Who	Email-date	Member?	Comment	Current Text	Suggested Text	Status (Accepted / Rejected / Modified / Duplicate)

Richard Greenberg	27-Jul	Yes			I am adding language for the draft policy "Fair and Reasonable Expenses": https://owasp.org/www-policy/operational/community-review-process.html
					
					Chapter Specific
					   Event Services, Catering, and Space for Chapter Meetings
					   Paying for a trainer for a local training
					   Infrastructure costs, such as projectors, tablets, needed for meetings
					   Travel and parking for chapter leaders to attend chapter events
					   Travel, food, and parking for chapter representative at other events where chapter has a table/booth
					   Travel, food, and parking for other events where chapter representative is speaking on behalf of OWASP
					   Costs for marketing, such as Google ads, to enhance presence at events
					   Event management software solutions, such as Eventbrite, Boomset, Sched, etc.
					   Transfers of funds to OWASP Projects
					   Shipping and storage costs for events and equipment
					   Raffle prizes and swag
					   Literature costs
					   Signage, tablecloth, banner costs
					Project Specific
					   Graphic Design
					   Technical Contractor
					   Software Licenses
					Applicable to Chapters, Projects and Committees
					   Annual Celebratory Leader Gatherings
					   Printing
					   Domain Names
						Modified. Short list of what will be allowed and outside of that $250 limit unless pre-approved

Richard Greenberg	27-Jul	Yes	Why are we removing from inventory "capital assets under $1,000, when purchased for staff or contractor business use after 12 months of use?" Capital assets under $2,000 purchased by the Foundation will be expensed and not amortized, additionally capital assets under $1,000, when purchased for staff or contractor business use, are removed from Foundation inventory after 12 months of use.			Rejected
Veronica Jimdnez	13-Aug		<blank email>			Rejected
Bjoern Kimminich	14-Aug	Yes	"Annual Celebratory Leader Gatherings" just feels wrong and if every project and chapter did this, even non "steak & lobster", OWASP goes bankrupt with no benefit other than happy leaders. If leaders want an annual party, every participant can pay their own food imho...			Accepted
Bjoern Kimminich	14-Aug	Yes	"Technical Contractor" is vague and could mean anything. Either be more specific by listing 2-3 examples or maybe remove?		Developer and Technical Editor	Accepted
Bjoern Kimminich	14-Aug	Yes	"Project Specific" does only list personnel/service costs. Maybe list conference swag, too? Juice Shop might be the most crazy swag producer in OWASP, but other projects have stickers and stuff too.		Under the $250 limit. Add link for preapprovals	Rejected
Bjoern Kimminich	14-Aug	Yes	"Provided sufficient Chapter or Project balances" makes absolutely no sense assuming the project/chapter balances will be eliminated. For everyone who opposes the new Donations Policy this is an invitation to go nuclear now due to inconsistency...			Accepted
Johnnie Bonner	15-Aug	Yes	<ok>			Rejected

Who	Email-date	Member?	Comment	Current Text	Suggested Text	Status (Accepted / Rejected / Modified / Duplicate)
Sherif Mansour	16-Aug	Yes	Fair and Reasonable Expenses/Hardware: Why on earth so hard to approve A/V Equipment such as a tripod/mic/projector etc...? Different chapters will have different needs. E.g, London most facilities are well equipped and catering is paid for. However we do have the need for a good camera to film the events because we record them. Other chapters are not so lucky. Some will need projectors or a/v equipment etc... A laptop etc.. is a bridge too far, but I can see how if you are running an event and have no way to present - you can see how that can be a problem. We also expense prizes for the CTF events, and purchase OWASP SWAG so I would factor that as well.			Accepted
Sherif Mansour	16-Aug	Yes	Also we pay for the speaker's travel expense (for chapter meetings) - it's rare and not an issue when it's a major city - but if you are a remote chapter and would like a speaker to travel to your event... yes it will cost. If the chapter has a budget, I don't see why the need to do a "Mother may I"			Rejected

Lisa Jones	17-Aug	Yes	I think to eliminate the debating and uproar over expenses. I think there needs to be standards and criteria spelled out where we possible. The community is looking for clarity and transparency on exactly is acceptable. The above statement is ambiguous and open to interpretation based on individual perception of what is reasonable and fair to the individual.
			
			It also raises several questions.
			
			   What and how will the expenses be measured?
			   Just exactly how is the leadership and community going to measure the fair and reasonable expenses?
			   What are the standards for non-profit foundations? I think they should be listed for clarity.
			   How will the staff manage this policy
				Generally, the policy of the Foundation is that all expenses should be "fair and reasonable" as measured by leadership, the community, and the standards for non-profit foundations.		Rejected

Lisa Jones	17-Aug	Yes	If Capital assets under $ 2,000 are not amortized then they should not be listed in inventory and thus will not need to be removed from inventory after 12 months of use.	Capital asset purchases for chapters and projects are strongly discouraged and if over $250 requires pre-approval by the Executive Director. Capital assets under $2,000 purchased by the Foundation will be expensed and not amortized, additionally capital assets under $1,000 are removed from Foundation inventory after 12 months of use.		Accepted

Who	Email-date	Member?	Comment	Current Text	Suggested Text	Status (Accepted / Rejected / Modified / Duplicate)
Various - Github			mikemccamon on Jan 30 Member These first three items are already in the draft policy. I do think we may need to put boundaries on this at some point. For instance can one chapter have steak and lobster and other think pizza is okay. @johndileo johndileo on Jan 30 Member This is where it seems like a budget approval process would make the most sense. Chapters that host local events and generate significant revenue should be able to submit a budget each year, with an outline of how they're planning to spend "their" money. And, yes, if a chapter brought in over $100K last year, and wants to spend extra on a steak-and-lobster dinner this year, that's reasonable. On the other hand, if a chapter has not produced any revenue, and wants to host food using the "general pool," pizzas or sub platters would be reasonable. Bottom line...supporting annual budget pre-approval, carefully managed, could address the "existential concern" of chapters' maintenance of control over the fruits of their local labours. @johndileo johndileo on Jan 30 • Member In the above comment, "their" is in quotes, because funds have never actually been separate - they've just been earmarked to be spent at the discretion of the chapter/project that raised them (subject to overall restrictions on what can/cannot be paid for). @johndileo johndileo on Jan 30 • Member I believe my real point here is that profit-sharing needs to continue for local events. Two points need to be addressed, though: Should the formula be revised from the one most recently approved by the Board (90/10 for the first US $5000; 40/60 for the remainder)? and For how long should the funds remain "theirs"? The point has been raised, and acknowledged, that holding funds indefinitely, for a chapter that isn't spending them, cannot continue - if for no other reason than that it puts our tax status in jeopardy. The existing policy related to this - setting a carry-over limit of US $5000 - has not, to my knowledge, been consistently enforced, and there is no clear process around it. So...I believe the appropriate thing to do is to continue the profit-sharing policy, but enforce a time limit (12 months? 18 months?) for either spending those funds or having an approved plan for how they'll be spent over a longer period. @mcpeak mcpeak on Jan 31 These first three items are already in the draft policy. I do think we may need to put boundaries on this at some point. For instance can one chapter have steak and lobster and other think pizza is okay. The "steak and lobster" reflects distrust of chapter leaders. It's probably intended as a straw man argument, but I'd like to know why we think this is actually a problem. @haralts haralts on Feb 1 Member The "steak and lobster" is a bad straw-man argument, as is the one-size-fits-all policy of setting arbitrary limits. No chapter has had steak and lobster at their meetings but if chapters want to break the pizza monotony they do have to spend more money. A carry-over limit of $5000 is arbitrary and inadequate for chapters that don't have a steady sponsorship stream but get their funding from regional conferences. @act1vand0 act1vand0 on Feb 12 • I agree with @johndileo, @mcpeak and @haralts and their comments above, indicating that chapters that bring more money (local conferences, sponsorships, etc.) to the Foundation should be entitled to use more funds for better food -- to a certain extent. I would not be OK with approving lobster and steak for any chapter meetup (or even the chapter's annual holiday party). This ties directly into the Chapter Tiers discussion, #3. Martín Santa Barbara Leader AppSec California Organizer		Summarized as "when chapters have money they can spend it"	Rejected
Various - Github			Travel expenses for speakers for local events - Payments for trainers at events @bkimminich bkimminich on Jun 13 Member A non-profit paying trainers to come to one of their regular meetings? Sounds odd to me. For a conference, fine, but conference budgeting shouldn't be mixed with regular chapter expenses. @RG-OWASP RG-OWASP on Jun 13 Member I believe what was meant was paying for training. @bkimminich bkimminich on Jun 14 Member I don't see how changing "paying for trainers" into "paying for trainings" addresses my point above.			Rejected

Who	Email-date	Member?	Comment	Current Text	Suggested Text	Status (Accepted / Rejected / Modified / Duplicate)
Various - Github			mikemccamon on Jan 30 Member In the draft policy these next two items require Executive Director approval. I do believe that our bigger chapter meetings merit having guest speakers that could travel, the issue would be if every chapter decided to fly folks in to do meetings. For instance is every chapter (285) chose to do this at a cost of $500 that would be 1/2 of our entire annual chapter budget. One proposal that had been floated at one time was designed to control this cost and I think the only easy way to manage it is through the size of chapter meetings (large gatherings can on occasion, smaller ones no). @jferg-newcontext jferg-newcontext on Jan 30 I would suggest that maybe rather than being chapter-size based it be event-size based. Our KC chapter regularly tries to do joint events with other, related groups in the area, and while our usual chapter meetings are very small, I can certainly see situations where we could bring someone in to speak to our group and 2-3 other local groups, which seems like it would be advantageous both to our small chapter's growth as well as OWASP as a whole. Additionally, this, and the infrastructure question below, tie back to the "with pre-approval vs automatically approved" question, which I'm still not 100% sure is fully explained in this document. @jferg-newcontext jferg-newcontext on Jan 30 Also, this statement gives me a bit of pause: For instance is every chapter (285) chose to do this at a cost of $500 that would be 1/2 of our entire annual chapter budget. The policy as written says "reasonable" expenses up to $2500, but says nothing about the frequency of that $2500. Based on the math above, 114 requests for $2500 would eat up the entire chapter budget for the year. Just spitballing, our chapter might spend $150-$200 on food and venue rental each month for a meeting, which would be $2400/year. So if 115 chapters spent that much in a year, it could likely become a problem, but all it takes is a few chapters to spend $2500 on things a year in addition to that for it to become a real problem. @mcpeak mcpeak on Jan 31 In the draft policy these next two items require Executive Director approval. I do believe that our bigger chapter meetings merit having guest speakers that could travel, the issue would be if every chapter decided to fly folks in to do meetings. Yes, we raise corporate sponsorships that want to support our local chapter. One of the things we can do with this support is make our speakers better by flying in targeted high value speakers. @mcpeak mcpeak on Jan 31 For instance is every chapter (285) chose to do this at a cost of $500 that would be 1/2 of our entire annual chapter budget. If those chapters are raising money they should be able to do so. If they aren't raising money and they're relying on central funds, I wouldn't favor that. We do need some tiering based on ability to raise sponsorships and otherwise bring money in. @haralts haralts on Feb 1 Member I agree with @mcpeak here. Chapters that raise money via sponsorships or by organizing successful regional events should be allowed to spend money in order to provide travel funds for speakers that require flights and hotels. This only improves the quality of the events, the chapter and OWASP. @staticeffect staticeffect on Feb 1 I do believe that our bigger chapter meetings merit having guest speakers that could travel, the issue would be if every chapter decided to fly folks in to do meetings. We are a smaller chapter that has worked super hard to raise money for ourselves. Seeing that we are 1) small and 2) remote, it means we have been looking at paying people to come speak to at our meetups. You are basically crippling smaller remote chapters from being able to reimburse a good speaker that could potentially bring more people to our meetings and increase our membership. TL;DR Since we worked to earn this money, shouldn't we be able to choose how to spend it within reason? @act1vand0 act1vand0 on Feb 12 I agree with most of what's been said above. Successful chapters that bring in money to the Foundation should be entitled to more freedom on what to do with that money -- within reason. Once again, this ties into the Chapter Tiers discussion, #3. So far everyone seems to be favoring this, and we hope it is approved. If/when that happens, we'd need to remove: Guest speakers, when pre-approved by the Executive Director, for Chapter Events.		Summarized as "when chapters have money they can spend it"	Rejected

Who	Email-date	Member?	Comment	Current Text	Suggested Text	Status (Accepted / Rejected / Modified / Duplicate)
Various - Github			ADD - Infrastructure costs, such as projectors, tablets, needed for meetings @mikemccamon mikemccamon on Jan 30 Member I am completely against this proposal. Capital equipment should not be supplied to local chapters. Again if all 285 chapters chose to "gear up" just with a $900 computer, our annual chapter budget would be completely deleted. Chapter meetings happen at the most once per month (usually less than four times a year) so I"m not sure how the Foundation would manage - or why we would want to - over 275 new assets. @johndileo johndileo on Jan 30 Member I think we're still stuck at the heart of our disagreement here... Chapters that conduct local conferences or other events, which generate significant local revenue, are not OK with being entirely subject to a single globally-managed Chapter budget process. This proposal will remain 100% unworkable until that is directly, openly, and acceptably addressed. In particular, I can tell you now that my conference sponsors will NOT be OK with having their donations dumped into the general fund - they want their money to support AppSec education in New Zealand, and it's our job as Chapter Leaders to make that happen. @johndileo johndileo on Jan 30 • Member Specific comment about "speaker travel" - this is part of the New Zealand Chapter's operating model. We are a national chapter, with activities and events hosted (currently) in four cities spanning the country. We had, since the chapter was founded, provided travel support for a number of speakers each year, so they can present useful content in more than one city. Since we have always had local control over the funds our local conference earned, this was never an issue. Now, you're saying it will never be acceptable to fund travel by speakers who aren't also Chapter leaders, unless the current ED happens to be in a good mood... @mcpeak mcpeak on Jan 31 I think we're still stuck at the heart of our disagreement here... Chapters that conduct local conferences or other events, which generate significant local revenue, are not OK with being entirely subject to a single globally-managed Chapter budget process. This proposal will remain 100% unworkable until that is directly, openly, and acceptably addressed. In particular, I can tell you now that my conference sponsors will NOT be OK with having their donations dumped into the general fund - they want their money to support AppSec education in New Zealand, and it's our job as Chapter Leaders to make that happen. 100% agree with this. @act1vand0 act1vand0 on Feb 12 I also agree with @mcpeak on @johndileo comment above. Once again, this ties into the Chapter Tiers discussion, #3.		Summarized as "when chapters have money they can spend it"	Rejected
Various - Github			ADD - Annual "Thank You" dinner for chapter leaders/volunteers @bkimminich bkimminich on Jun 13 Member Again, fine for conference volunteers/organizers but not each and every chapter's anual year end party should be paid by OWASP. @RG-OWASP RG-OWASP on Jun 13 Member When you say "paid for by OWASP", what do you mean? What if the chapter raised the money themselves? @bkimminich bkimminich on Jun 14 Member First of all, chapters are no legal entities, so they can't raise anything themselves and expect to keep it for any use they see appropriate. Second, an annual dinner is absolutely not appropriate to be paid by a non-profit organization for one of its chapters. Consider all chapters did that with sponsor money. I doubt this is what OWASP supporters have in mind when giving to the foundation. @johndileo johndileo on Jun 14 Member they can't raise anything themselves and expect to keep it for any use That is precisely the source of contention around these proposed policy changes. This is part-and-parcel with the stated goal of eliminating chapter balances, and requiring ALL chapters to ask for funding from a single, centrally-controlled pot of money - without any consideration for the level of fund-raising they have done. @johndileo johndileo on Jun 14 Member an annual dinner is absolutely not appropriate When chapters have a large cadre of active volunteers, who have each worked many hours conducting a number of chapter activities throughout the year, and when those chapters have also raised a significant amount of money through those same efforts, holding an annual celebration party/dinner is entirely appropriate. The fact the volunteers didn't happen to work together on a single event should not be relevant.		Summarized as "when chapters have money they can spend it"	Rejected

Who	Email-date	Member?	Comment	Current Text	Suggested Text	Status (Accepted / Rejected / Modified / Duplicate)

Various - Github			- Travel and parking for chapter leaders to attend chapter events
			  - Travel, food, and parking for other events where chapter has a table/booth
			  - Travel, food, and parking for other events where chapter representative is speaking on behalf of OWASP
			 @mikemccamon
			mikemccamon on Jan 30 Member
			I'm not thrilled with all of these but see some logic. I would specify travel in lines 32 and 33 are for local events of mileage less than 50 miles from the chapter location.
			
			Line 34 would require pre-approval but this is the sort of travel we want to ENCOURAGE! Please, go apply to speak at BlackHat about OWASP.
			
			 @johndileo
			johndileo on Jan 30 Member
			Again, I 100% disagree with your comment on line 32. Within our chapter, we don't ask for travel assistance when events are within 50 miles of our home locations. They're only needed when a leader is travelling to a different city, which is a short flight away (e.g., AKL-WLG is 55-minute flight; AKL-CHC is 75-minute flight; AKL-DUD is 110-minute flight, etc.).
			
			 @johndileo
			johndileo on Jan 30 Member
			Another aspect of the same thing...
			
			As part of our annual conference, we provide financial aid support to students, unwaged professionals, members of underrepresented populations, etc., for travel to the conference. Your proposed restriction on the policy would appear to prohibit this, as well - despite its importance to fulfilling the chapter's mission.
			
			 @haralts
			haralts on Feb 1 Member
			@johndileo is right. If travel is within 50 miles, no travel assistance is usually needed. In a large metropolitan area however, events can be 70 miles away, yet are still "local". When traffic is considered, that pushes travel to and from these events upwards of 2 hours each way, these events require travel funds.
					Summarized as "when chapters have money they can spend it"	Rejected

Various - Github			ADD - Travel expenses and food for chapter leaders attending Global AppSec conferences @bkimminich bkimminich on Jun 13 • Member If I'm not speaking or in the org team of a conference, I never would assume OWASP to pay my travel costs. @RG-OWASP RG-OWASP on Jun 13 Member There is indeed a high value in leaders assembling at OWASP global conferences to collaborate and share ideas. Not everyone works for a company that will pay their way. The leaders list is one way to communicate, but as we can see, email leaves a lot to be desired, and some people are easily offended. Plus, being an international organization, language via email is easily misinterpreted. @bkimminich bkimminich on Jun 14 Member OWASP leaders do get free access to conferences by default, no? That makes total sense, no matter where they come from. But if a leader decides to travel to a conference where he/she has no speaking engagement, is not part of the orga team and is also not hosting any open space/round table etc. I see no reason why OWASP would pay travel costs for him/her. Again, if every leader would invoke that rule, leaders could fly around the globe to conferences and chapter meetings at will. @johndileo johndileo on Jun 14 Member I have to disagree here...and have to other similar comments. Some chapters are located in parts of the world where there has never been - and likely never will be - a "nearby" conference, making self-funding of travel prohibitively expensive. There are also likely to be chapter leaders who choose not to submit talks and/or training to conferences, and also are unable to obtain employer support for their attendance. A policy that prohibits ever funding such a leader's travel to Global AppSec conferences means those leaders will never have the opportunity to take part in the face-to-face Leaders meetings, sit in on a Board meeting, or otherwise network with other chapter leaders. My belief is that it is appropriate - provided the chapter has sufficient funds, and the individual doesn't have access to travel funding from other sources (employer, etc.) - for a chapter to support the travel of one chapter leader to one Global AppSec conference per year (presumably, the "closest" one), as a representative of the chapter.		Summarized as "when chapters have money they can spend it"	Rejected

Who	Email-date	Member?	Comment	Current Text	Suggested Text	Status (Accepted / Rejected / Modified / Duplicate)
Various - Github			This should not be an approved expense. There is no business reason to the Foundation for a chapter leader to get free travel to simply attend one of our Global events. This occurred on several occasions last year and I believe there is some tax exposure to this sort of benefit which we need to explore. @johndileo johndileo on Jan 30 Member Another point on which I, and I'm sure others, 100% disagree. At every Global AppSec conference, there is at least one face-to-face meeting of Chapter and Project leaders. For chapters that will never be close to a Global AppSec conference (such as New Zealand), it is absolutely appropriate for the chapter to provide travel support, so leaders can participate in person. Again...it's much more appropriate for a chapter that has generated significant amounts of its "own" money, through local events. @mcpeak mcpeak on Jan 31 This should not be an approved expense. There is no business reason to the Foundation for a chapter leader to get free travel to simply attend one of our Global events. This occurred on several occasions last year and I believe there is some tax exposure to this sort of benefit which we need to explore. I agree. Chapter Leaders can pay to attend conferences they want to attend. I do believe we should cover costs for organizers of conferences though. @haralts haralts on Feb 1 Member I disagree. That would preclude Chapter Leaders from attending Global events and meeting other Chapter Leaders if they are not fortunate enough to work for companies with a large enough travel budget to sponsor such travel. If a Chapter has enough budget, it should be allowed to use it on travel to Global events. @act1vand0 act1vand0 on Feb 12 I agree with @johndileo and @haralts on this one -- a well established chapter bringing good money to the Foundation should be able to use some of its "own" money for this purpose if the leaders of the chapter consider this appropriate. There's a lot of value in having good leaders attend these events. Once again, this ties int the Chapter Tiers discussion, #3.		Summarized as "when chapters have money they can spend it"	Rejected
Various - Github			ADD - Costs for marketing, such as Google ads, to enhance presence at events - Event management software solutions, such as Eventbrite, Boomset, Sched, etc. @mikemccamon mikemccamon on Jan 30 Member We already cover this so we would approve @johndileo johndileo on Jan 30 Member You're still holding to the "approval is required for every item" model, and the uncertainty it introduces, which is what we've been arguing against in total. @act1vand0 act1vand0 on Feb 12 Well established chapters should have these items pre-approved. See Chapter Tiers discussion, #3.		Summarized as "when chapters have money they can spend it"	Rejected
Various - Github			ADD - Transfers of funds to OWASP Projects @mikemccamon mikemccamon on Jan 30 • Member Projects will not "need funds" in our planned "fair and reasonable" future - they would just get pre-approval and spend their funds. We might be creating some restricted giving jeopardy here as well so we should avoid this. @johndileo johndileo on Jan 30 Member See above comments...disagreement with this entire principle is the point of the conversation.		Summarized as "when chapters have money they can spend it"	Rejected
Various - Github			ADD - Shipping and storage costs for events and equipment @bkimminich bkimminich on Jun 13 Member Should rather be a conference thing also. @johndileo johndileo on Jun 14 • Member I disagree. Marketing materials and supplies, which are used throughout the year, can be owned by - and need to be stored by - any Chapter, not just the ones that also host conferences. @bkimminich bkimminich on Jun 14 Member Good point, for chapter of a certain size even a "normal" chapter meeting might be logistically challenging enough to warrant such expenses.			Accepted. Under $250 limit

Who	Email-date	Member?	Comment	Current Text	Suggested Text	Status (Accepted / Rejected / Modified / Duplicate)
Various - Github			ADD - Raffle prizes and swag - Literature costs @bkimminich bkimminich on Jun 13 Member I assume you do not mean printed OWASP books as giveaways here? Why should OWASP pay for a chapter library? @RG-OWASP RG-OWASP on Jun 13 Member Literature, as in marketing brochures to hand out encouraging people to join OWASP and attend our meetings and conferences. We hand out hundreds of these at other company and organizational meetings and conferences every year. @bkimminich bkimminich on Jun 14 Member Okay, then I suggest to call it "Printing costs for flyers/brochures/handouts" - all that is obviously fine. @johndileo johndileo on Jun 14 Member The change you're suggesting imposes an unnecessary restriction on the source of the literature - specifically, that it has to be printed locally. Revising the language, to clarify what "literature" means, would be reasonable - though I don't think it's needed. @bkimminich bkimminich on Jun 14 Member literature noun /ˈlɪtrətʃə(r)/ /ˈlɪtrətʃər/, /ˈlɪtrətʃur/ [uncountable] pieces of writing that are valued as works of art, especially novels, plays and poems (in contrast to technical books and newspapers, magazines, etc.) Let's just agree not to use that word for info material such as flyers and the like...			Accepted. Under $250 limit
Various - Github			ADD Signage, tablecloth, banner costs @mikemccamon mikemccamon on Jan 30 Member All of this is stuff is fine so long as it doesn't get out of hand. @haralts haralts on Feb 1 Member Again, I see vague wording here, which leads to uncertainty as to what will be approved and what will not be approved. A recent rejection to another leader said: "we don't pay for parking" Really?! If parking is $20+ for a local event that required chapter participation, why is parking excluded?! How is the leader going to get there and where should they park? @act1vand0 act1vand0 on Feb 12 I'm aware that a leader from the LA area was refused parking reimbursement and I fully disagree with that decision. Regarding shipping / raffle / literature / etc costs, once again I think it needs to be based on the Chapter Tier, see discussion in #3.			Accepted. Under $250 limit
Various - Github			johndileo commented on Jan 30 Hearkening back to Josh's use case, there should probably be an entry for other "durable" goods (computers, audio/video equipment, etc.) for use at chapter events, subject to some sort of review. There are probably a few other items that could be added to a list of "approved in principle, but the details require approval." For example, if the chapter wants to purchase a laptop and conference streaming software (as Josh noted), it wouldn't be acceptable to spend chapter funds on a high-end gaming rig. This would be separate from items generally considered outside the "umbrella' of running a chapter, but that might still be acceptable on a case-by-case basis, and yet another list of items that would never be acceptable.		Summarized as "when chapters have money they can spend it"	Rejected
Richard Greenberg	30-Jan	No	I have created a Chapter Tier chart that attempts to formalize the classifications of, criteria, and entitlements of chapters at OWASP. Please comment. This will helping our Fair and Reasonable Expenses discussion as well. Chapter Tiers.docx			Rejected. Out of scope for Chapters Policy
Marin	12-Feb	No	I agree with @RG-OWASP that we need some kind of classification for chapters, e.g. one that is brand new and will (hopefully) hold 4-5 events a year vs. one that's been around for a while, holds 8-12 events a year, and is a key player in bringing money into the Foundation by having a successful local conference with major revenue, bringing in corporate sponsors, etc. I also agree with @mikemccamon that for the smaller chapters with low activity, it'd be helpful to have a centralized budget for all of them. I tend to think this would be the case for most chapters. This way they can continue to run a good (but small and/or low activity) chapter while we're able to alleviate the Foundation from managing separate budgets for all of them. I'm looking forward to the conversation where we can discuss and formalize the idea of chapter tiers, and how we'd adjust the expense-reimbursement doc to reflect this. Martín Santa Barbara Leader AppSec California Organizer			Rejected. Out of scope for Chapters Policy
Bjorn Kimminich	13-Feb	Yes	The chapter classification criteria proposed are very vague. Also it seems the entire discussion boils down to "does local conferences = brings more money = allowed to spend more money" which could be solved by making bigger expenses part of said conference budget plans. Just as an example: Expecting to get an annual chapter christmas party sponsored has a much different vibe than budgeting a conference after-party for the organizers of a conference.			Duplicate