

Who	Email-date	Member?	Comment	Current Text	Suggested Text	Status (Accepted / Rejected / Modified / Duplicate)	Notes
Lisa Jones	6/21/2021	No	<p>For Attendee Privacy Already stated in the approved chapter policy is the following statement: "OWASP membership and participation in chapter meetings are subject to locally applicable data protection regulations (for instance, see GDPR). Where conflicting local regulations exist, the most restrictive should be observed."</p> <p>Not sure if we want to be consistent?</p>			Accept	
Lisa Jones	6/22/2021	No	<p>I think that Should "AppSec Days" be used in the title of the event to create brand awareness and consistency as well as use the trademark?</p> <p>There was confusion in the past with local and regional events supposedly not aware that their sponsors needed to pay in full prior to the event start date to attend. (For in-person events in the past.) Once this was clearly communicated the local events teams would assist with collections. This reduced and kept collections to a reasonable level. There will need communication a procedure outlined on how and who will work with the local events teams to obtain the aging report for their event.</p> <p>I see the 80/20 split. What is the plan if the event expenses erode the profits to a negative or extremely low ROI?</p>			Nothing here to add to policy	
Lisa Jones	6/23/2021	No	<p>In the past, there was no submission, communication, or organization of local and regional events. This would be beneficial in creating a marketing plan moving forward.</p> <p>There used to be a specified timeframe before and after a planned Global AppSec that local and regional events were not scheduled. 30 days comes to mind, but not sure. Events not competing against each other, saturating the market, and lowering the attendance. (in-person) This would go for all events free or at a fee. Limited resources to assist leaders. This was when we had 1 events person.</p>			Reject	

Who	Email-date	Member?	Comment	Current Text	Suggested Text	Status (Accepted / Rejected / Modified / Duplicate)	Notes
Tanya Janca	6/25/2021	Yes	<p>Thank you for listening to my previous feedback and adjusting the policy. Below are comments on the policy that I hope you find helpful.</p> <p>I think it's awesome that basically anyone can organize an OWASP event now, this means people who aren't already bogged down with being leaders</p> <p>I am small concerns about just anyone being able to run an event; I feel there's risk in having unknowns in play. What if they lose lots of money? Who pays?</p> <p>Will the OWASP staff be offering advice to people running the event? For instance, finding sponsors. Lots of people don't know how to do that.</p> <p>If you have content or tips for people running events, perhaps add links for each line item in the policy to any helpful articles? It would be helpful.</p> <p>I like the "this stuff is out of scope" part. Good, clarity</p> <p>Linking the code of conduct and privacy policy are good</p> <p>So cool that event leaders become OWASP Leaders! How long does that status last? A year?</p> <p>So event leaders have to pay to become a member, then they can become an event leader? Wait, I see the answer further down.</p> <p>I really like the part that clarifies the seed funding.</p> <p>Not covering travel is going to limit who speaks at these events. I understand the foundation wants to make money, but saying it's because they want to invest in local talent sounds like an excuse. In my opinion local talent should learn and develop at meetups, and then apply to conferences when they are ready.</p> <p>Speaker fees and training – add link to the policy.</p>			Modified	Put links where needed - there is no speaker policy. The agreement is linked.