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The Board’s composition:
- 3 elected by the community,
- 2 appointed by the affiliates,
- 4 co-opted by the Board itself,
- 1 founder.
Elected community members and affiliate-appointees:

- Understand the wiki world,
- Are embedded in the network of our crucial supporters,
- Often do not have external board experience,
- Often are not top experts in their professional fields,
- Often do not have the exact skills that the Board needs at the time.
Co-opted external members:

- Often do not understand the wiki world,
- Often lack network with our crucial supporters and their support,
- have external board experience,
- are top experts in their professional fields,
- have the exact skills that the Board needs at the time.
“The Wikimedia Foundation Board of Trustees oversees the foundation and its work, as its ultimate corporate authority.”

https://wikimediafoundation.org/role/board/
The system got established a decade ago. We had a budget of 10M, now we’re approaching 100M.

Does the current system of composing the Board warrant competence?
The WMF is a very different organization now: highly professionalized, proceduralized, structured, hiring people with top experience.
The Board should catch up.

We need ALL Board members to be BOTH professionally competent&experienced AND knowledgeable about wiki world&open source

What are the ways we can achieve that?
a community-elected electoral committee, which:
- nominates people per the Board’s request for specific expertise, AND/OR
- ranks candidates by given criteria from the poll of candidates proposed by the Board, AND/OR
- proposes 2-3 candidates for each specific expertise seat for the Board to choose from, AND/OR
- creates pipelines of candidates for given specific expertise seats, ready to take some role in the movement (additional advantage of having a pool of advisors at hand),
Other possibilities:
- an affiliate-elected commission serving in a way similar to the community-elected committee, but possibly also vetting the candidates in the process AND/OR ranking the candidates by certain criteria,
- a community-elected electoral committee and an affiliate-elected commission participating in designing the desired competence matrix with the Board,
- a community-elected electoral committee and an affiliate-elected commission participate in creating a point system for evaluating candidates against a-d criteria with the Board.
Questions? Comments? Insults?
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