

**Evergreen Governance Committee
Meeting Minutes
December 14, 2010, 1:00 p.m.
Conference Call**

Attendees

Lori Bowen Ayre, Galecia Group
Galen Charlton, Equinox Software
Elizabeth McKinney, GPLS
Chris Sharp, GPLS
Dan Scott, Laurentian University
Sylvia Watson, Indiana State Library

Committee Updates

Communications

- still soliciting feedback on the Open-ILS-General mailing list

Evergreen Conference

- call for presentation proposals released – none received as of Friday 12/10
- discussing fees for conference pricing in order to begin registration ASAP

Governance Discussion

Dan mentioned that Bradley Kuhn would like to be included in any relevant communications around conference issues.

Discussion references the “Sponsorship agreement” document posted at <http://evergreen-ils.org/dokuwiki/doku.php?id=governance:structure> (2010-12-13 version)

Regarding the wording change of section 6 “Representation of the Project in the Conservancy ”: replacing “Interim Oversight Board ” with “Evergreen Oversight Board”, Dan mentioned that the goal of the wording was to strike the balance between having “something to point to” and not having to enter into a new agreement because of the term “interim”.

Sylvia requested that Wendy Knapp's name be removed from the list of Evergreen Oversight Board members, since her position has been filled by Alice Davidson. This prompted the point that the entire list should be reviewed and corrected where necessary.

Sylvia brought up the issue of fiscal sponsorship, referring to Jim Corridan's calculations based on the 2010 Evergreen Conference's expenses vs. revenue. It has been suggested in emails that the Governance Committee donate 10% of its annual income to the Software Freedom Conservancy (SFC).

A 10% (of gross income) commitment actually resulted in a net loss. A 5% commitment netted a small amount, but leaves little for other Evergreen Foundation uses.

The percentage of revenue donated to the SFC is not specified in the draft sponsorship agreement.

Lori suggested selling Evergreen-themed merchandise at the conference to increase revenue.

It was asked whether it is acceptable to donate a percentage of net proceeds rather than total revenue? - According to Bradley, most open source projects do not accrue a substantial surplus, so the suggestion is to based the percentage on total income rather than net proceeds.

Sylvia asked what happens if the Evergreen project's annual finances result in a net loss?

Chris asked whether the Evergreen 2011 conference planning committee should consider raising the registration fee in light of these considerations. (Last year's fee was \$135.00 with an early bird price of \$125).

Galen mentioned that it is not obligatory that the conference make enough money to fund the SFC donation.

Dan suggested that we plan the EG2011 registration fee to account for the SFC donation.

Elizabeth asked whether development partnerships that come through the foundation should include a percentage donation for the SFC. Dan asked why agencies wouldn't just pay development vendors directly? Elizabeth responded that writing a single check to the Evergreen Foundation would be better for state agencies rather than several individual checks to different parties that would have to be justified separately.

The question remains as to whether 5% of annual income should be the suggested donation amount.

The Software Freedom Conservancy will use the address of the Georgia Public Library Service as the address for the Evergreen project.

Elizabeth brought up the issue of a single representative for the project to the SFC. In the last meeting, this role was to be shared by Galen, Dan, and Elizabeth. Elizabeth mentioned that she would like us to be explicit in the sponsorship agreement as to our intent so it will be clear to project members beyond its current membership.

Adding the language “communicating the needs of the board” to the representation section was suggested. This brought up the question whether this would hinder things by requiring that the representative would have to get explicit board approval for each expenditure. It was agreed that setting a budget and approving amounts within that budget would be a reasonable solution.

Next meeting

January 18, 2011, 1:00 p.m. Conference Call