

## Proposal I

### *“Point Three for Everybody – Same Definition of Earned Revenue”*

	Rate	From	To
- Bracket One	0.32%	\$0	\$900,000,000
- Bracket Two	0.01%	\$900,000,001	\$1,000,000,000
- Bracket Three	0.01%	\$1,000,000,001	Infinity

- **Rationale for Equity**

- Each Member has full autonomy and responsibility for every dollar of Earned Revenue it chooses to earn.
  - And as part of belonging to a member organization, each Member should reserve some portion of every dollar earned to support the member organization.
- A regressive tiered rate dues structure is fundamentally inequitable based on the **wide range of households per territory** across the Membership.
  - The number of households within a territory can serve as a proxy for the **market size potential** of that territory.
  - Below is an example of this inequity in action:
    - 42 Goodwills with 337K households or less would need to surpass Portland’s network-leading \$126 Revenue per HH before they could enjoy ‘dues-free’ growth which Portland has enjoyed for the past 20 years - growing over \$140M in ‘dues-free’ revenue during that period.
      - Conversely, Portland has enjoyed ‘dues-free’ growth once it exceeded \$30 revenue per HH because it has 1,421,467 Households in its territory.
- Maintaining a cap on dues will result in a similar degree of inequity over time.
- At 0.32% of revenue, the value to belong to the member organization is immense for each Member but for perhaps different reasons:
  - Small Goodwill:
    - Member services (quality foundations, consultations, shared services)
  - Mega Goodwill:
    - Value of the Goodwill Brand, a 120-year old, \$7.5B social enterprise
      - Even the largest Goodwill makes up only 4% of total network revenue.
    - Protection of the Brand
- Dues at 0.32% of revenue compares favorably to other member organizations and franchises.
- A concern of this Plan might be that larger Goodwills will exert undue influence given the larger share of dues they pay in this structure.
  - 28 Goodwills make up 50% of Earned Revenue.
  - However, the GII Board sets the strategy and these members are elected by the Delegate Assembly.
    - Using the example above, these 28 Goodwills only make up 17% of Delegates – assuming their local Board representative votes the same as the local CEO.

**Other Features:**

- **Revenue-neutral**
  - Future revenue would be based on the growth rate of the network’s earned revenue. The amount could be higher or lower than CPI.
    - Current dues structure allows for CPI increase but also places a further disproportionate share on smaller Goodwills in doing so.
- **Reasonable glidepath: 5-years**
- **Same Earned Revenue definition**

Bracket Ranges		Dues Percentage
0	900,000,000	.32%
900,000,001	1,000,000,000	.01%
>1,000,000,001		.01%

Equity Ratio (Dues Percentage for Highest Earned Revenue Goodwills to Lowest Earned Revenue Goodwills - with Earned Revenue defined by proposer)					
	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028
	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
<b>Total GII Dues Revenue Projected</b>					
Current Structure	\$26,510,633	\$27,305,952	\$28,125,130	\$28,968,884	\$29,837,951
Proposed Structure	\$26,897,236	\$27,704,154	\$28,535,278	\$29,391,336	\$30,273,077
Change in GII Revenue	\$386,603	\$398,202	\$410,148	\$422,452	\$435,126