

** The text between square brackets has been modified to deidenfy the responders according to the survey privacy statement: https://foundation.wikimedia.org/wiki/Naming_Convention_Proposals_Movement_Feedback_Survey_Privacy_Statement/

How do you use the Wikimedia name?	Responses						
Externally (outreach, events, representing the movement to external parties, etc.)	79						
I do not use the Wikimedia name	238						
Internally, within the movement (community policy writing, community governance, community communications, casually in community conversations, etc.)	225						
Internally, within the movement (community policy writing, community governance, community communications, casually in community conversations, etc.),Externally (outreach, events, representing the movement to external parties, etc.)	522						
Internally, within the movement (community policy writing, community governance, community communications, casually in community conversations, etc.),I do not use the Wikimedia name	6 Invalid						
Externally (outreach, events, representing the movement to external parties, etc.),I do not use the Wikimedia name	2 Invalid						
Internally, within the movement (community policy writing, community governance, community communications, casually in community conversations, etc.),Externally (outreach, events, representing the movement to external parties, etc.),I do not use the Wikimedia name	8 Invalid						
Total	1080						
Proposal 1: Wikipedia as a Network							

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the above proposed naming convention? These statements are based on the Movement Branding Criteria that was generated in the 2019 through community consultation [select one option] (required)							
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Total	
This proposal will help explain the different elements of our movement and reduce confusion	535	190	129	158	68	1080	
This proposal will help protect and improve our reputation	425	208	202	171	74	1080	
This proposal will help support and bring awareness to the sister projects	575	172	120	154	59	1080	
This proposal will help mitigate legal risks	411	125	413	90	41	1080	
This proposal will help support movement growth	415	202	229	176	58	1080	
This proposal is sufficiently adaptable (personalizable and localizable) for movement members	434	173	226	185	62	1080	
Please explain why you made these selections and/or provide recommendations for improvements (Optional) - Some information here could have been altered to deidentify the respondent							
<i>Below are a sample of the 478 responses per the survey privacy statement - The sample here represents the four categories mentioned in the report</i>							
Our community should be encouraged and supported to think of ways to communicate and continue the usage of WIKIMEDIA instead of reinventing the wheel							
This is the worst idea, we are a movement, not an Encyclopedia							
Le changement de nom rajoute de la confusion. L'utilisation de Wikipédia rajoute encore plus de confusion. C'est inutile. La communauté Wikimedia est très largement opposée à ce changement de nom.							

Network is a good name to describe the whole movement but awkward as the formal name of an organisation. The meaning of the "group"/"network" distinction is unclear. Network also sounds like we're become an internet service provider.							
Le meilleur lien avec la notion d'interconnexion, la meilleure utilisation de Wikipédia. La notion de réseau est claire pour tout le monde en 2020 et permet à chaque projet de se faire une place spécifique dans l'ensemble. Permet d'expliquer facilement si un wiki est ou n'est pas dans le réseau Wikipédia.							
People might confuse use like a broadcast media							
It took some time to get used to replacing Wikimedia with Wikipedia in the "umbrella". I heard about it about 10 months ago. My first reaction was "No!" But then I started to like it. It took some time, but it took me longer to figure out the distinctin Wikimedia/Wikipedia when i started [#] years ago. Then it was said such a change, Wikimedia->Wikipedia was not an option, and now it is the only option. I like it. I think a lot of people dont. Of the 3 options I just like the "ring" of movement most.							
I don't understand what means "Trust" in that context...							
Many organizations have grown to be Wikimedia affiliates and renaming them to Wikipedia * may open liability issues.							
Stop this process immediately as demanded in the Open letter							
Naming everything Wikipedia will not help making sister projects known, it will make everything more confusing.							

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statement about each proposed descriptor term? "This descriptor term will help explain the different elements of our movement." [select one option] (required)

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Total	
Network	387	182	176	217	118	1080	
Group	321	190	253	231	85	1080	
Trust	485	201	209	123	62	1080	

What else could be improved of this overall naming convention proposal? (optional) - Some information here could have been altered to deidentify the respondent

Below are a sample of the 439 responses per the survey privacy statement - The sample here represents the four categories mentioned in the report

Use "Movement" rather than "Network", it is much easier to localise (we already use it)							
Please bring back the inclusive phrasing of WIKIMEDIA projects							
Not implementing it.							
Add tagline to the projects to: Wikidata, part of Wikipedia Network. Should Wikipedia Network be translated?							
maybe "foundation" instead of "trust"							
do not spend any money on branding! branding is useless and does not contribute to the spread of free knowledge.							
Stick with the status quo							
The risks are only partially considered							
Difference between User group and Organization is not very clear.							
Network to me sounds like Cartoon Network or a media corporation, this wording doesn't reflect our movement IMO.							
Not implementing it.							

<p>Мне до сих пор кажется, что уход от "Викимедиа" не является достаточно удачным решением. Возможно дело привычки, но... не станут ли проекты подчинены Википедии? С другой стороны точно возникнет путаница между организацией и проектом.</p> <p>Не легче ли развивать текущее название и больше сил потратить на популяризацию самих проектов? Например сейчас уже можно сделать выводы, какие проекты стоит объединить, а какие расширить. Становится понятно, что нужна более глубокая интеграция между проектами.</p>							
Proposal 2: Wikipedia as a Movement							
How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the above proposed naming convention? These statements are based on the Movement Branding Criteria that was generated in the 2019 through community consultation [select one option] (required)							
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Total	
This proposal will help explain the different elements of our movement and reduce confusion	536	183	142	144	75	1080	
This proposal will help protect and improve our reputation	443	187	211	167	72	1080	
This proposal will help support and bring awareness to the sister projects	577	162	151	131	59	1080	
This proposal will help mitigate legal risks	408	137	411	86	38	1080	
This proposal will help support movement growth	451	174	223	156	76	1080	
This proposal is sufficiently adaptable (personalizable and localizable) for movement members	443	151	243	170	73	1080	

Please explain why you made these selections and/or provide recommendations for improvements (Optional) - Some information here could have been altered to deidentify the respondent

Below are a sample of the 430 responses per the survey privacy statement - The sample here represents the four categories mentioned in the report

Association wäre Movement vorzuziehen.							
Not using the Wikipedia name, as it can only create more confusion between the foundation, movement and projects, whatever the surrounding words.							
I'd prefer Foundation, not Organization. I'd also like to avoid a word with different spellings (organization and organisation).							
Wikipedia can function as a functional umbrella, but only if sister projects are more clearly and more tightly connected with Wikipedia. It remains to be seen, if e.g. Wiktionary can (which I believe) as a main category (Category:Words) within Wikipedia, of it WD or WC can do the same. Unnecessary simplification in naming can be counterproductive, so long as the technicalities remain different.							
Proposal 2 is very similar to Proposal 1 but it is not better. I will not repeat what i stated at Proposal 1. Not a good idea against the clear strong worded requirements of the active community of the movement.							
Nichts. Die Ansätze sind schon falsch.							
Organization ist hier doppeldeutig.							
Keeping movement makes a lot of sense. Wikipedia Organization is a bit wordy, but better than network.							
KISS principle (Keep It Simple S...)							
Movement is more "political" than network, refers to common/pursued values that need to be clear.							
سوف يزيد من الخلط و يعقد المسائل القانونية و يضعف المشاريع الأخرى							

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statement about each proposed descriptor term? "This descriptor term will help explain the different elements of our movement." [select one option] (required)							
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Total	
Movement	376	129	183	220	172	1080	
Group	335	132	309	224	80	1080	
Organization	413	167	226	190	84	1080	
What else could be improved of this overall naming convention proposal? [open question] (optional)							
Below are a sample of the 381 responses per the survey privacy statement - The sample here represents the four categories mentioned in the report							
Do not use the word 'organisation', use something that clearly refers to participants but not a legal branch, e.g. Wikipedia Community Antarctica							
stop trying to insert 'Wikipedia' into this.							
Chapter: Wikipedia Movement Placename, Foundation: Wikipedia Movement Foundation							
Keep the current state as proposed by the majority of the community on meta.							
Status quo beibehalten							
Movement is a good term but Wikipedia leads to serious legal concerns for various chapters and user groups.							
Trouver un meilleur mot que "organisation".							

I, obviously, didn't well understand the flow of this survey :) I much prefer movement I think it has all of the right ingredients to help when discussing and driving forward our work and efficiently communicating what we are trying to achieve as a collective.							
I tend to like Foundation better than Organization, but understand the benefits of the .org opportunity it offers.							
Have one global holding brand that does not contain the word "wiki", one global suffix such as "global" to indicate when something is global, continue to have global names for Wikidata etc and everything else is not standardised but something appropriate for the culture it belongs in.							
Halt the rebranding.							
Proposal 3: Wiki + Wikipedia							
How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the above proposed naming convention? These statements are based on the Movement Branding Criteria that was generated in the 2019 through community consultation [select one option] (required)							
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Total	
This proposal will help explain the different elements of our movement and reduce confusion	570	204	129	108	69	1080	
This proposal will help protect and improve our reputation	543	198	173	107	59	1080	
This proposal will help support and bring awareness to the sister projects	515	178	181	140	66	1080	
This proposal will help mitigate legal risks	534	174	283	53	36	1080	
This proposal will help support movement growth	476	190	235	123	56	1080	

This proposal is sufficiently adaptable (personalizable and localizable) for movement members	476	190	235	123	56	1080	
---	-----	-----	-----	-----	----	------	--

Please explain why you made these selections and/or provide recommendations for improvements (Optional) - Some information here could have been altered to deidentify the respondent

Below are a sample of the 460 responses per the survey privacy statement - The sample here represents the four categories mentioned in the report

"Wiki" is vague, has tons of meanings, and really dilutes the power of the product involved here -- that Wiki is in our naming structure right now is kind of an accident of history, not something core to our identity.							
Wikimedia brand already serves our needs best							
I think that trying to brand the whole movement simply "Wiki" without trademarking it is a non-starter. It will cause more confusion than existing trademarks, especially given how much we've tried to educate the general public on the difference between wikis in general and our Wikimedia Movement over the last 15 years.							
Wiki is a type of software.							
The movement name is now too short. Definitely needs two words to be clear. The chapter name remains too long. Other elements are better here: compact affiliate name options. I think Wikigroup is a fine term. The tagline "part of the <Foo> Movement" is better than what you have here.							
Stick with Wikimedia.							
It is even worse – wiki is a generic word. Wikimedia and Wikipedia are now established since two decades.							
wiki is too generic as a word. We actually will INCREASE legal risks.							
Vous listez vous-mêmes les risques qui sont bien supérieurs aux prétendus « avantages » de ce renommage.							

Sorry, but this is awful. The wiki idea existed before Wikipedia and other Wikimedia wikis, and there are many, many wikis that are completely unrelated. It's true that we made the wiki idea more popular, and Wikipedia is, of course, the most popular wiki site, but it still doesn't mean that we can own the "wiki" name like this. I understand why it's tempting, but it's absolutely unacceptable.							
It's nice and simple.							
It will not make it easier to explain the difference between the project and the organizations, i.e. Wikimedia Foundation and affiliates. The term "Foundation" as part of chapter's name will give a stronger link between the Foundation and the Chapter, which isn't recommendable. For the chapters it will be a longer and more complicated name and it will in many cases be more or less impossible to localize to national language.							
How much do you agree or disagree with the following statement about each proposed descriptor term? "This descriptor term will help explain the different elements of our movement." [select one option] (required)							
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Total	
Organization	392	179	227	200	82	1080	
Group	353	136	277	222	92	1080	
Foundation	320	106	231	248	175	1080	
What else could be improved of this overall naming convention proposal? [open question] (optional)							
Below are a sample of the 383 responses per the survey privacy statement - The sample here represents the four categories mentioned in the report							
"Wiki" really seems to generic. Isn't this the common descriptor for any user editable online "database" similar to the Wikipedia?							

Use "Wiki Foundation" instead of "Wikipedia Foundation" - keep "-pedia" for those activities that relate to encyclopedias.							
We already have much confusion between "Wikimedia projects" and "WikiProjects". We don't need another "Wiki Project".							
To avoid confusion with likeminded but organizationally distinct projects, the movement might need to be described in some unwieldy way like "Wiki by Wikipedia Foundation" or "A Wiki Project Sponsored by the Wikipedia Foundation". I don't think that would be much of an improvement, though.							
Слово вики не монопољно							
We should have a wide range of options to affiliates. We should not create immediate connection between the WMF and chapters.							
"Wikigroup" and "Foundation" work well for me. The unqualified use of "wiki" is a strong negative for me.							
Foundations have different meaning depending on countries so naming all chapters this way will be an issue Some Groups are more mature than Chapters. Only were recognised later and thus called Groups. It would not be helping that the original first ones be called a way and those who came after called a different way							
All of these options are the same, and bad. The community should be able to pick real options, including the status quo.							
I really like keeping Foundation! But I'm worried about the use of Wiki as lots of Wikis exist.							
Using Wikimedia for the Foundation.							

The term Wikipedia exists in many languages. It is also used internationally as simply "Wikipedia". How much of the naming convention do you think should be open to translation? (optional) [select option] (optional)							
	Count						
Some Words - "Wikipedia" is used without changes across languages BUT descriptor terms are translated	370						
All Words - Wikipedia AND descriptor terms are translated	405						
Other* [open field]	190						
No Response	115						
*Other: [Sample of open field responses]							
Do you mean translated, or transliterated? It seems rude to expect everyone to use latin characters all the time, and confusing.							
All words should be open for translation. Some languages haven a Culture of translating							
You have to search terms that have not necessity of traslation							
i am not have knowledge in this issuen e xpert							
Keep the Status Quo							
Don't use Wikipedia.							
Shouldn't be Wikipedia. But Wikimedia should stay the same, descriptors translated							
transcription possible selon la langue (par exemple Wikipédia, ou transcritpion dans un autre alphabet)							
Wikipedia is written in local alfabet transcribed (e.g. in Hebrew :ויקיפדיה)							

For those interested, the Brand Project team invites you to suggest other naming elements. It can be a whole proposal or a phrase or a word for consideration.

Common terminologies used in the suggestions - Sometimes different terms were repeated in one response.

Terminology	Count						
Blank	650						
Status quo	258						
Wikimedia variation	42						
Wikipedia variation	54						
Wiki variation	69						
Knowledge variation	22						
Organization	23						
Movement	38						
Community	19						
Network	24						
Association	12						
Trust	14						
Anything but Wikipedia	10						
Suggest other elements - MOVEMENT	Movement Tagline	User Groups	Chapters / Thematic Organizations	Foundation			
<i>Below is a sample of the 430 responses per the survey privacy statement - The sample here represents the themes above</i>							
Wikimedia movement		Wikimedia xxx/Wiki xxx	Wikimedia	Wikimedia Foundation			
Wiki(pedia) Movement	a Wiki(pedia) organisation	Wiki(pedia) Community Group Penguins	Wiki(pedia) Community Antarctica	Wiki(pedia) Foundation			
Network, Community,	Part of the Wikipedia Family			Trust			
Wikimedia	Quality knowledge freely available for everyone	Wikimedia	Wikimedia	Wikimedia			

The Wiki Movement	A project by the Wiki Movement	Wiki Group	Wiki Chapter	The Wiki Foundation / The Wiki Movement Trust			
Wikimedia Foundation		Wikimedia Foundation		Wikimedia Foundation			
Wikimedia	Wikimedia	Wikimedia	Wikimedia	Wikimedia			
Wikimedia		Wikimedia User Group	Wikimedia [Place]	The Wikimedia Foundation			
Le Réseau Wikipédia RWP, WPN (Wikipedia Network)	faire partie du Réseau Wikipédia RWP	Groupe Réseau Wikipédia Pingouin - GRWP Pingouin, WPN Group Penguin	Réseau Wikipédia Antarctica RWPan anWPN	La Wikipédia Fondation WPF, Wikipedia Foundation			
Wiki Knowledge Movement	A Wiki Knowledge project	[adjective] Wiki Knowledge User Group	Wiki Knowledge [Country]	Wiki Knowledge Foundation			
Wiki Movement	Wikipedia, Commons, Data, and More	Wiki Group Penguins	Wiki Network Antarctica	Wiki Movement Foundation (or just keep it Wikimedia Foundation)			
Wikipedia Movement	A Wiki Project / A Wiki Organization	Wikipedia Penguins	Wikipedia Organization(Antarctica)	Wikipedia Foundation			
Organisation		Local User Groups	Regional Organisations	Organisation			
WikiKnowledge		WikiKnowledge Penguins Group	WikiKnowledge Antartica	WikiKnowledge Foundation			
Wikipedia Movement	Part of the Wikipedia Movement	Wikipedia Group Penguins	Wikipedia Movement/Foundation (either) Antarctica	Wikipedia Movement Foundation			
		Wikiproject	Branch	Society			
Wikipedia	Community	No suggestion	No suggestion	WMF			

				Wikimedia			
Wikimouvement	I don't understand "tagline" meaning	Wikigroup	Wikichapter "country" / Wikitheme	Wikifoundation			
Wikimedia Network	Part of the Wikimedia Network	Wikimedia User Groups		Wikimedia Foundation			
Wikis for Knowledge	A Wikis for Knowledge Project/Organiz ation	Wikis for Knowledge group Penguins	Wikis for Knowledge Antactica	Wikis for Knowledge Foundation			
Global Associaton of contributors to Wikipedia and other free knowledge projects	Part of the Global Associaton of contributors to Wikipedia and other free knowledge projects	<whatever they choose themselves>	Chapter of the Global Associaton of contributors to Wikipedia and other free knowledge projects	Wikipedia Servers Foundation			
Wikivers, Wikinet, Wiki Wiki		Wiki relative, Wikimedia	Wiki Association, Wiki ally, Wiki Wiki Group	Wikimedia Foundation, Wiki Federation, Wikiverse Coalition, Wiki Alliance, Wikinet, Wiki Movement, Wicked, Wi			
Free Knowledge Movement	Part of the Free Knowledge Movement	Free Knowledge *Penguins	Free Knowledge Antartica	Free Knowledge Foundation			
Keep the Status Quo	Keep the Status Quo	Keep the Status Quo	Keep the Status Quo	Keep the Status Quo			

Please expand on why you have proposed these naming elements - Some information here could have been altered to deidentify the respondent

Below are a sample of the 337 responses per the survey privacy statement - The sample here represents the themes above

<p>The WMF / chapter / UG distinction will be well served by the label "International". "Association" (or whatever fits local company law) should be considered for chapters and UGs. "Movement" works currently and I think I prefer it equally to the proposed "Network".</p>							
<p>The use of the word "member" emphasises the key role of the projects working together as equals in the Movement. The word "Movement" itself inspires people to get involved, it being naturally a term that implies progress.</p>							
<p>Keep things the same because all of the proposals have been worse than the status quo.</p>							
<p>"Wikipedia" is used everywhere so clearly inter-related (current "Wikimedia" is not related to Wikipedia for the public), "Movement" implies we are not static, has connotations of a grass roots groundswell (which we are), Foundation is about having strong base/roots</p>							
<p>We already are the Wikimouvement for all non-Wikimedians. It would consecrate a usual and widely spread way of speaking (and thinking) about us.</p>							
<p>The Wikipedia Projekt has a big quality in being a community. This should be reflected in the branding. The word "Community" also immediately shows readers they can join in.</p>							
<p>Wikimedia should remain "Wikimedia"</p>							
<p>Affiliate- connected, but independent - to attach or ally on terms of fellowship; Alliance= Merging of efforts or interests; trust = exactly what it says it is. A trusted entity that holds the trust of the community; in turn holds the best interests of the community to heart</p>							
<p>I don't see that a change is necessary but if it is, it should be broadening (Wiki) not excluding (Wikipedia). After all there are many Wikipedias. Even 'Wikipedias Foundation' would be an improvement on some of these proposals.</p>							

foundation has a very positive meaning in different languages: non-commercial, charitable ... // user group is understandable and self-explaining.							
I think all of them include the interconnection part – it's just that we shouldn't use "Wikipedia" as a central brand. It brings much more confusion than it actually solves anything.							
Please rank the proposals in order of how well you think they will help us reach our 2030 goals, with 1 being the most helpful and 4 being the least [rank] (required)							
"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."	to						
	1st Preference	2nd Preference	3rd Preference	4th Preference	TOTAL		
Proposal 1: Wikipedia Network	195	384	339	162	1080		
Proposal 2: Wikipedia Movement	181	359	376	164	1080		
Proposal 3: Wiki + Wikipedia	116	300	326	338	1080		
Suggested Proposal	588	37	39	416	1080		
*[Suggested Proposal] Text							
(non suggestions have been removed as they are classified as an open response - the following is a sample of the responses per the survey privacy statement - The sample here represents the themes above							
It's perfect now							
Wiki(pedia) Community							
Wikimedia Network							
Wikimedia							
none of the 3 proposals							
WIKIMEDIA							

This question is flawed							
Wikimedia Foundation							
Wikipedia International							
Current brand - Wikimedia Foundation							
Status quo - "Wikimedia Foundation"							
Wikipedia Org.							
Wikimedia Foundation							
Leave things as they are							
status quo							
Wiki Movement							
WikiFoundation + Wikimedia Movement							
Wikipedia Organisation							
WikiKnowledge							
Wikimouvement							
Wikis for Knowledge							
Wikimedia Movement, Wikimedia Foundation, Wikimedia community, Wikimedia projects							
Wikiknowledge							
Wiki Knowledge							
nothing with "wikipedia" in it.							