

Issues with DASC

- **Denise Ponchak, Chair of DASC Executive Board has expressed strong concerns on two issues**
 - “by our longstanding MOU all revenue generated by our joint conferences is supposed to be split 50-50 and volunteer support is supposed to be shared 50-50. To the best of my knowledge, neither of these have been upheld by the AESS for 5 or more years.”
 - “The DATC has always felt miffed that we provide nearly 100% of the volunteerism. With the new knowledge of the revenue generated from our hard work not being shared back with us, they are quite angry and have been considering if we should continue to be partners.”
 - “In 2012, the IEEE AESS received \$2,653.28 for paper downloads from ICNS and \$15,571.35 for paper downloads from DASC. The DATC share should have been half – ~ \$9K and that was just for last year. I expect 2013 will be a similar if not greater amount.”
- **To understand the revenue question, we need to dig into some arcane IEEE matters – next chart**

Revenues from Conference Publications

- Current MOUs contain this - which is the red flag for the DATC

- *Ownership is defined as the financially responsible IEEE OU(s), or in the event of no financial sponsorship, the technically co-sponsoring IEEE OU(s). Non-IEEE entities can be sponsors of a conference, however they cannot be the owner of conference content.*

- There have been four streams of conference revenue

- **Splitting the Conference surplus**

- 50-50**

- Includes payments to the Conference bank account for submitting papers to CPP. IEEE paid \$25 for each paper. In 2012 this was changed to a minimum payment of \$1000. Starting 1 January this payment will be discontinued

- Last year the conference surplus was \$45,600 → \$22.8K to AESS

- **Payments to the IEEE OU sponsors for each paper downloaded**

- These numbers are small – totals in 2012 from 2006-2012 conferences were \$980 for ICNS and \$2,289 for DASC. But IEEE then charges expenses against this, so both end up negative

Allocation of “Package Net”

- The formula for distribution has changed over the years. In 2012 it “stabilized” on
 - **35% Content: articles added to xPlore over the prior 3 years**
 - **65% Usage: Institutional downloads over the prior 2 years, including all conferences with downloads regardless of conference year**
 - Under the current algorithm, Package Net will not be calculated down to the conference-level. As such, there will be no specific "total value" of an individual conference.*
- In 2012, AESS received a total of \$386,979.17 after subtracting expenses. The total IEEE-wide was \$27,730,471.42
- To try to understand Ponchak’s claims. Rich Jannuzzi applied the same algorithm at the Conference level, yielding
 - **DASC, \$35,532, ICNS \$5971, both about twice her numbers**

Discussion

- If AESS were to lose DASC, while IEEE might see negligible reduction in IEL revenues, AESS would stand to lose \$35K + \$23K = \$58K annually.
- So, what should we do?
 - IEEE could grant mutual rights to publish to each co-sponsor. AIAA could publish as they see fit and own those revenues 100% as we hold the xPlore revenues.
 - We could agree to an arrangement with the DATC that we would pay them a portion of our download revenue according to a mutually agreed formula.
 - We could negotiate a different split of conference surplus
 - We could become a technical co-sponsor
- I talked with Denise:
 - Can we find someone to take over as Treasurer from Ellis?
Also looking for registration chair.
 - She's open to any way of sharing pubs revenues or AESS becoming Technical cosponsor
 - DASC Executive Committee is meeting Thursday. She would like some indication from us before then