== Part 3: The Future of Movement Governance ==

Thoughts and Ideas:

- The way these two choices are presented mixes together whether the Global Council should be subordinate to the WMF or the other way around (something recommendation #4 gives clear guidance on, so there shouldn't even be a need to debate it) with whether the GC should follow an assembly model, and with whether it should be a standalone legal entity.
- Third scenario provides us with a structure that can make decisions in a transparent and participatory way. A General assembly every two years could provide some sort of predictability as well as give the communities and affiliates a place to directly influence decisions.
- Hard to differentiate movement and foundation matters. Foundation has to invest money/workforce into making movement-wide ideas happen, and it might not be willing to. Legal liability is also a problem: WMF cannot reasonably bear it without final decision-making authority in some matters.
- 2nd scenario is the best option, as an advisory body can provide Foundation additional perspective. Foundation should not intervene if there is an imminent emergency, and should consult community bodies before making a decision.
- There's no one-solution fits all scenario that is more aligned with our principles. There are always issues within the community that needs foundation support (e.g. ToS Violation / govt requests). Sometimes, the foundation can consult with the community, sometimes they must, but sometimes they just cannot due to legal or safety concerns.
- The status quo is somewhat a compromise but that doesn't mean everyone will be happy.
- IMO the more important questions do discuss would be what representative governance means (e.g. why half editor-elected, half affiliate-elected?)
- We felt there are other scenarios that are not represented here, including building role of Hubs and Affcom
- ...about decentralisation one practical criticism from Jo Freeman https://www.jofreeman.com/joreen/tyranny.htm
- Avoid the new governance body becoming a "bunch of VIPs"
- Resources available for affiliates to engage in conflict resolution and mediation -- standard enforcement process (outside Wikimedia platforms) to resolve community reports among organizers about violations of UCOC -- because policies are nothing without clear enforcement procedures
- the scenarios lack participation of project contributers and users
- The projects could have representation if they want to, nothing is stopping them from creating a user group using whatever governance method that project use on-wiki
- such a structure would become disjunct from the actual project structures/users unevitably
- not if it is governed through on-wiki methods, it could be "direct democracy" for any decision with on-wiki elections, village pump discussions for everything they do

- A problem some of us see at WMLGBT, though, is that a small number of people want to do the organisation of that kind of governance, which means those people immediately become more distant from the community — because we spent time on governance, we have less time to spend within the community
- Use existing methods of governance within wiki projects to create possibilities to participate in governance
- What is the problem that we are trying to solve with these new structures? And how do they interrelate? And how do we feel these structures would solve those problems?
- Meta says "The Global Council is a planned body that is intended to serve as 'a global structure that responds to the needs of our Movement as a whole and represents communities in an equitable way' ", but we could use very similar language to describe the BOT; WMLGBT aspires to be such a purpose.
- Also, how would any new structures avoid exacerbating existing inequalities within the Movement?
- An essential feature is translating b/t hyperlocal implementation + policies and global policies.
- New scenarios are needed. [hyperlocal support isn't addressed by scenarios 2 or 3. neither 2 nor 3 seems right, a general assembly should be more than advisory, but where or not it's a separate entity isn't important compared to supporting/empowering local context]
- What problem specifically would the different modesl try to adress and in what ways do we think they could adress them? We could clarify this before the conversations happening at the Summit. How may a new structure fix specific problems?
- how the various entities are constituted is not clear in the Scenarios
- may be a 4th scenario +
- these events + processes may be over-selecting for people who attend in-person events and need $ for their projects or care about financial allocation; as opposed to the majority of organized community groups that operate online, engage in both central and distributed governance online, and are not primarily $ constrained (nor able to scale / unblock their work by receiving funds)
- Scenario 3 is more aligned with the movement strategy, in scenario 2 the GC is only advisory. This doesn't solve the issue of the WMF making decisions that the communities disagree with.
- The MCDC is being very diplomatic, not many changes, at the end the WMF still decides.
- How do the GC consult the communities to make sure we don't reproduce the same issues?
- How do we get feedback from everyone in the movement? To make a good decision we need a good information flow to make sure the communities are engaged in involved. How do we collect data to make well informed decisions? The GC will face the same issues than the WMF faces right now.
- We need to talk about the functions of the GC - why do we need it?
- Not interested in GC, more interested into what is going on locally. We don't want the WMF or the GC to decide everyting. We don't have time to invest in global conversations, it is a diversion from the core work on the Wikimedia projects.
- The idea of a global general assembly is interesting

- Now the Indian communities are at the stage of being able to contribute and give feedback. Now it's time to get engaged.
- All scenarios can work, as long as they take into consideration the needs of each community.
- The global general assembly scenario is interesting, as it would not be only the Foundation taking the decision.
- Resource sharing should be more equitable: large part of all movement resources handles by the Wikimedia Foundation and significant part of it by few number of big affiliates
- Take care of possible conflicts and overlapping between affiliates (earlier there was a geographic separation, nowadays this does not exist anymore)
- Essential instfrastructure of free knowledge -- we should be open for new projects and new ideas, for example people are less interested in encyclopedia and more in videos or interactive contents, but they have negligible support.
- Scenario 2 is very close to the the status quo (Scenario 1), which is very few change and not inline what was the result of the global strategic consultation or the roles and responsibilities group recommendation, which would be closer to Scenario 3
- How can we involve communities in these conversations? People in africa like to meet in larger group to discuss these issues. How can we make it engaging for them? Bring in people from MCDC and have them talk about governance, with jokes and fun things to make it engaging.
- Bodhisattwa: #1 status quo, not ideal. #2 not sure that this level of representation will actually help to hear voices of smaller communities. a lot of bureaucratic conversations around charter (like hubs requirements, but maybe we need something for microhubs). in #3 the most favourable to be represented, but more bureaucratic processes, more conflicts, and additional systems would need to be built. No idea about what topics GC needs to discuss / have power over. I want to see a huge number of hubs / miscrohubs on the grassroot level. not interested in GC as such, as most likely GC would not resolve it for smaller communities (even if there is one representative for the project / language community)
- as one example of issues that smaller communities have, but probably are not going to be heard globally: tech development for smaller communities, things need to be built from scratch, tools, no infractrusture to support (WS not indexed by Google)
- scenario 3 makes sense. One question I would have about this scenario - are there areas where it's unclear about the boundaries between 'movement matters' or 'foundation matters'? (ie, the decision-making purview of general assembly vs. the board of trustees)
- WMHU: regarding the technology topic, a community wishlist is a good way, but it is not significant enough
- sanjeev: more interested in online community governance (less tech developed community, issues with adminship, and Phabricator etc)
- WMHU: Global fundraising is not always the best way to do things, giving feedback, but no changes
- it's been 7 or 8 years since we have a user group and we are progressing too but I don't know how it's different than not being an affiliate .. like registering for UG, we made some by laws but till now we didn't make them into action, so are we just progressing as an community or being an affliate it could have some more benefits of it.

- maybe we need to be specific in the role of Affiliates in the movement. Some individuals do not want to join an affiliate for specific reason.
- I still think the main problem of scenario 1 & 2 is that 12 non-elected people are deciding for the whole community. People on Global Council should be elected and co-opted so they are representative of all the movement. Global Council should define how decision are made, not the Board of Trustees.
- In scenario 2 what's the point to have a Global Council if it's only advisory ? +1
- The representative models need to be considered carefully so that they do not fall under the danger of being "taken over" by a lot of small affiliates who might not have large experience in governance but constitute a major share of votes (that might not be that much informed).
- Small chapters should have a fair representation in the general assembly. Small chapters typically have no employees, no executive director; they only have volunteers that are working on local projects, partnerships with national institutions, and hubs + international collaboration. There could be a fragmentation amongst volunteers, e.g. a volunteer only managing "Wiki Loves" activities, or collaboration with educational institutions.
- Potential conflict of interest; one person representing multiple user groups / especially serving on multiple boards...
- Can we fix the problem of the current system instead of investing so much time and money in creating a new system?
- ...scenario 2 would not change the current situation, we already have advisory bodies
- in favor of a larger assembly for representation, an is not inline with the strategy
- Neither scenario really represents the reality of the Wikimedia affiliates (chapters being the decision makers over TO and UG) or the community of Wikimedia projects (the Foundation or Wikimedia affiliates being the ones who want to decide about the community).
- Scenario 3 makes much more sense when we take the principle of representation seriously. I imagine a future where our communities of editors would also have a chance for their voice to be heard (not just the affiliates and the WMF) – how can we make the communities of content creators an active part of the movement? A general assembly seems to be a much better answer than an small advisory council
- Scenario 2 (another advisory entity) doesn't seem to be in line with the recommendations that came out of the strategy process
- To fix the current problems we need to put the communities in the center
- I doubt the limits of the third option, to what extent decisions on Foundation matters do or do not affect the matters of the movement.
- how do we avoid the vote for the general assembly to be a popularity contest
- the 3rd scenario is better when get more equitable representation and the assembly is accountable from community and affiliates.
- gap between communities and affiliates needs to be filled and this is not considered in these conversations.
- I am not clear about how the general assembly would be formed. More information about this would be helpful
- How can we enable the communities of Wikipedia's sister projects (with emphasis on small projects) to have decision making

- How do we integrate communities into decision-making if they are not interested in participating in this type of process? Affiliates do not represent entire communities (e.g. German Wikipedia and Wikimedia Deutschland).
- How we prevent chapters from having too much power in decision-making (it takes one word from chapters for a user group to lose its funding or recognition from WMF).
- How do we balance long-term Wikipedians and newer Wikipedians, when the longer-term folks have more time to decide an opinion where the newer folks are just getting acclimated to all the Movement dynamics
- ...what does "everyone is joining us" mean?
- Scenario #3: which are the boundaries between "movement" and "foundation" matters? Isn't the WMF, by defintion, part of the movement? How would a "mandate" to the "movement" affect to any given part (imagine a random UG). What happens if the "mandate" to the "movement" collides with the WMF's plan?
- What is the status quo? We don't currently have a movement charter, which makes the status quo hard to describe. We're trying to both describe it—for the first time—as well as changing it at the same time.
- fan of "form follows function" - concern is that we're talking about process before we know what we're trying to solve.
  - +1 to this - be precise about what we're solving for
- think of the models/ scenarios of one step along the way, with potential to develop further in the future
- Consultations are currently time consuming. There's a hope that the future structure will make it easier to have consultations. Respect people's time.
- Language barrier is a serious challenge for our movement. There is no enough human resource to communicate the larger processes, policy issues to the actual community on field in their own language. The people who are good at English or other major global languages are only presenting their views.
- There are different kinds of communities, and they have different levels of interest in governance. Some do not want to be involved in larger processes. There are different types of human involvement in our movement, and we need to have room for all of them. We can have individual models, affiliate models, and global models. We need room for all of these models.
- Scenario #2: Why is the decission arrow pointing from the WMF to the Community instead of the opposite? Shouldn't the Community be represented by the Global Coundil and the Global Council DECIDE over what the WMF is going to do with the resources? Shouldn't the WMF ADVISE the Global Council about how to make the best decissions?
- Perhaps trying to break down "categories" of issues which are currently not always "managed" by the same entities, or sometimes in the hands of several entities (eg, funding, techs, brand) and apply different scenario propositions on those categories rather than to the global situation to get a clearer picture (it was suggested that Wikimedia France provided an approach along those lines) and move away from always opposing Wikimedia Foundation versus Affiliates
- conversations around money are lacking: funds and their allocation are a very important dimension in governance strucutres, and are currently not addressed in the scenarios. Important question: who decides who gets how much money? (original idea of governance group was: global council)

- We need to make changes for people that prioritize how much we demand of people's time. If everything is important, nothing is important. We don't need to vote on everything. At the summit, we should discuss what needs our time.+1000000
- maybe there is no "one solution" of the many different needs that we have?
- A lot of the discussions feel like they are designed around the needs that chapters have in the movement.
- Is the MCDC thinking of experiencing with a sandbox before they finalize the charter so we can give feedback and experience what they are proposing?
- I like scenario 3! This one most closely aligns with Movement Strategy done to date. It emphasizes decentralization. Which things are deemed "foundation" and which things are deemed "movement" is a source of conflict. A central question is who has access to "Wikimedia Movement funds".
- Worry: hubs seem like a potential layer of bureaucracy between affiliates and central governance, and could prevent people from accessing governance resources and centralize power rather than distributing it.
- The Central and Eastern European hub is presented as a success story for distributing power. The CEE is low power and small, but it has been helpful to participants.
- There are some groups which need more power, like the Wikimedia Europe organization in planning, which may compel some participants or stakeholders to participate in bureaucratic processes which currently they are not obligated to join.
- These scenarios are going beyond what has been proposed by the MCDC: we should look at the MCDC proposals and see if their definition of a Global Council is aligned with our understanding of what is written is the movement strategy
- Hubs may set up blocks / barriers / borders which prevent online users from accessing resources and benefits which are not from their hub or affiliate.
- Hard to consider these scenarios on their own. The real question is what do we want to achieve (as asked in the previous discussion: "What could be improved by introducing a new structure?"). Then, we can build a governance structure designed to achieve those things.
- There is a proposed governance structure where only the global council directly talks to the Wikimedia Foundation, when presently the community can petition the Wikimedia Foundation directly. The Global Council in that way could disempower community stakeholders if it is a barrier for community to speak to WMF. The global council should not represent the Wikimedia community.
- Larger bodies, like in Scenario 3, would be necessary to achieve equity in decision-making
- We already have many community structures which work locally, but who do not have communication power to escalate their concerns to the Wikimedia Foundation or whatever level of governance is highest. Creating new organization structures will not solve the challenge of groups needing better communication channels.
- Specifics would be necessarily to truly evaluate these scenarios. What is each trying to achieve?
- It's hard to engage with governance before finalizing roles and responsibilities. I don't know how to engage with these questions before we answer "what we're trying to do"
- A global/general assembly elected by the movement and having decision-making power rather than just advisory power would be more in line with the movement strategy and be more inclusive

- need to decide the decision power of different movement entities (e.g. should small user group have the same voting power as big, super-capable chapter?)
- We have been having these conversations for many years, 5+, from the Wikimedia Movement Strategy and the "Roles and REsponsibilities" recommendations there. The community stakeholders have been asking for things and continue to ask for things in all these discussions.
- future of governance will be influenced also by development of humans (both individually and collectively), the evolution / development follows some principles (more complexity, more inclusiveness, more global perspective, more love, etc (see 20 tenets by Ken Wilber); currently it is not clear how it will manifest, but "teal organisations" (coinedby Frederic Laloux) seems going in that direction
- The proposed scenarios are all top-down, and presume that a global council or general assembly or anything else governing at the top can gain respect and power to address all problems at lower levels. Another possible scenario is funding more groups at the bottom to build up their capacity first. Without empowering lower-level groups immediately and over time, it will be difficult to get respected high level leadership from these groups.
- I think it would be important to clarify the relation between the WMF and the Global Council. It seems that a fine balance would have been found; if the Global Council would be too weak it would be irrelevant. If it would be too strong the WMF would loose the control over the projects they own. (ie. advisory role might be too weak for the Global Council).
- We need to look at the legal implications of the governance scenarios we discuss. What legal status does GC have? If our GC is a legal organization it needs staff to manage that. The WMF will therefore become an affiliate.
- GOVERNMENTABILITY and Complexity: we could have different topologies of what needs to be governed and how huge lump of WIKIMEDIA can be federated entities that are resource focused based on technical, topical and contextual needs.
- I would rather have tech on other continents for start, but once WIKIMEDIA FOUNDATION is split in 3 or more entities it would be easier to not make single bad 'solution'
- We need to educate people on how to think of and take part into governance: how are the structures? How do they function? What could be improved
- It is suggested that the WMF could or ought to be splilt into 3 or more entities, not all in San Francisco. Or rotating locations/roles.
- Silicon Valley is not our natural and only possible HQ
- I like the General Assembly because we are so diverse. But I recall the critique that it would be hard for such a body to make decisions. So I think it would have to delegate to a selected decision making body, perhaps the Council. I want the GA otherwise too many small interests will not have any official representative.
- ...some sort of hybrid model between the suggested sceanrios would make sense
- its not about just creatng srtcutures, but hey need to be fluid and representative of minority voices and digital participants and inclusive.
- Conscious baout the burden we place on affiliates to participate in global governace, balance between structure and process and content.
- participation should not be a requirement and not a burden. Groups should be encouraged to be lean

- most excited about hubs. they are managable . global level is also important but a bit overwhelming
- Hubs could also take on some of that burden on behalf of smaller affiliates, so the latter can focus on the actual work
- ...we are not sure what we like, but we know we do not like model 1, lets not do small changes on that model
- The thrid model might be too large of a change by itself and might bring chaos, model 2 might be a good first step, and then promote it to model 3. It migth also be good to just make a statement "we want model 3 in 5 - 7 years, what are the steps to get there. It is ambitious but also exciting. Overall within our group the preference seems to go to model 3, but concerns with regards to the speed at which we get there (and which steps to take).
- We also foudn that Georges talk of Language hubs is also an interesting way to look at governance. on another level.
- How will a group as large as the general assembly proposed by WMDE actually work? How will people agree and make decisions? A smaller group would be better.
- Will an elected General Assembly solve the issue of minorities not being heard. It sounds like the UN general assembly which does not work.
- One outcome -- want to ensure that the outcome focuses on diversity and equity globally for languages and geographies.
- It won't stay the same...
- We understand the existing system -- can we focus on incrementally improving the model than creating a brand new one that no one understands the working of?
- We could focus on #3, which might solve some of the problems we observe. But most of the contributors are volunteers, and they don't have capacity to engage with governance in addition to the volunteer work they actually came here to do. As a result there's a very small group that seems to decide everything
- No one size fits all - we should focus on increasing the number of volunteers and retain them.
- Lack of representation - there has never been someone from Africa on the Board of Trustees. Communities from the global south feel like they are not well represented by the BoT.
- A very large general assembly seems unwiedly. Rather than having new bodies - maybe the current WMF board of trustees needs a representative advisory body.
- Concern is that a global council is likely to be a large body that is mainly remote and a body like this can be unwieldy in terms of process. Getting anything to be adopted by it will be difficult. May require lots of discussion to do anything -- lots of discussion without outcomes. How much actual power should we give it? Decisions that NEED to be made, is this the right body to give it to? This body should be more of an advisory body rather than critical / decision making responsibilities given the urgency of some decisions. Look forward to hearing more opinions from others about that.
- We should not wait 10 years before we set up the perfect structure. Can we start small? And scale the Global Council before/in parallel when we set up a new legal entity? The Wikimedia Movement likes to experiment with things. We should experiment with Governance. We are not doing it and this is one reason why people are dropping out of these conversations - it is too theoretical.
- Rather than one large grand body would smaller groups of people working on different things be better.

- There are lessons to be learnt from grassroots community in Africa where the communities are working in a fleible way.
- Are these scenarios going to give us more power or just to make things more confusing and complicated?
- Very concerned with another level of bureaucracy taking additional resources
- We should ensure that the Technology Council is experimented with sooner rather than later. Let's start small and get going! Tools/software is so key to our work and should not be centrally controlled and developed as it is now, but we should take advantage of the expertise and different needs and ideas in the wider movement.
- We have a lot of the same people involved in the same conversations possibly making new levels of governance and decision-making. It invites me to wonder if the same people are making the decisions to continue maintaining the power of decision-making or if it is the same group of people who are here because they are the ones who are so passionate about helping us move forward.
- How do we have substantive debates/discussions with decisions when everyone is remote? There are important process considerations in forming this.
- When we say "democracy" -- this is not the same thing in all countries, do the words mean the same things to us all?
- the only way to get funds is to be involved in some form of affiliate structure, as the vast majority of users are not represented in these funding or governance decisions. perhaps governance means we must be active in some form of affiliate as that is the only way for the voice to be heard in the movement discussions
- Some people get frustrated by the way we experiment: nothing moves, nothing changes. According to the timeline of the MS the Charter should be done by now, and the global council should have been established.
- Democracy vote is considered a standard in europe, many people on earth live their whole life without democracy. We base a lot of our projects on consensus. Why cannot consensus work for the movement governance?
- Status quo is not an option, we need things to change
- We need to be careful with experimenting. Bad decisions can have tough consequences on the whole movement.