Who	Email-date	Member?	Comment	Current Text	Suggested Text	Status (Accepted / Rejected / Modified / Duplicate)
Grant Ongers	27-July	Yes	I'd like to modify the wording on: "Administer fair and open elections as often as once every 24 months for Leadership roles in their group." to be: "Manage leadership appointments and changes in accordance with the relevant guidelines." And to add the following text under the heading Leadership: "In the case of Chapter, Committee, or group leadership, OWASP follows an elective representative approach; so fair and open elections for the leadership roles in these cases are required at least every 24 months to ensure that the leadership of those entities do represent the will of those communities. In the case of Project leadership, OWASP follows other open source initiatives in allowing project leadership to remain with the project initiator (or their successor, through whatever internal process) and to allow the forking of projects and then the relative popularity of the forks to determine dominance. A project that forks from an existing OWASP project can make an application to become a new OWASP project and potentially to even replace the original should that be in the best interest of the Foundation."			Accepted
Christian Folini	27-July	Yes	Looking over the "Leaders (Draft WIP)", I get the feeling the policy interferes too much with the running of chapters, but even more projects. Treating all the projects alike and forcing the same rules on all projects is having a negative impact on many projects that face unique situations that can not be addresses by out of the box solutions. Enforcing leadership elections in projects is such an example or forcing projects to work with OWASP mailinglists is another one. While I see the positive idea behind it, this is just not working for all projects. Some projects will simply prefer slack and while I think they ought to be doing business via mailinglists, it should not be enforced. -> Give the projects more freedom to develop, don't interefere so much. I also see significant redundancy with the new donations policy. A link to said policy should be enough. Disputes: I like the idea of an escalation ladder. But having HQ staff interfere with problems with project leaders, especially elected project leaders, is a troubling thought. OWASP staff is not elected and can not be contested the way an elected committee and ultimately the board of directors can.			Accepted
Rick Mitchell	4-Aug	Yes	> Leaders serve at the pleasure of the OWASP Board and the larger AppSec Community. Why start this off adversarially? Making this statement as such only serves to sow disharmony. Projects are Open Source and are highly likely to simply leave the organization were the board to attempt to unilaterally remove a leader. I'd suggest: "Leaders serve at the pleasure of the larger AppSec Community"			Accepted
Rick Mitchell	4-Aug	Yes	> Document proceedings of the group on the OWASP Foundation supplied Mail List This is a policy document it shouldn't attempt to define working models/mechanisms. While it's nice to promote use of org resources/solutions requiring their use without other options simply limits the effectiveness of the document, what happens in 3 years when Google groups goes away? Then you're bound to find a mailing list replacement or update this document again as it's overly prescriptive. Additionally what about projects/regions that dislike this mechanism. I'd suggest something more generic: "Document proceedings in an open manner or make them available upon request."			Accepted
Rick Mitchell	4-Aug	Yes	> Protect participant data and ensure GDPR Compliance in proceedings What does this mean? I"m not a European citizen and have no insight into GDPR requirements (which is likely true of numerous chapter/project leaders). Does the org have a consultant available to ensure this is happening and provide guidance to chapters/projects? (The Org as a whole). Obviously participant data should be protected, however making reference to particular compliance requirements without a plan to actually deal with such seems like a mistake. I'd suggest simplifying as follows: "Take reasonable steps to protect participant data in any proceedings or participation related to OWASP projects or activities"			Accepted
Rick Mitchell	4-Aug	Yes	> Annually sign a Leaders Agreement that includes these Core Principles Where is this? What's the mechanism to tracking/maintaining these? How are we supposed to approve this policy with the reference to this doc if it doesn't exist? I'd suggest just removing this. It's more administrative overhead that the org doesn't need.			It is posted

10/27/2020

Who	Email-date	Member?	Comment	Current Text	Suggested Text	Status (Accepted / Rejected / Modified / Duplicate)
Rick Mitchell	4-Aug	Yes	> Injure or impugn the reputation the Foundation, colleagues, staff, or Directors on social media Why is this limited to "social media"? I'd suggest simply dropping the "on social media" portion, it shouldn't happen at all.			Accepted
Rick Mitchell	4-Aug	Yes	> Authorize expenses that are in violation of OWASP Foundation polocy "polocy" => "policy" maybe even "policy(ies)"			Accepted
Rick Mitchell	4-Aug	Yes	> If the Foundation Staff or Board of Directors determines that a Leader has not complied with these rules, their status as a Leader may be revoked. Sure, however in the case of projects this likely just leads to forking or leaving the org. (For chapters it likely means the chapter just disappears quietly into the night.) I understand there has to be some recourse but the org needs to be aware of what this means or how it could turn out.			Rejected
Rick Mitchell	4-Aug	Yes	> however groups must abide by the Code of Conduct, Foundation bylaws, and the polices in these Rules of Procedure. This document/section isn't "Rules of Procedure".... I'd suggest: " however groups must abide by the Code of Conduct, Foundation bylaws, and the polices."			Accepted
Rick Mitchell	4-Aug	Yes	> Be responsive to all requests generally within 5-7 business days. Staff don't even hit this SLA. It seems ridiculous to try to set an SLA for volunteers when paid staff can't even hit the SLA. Also this suggests that "leaders" must be responsive, however some projects/chapters are too big for that. I'd suggest simply removing this bullet.			Accepted
Rick Mitchell	4-Aug	Yes	> Commit to serve for a minimum term of 24 months. Or what? While consistency is important this simply serves to limit and discourage participation. These are volunteers, who knows what life changes might occur in a 24 month period. This should be removed or made more volunteer friendly: "Commit to serve as long as possible. Up to 24months for elected positions." (More on that below.)			Accepted
Rick Mitchell	4-Aug	Yes	> Administer fair and open elections as often as once every 24 months for Leadership roles in their group. This isn't applicable for projects, and many chapters as well. For my local chapter there's a core group of volunteers that decides, there's an open planning meeting once a year. Leaders are invited to volunteer and there are never "too many". I have no idea how we'd even hold an election. I guess we could ask at a chapter meeting if people were okay with the choice/option but given that there are thus far never any alternatives that seems kind of pointless. Plus again this simply adds administrative overhead to the org/staff that already has trouble delivering and being responsive. Who is going to track the 24 months for 1000s of projects/chapters? Who is going to setup the system/process for each election? (Expecting the projects/chapters to do this doesn't seem practical, we can barely get them all updating the website.) Also it seems likely that the "voting" would be limited to members, but projects/chapters have no mechanism by which to check membership, so there's another staff task....			Accepted
Rick Mitchell	4-Aug	Yes	> When their are violations, please follow the following hierarchy when escalating concerns: "their" => "there"			Accepted
Rick Mitchell	4-Aug	Yes	> Leaders will be provided an Owasp.org email account and shall this address for all OWASP related matters. I think you want "and shall use this". While it's good to promote consistency, who is going to police/enforce this. Seems like yet another task the org can't and doesn't need to handle. Stating that leader email addresses are listed on the site should suffice to make them reachable. (However again, I'll ask who is going to police/enforce that.)			Accepted

Who	Email-date	Member?	Comment	Current Text	Suggested Text	Status (Accepted / Rejected / Modified / Duplicate)
Rick Mitchell	4-Aug	Yes	> Social Media accounts associated with OWASP Projects, Chapters, or groups are controlled by the OWASP Foundation. While the Leader, or in rare cases members, may create an account and manage its day-to-day operations, credentials including passwords and recovery emails must be transferred when there is a change of leadership. It makes sense for these to be transferred when/if necessary, however the oversight or control seems like yet another thing the org/staff can't and shouldn't have to handle. I'd suggest a rewrite: "While the Leader, or in rare cases members may create Social Media accounts associated with OWASP Projects, Chapters, or groups and manage their day-to-day operations, credentials including passwords and recovery emails/numbers must be transferred when there is a change of leadership"			Accepted
Rick Mitchell	4-Aug	Yes	> In either case, custom domain names shall point to the corresponding page on the Foundation website for the group, and if maintained by a Leader, its use shall be registered with the Foundation. This needs to be clarified. What does "shall point" mean? That they're simply used for redirection? (That's not practical, GH pages doesn't provide the flexibility that some projects need.) Does it simply mean a link back to owasp.org? (Which seems reasonable, along with appropriate copyright/trademark markings etc). Either way it needs a rewrite of some sort.			Accepted
Rick Mitchell	4-Aug	Yes	> Leaders shall host group meetings no less than four times a year. Chapter Meetings must be in-person. Again while regular meetings are a good goal, this seems like a ridiculous thing for the org to try to police/enforce. What if a volunteer can only manage 3 in a year? Also given the on going global health crisis trying to enforce "in-person" chapter meetings seems like a mistake.			Accepted
Rick Mitchell	4-Aug	Yes	> This includes but not limited to the OWASP Mailing Lists "This includes but is not limited to the OWASP Mailing Lists"			Accepted
Rick Mitchell	4-Aug	Yes	> The minimual acceptable channels for this posting is the group's main webpage on owasp.org and the OWASP Mailing List (Google Groups), or in the case of Chapter the OWASP Mailing List can be replaced with an OWASP Meetup account. This seems too prescriptive, outlining the specific technologies/platforms to be used may bottleneck or invalidate the policy in the future. Also there's a typo "minimual". I'd suggest a re-write: "At a minimum meetings should be announced via two public communication mechanisms known to be regularly used by the project/chapter/group."			Accepted
Rick Mitchell	4-Aug	Yes	> Section 5: There are numerous policy/documentation references prior to this point however they aren't linked/cross referenced until this section where donations etc are linked. I'd suggest that more linking is a good thing. While it's a maintenance headache (potentially) it makes things much more usable and user-friendly.			Accepted
Rick Mitchell	4-Aug	Yes	> General Bulleted lists within the doc don't seem to consistently use (or not use) periods.			Accepted
Lisa Jones	10-Sep	Yes	Leadership * Leader should contact the Foundation immediately if need to step down as leader. * Minimum of 2 Leaders per chapter - Chapters with 1 leader are not meeting the minimum criteria for an active chapter. Two leaders are required for the expense approval process. OWASP.org Email Accounts Leaders will be provided an Owasp.org email account and shall monitor regularly for information from the he Foundation. The email address of Leaders will be listed on the OWASP website. By using the OWASP email address, Leaders ensure vendor neutrality, protect their own privacy, and allow for identity portability within the OWASP community.			Accepted
Lisa Jones	10-Sep	Yes	A group's webpage shall minimally include: Group leadership with contact information Link to the group's Mailing List (Google Group) Meetings Notices (For Chapters 2 weeks prior) Website Chapters and Projects reposting and rewording of certain policies has been a problem. ie. donation I suggest that leaders are instructed not to re- post policies that are associated with financial matters because of the regulations the Foundation is held to by the IRS for non-profit 501c 3. The Foundation will only review and update the policy page on owasp.org and leaders would need to review that page on a constant bases and update their individual chapter page to be compliant with the regulations. As we have seen getting leaders to update owasp.org chapter pages does not occur on a regular bases.			Accepted

Who	Email-date	Member?	Comment	Current Text	Suggested Text	Status (Accepted / Rejected / Modified / Duplicate)
Lisa Jones	10-Sep	Yes	Social Media The below statement as far as I am aware is not happening. This is an area that does needs to be addressed. There have been cases where chapters use other social media accounts to fun their chapter outside the knowledge of the Foundation. Even when they have been made inactive. Social Media accounts associated with OWASP Projects, Chapters, or groups are controlled by the OWASP Foundation. While the Leader, or in rare cases members, may create an account and manage its day-to-day operations, credentials including passwords and recovery emails must be transferred when there is a change of leadership.			Duplicate
Lisa Jones	10-Sep	Yes	Domain Names Is there a list of current list of chapter and project domains in place today? Who is managing an enforcing? Are we or do we pay for domains? I would think that this will need to addressed especially since OWASP now is a registered trademark. More important how is the Foundation going to handle the projects that have their own separate websites?			Rejected
Lisa Jones	10-Sep	Yes	Meetings Chapter Meetings must be in-person. In person, Virtual or OWASP chapter run event were always acceptable ways to meet the criteria of 4 meetings a year. (Preferably a calendar year, spread apart)			Accepted
Lisa Jones	10-Sep	Yes	Section 5 should be removed and leaders should be held accountable for the Policies and Procedures listed on the owasp.org website.			Reject. Will include here too
Maetha Wadee	24-July	No	<empty>			Rejected
Maetha Wadee	24-July	No	<empty>			Rejected
Ms. Lynn Wilderson	26-July	No	<empty>			Rejected
Josh Sokol	27-July	No	I respectfully disagree on the elective approach for Chapters. This has been discouraged in the Chapter Handbook for over a decade: https://owasp.org/www-policy/operational/chapter-handbook-existing			Rejected
Josh Sokol	27-July	No	My suggestion is to not adopt a new policy on this and continue to leverage the handbooks that were designed to address these issues that are specific to those entities: https://owasp.org/www-policy/operational/chapters https://owasp.org/www-policy/guidebook/chapter-leader			Rejected
Nargiza	30-July	No	<empty>			Rejected
JVenny Firdaus	2-Aug	No	<empty>			Rejected
Big Daddy	3-Aug	No	<empty>			Rejected
Thai My Luc	5-Aug	No	<empty>			Rejected
David Juarez Mena	15-Aug	No	<empty>			Rejected
Robby Ramon	24-Aug	No	<empty>			Rejected
Asil Kadro	10-Sept	No	<empty>			Rejected
Marcus Bock	16-Sept	No	<empty>			Rejected