
Report on the
Space Frontier Foundation Board of Directors
60 Day Review Resolution
October 20 - December 18, 2001

Released December 31, 2001

Table of Contents

Introduction..... 1

The 60-Day Review Resolution..... 2

Summary of Key Findings 5

Summary of Key Recommendations 6

Action 1 – Financial Review..... 7

Action 2 – Advocate Process Review 10

Action 3 – Fundraising Review 11

Action 4 – Internal Communications Review..... 13

Action 5 - Projects Review 15

Action 6 – Message Development Review..... 17

Attachment 1 – Proposed Advocate Selection Procedure 19

Attachment 2 – Proposed Advocate’s Duties and Responsibilities..... 21

Attachment 3 – Proposed Project Manager Job Description 23

Specific Responsibilities 23

Attachment 4 – Proposed Projects Coordinator Job Description 24

Attachment 5 – Proposed Procedures for Policy/Message Committee 25

Introduction

At the inaugural meeting of the new Board, a resolution was passed that called for the Board to perform a 60-day review focusing on ten different aspects of the Foundation in order to recommend changes that would strengthen our organization. The 60-day review resolution, which was distributed to all Advocates via e-mail, can also be found on the Advocates Web Site (<http://www.space-frontier.org/Advocates/index.html>) and is included as the next section in this report.

As of December 18, 2001, this 60-day period ended and the assigned Board members have completed their reviews of the first six items in the resolution that dealt with the way the Foundation operates. This report includes a compilation of the findings and recommendations for these six items. It is being distributed to the Advocates through the Advocates Web site for a comment period that will last until January 15, 2002. Advocates can comment on this report by posting to the appropriate thread on the Advocates BBS. The Board will consider all comments before implementing any of our recommended changes.

The reviews of the last four items in the resolution that dealt with the structure of the Foundation proved to be more complex, requiring additional care and effort. They are not yet complete. In order to provide the time these important areas deserve, we have extended the review period for these four items for no more than 60-days to allow us to adequately complete these reviews. You can track our progress on these review items by checking the Board Meeting minutes that can also be found on the Advocates Web Site. We look forward to reporting our findings and recommendations on these items to you soon.

-- Bob Noteboom, Chairman of the Board

The 60-Day Review Resolution

Space Frontier Foundation Board of Directors 60-Day Review Resolution October 20 - December 18, 2001

Whereas the new board recognizes that significant changes may be required to strengthen the organization, we propose a 60-day review during which the following will apply:

- Recognizing the outstanding contributions and superior work ethic displayed by the current President, Treasurer, Secretary, Advocates Coordinator and the Executive Director, we request that each of these individuals continue in their current positions and provide assistance to the Board during the length of this review.
- The Executive Director will report to the Board Chair or his/her designated representative on a schedule selected by the Board during this review period.
- As a minimum, weekly Board meetings will be held to report progress on objectives listed below. Meetings shall not exceed 90 minutes without approval of the Board. All members of the Board as well as the President, Treasurer, Secretary, Advocates Coordinator, Project Coordinator and the Executive Director will be expected to attend these meetings.
- Due to potential legal and fiscal liabilities, new projects, new contracts and other obligations must be approved by the Board prior to initiation.
- In order to deepen the communication between the Board and operations of the Foundation, all official media statements (e.g. press releases, interviews, etc.) shall be reviewed by the Board prior to release, or, in the case of breaking news stories, as quickly as practicable thereafter.

During this 60-day period, Board Members shall provide regular reports to the Board, shall provide a written document describing their recommendations for Board approval and shall be responsible for the following specific responsibilities:

- Shubber Ali will work with the Treasurer and the Executive Director to review all existing financial processes, statements, contracts, and other relevant materials and determine the current financial status of Foundation operations and projects. He will then recommend to the

Board any changes required to establish realistic operating budgets and apply industry standard accounting systems and procedures to all Foundation operations.

- John Carter McKnight will work with the Advocates Coordinator to review the current Advocate nomination and approval process. He will then recommend to the Board any changes required to formalize this process.
- Bill Boland will work with the Executive Director and President to review our current and potential fundraising sources and direction and determine their future viability and desirability. He will then identify additional opportunities for fundraising and recommend guidelines to be used in selecting which fundraising initiatives should be pursued.
- Denise Norris will work with the Secretary, Executive Director and Advocates Coordinator to review our current processes for internal communications with Advocates and general membership. She will then recommend to the Board any changes required to improve these processes, which shall include as a minimum the creation of regularly scheduled e-mails and a revitalized internal Advocates web site.
- Bob Noteboom will work with a Board appointed Projects Coordinator and the President to review the requirements and reporting processes for current projects and operations. He will then recommend to the Board any changes required to improve accountability and increase synergy between projects and the operations.
- Tony DeTora will work with the President to review our current processes for establishing the message (i.e. Vision, Policies, and Positions) of the Foundation. He will then recommend to the Board any changes to these processes that will allow us to better clarify our message, integrate the knowledge, experience, and beliefs of our Advocates, and document a clear vision, a coherent set of policies, and timely and consistent positions.
- Rick Tumlinson will work with other Board members and the Founders to perform a Vision/Policy review. The goal of this review is to develop an overall Vision Map for the Foundation that highlights and explains the goals and inter-relationships between existing Projects, activities and the core Vision of the Foundation.
- An individual appointed by the Board will work with the President and other officers to perform a PR/Media review. The goal of this review is to define (based on the final state of message development, Vision Map and top level goals of the organization) the type, form and

structure of the Foundation's media operations, outreach, and archival activities.

- An individual appointed by the Board will work with the President and other officers to perform a review of the Foundation's organizational affiliations. The goal of this review is to trace, define and explain the strategic value, benefit, commitments, cost and potential liability associated with relationships between the Foundation and other organizations.
- The Chairman of the Board coordinating with all other Board members and the advice of legal counsel will review the bylaws of the Foundation and identify to the Board the changes required to strengthen our organization and to allow it to transition into an organization that can continue to grow and sustain itself.

At the end of this 60-day period, we will issue the Board's findings and recommendations for review and comment by the Advocates for a two-week period prior to implementing any changes.

Summary of Key Findings

1. There is no accepted standard or process for planning, managing, and controlling the Foundation finances. This has resulted in the Foundation being approximately \$80K in debt.
2. No written or agreed-upon procedure currently exists for the nomination and approval of Advocates.
3. Fundraising is insufficient to cover operational activities and this has resulted in the Foundation running up a considerable debt (approximately \$80K). No fundraising strategy exists to cover this debt or raise the money required to support future projects.
4. Other than the Advocates BBS (which is used only by a vocal minority), there are very few mechanisms available to communicate Foundation news to members.
5. A consistent understanding of the roles and responsibilities of a Foundation Project Manager (including planning, budgeting, and communication) does not exist.
6. The current processes for establishing the message of Foundation are very poorly specified and delineated.

Summary of Key Recommendations

1. The Foundation must immediately reestablish clear and accurate books (preferably in electronic format) and standard policies and procedures for managing its finances. It must also establish an operating budget for next year (2002) based upon realistic expectations.
2. A clear, written procedure for the selection and approval of new Advocates should be drafted for Board enactment.
3. Budgets for future expenditures should be based upon realistic fundraising plans. Board members, Advocates, and existing major donors should be approached to provide donations and/or loans to cover the short-term debt. The Foundation should establish a diverse set of strategies and mechanisms for fundraising to reduce its reliance on a single donor. These strategies should include reaching out to the membership for donations on a regular basis, sponsorship of major events and projects, and the use of Board members to solicit contributions from major donors.
4. The Foundation should establish a number of new internal communications mechanisms including Advocate and Member e-Newsletters, on-line voting and plebiscites, an on-line e-zine, a semiannual four color magazine, reinvigorated Advocate and Members-only websites, and an up-to-date Advocates Handbook.
5. The Board should appoint a Projects Coordinator and the roles and responsibilities of the Projects Coordinator and Project Managers should be clearly defined and documented.
6. A standing Policy/Message Committee (PMC) be established to facilitate the message process; to produce message entities (policy documents) that display a clear understanding of the Foundation's current policy positions; and to help establish the framework for the development, review and approval of all policy positions for the Foundation.

Action 1 – Financial Review

The Resolution:

Shubber Ali will work with the Treasurer and the Executive Director to review all existing financial processes, statements, contracts, and other relevant materials and determine the current financial status of Foundation operations and projects. He will then recommend to the Board any changes required to establish realistic operating budgets and apply industry standard accounting systems and procedures to all Foundation operations.

Findings:

Overall, the Foundation is in the red. The current financial shortfall appears to be the result of two things:

- Poor financial management that has led to the Foundation to make sub optimal financial decisions in the past
- A reduction in our funding streams due to a drop-off in patron/sponsor support due to the economic climate and lack of strong self-promotion by the Foundation.

The financial review was undertaken to address and clarify the issues surrounding the first point. Based upon a review of the documentation provided (it took some time to get all the documents, and many were only recently received and are still under review), it appears that the financial management issues are tied to a number of process breakdowns which, in combination, led to our current “in the red” position.

It appears the current financial problems of the Foundation are due, in no small part to the lack of formalized processes for most basic aspects of financial record keeping and transaction processing in place today.

The current disorganized financial state of the Foundation is a result of the lack of an experienced financial professional who has the time and resources to properly manage the inflows and outflows of cash for operations as well as events/projects. This role has therefore been apparently split between the Executive Director and the Treasurer; however, the former is already overly tasked with the day-to-day operations as well as multiple other requirements and does not have the bandwidth to monitor this as needed (nor should he); the latter serves this role in a part-time capacity and should likewise not be required to manage the accounts on a deposit/payment level.

Specific problems that have arisen due to the lack of a focused individual on minding the finances of the organization include:

1. Lack of standards for accounting from year to year (for IRS form 990). This appears to be the result of different people completing this form each year, which

may explain why significant fluctuations occur in various categories (e.g. membership dues).

2. Lack of clear bank account separation – cash inflows and outflows, regardless of category (e.g. project, event, operational expense, etc) were all being funneled through the same account. This makes it near impossible to, at any point at time, determine the financials of a particular project or event. At best, we knew how much was in the account and thus when checks could be written which wouldn't bounce, but it led to many delays in invoice payment based on funds availability – which implied that funds were being co-mingled in order to meet near-term obligations (e.g. it was possible that deposits for an upcoming conference were being used to pay for utilities, etc.).
3. Projects and events are started without sound financial budgeting, which has resulted in significant losses due to revenues for these projects and events not covering the expenses incurred. The actual magnitude will not be certain until after the audit, when individual inflows and outflows have been clearly mapped for every financial transaction of the Foundation for 2001.
4. Manual bookkeeping – based on the ledgers received, almost everything is being tracked on paper, not electronically, which increases the difficulty in doing basic financial analysis of the cash flows, current cash position, liquidity, etc., of the Foundation and its various projects.
5. The Foundation has served in the past as a conduit for funding which comes from other organizations for projects that are then “funded” through SFF. However, there does not appear to be an appropriate administrative fee assessed to justify SFF expending resources (through management, at minimum) of those funds.

Recommendations:

The issues raised above can be mitigated or corrected, but will require significant changes in the way operations are run, as well as a concerted effort by the Board, the Executive Team, and the Advocates to grow, strengthen, and diversify our sources of funding and support. Operationally, we are already moving towards this, with plans for:

1. Quarterly and annual budgeting, along with variance tracking (and, for large items, explicit board approval)
2. An annual independent audit – this is necessary for the certain forms of fundraising.
3. Ongoing bookkeeping services – this will remove the burden of record keeping and mundane administrative financial activities from the Executive Director, who has higher priority items to address. The bookkeeper should be responsible to (and report to) the Treasurer, with copies of key monthly financial statements sent

to the Finance Committee and Board of Directors. Included in this is the need to purchase and use financial software (recommendation: Quickbooks) by the bookkeeper and the Executive Director.

4. Separate bank accounts for specific events/projects and our general operational account – this should rectify the major problem we've had to date in identifying the profitability (or lack thereof) of events/projects. Their costs, and revenues, will tie directly to their own P&Ls, allowing better forecasting, accountability, and decision-making regarding future events/projects and their potential viability.
5. Activity-based costing – This should resolve the issue of overhead allocation raised above, by attributing total costs associated with time, resources spent on a project or activity TO that project. For instance, if a paid Foundation employee works on a project, a portion of their salary that is proportional to the time they spent on the project should be allocated to the project. Activity-based costing will also allow the Foundation to properly assess fees to projects for which the Foundation simply serves as a funds conduit (e.g., FINDS is the source of funding) thus offsetting overhead costs incurred associated with those projects.

Conclusions:

On a strategic level, the Board must develop the programs and processes that will increase our funding stream and diversify the sources of that funding. Doing so will allow us to institutionalize many of the required financial disciplines for the ongoing health of the Foundation (such as a full-time finance officer). However, this is not within the purview of the financial review, and remains a recommendation to the Board to pursue through the appropriate channels (e.g. membership committee, etc.)

Unless the procedures recommended above are implemented and strict financial discipline instituted, the problems will likely continue to manifest themselves every time the Foundation undertakes any effort.

Action 2 – Advocate Process Review**The Resolution:**

John Carter McKnight will work with the Advocates Coordinator to review the current Advocate nomination and approval process. He will then recommend to the Board any changes required to formalize this process.

Findings:

1. No written or agreed-upon procedure currently exists for the nomination and approval of Advocates.
2. The Advocates Handbook is substantially out of date, and does not clearly explain the duties and responsibilities of an Advocate, including the role of current Advocates in the selection of new ones.

Recommendations:

1. Draft for Board enactment a clear, written procedure for the selection and approval of new Advocates.
2. Draft for inclusion in a revised Advocates Handbook a section on Advocates' duties and responsibilities

Status:

1. Procedure drafted and agreed to in principle by the Board. Motion to approve still required.
2. No bylaw changes necessary to implement
3. Duties and Responsibilities section drafted, some comment received. No comprehensive overhaul of the Handbook currently planned or under way, so section currently on hold.

Action 3 – Fundraising Review

The Resolution:

Bill Boland will work with the Executive Director and President to review our current and potential fundraising sources and direction and determine their future viability and desirability. He will then identify additional opportunities for fundraising and recommend guidelines to be used in selecting which fundraising initiatives should be pursued.

Findings:

1. The Foundation's fundraising is insufficient to cover its operational activities and those operational activities are poorly budgeted, creating an uncertain environment for understanding what funds are required. There exists a tangible unwillingness to link fundraising necessity to the ability of the Foundation to conduct its affairs. This is a major organizational disconnect.
2. The fundraising requirements in the short term are likely to be acute, both in terms of amount and timing and there is no credible fundraising strategy capable of raising enough funds to cover our near term debts.
3. The Foundation is heavily dependent on donations from FINDS to fund our various activities, including but not limited to General Operations, Return to the Moon Conference, and the Space Frontier Foundation Conference.
4. The Foundation obtains only a small amount of its funding through voluntary contributions from Advocates and Supporters. Dues from the general membership are not mandatory, but voluntary, so they are donations.
5. Projects and events are heavily dependent upon sponsorship for funding and are in general, and with certain exceptions, not geared toward fundraising. The one event undertaken with 'some' emphasis on fundraising was the Arthur C. Clarke 2001 Gala at the Playboy mansion in November of this year.
6. Individual Board members have not accepted the traditional non-profit roles of 'give, get or get out'.
7. The Foundation's internal resources to conduct effective and sufficient fundraising are limited. However, it does have some fundraising assets to work with, to modify, and to retool to more effectively produce funds.

Recommendations:

1. Budgets for future expenditures should be based upon realistic fundraising plans. At the earliest possible date, the Board must establish an operational configuration based

upon what we can currently pay for. After establishing this operational configuration, the Finance Committee should produce a two-year projection of the Foundation's needs for operating funds.

2. Once a credible operating budget is established, Board members, Advocates, and existing major donors should be approached to provide donations and/or loans to cover the short-term debt.
3. The Foundation must establish a diverse set of strategies and mechanisms for fundraising to reduce its reliance on a single donor.
4. The Foundation should establish a program to directly solicit contributions from current Advocates and other Supporters on a regular basis.
5. All Foundation Projects should include realistic plans for raising the funds required to sustain the Project. While new Projects may receive initial seed money, Projects should not expect financial support from General Operations. It is recommended that the Foundation focus its energy on a few concrete events and relationships which will produce income through activities we conduct, endorse and/or sponsor. The events should be structured to provide the lion's share of funds raised to Foundation projects.
6. Foundation Board members should be expected to raise a specified amount through their individual initiative for use as seed money on new projects. An amount of \$5,000 each is recommended, which for 7 Board members would yield \$35,000. Emphasis should be placed on seeking new money, not credit for past activity, however substantial and/or well done.
7. The Board should establish a permanent Fundraising Committee consisting of no fewer than two Board members and at least a representative from the Finance Committee that would be responsible for supporting the development and implementation of fundraising strategies, assets, and tools.

Action 4 – Internal Communications Review

The Resolution:

Denise Norris will work with the Secretary, Executive Director and Advocates Coordinator to review our current processes for internal communications with Advocates and general membership. She will then recommend to the Board any changes required to improve these processes, which shall include as a minimum the creation of regularly scheduled e-mails and a revitalized internal Advocates web site.

Findings:

1. Poor Advocate and Member Communications - Except for the infrequent “Space Front”, the Foundation news is not delivered to the Advocates.
2. Bulletin Board Used by Vocal Subset - The messages on the Advocate Bulletin Board are from a consistent core set of Advocates.
3. Advocate Website Under-utilized - The content on the Advocates Page is out dated and visually unappealing.
4. No Members-only Website - Dues paying members have no special benefits.
5. No Community Calendar - No single place to see all Foundation events on Website.

Recommendations:

1. Monthly Advocate e-Newsletter - Each month, the Advocate Coordinator should prepare a brief e-newsletter to be distributed to the Advocates. This newsletter should contain at minimum at Foundation News, A Message From the President (or rotating Leader), Up Coming Events, and the Advocate’s Corner (a view from a different Advocate each month).
2. Monthly Member e-Newsletter - Each month, the Executive Director should prepare a brief e-newsletter to be distributed to the Members. This newsletter should contain at minimum at Foundation News, A Message From the President (or rotating Leader), and Up Coming Events
3. Plebiscites & Voting - Foundation should encourage the use of online polling and voting to place a direct say in Foundation policy and activities in the hands of the Advocates.
4. Put Space Front Online - Space Front should become an on-line e-zine published monthly.

-
-
5. Issue Semi-Annual 4 Color Magazine - A full color Semi-Annual Magazine should be created and mailed to Members and Advocates highlighting the accomplishments of the Foundation and it's vision for the future.
 6. Invigorated Advocate Page - The Advocate's page should be turned into a resource for Advocates that includes Board Minutes, All Policies, Draft Policies, By-Laws, Project Status, Annual Reports, Voting, link to BBS, Conspiracy of Dreamers, etc.
 7. Community Calendar - A single calendar should be created that includes all Space Events, Foundation or otherwise.
 8. New Advocate Materials – The Advocate Handbook should be completed and the new High Frontier book that includes the Conspiracy of Dreamers section should be distributed to all Advocates.

Action 5 - Projects Review

The Resolution:

Bob Noteboom will work with a Board appointed Projects Coordinator and the President to review the requirements and reporting processes for current projects and operations. He will then recommend to the Board any changes required to improve accountability and increase synergy between projects and the operations.

Findings:

1. A consistent understanding of the roles and responsibilities of a Foundation Project Manager does not exist.
2. For the sixteen Foundation Projects identified, most Project Managers can describe the purpose of their Project, what it is doing, and what it has accomplished.
3. Written budgets and plans do not exist for most Projects and Project Managers do not know how much funding their Project requires.
4. There is no standard mechanism in place to communicate the purpose, plans, accomplishments, and needs of a Project to others outside the Project.
5. General Operations does not provide the standard services expected by Projects (e.g. grant administration, press release distribution, etc.) and Projects are not aware of what services are provided by General Operations.
6. Projects are not prioritized and the level of Foundation support provided to projects is neither clear nor documented. This leads to confusion as to what projects the Foundation is supporting and how they are being supported.

Recommendations:

1. The roles and responsibilities of the Project Manager (which should include developing plans and budgets for a Project as well as communicating its accomplishments to those outside the Project) should be defined, documented, and communicated to all Project Managers.
2. The Board should appoint a Projects Coordinator. This individual would be responsible for ensuring that Project Managers are aware of their responsibilities and are abiding by standard policies and procedures and would also assist Project Managers in obtaining assistance from General Operations.

-
-
3. A document describing the standard services to be provided by General Operations should be developed and distributed to all Project Managers.
 4. Current Foundation projects should be prioritized and categorized to indicate the level of support provided by the Foundation for each project. As a minimum, the following categories should be used:
 - a. Managed – Projects directly managed by the Foundation, which usually also includes providing financial support.
 - b. Sponsored – Projects that are not managed by the Foundation but are directly supported to some extent either financially or through in-kind services.
 - c. Endorsed – Projects that are neither managed nor directly supported by the Foundation but are consistent with the Foundation’s goals and are officially recognized by the Foundation. The Foundation may indirectly support these projects by publicizing the Foundation’s endorsement of the project.

Status:

1. A draft Project Manager job description has been developed and is attached to this document.
2. A draft Projects Coordinator job description has been developed and is attached to this document.

Action 6 – Message Development Review

The Resolution:

Tony DeTora will work with the President to review our current processes for establishing the message (i.e. Vision, Policies, and Positions) of the Foundation. He will then recommend to the Board any changes to these processes that will allow us to better clarify our message, integrate the knowledge, experience, and beliefs of our Advocates, and document a clear vision, a coherent set of policies, and timely and consistent positions.

Findings:

Message is a broad term meant to encompass the entirety of Space Frontier Foundation policies, positions and related statements. These message entities range from simple catchphrase-like “cultural cruise missiles” (i.e. Dan Goldin must go!; Cheap Access to Space; Space is a Place, not a Program) up to large full policy documents that address the Foundation position with regard to a specific area. Message is at the very heart of the Foundation, and it is the Foundation’s message that we seek to distribute throughout the popular media, the existing aerospace community, the political community and the population as a whole.

1. The current processes for establishing the message of the Foundation are very poorly specified and delineated. Message establishment is done largely through informal means and those wishing to establish a formal Foundation position on a subject must jump through many hoops and fight many undisclosed battles in order to see it through any stage of this process. Message is determined by consensus, but a consensus of whom is not clearly prescribed except to say that the Board must approve any official policy.
2. Full policy documents have not been written, despite the accumulation of specific policies through the years. Many of these policies exist in previously released press releases, testimony to Congress, Op-eds, articles in Space Front or other publications and through general knowledge and use by the leaders or members of the organization.

Recommendations:

Since message is so important to the Foundation, it is imperative to establish procedures firmly in writing, to disseminate these procedures to the Advocates and to fully utilize these procedures. These procedures must encompass all areas of message process: recommendation, prioritization, development, writing, provisions for feedback, Board approval, distribution to the membership, and distribution to the outside world. These procedures must also encompass each of the message entities: cultural cruise missiles; press releases; briefing materials; Op-eds; articles; white papers; and full policy papers.

-
-
1. A standing Policy/Message Committee (PMC) should be established to facilitate the message process; to produce message entities (policy documents) that display a clear understanding of the Foundation's current policy positions; and to help establish the framework for the development, review and approval of all policy positions for the Foundation. The PMC should be composed of not less than six members, no more than four of who shall be Board members. Rick Tumlinson should be asked to serve as the Chairperson of the PMC and Tony DeTora, John Carter McKnight, Bob Noteboom, Jim Muncy and Bob Werb should be invited to join as members of the PMC with participation by other individuals as deemed necessary by the Committee Chairperson.
 2. With the realization that office staff are often unavailable or engaged in other pressing Foundation business and the expectation that the PMC will be a strategic committee responsible for writing policy recommendations for the Board to consider, an individual should be tapped in the role of Communications Director to take responsibilities for disseminating the message once established. This as yet unnamed individual will be expected to coordinate with office staff, Advocates, volunteers and all other interested parties in distributing press releases, letters, policies, etc. to come out of the PMC.
 3. A prioritized list of message documents should be established by the PMC as a recommendation to the Board. The Board should review this list, makes changes as it sees fit and request that the PMC move forward according to this prioritized list.
 4. The PMC should establish a clear procedure by which a policy entity can be recommended, developed, written, approved, and distributed. A set of recommendations is attached, but the final procedure should be determined by the PMC.

Attachment 1 – Proposed Advocate Selection Procedure

1. Current Advocate recommends a candidate to the Advocates Coordinator. Recommendation in writing to include candidate name, position, and reason for recommendation, focusing on what the candidate has done to further the goal of opening the space frontier. Anyone on their own initiative wishing to become an Advocate must get a current Advocate to recommend them under this procedure.
2. Advocate Coordinator opens a file on the candidate and enters candidate information into a process spreadsheet. Draft spreadsheet to follow.
3. Advocate Coordinator contacts the Board to determine if any Board member knows the candidate well enough to officially nominate them **[note: this will require a bylaw amendment reducing the number of members required to nominate from two to one]**. Contact email to include the information provided in the recommendation.
4. Once nominated, candidate to be informally interviewed by Board members. Board may delegate interviews to any two members and provide them with their proxy for the approval decision. In cases where the Board specifically determines that the candidate is sufficiently well known to the Board or to the members named as a nominating committee, this process can be skipped.
5. Board members are polled informally. Any Board member may veto a nomination, ending the process.
6. If no veto, the nomination is scheduled by the Advocates Coordinator as new business at the next regularly scheduled Board meeting.
7. Nominee is voted on in the meeting. Unanimous consent required.
8. If a candidate has been vetoed, the Chairman of the Board will inform the Advocates Coordinator. The Advocates Coordinator shall notify the Advocate who recommended the candidate that the Board has chosen not to act on the recommendation. Names may be submitted for consideration again after six months from the date the Advocates Coordinator is notified of the veto.
9. After Board approval, the Advocates Coordinator contacts the candidate to inform them that they have been selected as a potential Advocate. Where possible, this should be the first time that the person is informed of their candidacy.
10. If they assent, either the Advocates Coordinator, a Board Member or another Advocate, at the direction of the Board and with the knowledge of the Advocates Coordinator, shall provide the new Advocate with a full membership kit, to include updated Advocate's Handbook, website passwords, pin, and other materials as determined by the Board in consultation with the Advocates Coordinator. The Advocates Coordinator shall review the contents of the package with the person to ensure that they are aware of the responsibilities of the position. The Advocates Coordinator shall also obtain contact and biographical information from the person. The person is now an Advocate.

-
-
11. At the next annual conference, the new Advocate participates in the formal induction ceremony.

Attachment 2 – Proposed Advocate’s Duties and Responsibilities

Advocates are the core group of the Foundation, the “doers” that make it a successful organization. They are more active in Foundation-related efforts than general members, either as volunteers or in a professional capacity. They are the pool from which the future leadership of the Foundation, its officers and members of the Board of Directors, are expected to emerge. An Advocate is someone who does several of the following:

- Contributes financially to the Foundation and its projects
- Volunteers their time for Foundation projects and activities
- Publicly advocates the philosophy and goals of the Foundation
- Actively works to open the space frontier

Advocates are expected to meet the following responsibilities to the Foundation:

- Represent the Foundation and engage with other Foundation members in a professional manner
- Vote annually to elect the Board of Directors
- Suggest potential Advocates to the Board of Directors
- Work to expand Foundation membership and support
- Promptly pay their annual dues of \$120

Advocates shall respect the following limitations:

- Advocates shall not unilaterally endorse a policy or position as a representative of the Foundation that directly benefits the Advocate
- Advocates involved in developing an official Foundation policy, position or project shall disclose any benefits they may receive as a result of the Foundation action
- Advocates disagreeing with an official policy or position of the Foundation may refrain from endorsing that policy or position, but shall not endorse any opposing policy or position as a representative of the Foundation

Once a candidate accepts the Board’s nomination as an Advocate, that status is good for life, unless the Advocate fails to pay their dues, submits a written resignation statement to the Chairman of the Board, or, in extremely rare instances, is removed by unanimous vote of the Board for conduct unbecoming an Advocate.

Who Can Become an Advocate?

One of an Advocate’s most important duties is recommending potential Advocates to the Board of Directors. The following criteria should guide an Advocate in evaluating a potential candidate:

- Does the person share the Foundation’s goal of opening the space frontier to human settlement through private as well as public means?

-
-
- Does the person actively work, as a professional or volunteer, to open the space frontier?
 - Does the person have the time to contribute to advocating the Foundation's goals?
 - Does the person have the financial resources to pay their dues promptly, at a minimum?
 - Does the person have a history of advocating the Foundation's goals, such that they are likely to continue to do so throughout their lifetime?
 - Does the person deal with co-workers and the public in a respectful, professional manner?
 - Will the Foundation benefit

Attachment 3 – Proposed Project Manager Job Description

JOB TITLE: Project Manager

Responsible to: Projects Coordinator

The Board of Directors assigns a Project Manager to every Space Frontier Foundation project prior to its initiation. The Project Manager works with the Projects Coordinator to prepare a project proposal (including project purpose, activities, and budget) and submits it to the Board for approval prior to expending any funds on the project. The Project Manager is then responsible for providing the Projects Coordinator with monthly reports of progress and updates to project plans for the duration of the project.

Specific Responsibilities

A Project Manager of a Space Frontier Foundation project shall:

1. Maintain a description of the project including a statement of how it relates to the overall mission of the Space Frontier Foundation.
2. Develop a budget for the project that clearly defines the funding requirements for the project including the dates when specific funding will be needed.
3. Maintain a list of activities (including expenditures) to be performed as part of the project.
4. Provide information on volunteer requirements to the Advocates Coordinator so that volunteer job openings can be posted.
5. Provide relevant information to the Foundation webmaster for the project website including a current description of the project, key project personnel, funds contributed to the project, key contributors (if they wish to be recognized), planned activities, accomplishments, and an accounting of how funds were spent.
6. Provide relevant information to the Spacefront editor regarding the progress and plans for the project so that they can be communicated.

Attachment 4 – Proposed Projects Coordinator Job Description

JOB TITLE: Projects Coordinator

Responsible to: Board of Director

The Projects Coordinator for the Space Frontier Foundation is selected by vote of the Board of Directors immediately after the Foundation's annual business meeting or any other such time as a vacancy may occur. The Projects Coordinator's term of office runs from his election until the next Space Frontier Foundation annual business meeting, or until his resignation or removal by the Board.

Specific Responsibilities

The Projects Coordinator of the Space Frontier Foundation shall:

1. Maintain a Project Handbook that defines and provides examples of all of the information that must be included in a project proposal (including project purpose, activities, and budget), what approvals are required for a project, and what must be reported during the duration of the project.
2. Work with the Board to identify a Project Manager for each new project prior to its initiation.
3. Work with a new Project Manager to prepare the project proposal and present it to the Board for approval prior to expending any funds or media attention on the project.
4. Verify that project proposals include all required information prior to appearing on the Board agenda.
5. Maintain a library of all approved project proposals and plans.
6. Ensure that all Project Managers are correctly reporting project revenues, expenditures, and variances from the budget.
7. Ensure that all Project Managers are providing volunteer requirements to the Advocates Coordinator so those volunteer job openings can be posted.
8. Ensure that all Project Managers are providing the required relevant information to the Foundation webmaster for the project website.
9. Ensure that the Project Managers are providing the required relevant information to the Spacefront editor so that information on project accomplishments is communicated.
10. Obtain monthly reports of progress and plan changes from all Project Managers and providing a summary report to the Board at all Board meetings.

Attachment 5 – Proposed Procedures for Policy/Message Committee

- A. Procedure for Board direction to the PMC
 - a. The Board shall have the authority to direct the PMC to
 - i. Produce a policy document that is deemed necessary,
 - ii. Reprioritize the list of policy documents being produced,
 - iii. Review, rewrite or revise any document submitted to the Board for consideration as an official policy document.
 - b. Any such direction from the Board shall be communicated by the SFF Secretary in writing to the Chairperson of the PMC.

- B. Procedure for requesting a policy document
 - a. Any Advocate of the SFF can submit a request for the PMC to produce a policy document.
 - b. Any request for a policy document must be submitted to the PMC Chairperson in writing. Letters, faxes, e-mails and any other communication so-deemed by the Chairperson shall be considered “in writing” while a posting on any BBS shall not be considered “in writing.”
 - c. The PMC shall produce a sample document to display the desired layout and information to be included in any request, but this shall not be seen as a required form or document structure for a written request.
 - d. The Chairperson shall review the written request and shall make a determination on whether the request is complete and reasonable (i.e. determine if it would be a frivolous waste of the PMC’s time).
 - i. If the Chairperson determines the request to be frivolous, the Chairperson shall notify the requestor of this in writing not less than two weeks after receipt of such request.
 - ii. If the Chairperson determines the request to be incomplete, the Chairperson shall notify the requestor of this in writing not less than two weeks after receipt of such request. As part of this notification the Chairperson shall specify what additional information is required in order to complete the request.
 - e. The Chairperson shall, within two weeks of receipt, forward any complete, reasonable request for a policy document to the PMC members for consideration at the next PMC meeting. Such request will be added to the agenda of the meeting and action shall be taken as deemed appropriate by the PMC, including but not limited to rejecting the request; accepting the request with a low, medium or high level of priority; or requesting additional information from the requestor.
 - f. Once the PMC takes action, the Chairperson shall provide written notification of such action to the requestor and to the Board.
 - g. The requestor may appeal the decision of the PMC to the Board by submitting an appeal request in writing and all other necessary documentation to the Chairperson of the Board and SFF Secretary. The Chairperson will add the appeal to the Board’s schedule and action shall be taken as deemed appropriate by the Board, including but not limited to

rejecting the appeal, changing the priority of such request, or instructing the PMC to produce a policy document as outlined in “Procedure for Board direction to the PMC.”

- h. Once the Board takes action, the SFF Secretary shall provide written notification of such action to the requestor and to the PMC Chairperson.

C. Procedure for prioritizing desired policy documents – initial

- a. The PMC shall produce an initial list of desired policy documents.
- b. This initial list shall be distributed to the Advocates and the Board for feedback and recommendations such that the official list can be as inclusive as possible.
- c. The PMC shall integrate the feedback received and develop an official list of desired policy documents.
- d. Each member of the PMC shall prioritize each document on the list with a code of High, Medium or Low priority. As all policy documents are seen as being of the utmost importance, this prioritization shall not be deemed to establish one policy or document as “more important” than another - the prioritization is only intended to indicate the relative importance of the timing of producing the documents not the relative importance of the content of the documents.
- e. These prioritizations shall be collected, reviewed and the PMC as a whole shall determine High, Medium or Low priority for each document on the official list.
- f. No more than five documents shall be deemed to be of High priority, and no more than ten documents shall be deemed to be of Medium priority. All other documents shall be deemed to be of Low priority.

D. Procedure for prioritizing desired policy documents – ongoing

- a. As policy documents on the High and Medium priority list are completed, other policy documents should be reprioritized by the PMC.
- b. Once a policy document reaches a priority level on the official list, it shall not be demoted to a less urgent priority.
- c. No more than five documents shall be deemed to be of High priority, and at no more than ten documents shall be deemed to be of Medium priority at any given time.
- d. As new policy documents are added to the official list, a priority level shall be assigned within the constraints listed in this document.
- e. If the PMC deems a policy document to be of critical and immediate need to the SFF, the policy document may be given the priority of Emergency and shall be treated as a High priority document in all respects with the addition of the following:
 - i. This document must be completed within four weeks of receiving an Emergency designation.
 - ii. Weekly updates must be provided to the Board until the document is complete.

-
-
- E. Procedure for developing and writing policy documents
- a. Each High and Medium priority policy document shall have an Issue Lead assigned by the PMC Chairperson. Issue Leads shall act as the coordinators and primary authors for the document, but are not required to be members of the PMC. Low priority documents may or may not be assigned a lead as deemed necessary by the PMC Chairperson.
 - b. The Issue Lead on any given policy document may be changed at any time at the sole discretion of the PMC Chairperson.
 - c. The Issue Lead for each High and Medium priority policy document shall produce a timeline for document completion that includes each step as specified by this procedure.
 - d. The mandatory steps to be undertaken in order to forward an official policy document to the Board for approval shall be:
 - i. Existing policy and other documents shall be reviewed for existing relevant positions with regard to the issue. Such review may be limited given the availability of the diverse sources and the expected time constraints, but the review shall be as thorough as possible within these constraints.
 - ii. An initial written DRAFT version of the policy document that incorporates existing relevant positions shall be produced for review and feedback from the PMC. The Issue Lead will provide this document to the PMC and the PMC will provide timely feedback as appropriate.
 - iii. A second written DRAFT version of the policy document that incorporates PMC feedback shall be produced for review and feedback from the Advocates. The Issue Lead will provide this document to the Advocate's Coordinator who shall make the document available to the Advocates. The Advocates shall have not less than seven days and not more than fourteen days in which to review the document and provide feedback to the Issue Lead.
 - iv. A written version of the policy document that incorporates Advocate feedback shall be produced for review from the PMC. The Issue Lead will provide this document to the PMC. The PMC shall
 1. Provide additional feedback for a further revision if necessary.
 2. If further revision is deemed unnecessary, this document shall be deemed the final written version.
 - v. A final written version shall be provided to the PMC who shall vote on recommending the document to the Board for approval.
 - vi. The PMC Chairperson shall within seven days provide to the Secretary and Board Chairperson any document that the PMC has recommended to the Board for approval.

-
-
- vii. Once written notification has been made, the Board shall add consideration of any document to the agenda of the next Board meeting.
 - e. If a policy document is voted down by either the PMC or the Board, written feedback shall be provided from the PMC or Board to the Issue Lead in order to facilitate the timely correction of any errors and produce a document that accurately states the position of the SFF. Once this feedback is incorporated, the Issue Lead may restart the procedure at the appropriate step.
 - f. A policy document shall be considered completed:
 - i. Upon official acceptance by the Board. Once a document is officially accepted, the Secretary shall provide notification to the Communication Director who shall then be responsible for further distribution and notification.
 - ii. Upon official abandonment of the policy document by the PMC if it is deemed that no policy can be reached that meets the needs of the SFF. The PMC Chairperson shall notify the Board in writing that such abandonment has taken place and the reasons that the PMC believes the issue is beyond resolution.
 - iii. Upon official abandonment of the policy document by the Board if it is deemed that no policy can be reached that meets the needs of the SFF. The Board Chairperson shall notify the PMC in writing that such abandonment has taken place and the reasons that the Board believes the issue is beyond resolution.

F. Procedure for review of existing policy documents

- a. Each policy document shall be reviewed by the PMC not less than two years following its acceptance by the Board or its most recent review.
- b. If, in the opinion of the PMC, the policy document should be revised
 - i. Such opinion shall be expressed by the PMC Chairperson to the Board and the Communications Director in writing.
 - ii. Such revision shall be treated as a new document and shall be prioritized, written, approved and distributed as per the relevant procedures.
- c. If, in the opinion of the PMC, the policy is not in need of revision such opinion shall be expressed by the PMC Chairperson to the Board and the Communications Director in writing.