Projects ▾

Petra Manche ▾

Create

- ⚐ **Projects**
- ⚑ Milestones
- ☑ Tasks
- ⚑ Discussions
- ⚟ Gantt Chart
- 🕐 Time Tracking
- 📄 Documents
- 📊 Reports
- ▱ Project Templates

- ⚙ Settings
- ? Help Center
- 📢 Feedback & Support

CCUF Incorporation Working Group ⊙

Overview | Tasks | Milestones | **Discussions (18)** | Time Tracking | Documents (15) | Team (17)

Filter: ?   ➕ ❭ enter your query   🔍   Sort by: Comments ▾

AMS submitted a proposal

Author: Brian Smithson

11/26/2014   1:58 PM

One of the companies that I've been talking to for both administrative services and collaboration tools submitted a proposal. You can see it in the alternatives/AMS folder. They came in WAY higher than the others, proposing to provide a "a part-time Executive Director and full time coordinator (1.5 FTE) to support the Founding Project Work and the Ongoing Services work". I will get back to them after the US holidays and hopefully realign their perspective on what we really need.

Comments: 0   Add comment

Membership tiers and fee schedule: some numbers to play with

Author: Brian Smithson

11/18/2014   9:51 PM

Assuming that we have a fee schedule which is based on the size of member organizations, I wondered what are the sizes of the current member organizations.

After some research, I found that we have the following mix of industry (vendor, lab, and consultant) organization sizes:

Size	Number of organizations
Up to 10	28
11-50	16
51-200	28
201-500	4
501-1,000	9
1,001-5,000	21
5,001-10,000	8
>10,000	52
Unknown	8

Three tiers works nicely:

Tier	Number of organizations
up to 50	44
51 to 5000	41
larger than 5000	60

But we still need to figure out, as best we can, how many of those organizations might drop out if we charge any fee. I did some rough revenue calculations based on retaining 90% of the current membership (losing 10% from each tier). If the fees were $100 for organizations up to 50, $750 up to 5,000, and $1,500 for larger than 5,000, we'd bring in $112,750.

We also need to figure out if we need to have a fourth category for organizations that only want to join one iTC; I hope not, but it's something to consider. So I also calculated revenue based on losing 10% from each tier and also losing an additional 10% from each tier to the "one iTC" category. If the fees were as above, plus $100 for the "one iTC" category, we'd still bring in $103,150.

I have been using $100,000 budget as a benchmark because so far it is more than sufficient for the quotes that I've received so far for admin services and collaboration tools. So far, so good. However, it doesn't include telecom services, and I worry that it doesn't include something else that should be included.

Comments: 0   Add comment

Kickoff notes for Alternatives to incorporating

Author: Brian Smithson

11/11/2014   9:41 PM

Kickoff notes for Alternatives to incorporating

Brian Smithson, November 11, 2014

Introduction

For those who think incorporation is not the best approach, you could save us all a lot of work if you can propose alternatives that at least provide an equally improved set of collaboration tools without the need to incorporate to pay for them. Otherwise, it's likely that we'll end up proposing some way to incorporate!

This is the group to look at how we might accomplish at least our most immediate goal of providing professional collaboration tools without incorporation or budget.

Volunteered: Joshua Brickman, Mike Grimm

A starting point

The starting point for the whole incorporation effort was to look at how we could get much better collaboration tools. After considering some alternatives, I found that they generally suffered from a continuity problem: what happens if whoever is developing and maintaining tools,

supplying them as a service, or the funding the effort, decides to no longer do so?

I concluded that the only solution was to incorporate and collect funds from member organizations. However, more clever minds might find an alternative solution that doesn't require incorporation.

Next steps?

Find an alternative solution ☺.

Supporting information

The aforementioned alternatives were considered and summarized in my New Delhi workshop presentation.

There is useful and relevant information in consortiuminfo.org's essential guide. In particular:

- There is discussion of non-incorporated structure in *2.3.4 — Non-incorporated models* of section *II – Structure* in Chapter 6: Forming A Successful Consortium Part II — Legal Considerations.
- See also *4.2.2 — Communications* in section *IV– Income Projections and Budgets* of Chapter 5: Forming A Successful Consortium Part I — Business Considerations.

I posted a tools requirements matrix on Teamlab.

See the most recent status of alternatives document for information about what tools are being offered, and there are some details about tools offerings in the individual folders under the alternatives folder.

See also a large library of consortium-related articles in consortiuminfo's Meta Library.

Related activities

This subgroup might seek input from the "Tools and telecom" subgroup.

Comments: 0   Add comment

Kickoff notes for Tools and telecom requirements

Author: Brian Smithson

11/11/2014   9:40 PM

Kickoff notes for Tools and telecom requirements

Brian Smithson, November 11, 2014

Introduction

What are our requirements for collaboration tools, and should we try to provide telecom (e.g., webex, gotomeeting, etc.) services?

I already have a requirements list and have been completing a matrix showing the requirements mapped to Teamlab and to prospective collaboration tools. However, I have not looked into telecom requirements and prospective services (and costs) in any detail.

Volunteered:nobody!

A starting point

Well, it's a good thing that the impetus for this whole incorporation topic was to get better tools. The tools prospecting work is pretty far along. And that is a good thing, because nobody volunteered to join this subgroup!

However, I have done almost nothing about telecom and I could certainly use some help from someone who knows about services like webex, gotomeeting, etc.

Next steps?

Fill in the rest of the tools requirements matrix (see below). Provide the other groups with information about how the tools will be better.

Look into telecom requirements, available services, and costs.

Provide the cost info for tools and telecom to the "Membership fees, classes, and rights" subgroup.

Supporting information

I posted a tools requirements matrix on Teamlab.

See the most recent status of alternatives document for information about what tools are being offered, and there are some details about tools offerings in the individual folders under the alternatives folder.

There is useful and relevant information in consortiuminfo.org's essential guide. In particular:

- See *4.2.2 — Communications* in section *IV– Income Projections and Budgets* of Chapter 5: Forming A Successful Consortium Part I — Business Considerations.

See also a large library of consortium-related articles in consortiuminfo's Meta Library.

Related activities

This subgroup should seek input from other subgroups, especially ""Membership fees, classes, and rights" and "Relationship to the iTCs and other CCRA-nation-driven activities". It should provide output to the "Membership fees, classes, and rights" subgroup.

Comments: 0   Add comment

Kickoff notes for Relationship to the iTCs and other CCRA-nation-driven activities

Author: Brian Smithson

11/11/2014   9:40 PM

Kickoff notes for Relationship to the iTCs and other CCRA-

nation-driven activities

Brian Smithson, November 11, 2014

Introduction

We currently support them on Teamlab, and would presumably continue to encourage iTCs to use CCUF collaboration tools. Do those relationships change if we become CCUF Inc., and if so, in what way?

Consider, for example, a vendor that is interested in joining an iTC but is otherwise unfamiliar with the CC and completely unfamiliar with the CCUF. Would it be a show-stopper if they had to join the CCUF in order to participate in the iTC? Can we make some accommodation for that which is still fair to others (relates to Membership fees etc., [in another subgroup]). Keep in mind that (a) an iTC can decide for itself if it wants to use the CCUF's tools and other resources, and (b) there is already a public access channel to iTCs that's baked into the iTC/cPP process and lets people review and comment on the CC portal.

Volunteered: Simon Milford, Andy Nissen

A starting point

Perhaps before considering the details of cases in which a non-CCUF-member is invited to join a new iTC or a CCDB WG, it's worth looking at what is the CCUF's relationship to iTCs, CCDB WGs, and other CCRA-nation-driven activities. The CCUF isn't obligated to support them, nor are they obligated to accept CCUF support. What is the value of such activities taking place in the context of the CCUF and its (assumption: improved) collaboration tools? What's the value to the CCUF, and what's the value to the activity?

Meanwhile, the "Membership fees, classes, and rights" subgroup is also considering how an organization or individual could join an iTC or other CCUF-supported activity, possibly without needing to join the CCUF, and/or by paying a reduced or zero fee, and/or having access and voting rights that are limited to that iTC or activity. This could mitigate the concern that someone important might not join an iTC because they would also need to join the CCUF as a full-fledged member.

Also under consideration, in the "Membership agreements and rules that apply to supported activities" subgroup, the issue of what (if any) rules or policies should be imposed on all CCUF-supported activities.

Next steps?

It could be that the next step is simply to look at the overall relationship between the CCUF and iTCs/CCDB WGs/other CCRA activities, and then work with the other two subgroups on the details.

On the other hand, there may be more to consider. I suggest that the subgroup members speak with Dag, David, and/or other CCRA officials to see what they think the relationship is and should be, and whether incorporation of the CCUF makes any difference to that relationship.

Ultimately, I think the output from this subgroup is some kind of proposal that characterizes and guides the relationship between the CCUF and CCUF-supported activities.

Supporting information

See the kick-off notes from the "Membership fees, classes, and rights" and "Membership agreements and rules that apply to supported activities" subgroups.

There is useful and relevant information in consortiuminfo.org's essential guide. In particular:

- Some background on value proposition is in sections *II – The Generic SSO Value Proposition* and *III – Personalizing the Value Proposition* of Chapter 2: Participating In Standard Setting Organizations: Value Propositions, Roles And Strategies.

See also a large library of consortium-related articles in consortiuminfo's Meta Library.

Related activities

This subgroup needs to work closely with the "Membership fees, classes, and rights" subgroup and the "Membership agreements and rules that apply to supported activities" subgroup. It may provide some input (from the CCRA people) to the "Tools and telecom" subgroup.

Comments: 0   Add comment

Kickoff notes for Engaging the CCUF membership

Author: Brian Smithson

11/11/2014   9:39 PM

Kickoff notes for Engaging the CCUF membership

Brian Smithson, November 11, 2014

Introduction

How and when should we inform and engage the CCUF membership in this process, and especially, how and when should we go about getting the CCUF to vote on incorporation?

If we go to the membership for a poll or vote with too little information, we're likely to get a resounding "no". But if we invest too much time before seeking feedback from the membership, we risk re-doing things or wasting the entire effort.

Volunteered: Simon Milford, Petra Manche

A starting point

I don't really have a starting point for this. I engaged some of the membership with forum postings, a session in New Delhi, and a few mentions during CCUF meetings. A more organized approach is needed to elicit input from or ask questions of the membership, assess the membership's expectations about incorporation (both positive and negative), and eventually figure out how to get an up-down vote to proceed with incorporation, if/when it is proposed by this WG.

More than just a mechanical polling exercise, I think the engagement needs to be done with a bit of marketing. Nobody will vote for incorporation without some kind of value proposition. In the Supporting Information section below I have some links about that.

Next steps?

Figure out how to get the CCUF membership thinking (positively, one hopes) and talking about incorporation, with the ultimate goal of holding a vote on incorporation.

Supporting information

I can provide a membership list (as of September 2014) that attempts to correctly identify organizational affiliations and geographic locations, if that is somehow useful.

There is useful and relevant information in consortiuminfo.org's essential guide. In particular:

- You'll probably want to read most or all of Chapter 3: Getting the Most from Your Membership
- It could be useful to consider what parts of the CCUF's value proposition increase in value by incorporating. Some background on value proposition is in sections *II – The Generic SSO Value Proposition* and *III – Personalizing the Value Proposition* of Chapter 2: Participating In Standard Setting Organizations: Value Propositions, Roles And Strategies.

See also a large library of consortium-related articles in consortiuminfo's Meta Library.

Related activities

This subgroup really needs to stay informed from all of the other subgroups, since in some ways it acts as the communication channel to the membership for this WG.

Comments: 0   Add comment

Kickoff notes for Membership agreements and rules that apply to supported activities

Author: Brian Smithson

11/11/2014   9:38 PM

Kickoff notes for Membership agreements and rules that apply to supported activities

Brian Smithson, November 11, 2014

Introduction

I think it will be relatively easy to find examples of membership agreements that won't be a problem for legal departments, but I wonder if we need to consider any rules (particularly having to do with transparency or decision-making) or policies (particularly related to IP and patents) that could or should apply to any CCUF-supported activities like WGs and iTCs.

The basic membership agreement for CCUF could be quite simple, and based on work already done in the current governance document. Consider also what rules or policies the CCUF should impose on activities that it supports (iTCs, other WGs) such as the WTO TBT Six Principles (I've posted a copy in the Resources folder) in order to preserve non-profit status and prohibit activities that might be considered collusion.

Volunteered: Petra Manche, Andy Nissen

A starting point

I don't have anything drafted or otherwise coherently written on this topic. I think that the bulk (literally and figuratively) of a CCUF Inc. membership agreement would be composed of boilerplate that we'd get from a legal advisor.

However, one area that wouldn't be covered in standard consortium boilerplate is: what rules or principles or policies should the CCUF require of any WG or TC activity that it supports?

For all of the talk about the WTO's Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT) "six principles of standards development", I don't see some of the basic principles of openness and transparency being faithfully implemented by some of the iTCs that the CCUF currently hosts on Teamlab. Some of those failures to follow principles may be attributed to inflexible or otherwise unsuitable collaboration tools, but other examples that I could give are not similarly excused.

So I think that this group could look at how those principles could or should be applied to the CCUF in general, but perhaps more importantly, how they could or should be imposed on WGs and iTCs that the CCUF supports.

Some additional considerations are presented in the consortiuminfo.org reference in the Supporting Information section below.

Next steps?

Aside from reviewing everything and thinking about things that I haven't covered at all, then consider what (aside from boilerplate) should be in a CCUF membership agreement, and what (if any) rules or policies should be imposed on all CCUF-supported activities.

Definitely look at the consortiuminfo.org materials I mention in the next section.

Ultimately, I hope this subgroup can formulate the part of a proposal which outlines the non-boilerplate parts of a CCUF membership agreement.

Supporting information

See the WTO TBT's six principles document located in this WG's Resources folder.

There is useful and relevant information in consortiuminfo.org's essential guide. In particular, see:

- Additional principles and policies input can be found in section *V – Policies and Procedures* in Chapter 5: Forming A Successful Consortium Part I — Business Considerations.
- Important process decisions are considered in section *VII – Significant Process Decisions* of Chapter 8: Creating A Standard Setting Organization Technical Process.

See also a large library of consortium-related articles in consortiuminfo's Meta Library.

Related activities

This subgroup should work closely with the "Relationship to the iTCs and other CCRA-nation-driven activities" subgroup, and perhaps also the "Membership agreements and rules" subgroup. It could work with the "Engaging the membership" subgroup if member input is needed.

Comments: 0   Add comment

Kickoff notes for Membership Fees, Classes, and Rights

Author: Brian Smithson

11/11/2014   9:37 PM

Kickoff notes for Membership fees, classes, and rights

Action Items for Membership Fees, Classes, and Rights

Brian Smithson, November 11, 2014

Introduction

This is a big topic to look into how we can create a structure of membership classes and fees that are fair to smaller organizations, and also to organizations that might have limited interest in the CCUF (but want to participate in, for example, one iTC), and yet bring in enough revenue to support the organization.

Consider both sides of the membership fee structure equation: raising revenue (for lack of a better number, shoot for $100K/year), and affordability and fairness of membership fees.

Volunteered: Alicia Squires, Erin Conner, Petra Manche, Andy Nissen

A starting point

I've made some assumptions, mostly based on how similar consortia work, but please feel free to consider other ways of organizing membership. Here is mine:

Membership and registration

Organizations are the "membership" entity. Once an organization has joined, any number of their employees may participate for no additional fee when they are registered under their organization's membership.

Membership by organization:

- Makes it easier for billing and official communications;
- Encourages broader participation within an organization than membership (and payment) by individual;
- Makes it possible to create rational and fair voting policies; and,
- It is typical of this kind of association.

An organization could be composed of just one individual, such as a consultant, an academic, or someone in between jobs. The policy would be that members must register according to their primary source of income from CC-related activities.

There may be cases where an employee of a consulting organization is representing a client organization, and we should be able to register such people under their client organization, on request of the client organization.

Most consortia handle individual registrations by matching the individual's email domain with one that has been authorized for their organization. This often requires multiple domains to be authorized for a given organization (e.g., ricoh.co.jp and ricoh-usa.com). This is something for the registration tool to handle; I'm just mentioning it here to explain the basic method for validating an individual's affiliation with a member organization. Also, an organizational membership would include some assignable roles for individuals, such as "primary contact", "primary voter", "alternate voter", and such.

Who pays what?

I propose that organizations in the CC industry – vendors, CCTLs, and CC consultants – pay an annual membership fee, and that other organizations participate in the CCUF for free. The rationale for this is:

- Industry (supposedly) makes money from CC certification activities;
- The mission of the CCUF has been focused on matters of interest to industry;
- Industry has been leading the CCUF;
- More than 75% of the organizations represented by CCUF members are industry;
- It would be difficult to get money from 26 national governments; and,
- We'd like to encourage greater participation from end users and others closer to the procurement end of the CC process.

Further, I propose that there should be two or perhaps three industry membership levels:

1. Full access membership for medium to large enterprises;
2. Full access membership for small enterprises for a reduced membership fee; and,
3. Possibly a 3rd membership level, with limited access membership for participation in one group (such as an iTC or pre-iTC working group), for a reduced fee or even for free. This might be necessary, but it does cause problems later so I hope we don't need to have it.

Most simply, the amount that industry members would need to pay in order to sustain the CCUF depends on a number of factors. For example, if you assume:

- 150 industry organizations join the CCUF
- 100 of them are in the 1st level. The remaining 50 of them are in the 2nd or 3rd levels.
- Budget target is $100,000.
- Level 1 membership fee is $1,000, and the fee for level 2 or level 3 is $100.
- Revenue would be (100 * $1,000) + (50 * $100) = $105,000.

As long as the revenue is greater than the budget, we're good.

So the questions that need to be answered are:

1. Should industry (only) be required to pay a CCUF membership fee?
2. How many industry member organizations would join?
   a. As of September, there were about 175 industry organizations in the CCUF membership.
   b. We certainly could lose some members if we start charging a fee.
   c. An informed estimate of industry membership is essential to establish a membership fee schedule.
3. If we have two or three levels of membership, how many industry members would be in each of the levels?
4. What is the first-year and following-years' budget estimates?
   a. The budget number is primarily set by the costs for starting and operating the association plus the cost for tools and telecom services.
   b. However, it also may depend on the outcome of the CCUF Strategic Planning activity. If, for example, a strategic goal is to be able to underwrite and host face-to-face meetings or conferences, then the budget would need to include funds needed for underwriting.

Membership classes, access rights, and voting rights

I haven't given this a great deal of thought, so I'll ramble about a few topics.

Stakeholder groups

On Teamlab, we assign one stakeholder group to each individual, and we can use that for access control (e.g., only people in the Vendor group can access the rather empty Vendors forum). However, it has been imperfect:

There are cases where an organization has multiple roles, like Cisco (vendor) and its subsidiary SiVenture (lab), and there are cases where an individual's role may be ambiguous, like someone from NSA IAD who might be representing the US Scheme or the US Government.

It will help if individuals register under an organizational membership because the appropriate stakeholder roles have been defined at the organizational level, but we'll need to allow organizations to register with more than one stakeholder role. Ideally, an individual would then be able to select from the stakeholder roles that are available for their organization.

Membership classes

First, I don't think there should be any super classes of CCUF membership, such as might be the case if the CCUF offered extra rights of some kind in exchange for a higher membership fee or sponsorship. Some consortia

Should there be voting and non-voting membership classes? The current CCUF governance allows anyone to vote (one per organization, generally). The only reason I can think of for not allowing someone to vote is if we have a 3rd level of membership that is limited to just on WG or TC; in that case maybe they aren't CCUF members but instead they are some kind of registered guest.

Maybe we don't need membership classes.

Access rights

In Teamlab, everyone has read-access to just about everything unless it's in a group marked Private. To have write-access in a group (e.g., to post a message to a TC forum), you need to be a member of the group. Access policies in general will be set by the "Membership agreements and rules" group, perhaps adopting something like the WTO TBT six principles.

Related to membership, however, I don't know if we need to associate membership with access unless:

1. We have stakeholder-specific resources, like a Vendors Forum. So far there has been no call for that.
2. We have a 3rd membership level that is defined by limited access, such as to one WG or TC.

Voting rights

For CCUF matters, all CCUF member organizations can vote. Hopefully, there are some tools to help automate the voting process, aided by membership data such as "primary voter" and "alternate voter" assignments. If there is a "registered guest" class, then they wouldn't be able to vote on CCUF matters (but perhaps could vote in their TC or WG).

For TC or WG matters, I think the group will need to set its own voting policy as long as it conforms to the aforementioned "Membership agreements and rules". Hopefully, there are tools that help groups assign voting eligibility and automate the process.

Next steps?

Aside from reviewing everything and thinking about things that I haven't covered at all, and assuming that the subgroup concurs with membership-by-organization, then I think most of the work has to do with answering the questions at the end of "Who pays what?".

Definitely look at the consortiuminfo.org materials I mention in the next section.

Ultimately, I hope this subgroup can formulate the part of a proposal which covers membership fees, classes, and voting.

Supporting information

See the most recent status of alternatives document for estimates of first and thereafter annual costs. Note that they do not include telecom costs, as those have not yet been estimated (as of Nov. 11, 2014).

I can provide a membership list (as of September 2014) that attempts to correctly identify organizational affiliations. It is how I figured out that 175 of 225 organizations were "industry". It hasn't changed much since September, but if you're ready for an update, I can generate one without too much effort.

See the WTO TBT's six principles document located in this WG's Resources folder.

There is useful and relevant information in consortiuminfo.org's essential guide. In particular, see:

- Chapter 5: Forming A Successful Consortium Part I — Business Considerations and scroll all the way down to section *IV– Income Projections and Budgets*.
- Chapter 2: Participating In Standard Setting Organizations: Value Propositions, Roles And Strategies and scroll all the way down to section *V – Joining an SSO*.
- And there is an interesting paragraph *3.5 — Signing up the Right Business Unit at the Right Price* in section *III – Solutions* of Chapter 3: Getting the Most from Your Membership.

See also a large library of consortium-related articles in consortiuminfo's Meta Library.

Related activities

This subgroup should work closely with the "Membership agreements and rules" subgroup, provide input to the "Tools and telecom" subgroup, and perhaps work with the "Engaging the membership" subgroup to estimate membership. And it should keep track of the CCUF MG's Strategic Planning activity.

Comments: 0   Add comment

Sub-group kickoff notes

Author: Brian Smithson

11/11/2014   9:31 PM

Hello CCUF Inc WG members,

In last month's teleconference, the initial activities of this WG were divided up into six topical areas and a call for volunteers was made. Thank you to those who volunteered for those subgroups.

I had planned to have another teleconference, but thought it would be better to wait and see if any of the subgroups made progress.

Seeing none -- I understand, I also have a day job -- then I thought I'd kick off each subgroup with some notes. I'll post those notes in separate discussion topics on this forum. Sorry for the barrage.

I encourage all WG members to read all of them, but particularly read the ones you volunteered for. Anyone else who would like to join the subgroups, please do so. If you have comments about the kickoff notes, please don't hesitate to post them!

Comments: 0   Add comment

Call for volunteers to work these topics

Author: Brian Smithson

10/17/2014   5:00 PM

As discussed in today's teleconference, these are the first topics to conquer. At this point, we need very high level discussion and/or proposals on these topics. Detailed cases and "wordsmithing" can come later.

For additional context, review the Welcome Message that I posted when starting this WG.

For a great deal more information about starting and operating a standards- or specifications-setting organization, go to the "Standards Library" on consortiuminfo.org.

I've included *a few notes* with each topic, below. To join one or more subgroups to work on them, send me an email (bsmithson@ricohsv.com) or post a comment to this discussion.

1. Membership fees, classes, and rights. This is a big topic to look into how we can create a structure of membership classes and fees that are

1. Membership fees, classes, and rights. This is a big topic to look into how we can create a structure of membership classes and fees that are fair to smaller organizations, and also to organizations that might have limited interest in the CCUF (but want to participate in, for example, one iTC), and yet bring in enough revenue to support the organization.

Consider both sides of the membership fee structure equation: raising revenue (for lack of a better number, shoot for $100K/year), and affordability and fairness of membership fees.

Already volunteered: Alicia Squires, Erin Conner, Petra Manche, Andy Nissen

2. Membership agreements and rules that apply to supported activities. I think it will be relatively easy to find examples of membership agreements that won't be a problem for legal departments, but I wonder if we need to consider any rules (particularly having to do with transparency or decision-making) or policies (particularly related to IP and patents) that could or should apply to any CCUF-supported activities like WGs and iTCs.

The basic membership agreement for CCUF could be quite simple, and based on work already done in the current governance document. Consider also what rules or policies the CCUF should impose on activities that it supports (iTCs, other WGs) such as the WTO TBT Six Principles (I've posted a copy in the Resources folder) in order to preserve non-profit status and prohibit activities that might be considered collusional.

Already volunteered: Petra Manche, Andy Nissen

3. Engaging the CCUF membership. How and when should we inform and engage the CCUF membership in this process, and especially, how and when should we go about getting the CCUF to vote on incorporation?

If we go to the membership for a poll or vote with too little information, we're likely to get a resounding "no". But if we invest too much time before seeking feedback from the membership, we risk re-doing things or wasting the entire effort.

Already volunteered: Simon Milford, Petra Manche

4. Relationship to the iTCs and other CCRA-nation-driven activities. We currently support them on Teamlab, and would presumably continue to encourage iTCs to use CCUF collaboration tools. Do those relationships change if we become CCUF Inc., and if so, in what way?

Consider, for example, a vendor that is interested in joining an iTC but is otherwise unfamiliar with the CC and completely unfamiliar with the CCUF. Would it be a show-stopper if they had to join the CCUF in order to participate in the iTC? Can we make some accommodation for that which is still fair to others (relates to Membership fees etc., above). Keep in mind that (a) an iTC can decide for itself if it wants to use the CCUF's tools and other resources, and (b) there is already a public access channel to iTCs that's baked into the iTC/cPP process and lets people review and comment on the CC portal.

Already volunteered: Simon Milford, Andy Nissen

5. Tools and telecom requirements. What are our requirements for collaboration tools, and should we try to provide telecom (e.g., webex, gotomeeting, etc.) services?

I already have a requirements list and have been completing a matrix showing the requirements mapped to Teamlab and to prospective collaboration tools. However, I have not looked into telecom requirements and prospective services (and costs) in any detail.

6. Alternatives to incorporating. For those who think incorporation is not the best approach, you could save us all a lot of work if you can propose alternatives that at least provide an equally improved set of collaboration tools without the need to incorporate to pay for them. Otherwise, it's likely that we'll end up proposing some way to incorporate!

This is the group to look at how we might accomplish at least our most immediate goal of providing professional collaboration tools without incorporation or budget.

Already volunteered: Joshua Brickman, Mike Grimm

Comments: 0   Add comment

---

1   2   Next ▸   Total : 18   Show on page : 10