

2020-07-07 [CNTT - GSC] - FMO Discussion

Materials:

- [Definition of Consensus](#)
- [Structure of Consensus Building in Communities](#)
- [5 steps making community decisions without consensus](#)
- [Disagree and Commit Definition](#)

Attendees:

- [Scot Steele](#) (AT&T)
- [Beth Cohen](#) (Verizon)
- [Tom Van Pelt](#) (GSMA)

Topics:

- Anti-Trust Policies:
 - [LFN Anti-Trust Policy Notice](#)
 - [GSMA Anti-Trust Policy Notice](#)
- Overview of reaching consensus model - **5 Min**
 - Restatement of disagree and commit methodology
- Identify voting group members - **15 min**
 - Proposals:
 - Operator/Supplier members designate voting member
 - WSL/PTL as Voting Members
 - LFN provides voting member(s)
 - CNTT TSC/GOvernance board members.
 - Other?
- Discuss Timeline - **10 Min**
 - Proposal Recommendation by 8/21
 - Transition plan by 9/11

Notes:

Feedback from the Board and multiple groups, need a decision by September. The next LFN GB meeting is August 19. Review the consensus definition, which is that it does NOT need to be agreed to by 100% of the participants, however a large majority (i.e. most of the participants need to agree the group's decision. Scott shared some materials that he recommends the group review for ideas on how to reach consensus. Cedric noted that in many Open Source communities, people who contribute more to the project, their recommendations have more weight than occasional users. Decision needs to include how the decision will affect adjacent communities such as GSMA and OPNFV and other LFN projects and communities. Identify voting member groups, see above. Cedric notes that the ability to vote should be based on the list of contributors who contributed to the code base. Rabi: Categories of voting members: Codebase (Docs) repository, People who attend meetings, companies that support the efforts. How do contributors get counted if they represent a company, or if they are individual contributors? Rabi: Maybe come up with a weighting method for the different types of contributors. Frederick Kautz: Need to watch for potential gaming of the system. Example: Lot of people contributing small amounts of code might change the results because too many voting members have like little commitment to the project.

The schedule for the decision needs to be updated as there is NO board meeting in September.

The weighting needs to be seen as fair and equitable to all the contributors to the project.

Follow on note: Arpit would like to see at least an update and hopefully a decision for the August Board meeting.