

Background:

Original Driver / Issue to Address:

- **Original Driver:** Three rulings at the Operating Committee on December 3 against minority interests to change an issue charge the day of the vote on the main proposals - the change eliminated minority interest options – and to push back on fair, consistent treatment of minority requests
 - The proposal to change the issue charge was **within the rules**.
 - A request for further voting analysis of majority positions was allowed because **the rules did not prohibit it**.
 - A request for further voting analysis made by a minority interest was not allowed because it was **against long standing stakeholder agreements**.
- **Issue to address:** Concerns about how minority interests are treated in the stakeholder process
 - Consistent, fair, treatment of minority interests
 - Understanding of the application of long-standing stakeholder agreements
 - Minority interests have less and less influence in the lower sectors by the month.
 - Concern that one sector has undue influence in standing committee matters – particularly, the planning committeeQuestion: Do stakeholders care?

Initial Sponsor: Greg Poulos

Subgroup Members: Is there interest?

Seeks to Accomplish:

- Ensure minority interests are recognized, fairly treated, and able to not just participate but influence decisions made in the stakeholder process.
- Ensure one sector does not have undue influence over decisions in the stakeholder process
- Address the monthly erosion of consumer perspective at the committee level (affiliate level).
- Include more transparency in the stakeholder process.