Analysis of Voting Rights Solutions

Thanks to all who provided comments. This provides an analysis of the comments provided to the various questions as of 2021-11-21 17:00 CET. The feedback forms are now locked, but all the NWM comments can be found [here](https://nwm-trial.etsi.org/#/documents/6967). The analysis of the comments is structured the same as the NWM.

# 1. Solution Preferences

The following chart indicates the received preferences and acceptable indications. In a few cases, it was not clear from the comments what the preferences were, but in general these did not affect the overall results.

**Recommended Action (also reflected below): Further Discuss Solution #6 and potential ways to further discourage misuse. This will include possible add-on such as the code in #7 or giving the PCG a role as a checkpoint (#10). This will be reflected in thread on detailing and enhancing solution#6. The remaining solutions will not be further pursued.**

You can find information a brief analysis of each of the candidate solutions in the section below.

# 2. Candidate Solutions

## 2.1 Solution#2 (ETSI) - Voting rights accrued via email list subscription

Detailed Description: Each IM has a Point of Contact (PoC). If that PoC is on the main email list for a group, the the IM has voting rights for that group. If the PoC forgets to renew and drops off the list, the IM loses voting rights (note that PoC is used since e-mail addresses are not associated with IMs)

Pro: 1, Con: 5

The objections to the solution were that it set the bar too low and was too complicated. In addition, MCC indicated it was a high complexity solution. The idea of having a separate interest registration process (separate from e-mail) was introduced. However, this solution would encounter the same concerns about setting the bar too low.

**Recommendation: Do Not Pursue this Solution**

## 2.2 Solution#3 (Open) - Voting rights accrued for all IMs

Detailed Description: Voting rights criteria eliminated. Any IM can vote in any group in any vote.

Pro: 1, Con: 7

The pros for the solution are that it is very simple. The objections to the solution were that it did not take into consideration company commitment and was a major shift in 3GPPs voting rights philosophy. MCC indicated it was a no complexity solution.

**Recommendation: Do Not Pursue this Solution**

## 2.3 Solution#4 (Contribution) - Voting rights accrued for at least one contribution

Detailed Description: If a contribution is submitted to a meeting that is sourced or co-sourced by an IM, then that meeting counts towards voting rights. Note that contributions currently often come from company groups, not individual IMs.

Pro: 0, Con: 10

The objections to the solution were that it would drive excess contributions. MCC also indicated it was a high complexity solution.

**Recommendation: Do Not Pursue this Solution**

## 2.4 Solution #5 (Email) - Voting rights accrued for at least one email

Detailed Description: If an email is submitted on the mail e-mail list of a group then the current or upcoming meeting counts towards voting rights for that IM. Note that currently e-mails are not tied to IMs.

Pro: 0, Con: 8

The objections to the solution were that it would drive excess emails. MCC also indicated it was a high complexity solution.

**Recommendation: Do Not Pursue this Solution**

## 2.5 Solution#6 (Check In) - Voting rights accrued by checking in

Detailed Description: This procedure is similar to the current f2f check-in procedure. The delegate clicks on a link that is provided as part of the registration confirmation. The token is unique to the delegate and must be submitted during the meeting window.

Pro: 8, Con: 2

The positives of the solution was that it was very similar to the check-in process used in f2f meetings. Even some of the supporting companies indicated that by itself, the bar was set too low. The objections to the solution that it set the commitment bar too low and that there should be other ways to show commitment. MCC also indicated it was a low complexity solution.

**Recommendation: Continue to Investigate this Solution. How can misuse be discouraged?**

## 2.6 Solution#7 (Check In Code) - Voting rights accrued by checking in with a code provided on a conference call

Detailed Description: A code is provided at the beginning of the meeting. The check in procedure is modified so that in addition to clicking the check-in link, the delegate must also provide the code. This ensures that the delgate is actually attending the meeting (or is in contact with someone who is)

Pro: 9, Con: 1

This solution is an extension of solution #6. It is slightly more resistant to misuse than solution #6 but imposes extra work on the delegate. Of those supporting solution #7, several indicated that #6 was preferred. The objection to the solution was the extra imposition on the delegate. MCC also indicated it was a medium complexity solution.

**Recommendation: Continue to Investigate this Solution as part of the investigation of Solution #6 (How to discourage misuse of solution #6)**

## 2.7 Solution#8 (Attend Call) - Voting rights accrued by attending conference call

Detailed Description: The participants report from the GTM sessions are correlated with the registration list and the list of participants is derived from the list of registered delegates who are verified as participating according to GTM/GTW.

Pro: 2, Con: 7

The pros were that it could potentially be used to check who was on the call. However there were significant concerns about the reliability of the tools, how they would work outside of GTM, and also that it set the bar too low. MCC also indicated it was a high complexity solution.

**Recommendation: Do Not Pursue this Solution**

## 2.8 Solution #9 (Registration) - Voting rights accrued by registration

Detailed Description: A delegate is assumed to be participating in the meeting if they have registered for the meeting.

Pro: 3, Con: 5

The pros were that this was a simple solution. The concerns were that it set the bar to low. Even among the supporters, this was a concern. MCC also indicated it was a no complexity solution.

**Recommendation: Do Not Pursue this Solution**

## 2.9 Solution #10 (Temporary) - PCG grants temporary rights per organization by application from that organization

Detailed Description: An IM submits a request to the PCG to be granted temporary voting rights. The PCG grants or denies the request.

Pro: 6, Con: 5

This solution was proposed as a standalone solution. However, many of the proponents proposed that it be used as a supplemental solution to guard against misuse. It was noted that as a standalone solution this will introduce scale problems and the PCG will face the same fairness issues that this group is facing. MCC indicated this was a no complexity solution.

**Recommendation: Consider some form of a PCG check as a potential supplement to #6 to discourage misuse.**

## 2.10 Solution#11 (ATIS) - Voting rights based on membership but lost if the member does not vote in an ANSI letter ballot four consecutive times. Regained 21 days after re-application in writing.

Detailed Description: All IMs initially start out with voting rights in all groups. But can lose the voting rights for a group if they do not vote in 4 votes. They can then petition (to the MCC) to have their voting rights reinstated after a waiting period of 21 days.

Pro: 0, Con: 7

This solution was opposed as too complex. It was presented for information as opposed to consideration as a candidate.

**Recommendation: Do Not Pursue this Solution**

## 2.11 Solution#12 (Probe) - Delegates ”probed” online periodically to ensure that they are attending the meeting

Detailed Description: A challenge of some form is sent to delegates and they are expected to respond to ensure they are actually attending the meeting.

Pro: 0, Con: 8

This solution was opposed as too intrusive. It also would not work well with delegates only following a few issues. MCC indicated it was high complexity.

**Recommendation: Do Not Pursue this Solution**

## 2.12 Solution#13 (NWM Check in) - Same as (6) but use NWM to provide the check in link to delegates

Detailed Description: A NWM single document is prepared before the meeting that contains individualized check in links for all the registered IMs. The delegates would click on the link for the IM they represent.

Pro: 0, Con: 5

This solution seems to add complexity for no additional value. MCC indicated it was medium complexity.

**Recommendation: Do Not Pursue this Solution**

## 2.13 Solution#14 (NWM List) - Delegates check in by adding a comment to a specific NWM sheet that is just to prove attendance at a meeting

Detailed Description: Delegates must provide a comment in a common NWM document (for a given meeting) to indicate they are present. When making the comment, they must be logged into NWM under the IM they represent.

Pro: 0, Con: 6

This solution seems to add complexity for no additional value. MCC indicated it was high complexity.

**Recommendation: Do Not Pursue this Solution**

# 3. Voting Algorithm

Should we adjust the algorithm to grant or lose voting rights? Most of the solutions (with the exception of #11) just provide an alternative way to measure participation that is then plugged into the existing voting rights formula. However, we are not precluded from adjusting the formula. What are the advantages/disadvantages?

Keep Current Algorithm: 5, Modify the Algorithm: 3

Although, the majority expressed the view of keeping the current algorithm, it is probably useful to continue the discussion to see if a better algorithm appears.

**Recommendation: Launch a dedicated discussion thread on this topic.**

# 4. Placement of changes in the Working Procedures

This is a discussion of whether we should make the changes to voting rights in Annex I (the restricted travel annex) or in the main body of the working procedures.

Annex I: 9, Regular Body: 0

Placing the changes in Annex I is appropriate to reflect the temporary nature of the solution.

**Recommendation: Any changes to voting rights procedures will be made to Annex I**

# 5. Other

There were several comments regarding obtaining voting rights retroactively and how we transition to any new scheme. Those will be addressed in subsequent discussions.