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“A world in which every single human being can freely share in the sum of all knowledge.”
Question: What is the problem that we are trying to solve? Why is change needed?
The vision we share

every single human being

The vision statement of the Wikimedia Foundation describes our dreams, hopes and ambitions; our most radical and audacious idea for an organization and community — 20, 50, 100 years from today. It stands in contrast to the mission, which aims to be a more realistic description of the status quo. Our current vision statement is:

Imagine a world in which every single human being can freely share in the sum of all knowledge. That’s our commitment.

Proposals to change the statement should be made at Vision/Unstable and all proposals will be reviewed at least annually.

https://w.wiki/WGf
Measuring progress towards “every single human being”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global population</th>
<th>Connected people</th>
<th>Know Wikimedia</th>
<th>Use Wikimedia</th>
<th>Contribute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>~7.8 billion</td>
<td>~4.75 billion</td>
<td>~1.5 billion</td>
<td>~1 billion</td>
<td>~250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Everyone on the planet

Our target market -- all the people on the planet with internet access

Based on movement strategy research we think this many people know about Wikimedia projects

Unique devices data indicates that about a billion devices access Wikimedia projects in a month

This many people edit the projects (at all) in a month

July 2020
What is the context by which we entered into this work?
Strategic priorities

Increase reach

Today, the Wikimedia sites reach about six percent of the world’s population, which is roughly a tenth of all Internet users. Wikipedia has achieved particular success among Internet users in the Global North. The reach of Wikimedia’s projects — and in particular Wikipedia, which accounts for the lion’s share of all pageviews — has grown exponentially since Wikipedia’s inception. Use of the projects around the world, however, is not uniform. Large numbers of women and other underrepresented groups will need to be invited/recruited, and the culture of WMF projects will need to be adjusted to accommodate them when they arrive. Some of these changes are happening already, such as the focus on making the sites more user-friendly for people who are less technically savvy. But other changes will be needed, too. It will be important to acknowledge the discomfort that current users will feel when proposals are made for changes. And we need to help everyone adjust to the idea that changes are truly needed in order for WMF to accomplish its mission.

— User:FloNight
The “holy-shit” graph. Active editors (blue) and the one-year retention rate (red) on the English Wikipedia, 2004–09

https://w.wiki/XBg
The Rise and Decline of an Open Collaboration System: How Wikipedia's Reaction to Popularity Is Causing Its Decline

Aaron Halfaker, R. Stuart Geiger, Jonathan T. Morgan, mit.technologyreview.com

First Published December 28, 2012 | Research Article | https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764212469365

Abstract

Open collaboration systems, such as Wikipedia, were once considered to be relevant. Wikipedia was created through a trend of open collaboration. However, recent research has shown that the number of editors on Wikipedia has been decreasing steadily for years and suggests that a sharp decline in editor numbers is not the problem. This article presents data that show how several changes in the Wikipedia model did not result in a more robust system, but rather a decrease in consistency in the face of a massive growth in the Wikipedia community.

The Decline of Wikipedia

The community that built the largest encyclopedia in history is shrinking, even as more people and Internet services depend on it than ever. Can it be revived, or is this the end of the Web's idealistic era?

by Tom Simonite  
October 22, 2013

The sixth most widely used website in the world is not run anything like the others in the top 10. It is not operated by a sophisticated corporation but by a leaderless collection of volunteers who generally work under pseudonyms and habitually bicker with each other. It rarely tries new things in the hope of luring visitors; in fact, it has changed little in a decade. And yet every month

https://www.technologyreview.com/2013/10/22/175674/the-decline-of-wikipedia/
The US is the country with the combined **largest readership**.

Total human readership from the US is **declining**: **mobile growth in the US is lagging** behind global mobile growth trends and is not offsetting the **decline in desktop traffic**.

The vast majority of **automated traffic** (crawlers) comes from the US.
We rely on Google referrals up to **5x more** than any other top web property or media company.

(Source: comScore Source/Loss report July 2015)
These are vital opportunities for Wikipedia to tap external expertise and enlarge its base of editors. It is also the most promising way to solve the considerable and often-noted gender gap among Wikipedia editors; in 2011, less than 15 percent were women.

The worst scenario is an end to Wikipedia, not with a bang but with a whimper: a long, slow decline in participation, accuracy and usefulness that is not quite dramatic enough to jolt the community into making meaningful reforms.

No effort in history has gotten so much information at so little cost into the hands of so many — a feat made all the more remarkable by the absence of profit and owners. In an age of Internet giants, this most selfless of websites is worth saving.


https://www.nytimes.com/2015/06/21/opinion/can-wikipedia-survive.html
POLICY

Wikimedia Foundation director resigns after uproar over “Knowledge Engine”

It’s damage-control time at the world’s biggest encyclopedia.

JOE MULLIN - 3/29/2016, 8:21 AM
Katherine Maher is announced as ED
ED goals for the first year

- Stabilize the Foundation
- Reconnect with the global community
- Fix product
- Grow readership/reach
Foundation recognized limited progress on “every single human being.”

Why? What could be done?
An encyclopedia is not relevant mental model in some regions

Wikipedia’s ‘old skool’ look reinforces the view for many young South African’s that this is an old fashioned place compared to other sites / content they consume.

- Black and white look feels cold and unengaging to many.
- Non rich content (pictures and video especially) make the page less engaging and less ‘modern’; they expect to see rich media.
- Mobile issues (usually non-responsive design not loading well) are frustrating and lead to disengagement.
- Volume of text to read can be daunting (especially if you don’t feel confident reading).

Data cost/time restrictions forces users to focus on priorities when online

The need for ‘pragmatic’ knowledge and restricted time online limit the ‘need’ for Wikipedia

- Much information is provided informally between friends and peers, often via digital channels.
- Job hunting and relevant skills and qualifications, cookery, improving your home, relationship advice, parenting challenges and much other ‘knowledge’ are spontaneously mentioned as useful knowledge ahead of more academic queries.

Local pop culture is an important point of cold Wikipedia for many and coverage was unevenly featured at all or was incomplete.

There was limited evidence of casual browsing driven by curiosity or ‘let me check that’ ...

That’s great for awareness, but presents (brand) challenges for the ‘school project place’

- Using Wikipedia via schoolwork defines it as the ‘school project place’ (and maybe a little bit uncool)
- Some teachers warn students off Wikipedia because of its perceived unreliability, and this perception can persist.
- The accessibility of the content (for school students) may feel too simple when you’re more adult and want a more adult experience.

- How many brands that we like as 10-13 year olds do we keep with us into adulthood?
Community organizers use different names to explain the movement.

WIKIMEDIA BRANDS
A report on community perceptions
June 2016

Key findings

Participants most often defined Wikimedia as an “organization of support” for Wikipedia.

25% of participants said they never describe Wikimedia outside of the Community.

On Wikimedia

Community perspectives

Half of all participants defined Wikimedia by relating it to “Wikipedia,” explicitly. Others described Wikimedia as an “unlisted” organization (3 of 28 responses or as a “movement” (1 of 28 responses).

A quarter of participants said they never describe Wikipedia outside of the community. These participants expressed difficulty in succinctly describing what Wikimedia is, and how it is different from projects like Wikipedia; one participant said “I don’t want to explain that there’s stuff other than Wikipedia because it’s such a long-winded.”

Regarding the Wikipedia logo design, the “simplicity” of the logo colors were cited by 13 of 28 respondents as a positive attribute of the Wikimedia brand system. 14 of 28 responses praised the round logo shape for suggesting “unity,” “wholeness,” “a globe,” or “harmony.”

https://w.wiki/Vvx
In 2016: 3 country focus

Mexico

Phone survey findings

What do you use the internet for the most?

- Look up information: India 30%, Nigeria 20%, Mexico 19%
- Social media: India 36%, Nigeria 29%, Mexico 37%
- Entertainment: India 36%, Nigeria 21%, Mexico 19%
- News: India 12%, Nigeria 6%, Mexico 3%
- Other: India 12%, Nigeria 5%, Mexico 19%

Have you ever heard of Wikipedia?

- 25% in India, 25% in Nigeria, 45% in Mexico

https://w.wiki/Vvz
“My big boss Google”

“Uncle Google”

“My big boss
Google”

“Google is
the shortcut”

“Google is
the solution to
the world”

“Google Maharaj”

17. People trust online search (Google in particular) to get them what they need.

Learn more: Research deck, slide 61

22. People confuse Wikipedia with a search engine or social media platform. This can create unrealistic expectations of its functionality.

Learn more: Research deck, slide 73

“Wikipedia is a ‘poor cousin’ of Google. It is the lesser model.”

“Google and Wikipedia are similar. Google is more distributed; Wikipedia is more analytical and comprehensive.”

“Wikipedia is a social network. You’d use it if a friend in the US was on it and you wanted to connect with them.”

https://w.wiki/Vvz
Insights: Many new users do not know Wikipedia, what it is for, and who makes it (the movement). People conflate site with Google.
Recommendation: Improve communications & brand awareness to support movement growth.
A “brand” in brief

“Brand” is not just names & logos...

“Brand” is also what you mean to people.

Recognition (“Yes, I’ve heard of Wikipedia”)

Associations (“free knowledge” “online encyclopedia”)

Affinity (“I Wikipedia is useful.” “I support Wikipedia”)

Graphic identity, logo

Name, wordmark

WIKIPEDIA
What brand can do for an organization

By now it should be clear that we are defining brand quite broadly. A brand is more than a visual identity: the name, logo, and graphic design used by an organization. A brand is a psychological construct held in the minds of all those aware of the branded product, person, organization, or movement. Brand management is the work of managing these psychological associations. In the for-profit world, marketing professionals talk of creating “a total brand experience.” In the nonprofit world, executives talk more about their “global identity” and the “what and why” of their organizations. But the point in both cases is to take branding far beyond the logo.

Strong cohesion and high levels of trust contribute to greater organizational capacity and social impact. A cohesive organization is able to make more efficient and focused use of existing resources, and high external trust attracts additional talent, financing, and authority. This increase in organizational capacity enhances an organization’s social impact. By leveraging the trust of partners, beneficiaries, and policymakers, an organization can make greater strides toward achieving its mission. On the flip side, those organizations that face challenges in terms of internal organizational coherence, or brand to an organization’s theory of change. At WWF, for example, part of the theory of change depends on the organization’s ability to persuade some of the biggest multinational corporations to enter into partnerships that lead the companies to change their business practices. WWF’s strong global brand is crucial to its ability to establish these partnerships. “You’re big, we’re big, so we understand each other,” as Emily Kelton, director of corporate relations at WWF US, puts it. Having a strong brand establishes a kind of parity between WWF and the companies they want to influence. By starting with a theory of change, and looking for the contribution that brand can make at each step, it

https://ssir.org/articles/entry/the_role_of_brand_in_the_nonprofit_sector
Building on New Readers research, we began marketing in Nigeria and India.

We centered this work on community insights for growing awareness Wikipedia.
We asked our community in Nigeria and India what Wikipedia “means” and built video ads from these insights.
Tell us about the video ads you have directed. What do they show about Nigeria? What did you want to communicate about Wikipedia for Nigerians?

Olushola: The video ads show a blend of characters between the old and young generations in Nigeria. It reflects our cultures, it shows that Nigerians are eager to learn new things, it shows that knowledge is not restricted by age.

Sam: We wanted the video ad to shape the Wikipedia brand in Nigeria, and to actively push the brand to the Nigerian audience.

Blossom: The essence of the video ads is to reinforce Wikipedia awareness in the minds of Nigerians that are already aware of the platform and also subtly create new awareness in the minds of the unaware via pop culture shapers like Mark Angel Comedy’s star, Emmanuella and the ever-green Pete Edochie.

Kayode: I think the videos show a cultural and fun part of Nigeria: they show that we are educated, knowledgeable and fun loving. I also wanted to rewrite what Wikipedia is in the minds of Nigeria. Wikipedia is a free encyclopedia, written collaboratively by the people who use it.

https://w.wiki/X84
Primary result

23% increase in Wikipedia awareness

Computed from the change in phone survey reported awareness from benchmark 25% to 48%, representing 7% more market awareness and a growth of 23%.

3. Tell us about the video. What does it show?
Bishakha: The video shows how a Hindi-speaking family in India discovers something unusual via Wikipedia. It’s a sweet video that appeals to our emotions. I think it’s going to get us lots of interest and attention!

Soni: The video is just a small example of your everyday life in India. We see a small family, very similar to a lot of Indian families out there. And we show how Wikipedia has become so important in our everyday life. In this video, we saw the girl find her grandmother’s photo on Wikipedia, which connected the entire family together. And we all have these little stories about how Wikipedia has affected our lives.

Abhinav: The video attempts to portray how Wikipedia when brought in our daily lives influences our behavior (also emotionally). The video is shot taking a very normal nuclear family that can be found all across the country. That is wonderful.

Swapnil: The video is the first of its kind for India. There is still room for improvement, we are excited to introduce more people to Hindi Wikipedia.

https://w.wiki/X85
Conclusions: Wikipedia brand is a powerful tool to introduce our movement and our values.

We can raise brand awareness in collaboration with community.
Wikipedia awareness among internet users

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Awareness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2016
Wikipedia awareness after marketing campaigns

Sources: https://meta.wikimedia.org/wiki/Global_Reach/Insights
Data from 2016, WMF and http://www.internetlivestats.com/
The Wikimedia Movement Strategic Direction redoubled the call to “collect knowledge that fully represents human diversity, and build the services and structures that enable others to do the same”
Our strategic direction: Service and Equity

By 2030, Wikimedia will become the essential infrastructure of the ecosystem of free knowledge, and anyone who shares our vision will be able to join us.

We, the Wikimedia contributors, communities, and organizations, will advance our world by collecting knowledge that fully represents human diversity, and by building the services and structures that enable others to do the same.

We will carry on our mission of developing content as we have done in the past, and we will go further.

**Knowledge as a service:** To serve our users, we will become a platform that serves open knowledge to the world across interfaces and communities. We will build tools for allies and partners to organize and exchange free knowledge beyond Wikimedia. Our infrastructure will enable us and others to collect and use different forms of free, trusted knowledge.

**Knowledge equity:** As a social movement, we will focus our efforts on the knowledge and communities that have been left out by structures of power and privilege. We will welcome people from every background to build strong and diverse communities. We will break down the social, political, and technical barriers preventing people from accessing and contributing to free knowledge.
Day 2 – November 18, 2017

Nicole Ebber, Guillaume Paumier, and Doron Weber joined for this day of the meeting.

Slides for the Movement Strategy discussions.

Movement Strategy: Understanding the Strategic Direction

- Pursuing knowledge equity may involve taking stands, advocating for change in the interest of free knowledge available to all. That change involves both opportunities and risks.

- Becoming global, equal, and inclusive is easy to say but hard to do. How do we translate our strategic direction into real actions, and how do we measure our success against the themes of “equity” and “service”?

- One of the main blockers of the Foundation’s work is fear from staff of community anger and backlash—it can be tremendous, and it often comes as a reaction to anything we do. It stifles good work.
We set out asking how the Wikimedia brands could support the strategic direction.
Objectives

- Clarify and expand Wikimedia and Wikipedia brand architecture to help us reach the objectives outlined in our global strategic direction.
- Develop messaging guidance to grow public perception and support to achieve our vision in its true and global sense.

Deliverables

- Brand research and positioning analysis
- Brand strategy documents
- Brand voice & messaging guidelines

Timeline

- Planning: March - May 2018
- Project kick-off: June 2018

Phase 1: Research

- Research reviewed: July 2018
- Research completed: August 2018

Phase 2: Strategy

- Strategy drafted: September 2018
- Strategy complete: November 2018

https://w.wiki/3Ez
Relevant work
WO has worked with Amnesty International, The Met, Project (RED), and Mozilla - a cross-section of organizations that share audiences, agendas, and missions with Wikimedia.

Proposal fit
Split into 3 phases, the proposal separates key efforts like research from positioning workshops, hopefully protecting inquiry and wide brand appraisal before “jumping into solutions.”

Understanding of Wikimedia ethos
WO discussed brands as tools to empower people, and recognized the movement strategy as an opportunity to invite more people into Wikimedia which will ultimately serve all other organizational goals. They include “community shareouts” and “toolkits” in their deliverables because they understand the need to support the network not just the Foundation. They are eager to use Wikimania as a launch point.
We did not set out to rebrand the projects or the Movement or the Foundation.
We set out asking how the Wikimedia brands could support the strategic direction.
4.2 billion people
Wikimedia is unique and needed in today's world

What the world needs

To access the internet (and in new ways)
To see ourselves represented online
To believe in the internet and the information it gives us
To debate different points of view
To connect with each other online and in real life
To teach ourselves everything we need to know
To protect our rights and those of others online
To instigate the change we want to see in the world
To adapt to do all this with each other and with machines

Your opportunity

What's special about you

Pioneers thriving after 16 years
Digital and physical community
Free from shareholders, advertisers, and partisanship
Transparent in everything you do, say, and make
Trusted by individuals and institutions
Committed to being representative
Essential for the internet and for all of us
Democratic by and for the people you serve
A living movement
A radical spirit
Jimmy Wales

Link to full content
You are doing amazing things, but it’s hard to tell from the outside

- Complicated
- Disjointed
- Not showing all the great things we do
Wikimedia is unknown/unclear to those outside our walls

**Unknown**

“Never heard of it before; not sure, maybe it is for old news and updates.”

– Prospect, United States

“I haven't heard of these various projects before. So that confuses me if they really did exist.”

– Prospect, India

**Wikipedia with video**

“That it is the same content as in Wikipedia, but we can find the information presented in videos or podcasts.”

– Prospect, Mexico

Similar to Wikipedia, but mainly a collection of videos and photos.”

– Prospect, Germany

Non-China Market n = 130
QW4. When you think of the word WIKIMEDIA what comes to mind? What would you expect it to mean or to provide?

Wikipedia is one of the best known projects in the world

Q7: Which of the following websites have you heard of before?

On average 8/10 people know Wikipedia

Source: New Readers Research Findings
Have you ever heard Wikipedia?
Our current brand architecture does not serve us well

Who we are | What people know us for | What we want to talk about
---|---|---
Wikimedia | Wikipedia | Wikidata
 | | Wikicommmons
 | | Wiktionary...
Let’s shorten the distance

What people know us for
Wikipedia

What we want to talk about
Wikidata
Wikicommmons
Wiktionary…
Let’s shorten the distance

What people know us for
Wikipedia

What we want to talk about
Free knowledge for “every single human being”
Knowledge is at the heart of human progress. It is only when we move away from individual opinions that we can chart a path together. It unlocks indecision, it reconciles differences, it breathes life into imagination.

Throughout history, knowledge has been in the hands of the few. It is incomplete, failing to reflect the diversity of humanity, limiting what we can know, what we can share, and ultimately, what we can understand. When our understanding is limited, so is our individual and collective potential.

Wikipedia was founded on the radical belief that knowledge belongs to all of us. And that everyone should be able to access it and participate in its creation. We believe knowledge should represent everyone and be shared freely.

This inspired us to create the world’s first free encyclopedia, which has grown to offer knowledge in more than 300 languages. Together our community has continued to innovate, finding new ways to create, collect, and share knowledge. Today we actively collect and freely share information ranging from images in Wikicommons, to an open library in Wikisource, to 5.8 million definitions in Wiktionary. And we’ve gone a step further by creating the potential to connect all knowledge through Wikidata.

What we offer today is a living collection of knowledge owned by all of us, and created by all of us.

But there are challenges we must still overcome. Systemic barriers prevent women and entire cultures from being present online. Technological barriers make it impossible for millions to enter the conversation. Knowledge today is shaped and controlled by governments, and bought and sold by corporations.

These challenges are what drive us. We are working to ensure that everyone can participate in the creation of knowledge so anyone can understand anything.

We believe in a world where knowledge is not the property of the few. Where the answers to our questions are made stronger with different perspectives. Where knowledge is not written by only a few cultures, in a few languages, but through a plurality of origins and in many languages.

A world where knowledge is freely shared to reach even more people, in whatever way they choose to discover it.

This vision demands all of our participation.

We invite everyone to read, contribute, and partner with us to keep knowledge alive. Wherever your interests lead you, and to whichever project you choose to support, everything we do is working towards one goal. Together we can set knowledge free.
Wolff Olins findings were discussed with the Board in November 2018

**Wikimedia Foundation Board Minutes**
November 9–11, 2018

**Location:** Monterey, California, USA

**Board of Trustees present:** Maria Sefidari (Chair), Christophe Henner (Vice Chair), Esra’a Al Shafei, Tanya Capuano, James Heilman, Dariusz Jemielniak, Raju Narisetty, Natalia Tymkiv, Jimmy Wales

**Non-Board members present:** Katherine Maher (Executive Director), Eileen Hershenov (Secretary; General Counsel), Jaime Villagomez (Treasurer; Chief Financial Officer), Gretchen Yen (Liaison to the Board of Trustees; Executive Assistant to the Executive Director), Chuck Rosolof (Legal Counsel), Doron Weber (Sloan Foundation)

**Non-Board members present for a portion of the meeting:** Lisa Alfieri (Engagement Director, EY), Alicia Bassuk (Board Development Facilitator, Ubica Strategy), Rucha Desai (Engagement Consultant, EY), Nicole Ebber (Program Manager, Movement Strategy), Katie Francis (Senior Paralegal), Mila Linares (Senior Strategy Director, Wolff Olins), Zachary McCune (Senior Global Audience Manager), Cynthia Pratomo (Creative Director, Wolff Olins), John Rogula (ERM Leader, EY), Tony Sebro (Deputy General Counsel), Kaarel Vaidla (Strategy Process Architect, Movement Strategy), Heather Walls (Chief Creative Officer)

**Slides (public version):** Slide deck

https://w.wiki/XST
Where else do we get feedback on brand?
What we hear from donors

• “I want my donation NOT TO GO TO YOU, but to GO TO WIKIPEDIA. WIKIPEDIA is the organization I believed I was donating my hard-earned $4.00. I use Wikipedia. I am glad to sacrifice for them. You, however, WIKIMEDIA, as far as I’m concerned, YOU STOLE MY MONEY AND I WANT IT BACK. You’re thieves. This is Christmas Day. You will go to hell. I will see to it. I can not, yet, make a copy to send you of your confirmation that you stole from WIKIPEDIA.”

• “I don't even know who you are, I donated to Wikipedia, and I would like to know how Wikimedia got my credit card number. PLEASE!!! Issue a refund as soon as possible!”

• “I have a deduction on my account, that I do not remember making and, I would like to know what your foundation is about. Please email me at your earliest convenience.”
Recognizing the Wikimedia brand is shared across a global community, the Foundation sought comments on the Wolff Olins research & strategy proposal.
Challenge: Our movement is only becoming more complex. We need new models to understand it.
Polarity Management increases in value as the system or issue:

- Increases in complexity
- Increases in diversity
- Increases in speed of change
- Increases in resistance to change

Polarity Management can help:

- Simplify the complexity without being simplistic
- Capitalize on diversity without alienating the diverse groups
- Provide predictability and stability amidst accelerating change
- Convert resistance to change to a resource for sustainable, ongoing change-ability

http://bertparlee.com/training/polarity-management/
Community feedback showed contrasting opinions on major topics. So we modeled these as polarities.
“Right now, we take a lot of time to explain the difference between Wikimedia and Wikipedia and then people conclude that we are from Wikipedia. I think it will help us as a simple entry point.”
-- Wikimedia Indonesia

“It’s important to distinguish between the community organizations and the projects. This is a constant problem.”
-- Wikimedia Norway

“the -pedia part of Wikipedia comes from encyclopedia, and is not appropriate for other projects, this would lead to confusion.”
-- User: Lmaltier

Example polarity with comments
From 319 comments, six major polarities emerged.
Working towards “every single human being” we reported on reach and response metrics.

### Reach and Response

[edit]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Affiliate discussion</th>
<th>via email</th>
<th>on Meta-Wiki</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reach</td>
<td>122 affiliates</td>
<td>14 mailing lists (9,066 registered subscribers)</td>
<td>9,078 page views of review talk page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>63 affiliates (52% rate)</td>
<td>38 unique responders</td>
<td>106 contributors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positions</td>
<td>24 support, 6 oppose</td>
<td>7 support, 12 oppose</td>
<td>13 support, 45 oppose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mistake: Recognizing that many community members never participate in calls for feedback or voting, we computed a ratio of “informed” (total views on proposal) to “opposed.” It minimized the concerns many voices raised.
It was a mistake.

“We realize this particular metric was unconventional and difficult to measure in the context of individual contributors. It also had the negative consequence of detracting from the goal of the consultation, which was to gather qualitative feedback about risks and benefits of a branding change to present in a report to the Board. This has been a learning for us and I want to personally apologize for the distress and confusion that this caused.” - Heather Walls (WMF) (talk) 08:55, 17 February 2020 (UTC)
The polarities became criteria for successful brand changes

- Good Movement branding must...
  - Explain who we are and resolve confusion
  - Protect and improve our reputation
  - Support and elevate the sister projects
  - Assess and address legal risks
  - Support movement growth
  - Be opt-in and adaptable for movement groups
Recognizing how far we need to go to introduce and explain our movement worldwide, “brand awareness” was included as one of five medium term priorities.
The Wikimedia 2030 movement strategic direction, ratified by the Wikimedia global community in 2017, calls for the movement, projects, and institutions to become the “essential infrastructure of free knowledge,” where “anyone who shares our vision will be able to join us.” This direction moves Wikimedia further toward fulfilling the broader Wikimedia vision, a world in which every single human can freely share in the sum of all knowledge.

To support the expanded effort and fulfill the vision laid out by Wikimedia 2030, the Wikimedia Foundation and staff are preparing for significant institutional and programmatic shifts over the coming decade. The first step is the creation of this “Medium Term Plan” to describe a medium-term perspective on major institutional and technical goals under the responsibility and mission of the Wikimedia Foundation.

This plan is the result of collaboration across the Wikimedia Foundation’s various areas of expertise, and a representation of how the Foundation intends to lead, build, design, and serve the world and the mission of free knowledge. It establishes clear goals, areas of priority work, as well as metrics to measure accountability to the movement, our donors, and ourselves. The Wikimedia Foundation plays a unique role within the Wikimedia movement, and the Medium Term Plan reflects our interpretation of the activities the Foundation can undertake to support the broader movement in becoming the essential infrastructure of free knowledge.
Wikimedia Foundation Medium-term plan 2019

Priorities

In support of these goals, the following priorities have been identified for investment and growth.

1. **Brand awareness** — Clarifying and strengthening the global perception of Wikimedia and our free knowledge mission, and growing awareness and affinity with people in places we don’t yet serve.

2. **Worldwide readership** — Increasing our total readership numbers by attracting and retaining users that reflect the world we’re trying to serve through integrating compelling consumption experiences on and off platform, supported by outreach and marketing efforts.

3. **Thriving movement** — Co-creating, growing, and cultivating a safe and welcoming, diverse, sustainable, and thriving movement of leaders, contributors, advocates, and partners for free knowledge.

4. **Platform evolution** — Improving and modernizing Wikimedia’s technical ecosystem to respond to a landscape where artificial intelligence (AI) is creating content, rich media dominates learning, and the tools people use to collaborate work easily across a multitude of devices and require minimal technical capabilities.

5. **Global advocacy** — Championing and defending the integrity and independence of free knowledge, the Wikimedia community, projects, and values with governments, businesses, civil society, and other stakeholders.

We will support these five priorities collaboratively as an organization, with the intention that every metric is owned by the collective Foundation. We will focus efforts across the Foundation ensuring that every area of investment is integrated and builds on the last.

https://w.wiki/X8d
Challenge: How can we act on 2030 goals with brand AND use open collaborative process?
The movement has used other methods for brand changes like contests.
Where does our movement brand come from?

But brand contests are not a good approach for representing a global movement with many cultures, usage needs, and strategic commitments to balance.
Where does our movement brand come from?

In 2003, the 2nd and 3rd place logos from the Wikipedia logo contest were appointed as the Wikimedia and Mediawiki logos.

Our current movement brand logo comes from a contest.
What did community say is missing with current movement branding?

- It’s not well-known (low recognition)
- It does not indicate who we are (no indication of volunteer-led, non-profit, knowledge movement)
- It is not supporting movement growth (not clear to new participants, new content, new donors, new partners, new perspectives)
- It’s confusing (conflation with Wikipedia)
- It was not designed to represent the movement.

https://w.wiki/Vvx
Brand changes can also be done quickly, with specialists using expertise.

Announcing EFF’s New Logo (and Member Shirt)

BY HUGH D’ANDRADE | JULY 9, 2018

Today, we are finally getting around to a new look for our organization thanks to the generosity of top branding organization Pentagram. We’ve launched a new logo nicknamed “Insider,” and it was created for us by Pentagram under the leadership of the amazing Michael Bierut.

https://www.eff.org/deeplinks/2018/07/effs-new-logo-member-shirt

EFF was founded on this day, exactly 28 years ago. Since that time, EFF’s logo has remained more or less unchanged. This helped us develop a consistent identity — people in the digital rights world instantly recognize our big red circle and the heavy black “E.” But the logo has some downsides. It’s hard to read, doesn’t say much about our organization, and looks a bit out of data.
To reiterate, briefly, the impetus for this project has been Mozilla’s desire to be better known and better understood by their past, present and future audiences.

Mozilla pursued visual brand change with staff team and community guidance in a 10 months project. They declined to utilize the Firefox brand directly.

What makes the situation slightly more awkward is the fact that Firefox seems to be the only browser left standing that actually displays the http:// in the first place. Edge and Chrome both hide it (at least by default). So does Vivaldi. Given Chrome's market share, it's not clear how many people will even associate the // with a URL. If Mozilla wanted to cater to the faithful, that's its prerogative, but the new logo may not do much to build recognition of what the foundation is all about.

MJ: One of my sharpest memories of this round of designs, once they became public was how many online commentators critiqued the work for being 'too trendy' or said 'this would work for a gallery not Mozilla.' This was clearly going to be an issue because, rightly or wrongly, it seemed to me that the tech and coding community had set the bar lower than we had expected in terms of design.

TM: Right! And no matter how many times we said that these were early explorations we received feedback that they were too “unpolished.” Meanwhile, others felt that they were too polished, suggesting that this was the final design. We were whipsawed by feedback.

https://blog.mozilla.org/opendesign/arrival/
Brand changes are divisive and frustrating in the short-term, with results measured by longevity.

The thing about redesigns is that sometimes all it takes is a few months of using something before people get used to it. And that seems to be exactly what happened with this rebrand. Roughly a year later, 73 per cent said they preferred Slack's new logo. The lesson? When you've really thought through your designs, people will often come round after a period of adjustment.
Conclusions: Brand change will be guided by community, with specialists to balance needs, maintain open process, and ensure changes have long-term impact.
The principles of our process

- **Invite all** Established & emerging communities require different engagement styles. We need everyone. Actively facilitate to include underrepresented groups.
- **Think from the outside in** Remember we are missing billions, and that our movement is not obvious, clear, or inviting to them today. Be open to improvement.
- **Document openly** All materials on Meta-Wiki, key materials in 7 languages.
- **Protect accuracy** Frequent updates and clarifications are needed to keep people informed and empowered.
- **Support affiliates** Consistent check-ins with 70+ affiliate liaisons.
- **Make the movement visible through the collaboration** Share project updates as public moments, host group Q&As and monthly office hours. Accept multiple forms of feedback, not just on-wiki, share back what we hear for all.
Challenge: What partners have proven success record on open, collaborative design projects?
Relevant work
Snøhetta began by building the new Library of Alexandria, home to Wikimania 2008. They lead design for collective cultural organizations like national parks, libraries, and social justice causes.

Proposal fit
With insistence on “co-creation” the Snøhetta plan relies on community input, feedback, and direction and begins with collaborative workshops to define a “concept.”

Understanding of Wikimedia ethos
Snøhetta sees design as a tool to welcome, invite, and celebrate shared cultural experiences. They respect the “singular in the plural” and cherish how Wikimedia culture is both “anarchistic and democratic.” Looking to make visible Wikimedia’s global community, they set out a plan to collaborate openly on naming and design in ways that would terrify a conventional branding agency. They want to do branding in a “wiki” way.
Challenge: How to make the undervoiced and emerging communities core to this work?
By inviting all affiliates to join the process, big and small, old and new.
Collaborating with 97 representatives from 41 nations
Our community created 23 concepts for the Wikimedia brand
23 Concepts from the Wikimedia Movement
“Interconnection”
In most brand changes, new logos are the controversial shifts.
In the Wikimedia movement, names are the controversial part of brand changes.
Worry that brand changes are set and unilateral

Sensitivity around Movement naming

Uncertainty of Board’s alignment with project

Opposition to expanded uses of Wikipedia name

Concerns over 2019 community review conclusions
705 people from 83 countries joined brand working groups.

Brand concepts received 1300 visits and 1,200 endorsements.

“Should the Foundation call itself Wikipedia?”

+45

-525
Challenges: How can we connect our movement together with a Wikipedia-based name? How can we show how parts connect and act on community criteria?
Approaching the Wikipedia name and reputation is done with immense care.

It is an entirely unique project, built by community and beloved by the world.
It was a long time before the Foundation became a serious presence in the movement.
This London Wikimeet in 2004 was the first time Jimbo had ever met more than one Wikipedian at a time in person.
Community built a movement
Almost two decades later...
Wikipedia Is the Last Best Place on the Internet

People used to think the crowdsourced encyclopedia represented all that was wrong with the web. Now it’s a beacon of so much that’s right.

REMEMBER WHEN WIKIPEDIA was a joke?

In its first decade of life, the website appeared in as many punch lines as headlines. *The Office*‘s Michael Scott called it “the best thing ever,” because “anyone in the world can write anything they want about any subject—so you know you are getting the best possible information.” Praising Wikipedia, by restating its mission, meant self-identifying as an idiot.
Future Historians Will Rely on Wikipedia’s COVID-19 Coverage

The deletions, the editor fights—all of it will be important to researchers studying this period.

By STEPHEN HARRISON

MAY 27, 2020 • 12:05 PM
How Wikipedia’s volunteers became the web’s best weapon against misinformation

In the Facebook era, the volunteer editors behind the archaic-looking website have built Wikipedia into a formidable force for truth.
North Face tried to scam Wikipedia to get its products to the top of Google search

*It swapped Wikipedia photos with its own product placement shots.*

By Dami Lee | @dami_lee | May 29, 2019, 12:25pm EDT

---

**Vavn Dorokhin** @vavndorokhin - May 29, 2019
Replying to @Wikipedia

¡Thank you for sharing and for all the amazing work you do, @Wikipedia! As a potential customer, I feel right to inform people I know about this incident and choose clothes from other teams or individuals. @thenorthface, your actions are harmful and will lead to distrust to you.

---

**Veronika Coleman** @tippedparadox - May 29, 2019
Replying to @Wikipedia @thenorthface and @LeoBurnett

I can not foresee myself ever purchasing a North Face product after this. #boycottthenorthface

---

**andypiper** @andypiper - May 29, 2019
Replying to @Wikipedia @thenorthface and @LeoBurnett

... are you hiring? because I believe in your mission, and this kind of stunt makes me as sad as it makes you all.
Where are we now
There is a general lack of trust in the Foundation. For historical and often financial reasons, individuals and affiliates are sometimes suspicious of the actions and intentions of the Foundation. Some community members who take this view have labeled the project as a “power grab”. This makes it harder to collaborate on initiatives that seem more risky or controversial.

Many communities were not convinced of our positive intentions with this project. Comments and reactions from community members show that the message of our intentions (to share the power of Wikipedia across the movement) did not break through or was not seen as positive.

We intentionally designed a process that looked different from typical community consultations. We wanted every affiliate to have a voice in the exploration and establishment of a new design system for movement groups. One way we tried to level the field was to reduce the number of interactions and reduce the time required to participate in the brand project. We know that not everyone in our movement has the same time to spend, or the same ease with written language. We hoped that our methods would create a reasonably equal opportunity no matter where you were connecting from.
Where did things go wrong

- **Our “non typical” process was seen as less legitimate.** Moving away from RfCs and contests has been viewed unfavorably. We did not properly explain the reasoning behind some of our choices, so by the time we did, they were perceived as against the values of the Wikimedia and wiki way.

- **The public position of the Board was ambiguous.** It was unclear whether the Board of Trustees supported the project and to what extent. The absence of Board minutes from 2018 and 2019 during moments of debate (e.g. the January 2020 RfC) allowed a narrative of doubt to take hold. Board support lends significant legitimacy to Foundation programs, showing that activities are happening under review, guidance, and stewardship towards long-term commitments.

- **We did not convince a significant segment of communities of the value of the change.** For those who see change as difficult for affiliates to adopt, both administratively and socially, the benefits are not currently seen as outweighing the costs.

- **Legal risks in making name change still require detailed review.** Several community groups have flagged legal risks for sharing name with the Wikipedia project and these concerns still need legal assessment.
Where did things go wrong

- **From initiation to design, the process took too long.** It is difficult to maintain a project over several years. The context of the movement and the world, along with tenure and needs of community leaders can change significantly over that time. This takes more resources than we set aside, and in retrospect it required different planning.

- **The process moved too quickly for many.** Some communities communicated that they did not have time to discuss and consider proposals properly. This resulted in a request to pause or stop the project.

- **Attachment to community identity.** We expected for some individuals and groups to be protective of their identity as Wikimedians, that’s a natural reaction in any change process. However, during our research many community members indicated a loose association with Wikimedia that they often explained using Wikipedia and as a result we underestimated the apparent attachment as expressed in the open letter.
Where did things go wrong

- **Timing of the project appeared out of sync with Movement Strategy.** Movement Strategy milestones did not come at projected times, making it difficult to align discussions and decisions. Though initiated to support Movement Strategy, the brand project was seen as being started too soon to reflect recommendations.

- **The global pandemic has thrown everything into question.** Because of the stress of the pandemic on staff and community, the lack of in person meetings where we often work things out, and the fact that we've postponed other things (elections, for instance)—some have said that the combination of those factors makes it a bad time to expect people to make such an important decision—it is an uncomfortable conversation to have while some people's "discomfort" plates are full. And there have been comments that working under such stress will not lead to a good outcome.
French people as usual :). O2 (talk) 17:55, 25 June 2020 (UTC)

44. Support, but all money should be given to wikipedia community in every country. WMF is not allowed to take any money out of it. If wikipedia is the given name it should be the leader of every dollar or euro! --2003:F6:371D:4B00:DC44:5EA8:2733:CA53 17:15, 28 June 2020 (UTC)

45. Support, of course they should. No one knows what Wikimedia means. Wikipedia is the flagship project of the Foundation and its orginal purpose. The argument that this is confusing is silly, actually it is clarifying. I can see that this might upset other projects which aren't a Wikipedia, but the truth is that the vast majority of them were set up as adjuncts to Wikipedia. SpinningSpark 16:29, 29 June 2020 (UTC)

46. Strong support, and the web address should be renamed to "world.wikipedia.org" --Ciao • Bestoernes0 • 19:26, 18 July 2020 (UTC)

is it acceptable for the Foundation to use the name Wikipedia to refer to itself?
don't fix it. The proposed name causes more issues than it solves, as others have pointed out. — Ynhockey (talk) 23:32, 7 July 2020 (UTC)

523. Strong oppose --Ghormon (talk) 07:04, 9 July 2020 (UTC)

524. Strong oppose Wikipedia is about the people, a foundation should be called a foundation. Everything else is misleading. -- Betateschler (talk) 06:32, 12 July 2020 (UTC)

525. Strong oppose Wikipedia is special one among Wikimedia wikis. Most of the people seeking knowledge in internet know about Wikipedia and accepted it as their primary reference centre. They consider Wikipedia as a large encyclopedia with lots of information rather than a free editable encyclopedia. Most of the Wikipedia users do not know about Wikimedia foundation and any other wikis because they do not need that. Wikipedia is a knowledge provider. Some of the common readers know Wikimedia Commons even though they do not know its relation with Wikipedia. So leave Wikipedia as encyclopedia and Wikimedia Foundation as a body governs the coordination of wikis. Keep the names same as it now. Thank you. --Path slopu (talk) 11:09, 17 July 2020 (UTC)

526. Strong oppose Wikipedia means "A media for wikis to be hosted" and wikipedia is a wiki hosted by WMF, so the name should NOT be changed. --07:38, 18 July 2020 (UTC) --The preceding unsigned comment was added by Thesinator05-2 (talk)

527. Strong oppose. I find it very unclear how the question "should we rename Foundation to Wikipedia Foundation?" is presented as "do we have the right of self-determination?" --Пётр Петров (talk) 05:02, 20 July 2020 (UTC)

528. Oppose no I think that's not right --Struppi (talk) 11:31, 20 July 2020 (UTC)
Open letter on renaming

Volunteers have built the good name of Wikipedia as an independent, community-driven resource for 20 years. The Wikimedia movement projects, including Wikipedia, thrive on decentralization and consensus. Clear distinctions among the Wikimedia Foundation, affiliates, and individual contributors are essential. Any change that affects this balance demands the informed consent and collaboration of the communities. Therefore, it is of great concern to see "Wikipedia" presented for the name of the organization and movement despite widespread community dissatisfaction.

We, the undersigned, request an immediate pause to renaming activities by the Wikimedia Foundation, due to process shortcomings of the 2030 Movement Brand Project.

- Assessment of risks during project planning and concept development.[1]
  - High cost for undemonstrated benefit. Renaming constitutes a disruptive change, and does not show a clear link to the promised outcomes.[2] Wikimedia affiliates are concerned about the hazards of using "Wikipedia" outside of a project context and have not found adequate assurances and support.[3]
  - High risks to community identity. These have been overlooked in evaluating naming options. In 2015, the Wikimedia Foundation noted that "Wikipedia is a strongly-held community identity. Name changes have implications for community cohesion and participation."[4] However, it failed to carry these concerns through the process and the surveys.
- Respect and inclusion of Wikimedia communities:
  - Miscommunication and confusion. Unclear assumptions by the Wikimedia Foundation have led to a lack of confidence in the brand process.[5][6][7]
  - Problematic evaluation and summary of feedback. The choice of metrics, particularly in the August 2019 community review, has put the premise and legitimacy of the process into question.[8][9][10][11]
  - Neglecting the views of Wikimedia communities. Formal and informal channels, including Requests for Comments[12] and straw polls,[13][14] indicated clear problems with the process. The current brand survey focuses on the very name for the Wikimedia Foundation that was overwhelmingly opposed in these community consultations.

Therefore, we ask the Board of Trustees and the Wikimedia Foundation to pause or stop renaming activities.

Every major activity in the Wikimedia movement has been delayed or postponed this year – the global Wikimania conference, Wikimedia Foundation board elections, Wikimedia Summit and Strategy working groups. It is appropriate to treat renaming with the same level of care and concern. Any future work should be restarted only in a way that supports equitable decision-making among all stakeholders.[15]

https://w.wiki/VD6
Community open letter on renaming

Community open letter on renaming/statistics

For comparative statistics of related polls and discussions, see all-statistics

This page describes some statistics about the signers of Community open letter on renaming, which was published on June 23, 2020.

Out of 909 signers that linked to Meta userpages: (updated 19:34, 16 July 2020 (UTC))

1. Global usergroups: 12 Stewards, 75 OTRS members, 13 Global rollbackers, 5 Global sysops

2. Sysops: 106 are a sysop on at least one wiki, 687 instances of sysops right. (That’s a surprising number of people who are sysops on multiple wts, huh.)

3. Other usergroups: 96 interface admins, 223 rollbackers, 118 bureaucrats, 34 checkusers, 19 overwatchers. (These are “on at least one wiki”.)


5. Home wikis: Number of user’s “home wikis”, defined as the wikis related to which they have the highest number of edits. (In the sandboxes, etc., etc.)

6. Article count: Total number of articles (including redirects) in that language.

7. Community size: Total number of edits on that language.

8. Not to forget the most frequent contributors.

9. Current brand survey focuses on the very name for the Wikimedia Foundation.

10. Therefore, we ask of Board of Trustees and the Wikimedia Foundation to pause the community name discussion for now.

Every major activity in the Wikimedia movement has been delayed or postponed this year due to the coronavirus pandemic. It is appropriate to treat renaming with the same level of care and concern. Any future work should be restarted only in a way that supports equitable decision-making among all stakeholders.
Learnings from Wikipedia brand workshop in Bengaluru, India.

Justice Okai-Allotey  Follow
Jun 15 - 6 min read

I got a message earlier this year about my availability to join the second Wikipedia Brand Workshop scheduled for Bengaluru, India; I wasn’t too sure how and what my contribution to the whole process would be. Mind you this has been a process I was actively involved in during the early stages of its conception by the brand’s team of the Wikimedia Foundation. As I got heavily involved in the user group activities in Ghana, it became apparent that anytime we had to introduce ourselves and the Wikimedia Foundation, we always had to clear a lot of doubts. When the WMF started the process to re-examine its brands, I got excited and got involved with the process.
The Signpost

28 June 2020

INTERVIEW

What is wrong with rebranding to "Wikipedia Foundation"?

By Smallbones

Contribute — Share this [show]

We asked four of the signers of the Community open letter on renaming to answer questions on the open letter and the issues behind it. They are Andrew, Joaipa, Pharos, and Sj.

Signpost: The Wikimedia Foundation’s handling of the proposed brand change and survey has been clumsy, tone-deaf, or even worse. But the argument for changing the brand name, as I understand it, is very well-intentioned. The WMF’s major goals include spreading knowledge in various forms to every place on earth. It has been very successful in doing this in the global north in the form of encyclopedias, making the name Wikipedia world famous. But many of its projects are much less known. Thus the WMF wants to promote the lesser known projects by using the world famous name. They have the legal right to make the change and there was no previous community approval process in place that can deal with such a far reaching change. So they have created a method of approving the change. Do you disagree with the WMF’s goal, the assumption that the name change will help the lesser known projects, or the method of approval?
Where did things go right

- **Global research validated 2016 community concerns** We learned that while billions know and use Wikipedia, few recognize or understand Wikimedia.
- **Solution to increased movement awareness is within portfolio** While other organizations have to build reputations and recognition from scratch with sustained marketing and communications, the Wikimedia movement has a world-class brand in Wikipedia.
- **Talking with affiliates showed interest in brand change** 2019 discussions found that many (24) community groups are interested in brand evolutions towards increased recognition and understanding.
- **Found a partner interested in co-creating with our community** It is rare for a brand project to include more than a few people, ours was open to anyone interested all the way down to the concept level, the foundation that determines most other design decisions.
- **Designed workshops for anyone to participate in project kickoff** Instead of private onboardings, the brand project partner facilitated workshops to collect perspectives on brand from across the movement. This started the process with sustained global collaboration.
Where did things go right

- **Heard from our community around the world** Knowing that successful global branding would need input from across the world, we have collected feedback from more than 40 nations at every step. An open “brand network” of volunteers interested in the project now totals more than 700 people from 83 countries.

- **Stayed in close contact with liaisons from a majority of affiliates** Developing a set of “affiliate liaisons” the brand project team provided frequent check-ins, personal planning, and private forums for questions and concerns to more than 70 affiliate liaisons.

- **Shared every step of the project publicly** Sustained documentation on Meta-Wiki of all project materials including videos, photos, presentations, and all research materials has set new model for transparent project documentation.

- **Developed live video sessions to speak directly to community questions** Adjusting to global pandemic and need for remote collaboration, the project team developed new video format for live project presentations. Meetings grew 67% in one month, with 500 community volunteers watching naming proposals live and sharing a Foundation-record 11 comments per minute.
If we proceed with change

- **Fractures within the movement** There is a risk in making brand name changes at this time that the changes would “formalize” a split between the Foundation and some community stakeholders resulting in a polarized rather than unified movement towards our shared goals.
- **Unresolved resentment, distrust, animosity threaten future changes** Concerns have accumulated in this process and threaten good-faith trust between Foundation and community in upcoming consultations and collaborations.
- **Infighting prevents movement from acting on 2030 goals** Distrust, skepticism, and concern could shift focus internal rather than on external, long-term commitments.
If we stay with status quo

- **Lack of recognition, relevance for movement** Research has established that Wikimedia is not a well-known brand and that it confuses general audiences from donors, press, and internet users. Retaining the status quo without adaptations means the movement will remain poorly-known and misunderstood, even while Wikipedia and other project popularity may grow.

- **Community groups must grow & build without strong brand** The 2030 goals and Movement Strategy recommendations call for community groups to lead more. Clear, recognizable branding will help further partnerships, appeal to new members, and support fundraising/grants. Sharing the movement’s best known brand name allows community groups to benefit from their connection to the ecosystem of free knowledge.

- **Avoidance of other hard strategic problems** Acting on research and strategy is hard. If major movement commitments become subject to routine petitions and second-guessing, Foundation staff and volunteers will be disinclined to pursue the difficult areas of work at the pace needed to meet shared goals by 2030.
Looking ahead
Adaptation = change to better suit an environment or challenge.
Challenge: How can we use the global standing of Wikipedia to support movement growth, knowledge equity, and our outreach to “every single human being”? 
Acting on strategy is hard. We are still facing the same challenges 10 years later.
Community Insights survey shows we still have much to reach "every single human being"

Newcomers who are...

- women,
- in East Asia, or
- not fluent in English

feel less empowered to succeed on-wiki than other newcomers.

If we want to increase our Movement’s geographic and gender diversity, we must focus on attracting and retaining newcomers.

- Wikimedians are 87% male. Almost half live in Europe and one-fifth in Northern America (as compared to 9.7% and 4.8% of the global population). Learn more.
- Compared to more tenured contributors, those who started editing in the last two years are three times as likely to live in Africa, twice as likely to live in Asia, and twice as likely to be women. They are also more socioeconomically diverse. Learn more.
- New volunteer developers are half as likely to live in Europe as tenured ones. Learn more.

Our growing diversity is at risk if we do not improve our social and technical environments, especially for those who often have worse experiences.

- Contributors who joined the movement in the last two years feel significantly less empowered to succeed on Wikimedia platforms if they are women, live in Eastern Asia, or are not fluent in English. Learn more.
- Almost half of women and of contributors living in Eastern Asia said they felt unsafe or uncomfortable in Wikimedia spaces in the last year. Learn more.
- Youth, newcomers, and contributors living in Africa and Southern Asia indicate more positive technical and social experiences in Wikimedia spaces than others, including feelings of belonging and engagement in their communities. Youth in particular are more satisfied with their technical experiences than others. Learn more in Platform Evolution and Thriving Movement.
Prácticas restaurativas

Prácticas restaurativas (Restorative practices) es un campo emergente de prácticas y estudios que conducen a la construcción de capital social y la consecución de disciplinas sociales a través del aprendizaje participativo y la toma de decisiones.

La hipótesis unificadora de estas prácticas es que el enfoque productivo y más propenso a realizar cambios hacia un mundo de paz no rodea hace cosas con ellos en lugar de para ellos o a través de ellos.

Esta hipótesis mantiene que ni las posiciones punitivas ni las altas y rigurosas son más efectivas que las prácticas participativas.

El campo de prácticas restaurativas ofrecen un hilo común de prácticas que aplican tanto en la escuela como en educación, justicia, trabajo social y gestión de conflictos. El objetivo es comprender, hacer y compartir con disciplinas que no utilizan estos enfoques.

Restorative practices

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

Restorative practices is a social science that studies how to improve and repair relationships between people and communities. The purpose is to build healthy communities, increase social capital, decrease crime and antisocial behavior, repair harm and restore relationships. It ties together research in a variety of social science fields, including education, psychology, social work, criminology, sociology, organizational development and leadership.

https://w.wiki/XSx
The opportunity we have is to live up to our vision and be a beloved movement, not just website, for “every single human being” in the world.
In January 2020, we asked 97 brand workshop participants to name a brand they admired.

They picked organizations with purpose not just products. The example brands have global relevance, clear values, and simple ways to join/support their work.
Our movement belongs among the world’s great brands. It is something for the whole world to use, support, co-create, and cherish.
Knowledge belongs to all of us.

every single human being
Thank you.