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Operations update
Revenue & Fundraising
FY18-19 Q2
FY18-19 YTD revenue

Notes:

- We have overperformed our budget in all fundraising categories: Online Fundraising, Chapter Fundraising and Major Gifts.
- Interest and dividend income in our investment portfolio was $560k higher than expected.

Other Income | $1.2m
Total revenue of $88.8M includes realized interest and dividend income
2018 Big English campaign

$60.3 million raised

3.6 million donations

$14 average online donation

*Preliminary numbers
Financial overview
FY18-19 Q2
Q2 Spending highlights

We have decreased the budget variance to 1% principally because:

Our program plans in Q2 were well organized and executed

- We made progress on our staffing growth by adding +16 FTE in Q2
- We awarded $1M FDC grants earlier in the year than projected

[1] "Others" included Data center expenses, Legal fees, Travel & Conference expenses, and other non-personnel expenses
Cash & investment portfolio*

- Total cash and investment balance increased by $40.8m due to revenue exceeding expenses in Q2.
- The overperformance of our fundraising campaigns and investment interest and dividends has also contributed to the cash growth.
- The decrease in short and long term funds resulted from maturity of investments and reflected as operating cash.
- We continue to evaluate our operating cash balance to ensure we are investing in higher yield-liquid short term investments.
Looking forward

Updates to our FY18-19 plan

**Investments:**

Expanding personnel resources for: product analytics, quality assurance, maps and language, Community Health Initiative, community events:

- Expanding support to Movement Strategy working groups
- Continuing our brand positioning, architecture, and messaging project
- Advancing implementation of Business Operations improvements
- Re-envisioning internal collaboration - (expanding and extending All Hands)
- Expanding staff development & leadership (D&I, exec search)
Talent & Culture
FY18-19 Q2
Chief Operations Officer

Janeen Uzzell

- San Francisco Jan-Mar 2019, with an option to renew through June
- Will relocate to DC or NYC
- [LinkedIn bio](#)
Chief of Community Engagement

Valerie D’Costa

- Washington, DC
- LinkedIn bio
Open positions

General Counsel

- Isaacson Miller (exec search)
- Posted January 2019
- Targeting June 2019

CTO

- Interviewing Odgers Berndtson and Korn Ferry as exec search firms
- Targeting FY19-20 Q1
Open positions

CTCO

- Bridge Partners (exec search)
- Ran initial search in FY18-19 Q1/Q2
- Restarted search in January 2019
- Targeting FY18-19 Q4
[redacted]
Turnover & Tenure

- Includes all req# positions, domestic and international
- Average tech industry turnover is 21.9% for organizations WMF’s size, per Radford survey data for 2018
[redacted]
Engagement
FY18-19 Q2
**Overall Engagement**
from November 2017 to November 2018

Increased 5 percentage points from last year

2018 New Tech benchmark = 71%
Overall engagement scores returned to the same level as May 2017
Next steps

• C-level review of the top impact items for opportunities where leadership can affect organizational change

• Each c-level will look at the top impact items for their teams and discuss with their team leadership what they can improve upon

• Next survey will be in November 2019
December 2018 metrics
## Key trends

- Total content continues to increase steadily, with Wikidata adding volatility to the rate of increase.
- Total active editors remains flat for years, due to two consistent trends: a **decline in new active editors** and a **slow increase in existing active editors**. Recent months have alternated between year-over-year gains and losses.
- New editor retention has tended to **increase in very spiky fashion** in recent years, due in significant part to an increasing number of new students from education programs on the English Wikipedia.
- The revert rate, which excludes bot edits, is declining, probably due to the increase of high-volume editing on Wikidata.
- **Total edit rate continues to grow**, mainly because of the same high-volume Wikidata editing.
- Mobile editing continues to increase at a **roughly linear rate**, which means that in percentage terms the increase is slowing.

### Dec 2018 Audiences metrics: Contributors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MoM</th>
<th>YoY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total content</strong></td>
<td>199.0 M</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—Wikipedia articles</td>
<td>49.6 M</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—Commons files</td>
<td>51.6 M</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—Wikidata entities</td>
<td>53.7 M</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net new content</strong></td>
<td>2,130,000</td>
<td>-6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—Wikipedia articles</td>
<td>186,000</td>
<td>-3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—Commons files</td>
<td>512,000</td>
<td>-6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—Wikidata entities</td>
<td>948,000</td>
<td>-25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active editors</strong></td>
<td>81,100</td>
<td>-1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—New (first-month)</td>
<td>14,700</td>
<td>-5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—Second-month</td>
<td>4,290</td>
<td>-9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—Existing</td>
<td>61,200</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New editor retention</strong></td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revert rate</strong></td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>-8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total edits</strong></td>
<td>42.0 M</td>
<td>-5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—Mobile edits</td>
<td>1.3 M</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—Data edits</td>
<td>21.4 M</td>
<td>-10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—File uploads</td>
<td>0.6 M</td>
<td>-7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—Other non-bot edits</td>
<td>12.7 M</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dec 2018 Audiences Metrics: Readers

Readers
User flows including Community Tech, Apps, Desktop & Mobile Web content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interactions[^1]</th>
<th>MoM</th>
<th>YoY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pageviews</strong></td>
<td>14.9 B</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Desktop</strong></td>
<td>6.1 B</td>
<td>-11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mobile web</strong></td>
<td>8.5 B</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Desktop previews</strong></td>
<td>1.63 B</td>
<td>-11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unique devices</strong>[^3]</td>
<td>1.59 B</td>
<td>+0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Sources and further details, also on mobile apps usage:
https://www.mediawiki.org/wiki/Wikimedia Audience#Readers

[^1] Pageviews (all platforms) + seen previews (desktop)
[^2] The rollout of the page previews feature was completed less than a year ago.
[^3] For all Wikipedias

Pageviews and previews normalized to 30 days/month

---

Key trends

- As usual, pageviews dropped sharply before the holidays, only to recover in early January, with a lasting increase in mobile views.
- We continue to see a **year-over-year growth in total pageviews**, slightly larger than last month (+3% vs. +2%).
- The recent Audiences metrics and insights presentation (to be published soon) contains results of some investigations into the trend developments since spring. In particular, referrals from search engines (mainly Google) saw a positive trend change in mid-May.
- Unique devices again increased year-over-year. But as noted before, this metric might be more susceptible to artifacts that decrease the accuracy of such longer-term trend assessments.
Pageviews year-over-year comparison

Wikimedia pageviews year-over-year comparison, May 2013-December 2018
Long-term pageviews trend
Pageviews by access type until December

Wikimedia monthly pageviews (desktop+mobile), 2013-2018

Note: this is a stacked chart- the totals are cumulative
Dec 2018 Audiences Metrics: Diversity

Diversity (beta)
How we’re doing in historically underserved markets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MoM</th>
<th>YoY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global South countries</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—Reader interactions²</td>
<td>3.90 B</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—Active editors</td>
<td>20,400</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—New editor retention</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>-2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—Edits</td>
<td>2.1 M</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—Non-bot edits</td>
<td>2.1 M</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mobile-heavy wikis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—Reader interactions²</td>
<td>688 M</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—Active editors</td>
<td>4,050</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—New editor retention</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—Edits</td>
<td>1.1 M</td>
<td>-2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—Non-bot edits</td>
<td>0.5 M</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key trends

- No notable trends. The size of the month-to-month trends here are well within the realm of normal fluctuations.

Notes

¹ Editor location data is deleted after 90 days, so it is not possible to calculate trends from before the metric was established. Trends started to accumulate in June 2018.

² Pageviews (all platforms) + seen previews (desktop)

³ The rollout of the page previews feature was completed less than a year ago.
Medium-term planning
Our design principles

- The medium-term plan is driven by the Foundation priorities rather than by the priorities or programs of each team.

- The medium-term plan will be concise and at the Foundation level, describing Foundation-level outcomes and outputs.

- Individual team 1-year operating plans and budgets will be created after the medium-term plan. While important, they will not be included in the published plan.

- Our process model will be to assign a central group to collect content from across the Foundation to be synthesized by the Exec team.
The context of our planning process

- **Mission**
  - **Strategic Direction**
    - **Medium-term Priorities and Plan**
      - **1-year operating plan and budget**
      - **Quarterly Team Plans**
        - **Focus for the planning process we design**
          - **Shared on Meta with budget**
            - **Internal only**
## Criteria for the process design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUR PLANNING PROCESS <strong>MUST</strong></th>
<th>OUR PLANNING PROCESS <strong>SHOULD</strong></th>
<th>OUR PLANNING PROCESS <strong>MAY</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Result in a plan that reflects the Foundation’s priorities in service of Movement’s goals</td>
<td>Stimulate cross-departmental conversation and collaboration</td>
<td>Include participation by every staff member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activate and inspire teams to focus on big picture impacts</td>
<td>Include opportunities to hear a full spectrum of voices</td>
<td>Be describable by anyone on staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide explicit delineation of who ultimately has responsibility for decisions</td>
<td>Result in a plan that can be expressed in one page/ (poster?)</td>
<td>Be shared in-progress with the community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Result in a concise, comprehensive and accessible summary of the Foundation’s commitments. | Be as easy for remote staff to contribute to as co-located staff | [aspirational should : ]
| Be reasonable to complete in the timeframe allowed | Be overt about trade-offs made | Unintended consequences? |
| Not defocus teams from quarterly goals | Reinvigorate staff commitments to Movement Goals | |
| Allow for adaptation or iteration over time | | |
| All relevant stakeholders are participating* | | |
| Reflect [WMF values](https://www.wikimedia.org/wiki/WMF_values) | | |

---

*mgrs/dirs have eye on it for their own leadership accountability, high potential ICs, veterans newbies, external folks?*
The phases of our process

**Exec team**
- Define **medium-term priorities**

**Foundation**
- Create **medium-term plans** that contain Foundation-level outcomes and strategies

**Foundation**
- Create 1-year **operating plan and budget** that define team-level outputs, outcomes, and resource needs

What will we **focus** on in the next 18 months - 5 years and **what will be different** in 5 years?

What do we need to plan to **create** and **achieve** to accomplish those priorities?

What do we need to **do or make** in the next 12 months to execute our plan?
Phase 1: Preparation
Work with Priority Leads to scope what input we’d like on the questions, challenges, goals for each priority. It will also include what is known (only) about resourcing needs.

C-team: Priority Leads provide priority scope & prep pres for focus groups

WG: Prep questions and facilitation for focus groups

Other: none

~2 weeks

Phase 2: Info Gathering & Mapping
Facilitate 2-3 focus groups to identify key challenges, goals, strategies and initiatives. We begin to map those ideas.

C-team: Priority Leads present to and participate in F.G.

WG: Facilitate Focus Groups

Other: Key Contributors from all depts participate in F.G.

~2-3 weeks

Phase 3: Consolidation
Convene to consolidate the challenges, goals, outputs, strategies, key themes into a high level summary and visual map of what we will do and not do.

C-team: none

WG: Consolidate information from Phase 2

Other: none

~2 weeks

Phase 4: Feedback and iteration
Gather feedback, further consolidate, and iterate with input from entire C-team and other Key Contributors

C-team: Provide feedback on and input to summary

WG: Present summary to C-team & Priority Leads

Other: Key Contributors for each priority provide feedback

~2 weeks

Phase 5: Final Plan
Draft the final medium-term plan and present to Priority Leads for sign-off.

C-team: Sign-off on final plan

WG: Draft final plan

Other: N/A

~2 weeks
Enterprise Risk Management: summary
Executive summary

EY facilitated 5 ThinkTank™ Risk Identification Workshop sessions with Wikimedia Foundation staff and board members to gather perspectives to their most significant risks that the Foundation should consider in planning.

- The identification process included the risk, the root causes of the risks, the potential impacts if the risk were to materialize, and the current and potential mitigation strategies to address the risks.
- In all, 23 unique risks were identified.
- Board and Staff perspectives were aligned on all of the Tier One Risks.
- EY facilitated a C-team risk assessment session, during which executives discussed and refined the risk descriptions and assessed the agreed to tier one risks on:
  - Criteria of impact: (financial, operational, strategic, reputational and legal);
  - Likelihood of the risk occurring to the assessed impact value; and,
  - Management preparedness/opportunities for mitigation improvements.
- 4 risks were categorized as Improvement opportunities.
- 4 risks were categorized as Test opportunities.
- Remaining Tier-Two risks were assessed through an open session.
Participant results

- Litigation and Regulation: 22
- Brand: 21
- Community Engagement: 17
- Technology Transformation: 11
- Cybersecurity: 10
- Planning and Execution: 8
- Culture: 7
- Organizational Alignment: 7
- Physical Security: 6
- Fake News: 6
- Funding: 6
- Competition: 6
- Talent: 6
- Organizational Structure: 4
- Business Interruption: 3
- Resource Capacity: 2
- Career Development: 2
- Board and Leadership: 2
- Fraud: 2
- Growth and Strategy: 2
- Capital Management: 1
- Ethical Conduct: 1
- Succession Planning: 1
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## Tier One risks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Name</th>
<th>Risk Definition</th>
<th># of mentions</th>
<th>BOD mentioned (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Litigation and Regulation</td>
<td>The risk that government may impose regulation preventing citizens from being able to access the Foundation’s offerings. In addition, this includes the risk that new litigation or policies may hold the Foundation liable for all content on its platforms.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand</td>
<td>The risk that the Foundation loses its credibility and the public does not trust its content. Further, the risk that the Foundation as a brand is recognized in a negative connotation.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Engagement</td>
<td>The risk that the Foundation fails to engage contributors and content creation decreases. Further, that the Foundation fails to reach new markets and developing communities.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Transformation</td>
<td>The risk that the Foundation does not evolve in order to keep up with digital advancements. This also includes the ability to maintain community engagement as preferences in digital experiences changes as well as the ability to maintain competitive edge as other companies have stronger development in leading technology.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cybersecurity</td>
<td>The risk that the Foundation fails to protect the company’s data or fails to restrict unauthorized parties from obtaining confidential data. This also includes the risk that the Foundation lacks sufficient measures for understanding, monitoring, detecting and preventing cyber threats and its capability to respond and recover from cyber attacks.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Execution</td>
<td>The risk that the Foundation is unable to properly develop, manage, and execute strategic planning and growth agendas to achieve and maximize vision of the movement.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>The risk that other companies may create similar knowledge sharing platforms and outperform the Foundation due to resources, alternative agendas, and technological advantages.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>The risk that donations from individuals, organizations, or any other entity decline or that the Foundation may accept funding or corrupt regimes that are not aligned with WMF’s mission. Further, the risk that the Foundation will not have enough funds to give grants.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Alignment between board and staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WMF Leadership Identified Risks</th>
<th>Associated Board Identified Risk(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Engagement</strong></td>
<td>* Volunteers/Community (Contributors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Editor Retention / Acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Community Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competition</strong></td>
<td>* Disintermediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* For profit entities taking over our space (e.g., google)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cybersecurity</strong></td>
<td>* Data protection and privacy of content and community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning and Execution</strong></td>
<td>* Our self-correcting mechanism is too slow in maintaining/ensuring accurate information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding</strong></td>
<td>* Attack on Wikimedia Foundation depleting our finances (Ganster style)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technology Transformation</strong></td>
<td>* Technological obsolescence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Failure to scale up technical capacities to new places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Failure to adapt UX/UI to new ways of content consumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brand</strong></td>
<td>* People lose confidence in the reliability of Wikipedia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Damage to the brand/reputational harm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Too much activism/advocacy that harms neutral POV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Litigation and Regulation</strong></td>
<td>* Legal changes in key jurisdictions imposing requirements on us that contradict our values or are difficult to introduce</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WMF Leadership Identified Risks</th>
<th>Associated Board Identified Risk(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Alignment</strong></td>
<td>* Conflict between movement organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Growth and Strategy</strong></td>
<td>* Having a too timid strategy and being outrun by other organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Strategic Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Focusing on our mission only from a value perspective, losing sight of users’ needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Failure to adapt to emerging markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fake News</strong></td>
<td>* Censorship / “Fake News”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical Security</strong></td>
<td>* - not identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Succession Planning</strong></td>
<td>* Lack of succession planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fraud</strong></td>
<td>* Financial fraud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Board and Leadership</strong></td>
<td>* Leadership/Vision unable to stay ahead of change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Board not performing the governance role expected for a global organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Culture</strong></td>
<td>* Being constrained by legacies and traditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Structure</strong></td>
<td>* - not identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Career Development</strong></td>
<td>* - not identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business Interruption</strong></td>
<td>* Long discontinuity of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Talent</strong></td>
<td>* Lack of diversity and global representation in core executive team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource Capacity</strong></td>
<td>* Lack of resources to grow effectively and invest in crucial areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethical Conduct</strong></td>
<td>* Harassment / sexism / etc. situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Management</strong></td>
<td>* - not identified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tier One risk validation

“Do you agree this is a tier-one risk that should be assessed today?”

Mixed perspectives

Unanimous priority
Enterprise risk profile

Leveraging collective insights and knowledge across the organization

Key Criteria:

- Relative Impact
- Likehold
- Management Preparedness
Tier One risk profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier 1 Risks</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Community Engagement</td>
<td>Improve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Competition</td>
<td>Improve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Cybersecurity</td>
<td>Improve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Planning and Execution</td>
<td>Improve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Technology Transformation</td>
<td>Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Brand</td>
<td>Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Litigation and Regulation</td>
<td>Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Funding</td>
<td>Test</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Risk exposure:
- High 5
- 4
- 3
- 2
- Low 1

Management preparedness opportunities:

- Improve
- Test
- Monitor

(impact + likelihood) / 2
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Next steps

- Present final Risk Profile to Executive Management and Board, and distribute to other management/leadership, as applicable
- Prioritize management efforts to:
  - Assign the ‘Improve’ risks to individual risk owners who will take the responsibility of reviewing the risks, refining the description of the risk and developing mitigation plans, then incorporate into risk plans under the risk owner or owners annual plans
  - Monitor planning improvements activities during Quality Reviews
  - Reassess risks in the ‘Test’ quadrant annually
- Establish an Enterprise Risk Management Steering Committee comprised by Audit Committee Chair, CFO, GC, Controller and Security Director
  - Share status with the Audit Committee, twice a year
Critical regions
Confidential
in-person
Brand
Wikipedia brand project

Movement socialization
January - May 2019
Project overview

**BRAND RESEARCH**
Understand the current state of Wikimedia brands among internet users worldwide.

**BRAND STRATEGY**
Recommend refinement of brand architecture and positioning for 2030 goals.

**BRAND REVIEW**
Review project findings and inspire movement groups to adopt brand strategy.

**BRAND DEVELOPMENT**
Begin name and visual identity development (as needed) to update brand system for 2030 goals.

- **July - Sept. 2018**
- **Oct. - Dec. 2018**
- **Jan. - May 2019**
- **July 2019...**
Goals

1. Review brand research and strategy with 80% of active affiliates
2. Inspire affiliates about 2030 brand dev
3. Document community brand needs
4. Develop “brand network” for reviewing future work across the movement
KPIs

1. 80% of “big” chapter and user groups do not oppose (20% highly support)
2. 60% of non-affiliated movement leaders do not oppose
3. More than 10 affiliates join “brand network” to guide continuing work
BRAND REVIEW: IN DETAIL

From February - April, the project team will

- Travel to meet with community group in several regions
- Attend key Wikimedia conferences
  - Iberoconf (Latin America)
  - WikiArabia (Middle East)
  - Wiki Indaba (Africa)
  - Wikimedia Summit (general)
- Have conversations with community leaders representing more than 80 affiliates
- Share brand research and recommendation for feedback and refinement
- Collect “brand” needs from community groups to serve 2030 goals
- Invite people to join “brand network” that will be consulted for future work, including possible naming and visual identity (logo) refinements

Additionally, we will:

- Meet with global brand managers/leaders to learn how other organizations staff and maintain global brand work
  - FIFA, NASA, Olympics, Apple, Netflix, Louvre, Harvard, Nat Geo, IKEA, Nobel, LEGO, Adidas, MTN, UN, BBC, Alibaba, etc.
- Share brand materials on Meta-Wiki and in Wikimedia Blog
- Share materials for feedback from individual contributors
- Collect notes into a final recommendation for the Board of Trustees

We will work closely with:

- Community Engagement - particularly Quim Gil and the Community Relations team
- Legal Dept - To assess cost and complexity of changes
- Wikimedia Deutschland - Project participants and ideal partners for work with affiliates.
Board calendar
Re-thinking the retreat
Committee updates
AffCom
Governance
Human resources
Audit
Executive session
Thank you
Financial overview
FY18-19 Q2
# Q2 Spending Highlights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>Averaging 11 vacancies addition to lower than expected benefits</td>
<td>-$0.4m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donation Processing Fees</td>
<td>The increase in fees is proportional to the increase of the funds raised through payment processors during the Big English campaign in Q2</td>
<td>+$0.3m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>The timing of awards for the Simple APG and FDC programs was earlier than expected. This will be offset in Q3.</td>
<td>+$1.1m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Services</td>
<td>Several departments has revised their contract services plans to postpone projects or have our staff complete the work instead.</td>
<td>-$0.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenses</td>
<td>Minor variances from Travel and other G&amp;A expenses.</td>
<td>-$0.3m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity fund</td>
<td>We have not yet needed to utilize the “Opportunity Fund” budget due to underruns in staffing and other areas.</td>
<td>-$0.3m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>-$0.1m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Q2 Spending Highlights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>Averaging 11 vacancies addition to lower than expected benefits</td>
<td>-$0.4m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donation Processing Fees</td>
<td>The increase in fees is proportional to the increase of the funds raised through payment processors during the Big English campaign in Q2</td>
<td>+$0.3m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>The timing of awards for the Simple APG and FDC programs was earlier than expected. This will be offset in Q3.</td>
<td>+$1.1m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Services</td>
<td>Several departments has revised their contract services plans to postpone projects or have our staff complete the work instead.</td>
<td>-$0.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenses</td>
<td>Minor variances from Travel and other G&amp;A expenses.</td>
<td>-$0.3m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity fund</td>
<td>We have not yet needed to utilize the “Opportunity Fund” budget due to underruns in staffing and other areas.</td>
<td>-$0.3m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>-$0.1m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Engagement
## Increases

from November 2017 to November 2018

At this question level, change less than 5 points is normal data fluctuation

Change that exceeds 5 points is statistically meaningful

For this year, 27 questions increased, these are the top

Of the top ten increases:

3 are factored in Learning & Development

3 are considered high impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Favorable Score</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior leadership effectively directs resources (funding, people and effort) towards the Foundation’s goals.</td>
<td>Company Confidence</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generally, the right people are recognized at the Foundation.</td>
<td>Feedback &amp; Recognition</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My manager (or someone in management) has shown a genuine interest in my career aspirations.</td>
<td>Learning &amp; Development</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am given opportunities to develop skills relevant to my interests.</td>
<td>Learning &amp; Development</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior leadership at the Foundation demonstrate that people are important to the Foundation’s success.</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I see myself still working with the Foundation in two years’ time.</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Day-to-day leadership decisions demonstrate that quality and improvement are top priorities.</td>
<td>Service &amp; Quality Focus</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My manager gives me useful feedback on how well I am performing.</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At this question level, change less than 5 points is normal data fluctuation. Change that is 5 points or more is statistically meaningful. Last year had 10 questions with decreases. All but the first one are not considered high impact.
Approval of senior leadership

November 2017
the ED approval was 87%

November 2017
C-Level approval was at 81%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SELECTION</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SELECTION</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ERM
The following are the 23 unique risks that were identified during the risk identification working sessions. The risks have been sorted by the number of times they were mentioned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Name</th>
<th>Risk Definition</th>
<th># of mentions</th>
<th>BOD mentioned (Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Litigation and Regulation</td>
<td>The risk that government may impose regulation preventing citizens from being able to access the Foundation’s offerings. In addition, this includes the risk that new litigation or policies may hold the Foundation liable for all content on its platforms.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand</td>
<td>The risk that the Foundation loses its credibility and the public does not trust its content. Further, the risk that the Foundation as a brand is recognized in a negative connotation.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Engagement</td>
<td>The risk that the Foundation fails to engage contributors and content creation decreases. Further, that the Foundation fails to reach new markets and developing communities.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Transformation</td>
<td>The risk that the Foundation does not evolve in order to keep up with digital advancements. This also includes the ability to maintain community engagement as preferences in digital experiences changes as well as the ability to maintain competitive edge as other companies have stronger development in leading technology.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cybersecurity</td>
<td>The risk that the Foundation fails to protect the company’s data or fails to restrict unauthorized parties from obtaining confidential data. This also includes the risk that the Foundation lacks sufficient measures for understanding, monitoring, detecting and preventing cyber threats and its capability to respond and recover from cyber attacks.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Execution</td>
<td>The risk that the Foundation is unable to properly develop, manage, and execute strategic planning and growth agendas to achieve and maximize vision of the movement.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>The risk that the Foundation is unable to create an inclusive organizational culture.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Name</td>
<td>Risk Definition</td>
<td># of mentions</td>
<td>BOD mentioned (Y/N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Alignment</td>
<td>The risk that the Foundation is not able to effectively and efficiently communicate strategic and operational information and objectives internally between its departments, especially information from corporate leadership to its other departments.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Security</td>
<td>The risk that the Foundation is unable to ensure the safety of its employees, readers, content creators, and any person or entity that uses its platforms.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fake News</td>
<td>The risk that the Foundation loses its credibility and the public does not trust its content due to fake or severely biased content on the website.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>The risk that donations from individuals, organizations, or any other entity decline or that the Foundation may accept funding or corrupt regimes that are not aligned with WMF’s mission. Further, the risk that the Foundation will not have enough funds to give grants.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>The risk that other companies may create similar knowledge sharing platforms and outperform the Foundation due to resources, alternative agendas, and technological advantages.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talent</td>
<td>The risk that recruitment efforts are inadequate in determining “fit” that provides support to the movement. Further, the risk that once new candidates are hired there is no formalized onboarding process, lack of continuity in staff, and high turnover.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Structure</td>
<td>The risk that the Foundation’s internal hierarchy and departments are misaligned and do not function effectively.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Name</td>
<td>Risk Definition</td>
<td># of mentions</td>
<td>BOD mentioned (Y/N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Interruption</td>
<td>The risk that the Foundation is not adequately prepared to sustain critical operations and provide essential services in the event of a disaster or catastrophe.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Capacity</td>
<td>The risk that the Foundation’s employees are spread too thin resulting in burnout and ineffectiveness.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board and Leadership Performance</td>
<td>The risk that the Board and executive leadership does not perform the role expected for a global organization in order to support the Foundation’s goal and mission.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Development</td>
<td>The risk that the Foundation has not established formal leadership and development training resulting in ineffective management or misalignment.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>The risk that financial fraud occurs within the Foundation or that the Foundation accepts funding from questionable sources/corrupt regimes.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth and Strategy</td>
<td>The risk that the Foundation’s current strategy to achieve its goals is not well-defined, resulting in a gap between vision and actions. Further, the risk that the Foundation is constrained by legacy and tradition inhibiting potential growth.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Management</td>
<td>The risk that a lack of clarity and formal processes in regards to delegation of funds can result in misappropriated or misused finances. Further, the risk that there is not a defined relationship between performance and investments.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Conduct</td>
<td>The risk that unethical behavior including harassment, fraud, or an act with harmful intentions occurs within the Foundation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succession Planning</td>
<td>The risk that key staff departures or unavailability are not able to be appropriately or effectively filled due to a lack of formal succession planning.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tier One Risk Details from Risk Identification Sessions
Litigation/Regulation

The risk that government may impose regulation preventing citizens from being able to access the Foundation’s offerings. In addition, this includes the risk that new litigation or policies may hold the Foundation liable for all content on its platforms.

**Risk Root Causes**
- Changing public policy environment in various jurisdictions
- Governments and regulatory agencies introducing new litigation that breaks up the shared internet space
- Rapid growth of nationalistic tendencies
- Government restricts citizens’ access to internet
- Government censors and/or manipulates content
- “No lean management practices applied to operations/administration”
- Increased desire by governments to control information and communication to their constituents

**Enterprise Risk**

**Impacts**
- Cannot reach audiences or serve populations at large
- Cost increase to support the Foundation’s projects
- Loss of contributors due to inability to create content
- The Foundation could be liable for any content on all platforms resulting in costly lawsuits
- Increased challenge to generate revenue via fundraising

**Current Mitigation Efforts:**
- Strong allies
- Broad presence
- Monitoring regulatory changes

**Potential Mitigation Efforts:**
- Educate policy makers, educators, and private interests about the model and importance of volunteer-edited encyclopedia
- Improve GDPR compliance
- Improve public policy function within the organization
- Strengthen community self-governance
Brand

The risk that the Foundation loses its credibility and the public does not trust its content. Further, the risk that the Foundation as a brand is recognized in a negative connotation.

**Risk Root Causes**

- Increased attacks on validity of journalism
- Inappropriate or extremely biased content posted on site is perceived as the opinion of Wikimedia
- The Foundation perceived as biased
- Increasingly polarized media
- A scandalous or unethical incident occurs and is continually associated with the brand
- Natural uncertainty about the reliability of the Foundation’s

**Enterprise Risk**

- **Reputation**

**Impacts**

- Decrease in credibility of content on the Foundation’s
- Decrease in community engagement and content creation
- Loss of trust in content
- Decrease in content creation
- Readers will go elsewhere for information
- Decrease in funding

**Current Mitigation Efforts:**

- Monitoring

**Potential Mitigation Efforts:**

- Improve training and support to volunteer communities
- Increase PR/Communications funding and staffing
- Invest in brand strategy
- Awareness efforts to increase understanding and use of the Foundation’s
Community Engagement

The risk that the Foundation fails to engage contributors and content creation decreases. Further, that the Foundation fails to reach new markets and developing communities.

Risk Root Causes

- Fewer people use devices that allow easy content creation or editing (i.e. increase in handheld devices)
- Insufficient attention to contributors’ needs
- “Historic lack of investment in community and foundation tools”
- Users lose sense of safety to edit and browse content without risk to self or others
- Goals of individuals and goals of the movement are not aligned
- Awareness gap prohibiting engagement in emerging communities

Enterprise Risk

Community Engagement

Impacts

- Loss of donors and funding
- Content becomes out of date or completely inaccurate
- Readers will go elsewhere for information
- Opinions become bias; they represent the few who do create/edit rather than a large, diverse community of knowledge

Current Mitigation Efforts:

- ✓ Improving Trust and Safety Processes Program
- ✓ Community Health Initiative

Potential Mitigation Efforts:

- Advancement team identifies new and more diverse sources of capital and leveraging resources of partners
- Integrated training support
- Trust and Safety tools team to complement Security team
- Community understanding and outreach. Fund teams to build community and develop good practices.
- Develop mobile app or mobile web development

Presentation confidential / attorney-client privileged
Technology Transformation

The risk that the Foundation does not evolve in order to keep up with digital advancements. This also includes the ability to maintain community engagement as preferences in digital experiences changes as well as the ability to maintain competitive edge as other companies have stronger development in leading technology.

Risk Root Causes
- Internal risk averseness
- Wikimedia has strong ties and tradition of content in the form of text
- Lack of scale relative to competitors
- Continually evolving digital landscape

“Not adapting to the unique needs of ‘the next billion’ internet users”

Enterprise Risk

Technology Transformation

Impacts
- Decline in community engagement and community reach
- Business model becomes obsolete
- Content becomes inaccurate or out of date
- Decrease in funding

Current Mitigation Efforts:
✓ Internal awareness

Potential Mitigation Efforts:
- Research and development efforts into different forms of content delivery
- Develop mobile app or mobile web development

Presentation confidential / attorney-client privileged
Cybersecurity

The risk that the Foundation fails to protect the company’s data or fails to restrict unauthorized parties from obtaining confidential data. This also includes the risk that the Foundation lacks sufficient measures for understanding, monitoring, detecting and preventing cyber threats and its capability to respond and recover from cyber attacks.

Risk Root Causes

- Users are not appropriately trained
- Inadequate detection mechanisms
- Presence of community members with rights to access private data and set code on projects
- Increasingly digital age
- “Internal culture towards privacy policy is confident so risk is taken lightly”
- Natural uncertainty about the reliability of the Foundation's platform

Enterprise Risk

Cybersecurity

Impacts

- Harmful to reputation
- Physical safety of an individual could be at risk
- Loss of public trust
- Decrease in funding

Current Mitigation Efforts:

- ✓ Strong Security Team
- ✓ Established Security Policy

Potential Mitigation Efforts:

- Continually develop and invest in Security Team
- Improve security processes, access controls, and incident response plans
Planning and Execution

The risk that the Foundation is unable to properly develop, manage, and execute strategic planning and growth agendas to achieve and maximize vision of the movement.

Risk Root Causes

- Existing strategy does not have detailed processes in place to effectively execute plans
- Ineffective partnerships
- Increasingly polarized media
- “Have not professionalized Wikimedia’s institutional capacity”
- “Comfort with choosing stable decline in financing rather than the emotional and personal challenges of change”

Enterprise Risk

Planning and Execution

Impacts

- Loss of key stakeholder trust
- Decrease in overall morale
- Loss of key stakeholder trust
- Loss of talent
- Fail to achieve ultimate mission

Current Mitigation Efforts:

✓ 2030 Strategic plan in place

Potential Mitigation Efforts:

- Trainings on strategic planning
- Properly resource and reallocate resources to work on the movement strategy
- Integrate internal organizations to align strategy
- Develop metrics and measurements to quantify progress
Funding

The risk that donations from individuals, organizations, or any other entity decline or that the Foundation may accept funding or corrupt regimes that are not aligned with WMF’s mission. Further, the risk that the Foundation will not have enough funds to give grants.

**Risk Root Causes**

- Grants have been a low priority
- Strategy is unclear
- Reactive rather than proactive in terms of obtaining donations
- Litigation changes that may restrict ability to accept donations in certain countries
- Revenue strategy is not diverse
- Difficult to fundraise in a manner which aligns with the WMF mission

**Impacts**

- the Foundation’s may become obsolete
- Content becomes out of date or inaccurate
- Unable to perform daily operations due to decrease in resources
- Decrease in impact
- Unable to invest in new and innovative initiatives

**Current Mitigation Efforts:**

- Big English fundraiser
- Application systems, open grant reviews, reporting requirements, and grant agreements that are designed to provide a baseline check on impact

**Potential Mitigation Efforts:**

- Diversity sources of revenue (moving away from banner only to email, major donors, endowment, etc.)
- Leverage big donors
- Potentially acquire a for-profit subsidiary that obtains venture capital or other investment funding
Competition

The risk that other companies may create similar knowledge sharing platforms and outperform the Foundation due to resources, alternative agendas, and technological advantages.

Risk Root Causes

- Tech giants control the way data is sent to users and may have alternate agendas
- Failure to adopt to advancements in technology
- Internal bureaucratic processes are slow which creates challenges to innovate
- Another company uses AI or similar mechanism to create content that is similar/better to the Foundation’s
- For profit corporations with more resources could recreate the Foundation’s platform

Enterprise Risk

- Decrease in community reach
- The Foundation becomes obsolete
- Loss of users and contributors
- Alternate agendas of large corporations could dilute communities with biased information
- Decrease in internal morale

Current Mitigation Efforts:

- Strategy 2030

Potential Mitigation Efforts:

- Innovation trainings and workshops
- Encourage and educate how human insight adds value to the encyclopedia
- Research and develop ways to make AI a central capability for volunteers
### Criteria scale - Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Relatively insignificant impact on the achievement of business objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2     | Low    | Temporary (i.e., less than three months) | Limited impact on the achievement of business objectives, for example:  
  - Short-term or limited reputation damage  
  - Limited impact on member retention  
  - Limited increase in costs  
  - Minimal impact to revenue |
| 3     | Moderate | Recoverable in the short term (i.e., within three to six months) | Moderate impact on achievement of business objectives, for example:  
  - Loss of high-value member or alliance  
  - Temporary loss of service or business capability  
  - Temporary, but recoverable reduction in credibility/reputation  
  - Short-term increase in costs or loss of revenue |
| 4     | High   | Recoverable in the long term (i.e., within 6 to 12 months) | Reduced ability to achieve business objectives, for example:  
  - Significant reduction in service and business capability  
  - Incurring excessive costs that significantly impact the budget  
  - Loss or misappropriation of significant assets  
  - Loss of significant number of key personnel |
| 5     | Critical | Recovery in more than 12 months or irrecoverable | Inability to achieve business objectives, for example:  
  - Critical or complete loss of business capability  
  - Excessive costs critically impacting viability  
  - Inability to retain a portion of members/inability to attract new members  
  - Significant operational losses leading to significant reduction of organization value |

- The impact represents the level to which the risk, if it did occur, would impact the ability to deliver upon the business objectives, with impact measured on an annualized basis.
- The consideration of impact should include both quantitative and qualitative effects to measure the severity of the risk event with revenue and cost as the common financial denominators.
## Criteria Scale - Likelihood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Slight</td>
<td>(\leq 10%)</td>
<td>Every 10 years and beyond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Not likely</td>
<td>(\leq 30%)</td>
<td>Every 6 to 9 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>(\leq 60%)</td>
<td>Every 3 to 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Highly likely</td>
<td>(\leq 90%)</td>
<td>Every 1 to 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>(&gt; 90%)</td>
<td>Yearly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The likelihood represents the probability of the occurrence of the potential event over the long range planning horizon. It is estimated relative to the assessed level of impact and the probability of impact to the business segment.
## Criteria Scale - Management preparedness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>Control properly designed and operating as intended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Limited improvement needed</td>
<td>Control properly designed and operating, with opportunities for improvement identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Significant improvement needed</td>
<td>Key control in place with significant opportunities for improvement identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>Limited control in place: high level of risk remains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Highly ineffective</td>
<td>Control does not exist or major deficiency identified: control does not operate as intended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall effectiveness of management and control activities at mitigating either the likelihood or impact of a risk.
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