measures include asking a Focus Group to produce an outline project plan, document roles and responsibilities (particularly for liaison and outreach), ensure regular progress reports and/or review by their parent Study Group, explain any deviations from the agreed Terms of Reference, publish tentative dates for deliverables and so on.

***Discussion:***

While there was sympathy for some of the issues raised by C151, it was noted that RG-WM is responsible for A.7 and the rules related to the creation and operation of focus groups and does not have oversight responsibility over the focus groups themselves, particularly those created by study groups. Further contributions were invited to propose any procedural improvements that could improve the situation.

**Agenda item 7: Recommendation A.8 - Alternative approval process for new and revised ITU-T Recommendations**

* [C142](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T17-TSAG-C-0142) (CT, MIIT, ZTE): Proposal to refine reselection of approval process in ITU-T A.8

**Agenda item 8: Resolution 1 - Rules of procedure of the ITU Telecommunication Standardization Sector**

* [C141](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T17-TSAG-C-0141) (CT, MIIT, ZTE): Proposal to refine annex A of Resolution 1

C141 proposes to refine annex A of Resolution 1 to include definitions introduced in revised Recommendation A.13 (Sept 2019) to align Resolution 1 with Recommendation A.13.

***Discussion:***

It was noted that C153 also covers such proposals to include definitions of non-normative texts in Resolution 1.

TSAG RG-WM Rapporteur proposed that, rather than including such texts on non-normative texts in Resolution 1 which deals primarily rules and procedures to develop normative texts, to remove such misaligned definitions of non-normative texts from Res. 1.

This proposal from RG-WM Rapporteur was for consideration, esp. for C141 and C153 contributors.

* [C143](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T17-TSAG-C-0143) (Korea): Proposal to revise the clause 9.4.4 of WTSA Resolution 1

C143 proposes to revise the clause 9.4.4 of WTSA Resolution 1 to consider the case where a Member State has abstained to the TSB consultation.

***Discussion:***

After shared details of the real case scenario, it was agreed that the 70% threshold specified in clause 9.4.5 of WTSA Resolution 1 should be calculated as #‘Yes’ replies / # ‘Yes’ replies + #‘No’ replies, i.e. the Member State ‘abstain’ reply should not be counted in this calculation, but if there is any statement in this reply, the statement should be taken into considered in finalizing the text for TAP approval.

* [C153](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T17-TSAG-C-0153) (Russian Federation): Proposal to draft revision of WTSA Resolution 1 for further improvement

C153 proposes both a thorough editorial review of Res.1 and substantive changes in several places. Due to time restraints, contributor was requested to focus on substantive changes in his introduction. The contribution highlighted such changes as the new footnote on page no.2, the added reference to WTSA Res 54 before ‘*resolves*’, new clauses 3.8-3.9, change in Section 6 to extend WTSA contribution deadline from 14 to 21 days, and the new clause 9.5.7 for SG to submit draft Recommendations to WTSA for approval.

***Discussion:***

Discussion was focused on the proposed new 9.5.7 *‘If there is no other SG meeting scheduled before the WTCA, the chairman of the SG shall forward the text to the WTSA’*, disagreement was raised, arguing it is not appropriate if technical Recommendations have to be mandatorily submitted to WTSA for approval where technical expertise might not be present.

**Agenda item 9: Resolution 32 - Strengthening electronic working methods for the work of the ITU Telecommunication Standardization Sector**

* [C145R1](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T17-TSAG-C-0145) (Japan): Proposed modification to WTSA-16 Resolution 32 “Strengthening electronic working methods for the work of the ITU Telecommunication” Standardization Sector

This document proposes to modify Resolution 32 to instruct the TSB director to study and develop guidelines for virtual meetings and remote participation, given the context of global spread of COVID-19.

***Discussion:***

It was generally supported for TSB to continue developing guidelines for virtual meetings, but the guidelines should be generic, not specially for COVID-19. Further Contribution with more specific, detailed proposal is invited.

**Agenda item 10: SG17 incubation mechanism**

* [TD903](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T17-TSAG-200921-TD-GEN-0903) LS on Incubation mechanism in SG17 [from ITU-T SG17]

SG17 Chairman presented this SG17 liaison statement to TSAG, with a brief introduction of the SG17 Technical Paper TP.inno *‘Description of the incubation mechanism and ways to improve it’* and proposes TSAG to consider it as a normative procedure to A series Recommendation.

***Discussion:***

It was questioned, although TP.inno had been approved by SG17 by agreement in its Sept 2020 meeting, whether ‘Technical Paper’ is the right type of document to publish such an ITU internal working method.

It was recommended for 1st TSAG meeting after WTSA-20 to consider this innovation of ITU-T working method and possibly to establish a new work item for A-series Recommendation.

The e-meeting finished its agenda and was adjourned at 17:12.

# 3 Summary of discussions on 21 Oct 2020, RG-WM e-meeting

This e-meeting received two input documents [RGWM-DOC1 (201021)](https://extranet.itu.int/meetings/ITU-T/T17-TSAGRGM/RGWM-201021/DOCs/T17-TSAGRGM-RGWM-201021-DOC-0001.docx) on A.1 and [RGWM-DOC2 (201021)](https://extranet.itu.int/meetings/ITU-T/T17-TSAGRGM/RGWM-201021/DOCs/T17-TSAGRGM-RGWM-201021-DOC-0002.docx) on Res.1. The agenda for the e-meeting, prepared by RG-WM Rapporteur as in [RGWM-DOC3 (201021)](https://extranet.itu.int/meetings/ITU-T/T17-TSAGRGM/RGWM-201021/DOCs/T17-TSAGRGM-RGWM-201021-DOC-0003.docx) with a RG-WM future work plan proposal in addition, was approved with no changes.

* [RGWM-DOC1 (201021)](https://extranet.itu.int/meetings/ITU-T/T17-TSAGRGM/RGWM-201021/DOCs/T17-TSAGRGM-RGWM-201021-DOC-0001.docx) Considerations on Recommendation A.1 (Chairman, SG15)

This document proposes two text updates to A.1 in response to China C137 submitted to September TSAG, on 1.4.7 and 2.3.3.10

***Discussion*:**

Russia questioned whether this proposal should be from an ITU membership rather than from SG15 Chairman, as a personal opinion and citing SG15 practice. Mr. Trowbridge responded referencing to special role of SG Chairman as specified in Res. 1 and A.1.

Regarding proposal 1 in this document: new text for 1.4.7, it intends to complete C137 proposal to include also non-normative text scenario, however the proposed text with details of Work Programme update was deemed unnecessary in this clause for ITU-T delegates. It was suggested that this proposal should be formatted similarly to C137, i.e., with only references to AAP, TAP for normative texts and approval by SG agreement for non-normative texts.

Regarding proposal 3 in this document: new text for 2.3.3.10, it proposes to specify a deadline of announcement of virtual meeting for at least 2 weeks. During the discussion, different practice of SGs were shared and it was confirmed that 1 week is a common contribution deadline, and SG2 set 3 weeks for e-meeting announcement deadline. SG17 practice so far is 1 month. It was suggested to discuss further to decide the announcement deadline and to add explicitly the specification of 1-week contribution deadline for virtual meetings.

Due to time constraint and the unlikeliness to reach consensus, the contributor didn’t bring up proposals 2 & 4 in this document for discussion.

* [RGWM-DOC2 (201021)](https://extranet.itu.int/meetings/ITU-T/T17-TSAGRGM/RGWM-201021/DOCs/T17-TSAGRGM-RGWM-201021-DOC-0002.docx) Ecosystem Collaboration (Update of TSAG C-140) (Canada, Ericsson, Ciena)

This document is an update to TSAG C140 after C140 was discussed in TSAG Sept 2020 meeting. It recommends the creation and use of a standardized template to facilitate collaboration, in the entire telecommunication and emerging ICT standards ecosystem. Revision shown in track changes clarified its proposals that:

* + when to expand SG scope, to consider new Q or FG, the use of a gap analysis template is recommended;
	+ TSAG to develop a standardized gap analysis template for inclusion in Res. 1

***Discussion*:**

During the discussion, it was first clarified that the first proposal should be split into two parts:

* + when to expand SG scope, to consider new Q or FG, it is recommended to conduct gap analysis;
	+ when a gap analysis is warranted, use of a standardized gap analysis template is recommended.

China repeated four points of their concerns they had raised in TSAG Sept meeting when C140 was discussed:

1. China believes ecosystem collaboration needs the collaboration between ITU-T and other SDOs from both sides, which could not be solved by ITU-T one-side by only introducing a gap analysis template in A.1 for new Recommendation or Res.1 for new Question and Focus Group. It should be promoted by mechanism as the IEC/ISO/ITU World Standards Cooperation (WSC).
2. what kinds of related SDOs are expected to be listed in the gap analysis template? It’s based on the SDO listed in Res.2 for each Question of SG or other SDOs without liaison relationship with ITU-T? It should be clarified.
3. operational issues about the gap analysis template should be considered and discussed in detail, for example: the detail evaluation principles or guidelines on how to assess whether the gap analysis content meet expectation or not. In order to improve the efficiency of discussion and avoid arguments, such evaluation principles should be discussed carefully and reach consensus first, before a gap analysis template could be adopted.
4. the impact of this requirement to bridging standards gap. Members from developing countries could not participate many SDOs and carry out the gap analysis required by the template, there will be negative influence for them to submit their new work item contributions to SG.

Then it was clarified that this requirement on gap analysis is not for new work item, but for new Question, Focus Group or SG scope expansion. It was also clarified that the gap analysis should not be used to prohibit ITU to start new work.

* RG-WM future work plan proposed in [RGWM-DOC3 (201021)](https://extranet.itu.int/meetings/ITU-T/T17-TSAGRGM/RGWM-201021/DOCs/T17-TSAGRGM-RGWM-201021-DOC-0003.docx)

Based on RG-WM meeting discussion, RG-WM Rapporteur Mr. Trowbridge prepared a RG-WM future work plan highlighting potential consensus could be possible in RG-WM for inclusion in Part II of TSAG Report to WTSA-20, for consideration together with other relevant inputs to WTSA-20.

He drew the meeting attention to TSAG-TD733 *‘Draft updated mapping of WTSA Resolutions and ITU-T A-Series Recommendations to TSAG Rapporteur groups’* and TSAG-TD852R3 ‘*IRM: Collection of activities of the regional organizations in their preparation of WTSA-20 with a mapping onto the WTSA Resolutions and ITU-T A-Series Recommendations to TSAG Rapporteur groups’* and proposed to start two email correspondence activities from 22 October-30 November 2020 on revision to A.1 and Res.1 respectively. He volunteered to prepare draft texts to kick start both email correspondence activities.

Two additional e-meetings of TSAG RG-WM will be held with the following terms of reference:

1. 8 December 2020, 16:00-17:00 Geneva time, on A.1
2. 9 December 2020, 15:00-17:00 Geneva time, on Res.1

This e-meeting finished successfully and was adjourned at 17:15.

# 4 Summary of discussions on 8 December 2020, RG-WM e-meeting on A.1

This e-meeting started at 16:10 since a TSAG RG-WP meeting closed late than scheduled. RG-WM Rapporteur Mr. Trowbridge welcomed the participants and the meeting agreed to discuss the only input document [RGWM-DOC1 (201208)](https://extranet.itu.int/meetings/ITU-T/T17-TSAGRGM/RGWM-201208/DOCs/T17-TSAGRGM-RGWM-201208-DOC-0001.docx) without a separate agenda document.

Mr. Trowbridge introduced [RGWM-DOC1 (201208)](https://extranet.itu.int/meetings/ITU-T/T17-TSAGRGM/RGWM-201208/DOCs/T17-TSAGRGM-RGWM-201208-DOC-0001.docx) *“RGWM Correspondence Report on Recommendation ITU-T A.1”*. The RGWM e-meeting of 21 October 2020 authorized email correspondence between 23 October – 30 November 2020 to develop draft proposed modifications to Recommendation ITU-T A.1, with a focus on ‘low-hanging fruits’ i.e., those proposed changes without much controversy, and this e-meeting session to review the correspondence result.

Mr. Trowbridge then informed the meeting that WTSA is likely to be further postponed until March 2022, and:

* There will be three meetings of TSAG between now and WTSA (January 2021, October 2021, January 2022), plus additional e-meetings of RGWM to be scheduled during 2021.
* TSAG does have the authority to update the A-series of Recommendations between WTSAs.

Bearing this in mind, the meeting agreed this e-meeting of RGWM today will review the correspondence result draft, attempting to remove square brackets.

Draft edits to Recommendation ITU-T A.1 at the conclusion of the correspondence is found in TSAG informal FTP area as [T-REC-A.1-2022-Draft-r1.docx](https://www.itu.int/ifa/t/2017/tsag/exchange/RG-WM/A1/T-REC-A.1-2022-Draft-r1.docx). The clearest areas for potential agreements identified from the start of the correspondence include the following:

* Addition to clause 1.4.7 adding references to the procedures to be followed when a work item is completed: in particular, referencing A.13 for “Agreement” of a non-normative work item, referencing A.8 for “Consent” of a normative text for which AAP is used, and WTSA Resolution 1 Clause 9 for “Determination” of a normative text for which TAP is used.

The meeting agreed to add reference to A.8 for normative text for approval by AAP and Resolution 1 Clause 9 for normative text for approval by TAP, but did not agree to remove the square brackets around the added reference to non-normative text and A.13, nor the square brackets around the added reference to Annex A and Section 8 of Resolution 1.

The meeting also noticed that the first sentence of 2nd paragraph of 1.4.7 needs update after A.13 was revised in September 2019, there are two different templates for normative and non-normative new work items.

In addition, A question was raised on ‘agreement by study group’ in clause 4.2 of A.13:

***4.2*** *Non-normative documents require agreement by the study group or TSAG (in the case of a document developed by TSAG) but they do not require approval according to [b-ITU-T Res 1] or [b-ITU-T A.8] procedures.*

The meeting had some discussion on the term of ‘agreement’ used in ITU CS/CV and WTSA-16 proceedings but did not conclude on this issue as it is out of the scope of this e-meeting on A.1 today.

* Enhancement of clause 2.3.3.10, which currently includes the two-month confirmation requirement for physical meetings, to establish a similar requirement for confirmation of virtual meetings at ‘**minimum of two weeks’**.

This proposed enhancement was agreed in the meeting.

* Establishing a deadline for contributions to stand-alone Rapporteur Group meetings (non-decision-making meetings) that is shorter than the 12-day deadline used for SG and WP plenary meetings at ‘**one week**’ for contributions to such meetings.

This proposed enhancement was agreed in the meeting.

This e-meeting closed at 17:09 after finished the review of [T-REC-A.1-2022-Draft-r1.docx](https://www.itu.int/ifa/t/2017/tsag/exchange/RG-WM/A1/T-REC-A.1-2022-Draft-r1.docx).

# 4 Summary of discussions on 9 December 2020, RG-WM e-meeting on Res.1

This e-meeting started at 15:00 as scheduled. RG-WM Rapporteur Mr. Trowbridge welcomed the participants and the meeting agreed to discuss the two input documents [RGWM-DOC1 (201209)](https://extranet.itu.int/meetings/ITU-T/T17-TSAGRGM/RGWM-201208/DOCs/T17-TSAGRGM-RGWM-201209-DOC-0001.docx) and [RGWM-DOC2 (201209)](https://extranet.itu.int/meetings/ITU-T/T17-TSAGRGM/RGWM-201208/DOCs/T17-TSAGRGM-RGWM-201209-DOC-0002.docx) without a separate agenda document.

Mr. Trowbridge introduced [RGWM-DOC1 (201209)](https://extranet.itu.int/meetings/ITU-T/T17-TSAGRGM/RGWM-201208/DOCs/T17-TSAGRGM-RGWM-201209-DOC-0001.docx) *“RGWM Correspondence Report on WTSA Resolution 1”*. The RGWM e-meeting of 21 October 2020 authorized email correspondence between 23 October – 30 November 2020 to develop draft proposed modifications to WTSA Resolution 1, with a focus on ‘low-hanging fruits’ i.e., those proposed changes without much controversy, and this e-meeting session to review the correspondence result.

Mr. Trowbridge then informed the meeting that WTSA is likely to be further postponed until March 2022, and there will be three meetings of TSAG between now and WTSA (January 2021, October 2021, January 2022), plus additional e-meetings of RGWM to be scheduled during 2021.

Bearing this in mind that RGWM should attempt to reach as much agreements as are feasible at this stage, the meeting agreed this e-meeting of RGWM today will:

* Review the correspondence result draft;
* Attempt to resolve whether 1bis.6 through 1bis.9 are removed, or are aligned with Recommendation ITU-T A.13;
* Attempt to resolve the square brackets for the language in 9.4 and 9.5 regarding evaluation of the 70% threshold;
* Consider any other contributions submitted to the e-meeting on the subject of Resolution.

Draft edits to Resolution 1 at the conclusion of the correspondence is found in TSAG informal FTP area as [T-RES-T.1-2022-MSW-E%20-%20Draft-r1.docx](https://www.itu.int/ifa/t/2017/tsag/exchange/RG-WM/Res1/T-RES-T.1-2022-MSW-E%20-%20Draft-r1.docx), includes the following proposed modifications:

* Purely editorial improvements from prior contributions (Russia C153, US DOC-0006 (29/07/20)

These purely editorial improvements were agreed in the meeting.

* Intention to reach a decision on whether text on non-normative document types (clauses 1bis.6 through 1bis.9) should be modified to align with A.13, or removed.

Members requested more time to consider the possible removal clauses 1bis.6 through 1bis.9.

* The prior agreed update to Clause 8.3 based on the ad hoc discussion from February 2020 TSAG in TD758.

After some discussion on whether there is any ambiguation that ‘the meeting’ in the proposed addition which was previously agreed in Feb 2020 refers to ‘SG or WP meeting’, this term was confirmed by the meeting as clear enough given the Clause 8.3 context.

The meeting agreed to the put ‘If agreed, ’ at the beginning of this addition into [].

* Clarification of the 70% threshold being a percentage of Yes/No without implying Abstain responses are not considered from Korea C143.

After lengthy discussion, the proposed clarification text was found too complicated by the meeting. The agreement was not to change current Clause 9.4.5 -9.4.6 texts but to add a note to clarify that ‘abstain’ reply will not be counted in the calculation of 70%. A suggested wording was “Note: Replies that do not explicitly support or not support consideration for approval at the study group meeting are not counted. Comments accompanying such replies are however collected (see clause 9.4.7).”

Mr. Scott Mansfield introduced [RGWM-DOC2(201209)](https://extranet.itu.int/meetings/ITU-T/T17-TSAGRGM/RGWM-201208/DOCs/T17-TSAGRGM-RGWM-201209-DOC-0002.docx) *“Ecosystem Collaboration (Update of TSAG C-140)”* recommends the creation and use of a standardized template to facilitate collaboration, in the entire telecommunication and emerging ICT standards ecosystem.

Questions and discussions on different practices among ITU-T SGs on how gap analysis were/should be conducted, whether A.1 Annex A template covers already gap analysis, whether the proposed gap analysis template should be included in Res. 1 or A.1, etc.

The meeting reiterated that gap analysis is a useful tool for collaboration and should not be a prohibit for ITU-T to start new work items. Further inputs on this discuss on gap analysis are invited.

Before this e-meeting was closed at 17:00 after finished discussion on both input documents, participants are reminded to submit contribution on any subject within the TSAG RG-WM scope to the upcoming TSAG Jan 2021 meeting by its contribution deadline at 24 December 2020.

## **Annex – List of participants of TSAG RG-WM e-meetings**

The list includes the remote participants from the TSAG RG-WM interim e-meetings, 20-21 Oct 2020 and 8-9 Dec 2020.
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|  | Marco Carugi | Huawei | 8 Dec 2020 |
|  | Dmitry Cherkesov | Russia | 20-21 Oct, 8-9 Dec 2020 |
|  | Robert Clark | TSB | 8-9 Dec 2020 |
|  | Simão Ferraz De Campos Neto | TSB | 8 Dec 2020 |
|  | Ena Dekanic | USA | 20-21 Oct, 8-9 Dec 2020 |
|  | Vasily Dolmatov | Russia | 8-9 Dec 2020 |
|  | Olivier Dubuisson | Orange | 20-21 Oct, 8-9 Dec 2020 |
|  | Belinda Exelby | GSMA | 20 Oct 2020 |
|  | Per Frojdh | Ericsson | 20-21 Oct, 8 Dec 2020 |
|  | Diana Gómez | Mexico | 8 Dec 2020 |
|  | Latonia Gordon | Apple | 20-21 Oct, 8-9 Dec 2020 |
|  | Bruce Gracie | Ericsson Canada | 20-21 Oct, 8-9 Dec 2020 |
|  | Harin Grewal | Singapore | 21 Oct, 8-9 Dec 2020 |
|  | Marco Hogewoning | RIPE-NCC | 8 Dec 2020 |
|  | Tony Holmes | UK | 8 Dec 2020 |
|  | Anne-Rachel Inne | ARIN | 21 Oct 2020 |
|  | Bilel Jamoussi | TSB | 20-21 Oct, 8 Dec 2020 |
|  | Xiongwei Jia | China Unicom | 20 Oct 2020 |
|  | Ajit Jillavenkatesa | Apple | 20-21 Oct, 8-9 Dec 2020 |
|  | Tatiana Kurakova | TSB | 8 Dec 2020 |
|  | Kenji Kuramochi Shimizu | Paraguy | 20 Oct 2020 |
|  | Junsen Lai | China | 20 Oct 2020 |
|  | Dominique Lazanski | UK | 20-21 Oct, 8-9 Dec 2020 |
|  | Jong Hwa Lee | Korea | 20-21 Oct, 8-9 Dec 2020 |
|  | Leo Lehmann | Switzerland | 9 Dec 2020 |
|  | Dan Li | Huawei | 20-21 Oct, 8-9 Dec 2020 |
|  | Fang Li | China | 20-21 Oct, 8-9 Dec 2020 |
|  | Ilia Londo | TSB | 21 Oct 2020 |
|  | Noah Luo | Huawei | 21 Oct 2020 |
|  | Yoichi Maeda | TTC | 20-21 Oct 2020 |
|  | Scott Mansfield | Ericsson Canada | 20-21 Oct, 8-9 Dec 2020 |
|  | Gaelle Martin-Cocher | InterDigital Canada | 21 Oct 2020 |
|  | Yuri Matsuka | Japan | 9 Dec 2020 |
|  | Aimee Meacham | USA | 20-21 Oct, 8 Dec 2020 |
|  | Mythili Menon | TSB | 20 Oct 2020 |
|  | Sungdong Min | Korea | 20-21 Oct 2020 |
|  | Shigeru Miyake | Hitachi | 20-21 Oct, 8-9 Dec 2020 |
|  | Yutaka Miyake | KDDI | 20-21 Oct 2020 |
|  | Carlos Munoz | TSB | 20 Oct, 8 Dec 2020 |
|  | Miho Naganuma | NEC | 20-21 Oct, 8-9 Dec 2020 |
|  | Yoshiaki Nagaya | Japan | 20-21 Oct, 8-9 Dec 2020 |
|  | Paul Najarian | USA | 20 Oct, 9 Dec 2020 |
|  | Lars B. Nielsen | Denmark | 20 Oct, 8 Dec 2020 |
|  | Hiroshi Ota | TSB | 8 Dec 2020 |
|  | Moon Cheol Park | Korea | 20-21 Oct 2020 |
|  | Glenn Parsons | Ericsson Canada | 20-21 Oct, 8-9 Dec 2020 |
|  | Bastiaan Quast | TSB | 8 Dec 2020 |
|  | Zhicheng Qu | ZTE | 20 Oct 2020 |
|  | Greg Ratta | USA | 20-21 Oct, 8-9 Dec 2020 |
|  | Paul Redwin | UK | 20-21 Oct, 8-9 Dec 2020 |
|  | Jim Reid | RTFM | 20-21 Oct 2020 |
|  | Arnaud Ritou | France | 20-21 Oct, 8 Dec 2020 |
|  | Chrystiane Roy | Canada | 8-9 Dec 2020 |
|  | Phil Rushton | UK | 20-21 Oct, 8-9 Dec 2020 |
|  | Minrui Shi | China Telecom | 20-21 Oct, 8-9 Dec 2020 |
|  | Takahiro Shigeno | Japan | 20-21 Oct, 8-9 Dec 2020 |
|  | Airisha Strasser | Austrilia | 20-21 Oct 2020 |
|  | Arnaud Taddei | Broadcom | 20 Oct 2020 |
|  | Eugene Tonkikh | Russia | 21 Oct, 8-9 Dec 2020 |
|  | Stephen Trowbridge | Nokia USA | 20-21 Oct, 8-9 Dec 2020 |
|  | Alexandre Vassiliev | Russia | 20-21 Oct, 8-9 Dec 2020 |
|  | Liang Wang | ZTE | 21 Oct, 8-9 Dec 2020 |
|  | Yanchuan Wang | China Telecom | 20-21 Oct, 8 Dec 2020 |
|  | Tong Wu | China Telecom | 20-21 Oct, 8-9 Dec 2020 |
|  | Weiling Xu | China | 20 Oct 2020 |
|  | Mitsuru Yamada | KDDI | 20-21 Oct 2020 |
|  | Xiaoya Yang | TSB | 20-21 Oct, 8-9 Dec 2020 |
|  | Heung-Youl Youm | Soonchunhyang University | 20-21 Oct, 8-9 Dec 2020 |
|  | Joao Zanon | Brazil | 20-21 Oct 2020 |
|  | Yuan Zhang | China Telecom | 20-21 Oct 2020 |

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_