

BOARD REPORTS, OCTOBER 2014

Reports for the trustees at the Wikimedia UK board meeting on Saturday
4th October. Prepared by staff.

Table of Contents

Agenda for Board meeting at Development House, Leonard Street, London. Saturday 4th Oct at 10:00.	2
Minutes of 7 June board meeting	4
Minutes of 19 September board meeting	14
2015-16 amended draft budget.....	17
Risk register.....	19
Chief Executive Quarterly Report	22
Wikimedia UK Communications Strategy – September 2014	28
Minutes of Volunteer Strategy Meeting, September 2014	36
Wikimania Report	38
Wikimania financial report	45
Governance Committee Report.....	47
Request to approve restricted gift (consent item)	53
Technology Committee Report.....	54
Education Committee	55
GLAM Committee	55
Grants Committee Report.....	55
Report on work in Wales	56
Wikimedia UK Technology Project Management	59
For decision: Board to approve Wikimedia UK acting as a signatory to the Lyon Declaration on Access to Information and Development.....	65
For decision: Board to agree to sign the Free Knowledge Advocacy Group EU (FKAG) position paper on copyright reform.....	68

Agenda for Board meeting at Development House, Leonard Street, London. Saturday 4th Oct at 10:00.

1. Housekeeping (10:00)
 - a. Standing agenda items:
 - i. Apologies for absence
 - ii. Approval of minutes of the previous meeting
 - iii. Matters arising not on the agenda
 - iv. Approval of agenda
 - v. Declarations of interest relevant to matters on the agenda
2. Office in camera session (10:15)
 - a. Standing agenda item:
 - i. Chief Executive confidential reports (*none at the moment*)
 - ii. Any other confidential matters
 - iii. New members
3. Chief Executive reports (10:45)
 - a. Standing agenda items:
 - i. Financial
 - ii. Risks register
 - iii. CE quarterly report
 - iv. Communications strategy
 - v. Wikimania report
4. Board committee reports (11:45)
 - i. Standing agenda items:
 1. Govcom report
 2. ARC report
5. Consent item (12:20)
 - a. Standing agenda item (These items are hoped to be uncontroversial matters where little debate is needed)
 - b. Request to approve restricted gift
6. Board in camera session (12:30)
 - a. Standing agenda item:
 - i. Board in camera session
7. *Break for lunch* (12:45)
8. Trustee reports (1:30)
 - a. Oral report on Subject Access Request under the Data Protection Act 1998 (MM)
9. Other reports (2:00)
 - a. Standing agenda items (Note: any requests for a board decision should come via the CE and should be included in the CE's report.)
 - i. Technology Committee
 - ii. Education Committee
 - iii. GLAM Committee
 - iv. Grants Committee
 - v. Report on work in Wales
10. Discussion items (2:30)
 - a. Consider signing the Lyon Declaration on Access to Information and Development.

- b. Consider signing position paper on copyright reform from the Free Knowledge Advocacy Group EU (to be released on 14 October).
 - c. Technology scoping report
 - d. Fundraising report
 - e. Review of 2014 AGM, and follow-up actions required
- 11. Other (3:25)
 - a. Standing agenda items:
 - i. AOB
 - ii. Date of next meeting
- 12. Close (3:30)

Minutes of 7 June board meeting

Attendees and Apologies

Present

- Michael Maggs [MM], Chair
- Carol Campbell [CC]
- Greyham Dawes [GD], Treasurer
- Chris Keating [CK]
- Joseph Seddon [JS]
- Alastair McCapra [AMC]
- Simon Knight [SK]

Apologies

- Padmini Ray Murray [PM]
- Kate West [KW]
- Saad Choudhri [SC]

Also in attendance

- Jon Davies [JD], Chief Executive
- Katherine Bavage [KB]
- Richard Symonds [RS], Minutes
- Jon Warsop [JW], Auditor (attended meeting part time)

Housekeeping

Approval of minutes of the previous meeting

MM asked if there were any changes to be made to the minutes of the last meeting. GD noted [action 2014-2](#), and pointed out that the financial efficiency figures (eg. the ratio of spend on charitable projects to fundraising costs) were not currently included in the Annual Accounts, but in any case are not strictly required. JD would arrange for them to be added to the illustrate version for wider public distribution.

ACTION 2014-2: SB to ensure that Charity Commission recommended financial efficiency figures (i.e. the ratio of spend on charitable projects to fundraising costs) are included in the charity's glossy annual review document.

DECISION: The minutes of the previous meeting were approved unanimously

Matters arising

ACTION 2014-1: MM noted that the anti-bribery policy had been approved following a board vote at [Anti-bribery policy](#).

MM noted that individual votes will now be included where decisions are not unanimous or *nem con*. Comments on reasons for votes will be included if requested by the trustee in question. MM also noted that in line with our commitment to transparency, on wiki votes will be in public wherever possible.

ACTION 2014-4: and ACTION 2014-3: MM asked if the Risk Register had been reviewed by the ARC. CC confirmed that it had been.

ACTION 2014-6: JD to note the comments in [the previous minutes](#) for the formatting of future CEO reports.

ACTION 2014-7: JD to ask Robin Owain for the reasons why Wici Cymru was refused charitable status, and to pass on GD's offer of help for any future applications.

ACTION 2014-8; ACTION 2014-9; ACTION 2014-10: MM went through decisions 2014-8, -9 and -10 and it was agreed *nem con* that these had been completed.

JD noted that, with KB and SK's help, one of Ed Saperia's ideas for charitable outreach had been funded by the WMF through an Individual Engagement Grant. The other two ideas of Ed's are on hold for the moment, pending more work on them by Ed and others.

Approval of Agenda

It was noted that auditors will be arriving at 11.00, and that the Annual Report and Accounts would be signed today.

DECISION: The agenda was approved *nem con*.

Declarations of Interest

The trustees approved the agenda, and noted that there were no conflicts arising.

Wikimania

- *Note: Part of this section of the meeting was held in camera as a [confidential document](#) was under discussion. However, the minutes of the discussion do not need to be held in confidence, and are being released below.*

JD discussed the Wikimania Report, providing a slideshow with commentary to Trustees. This covered the background to the Wikimania conference over previous years, the structures that organise it, and the relationships between the Chapter, Foundation and volunteer bid team.

JD provided an overview to the background to Wikimania 2014 and the measures the chapter had put in place to support its delivery.

GD asked: How much of the publicity for Wikimania would be by internet, and would the chapter figure prominently in it? KB replied that in terms of external publicity, Chapter staff were in the process of discussing contracting an external PR agency to support the development and promotion of narratives around the conference. GD emphasised it was important to use this as an opportunity to highlight the unique and impactful work of the chapter, as well as of the broader movement.

The board discussed WMUK's plans for Wikimania. JD explained the current structure and outlined the key volunteers and the jobs they are performing. The board were happy with the "WMUK Plans for Wikimania" [presentation](#) that JD had prepared but asked that the text of the document be revised prior to publication to ensure that it did not include any informal statements.

JD explained the Wikimania working budget sheet he had prepared, which outlined a proposal for increased spending on Wikimania, in both the Wikimania budget and already existing programme budgets. JD asked the board to agree that up to £38,500 extra funding is to be taken from reserves to fund extra Wikimania spending in line with his proposed Wikimania budget, with the understanding that a proportion of this can be 'claimed back' from the WMF or raised by other means.

DECISION: That up to £38,500 extra funding is to be taken from reserves to fund extra Wikimania spending in line with the proposed Wikimania budget. This was approved unanimously.

Approval and sign-off for the statutory 2013-14 Annual Report & Accounts

The company's auditor, Jon Warsop (JW), arrived at 10.50, and the agenda was re-ordered so that the board could discuss the annual report.

GD took the board through the annual report, and explained the purpose of the letter of representations that needs to be signed on behalf of the board. GD went through the items on the letter and explained each of them. GD said that he was happy that the representations can properly be made, and he recommended that the board should authorise the signing.

JW thanked GD for his explanations and introduced himself. He explained that, in signing the report, the trustees are acknowledging their responsibilities under company law. He asked if there were any final comments or concerns the trustees would like to make: the trustees had none.

AM noted that some minor corrections were needed to page 19, to correct the numbering of the notes. The changes were agreed, and fresh copies of the formal Annual Report & Accounts were printed.

AMC moved that we sign the Report & Accounts. CK seconded the motion.

DECISION: That the Board of Trustees approves the Annual Report & Accounts and agrees to sign the letter of representations. Approved unanimously.

MM asked GD as treasurer to sign the letter of representations on the board's behalf, which was agreed *nem con*.

JW as auditor signed off the Annual Report & Accounts, and GD signed the letter of representations.

JW noted that GD, RS and DJ were to be congratulated on their joint work to produce the accounts documentation entirely in-house for the first time this year. AMC noted that the management letter prepared by the auditors last year had identified certain accounting issues, and it was extremely reassuring to see the huge extent to which those had all been addressed through effective processes in just 12 months. This was a major achievement which should be acknowledged, and fed-back to staff.

GD noted that the support by the auditors had been extremely helpful to achieve this fast track to a clean bill of health. JW seconded this relationship had worked well, and that in particular DJ's work as the management accountant had been very valuable.

New Members

Note: There was an in camera discussion regarding new members.

The State of Wikimedia UK

JD had, prior to the meeting, shared a document with the board which contained some key observations on the operation of the charity and some future options. The board had also

shared with JD their thoughts on this before the meeting, and JD had also reviewed the document with senior staff. At the meeting, JD updated the board on the meetings he had had with staff and there were further discussions about the ideas put forward.

Note: There was an in camera discussion to discuss the State of Wikimedia UK. The following decisions are made available publicly from this in camera session:

Resolved, nem con: The board approved the building of a lightweight overlay to the WMUK website as part of the charity's goal of encouraging more non-Wikimedia volunteers.

Resolved, nem con: The board noted their support for short-term administrative assistance in order to enable KB to undertake a wide-ranging fundraising scoping exercise (with initial results planned for September). This will help support our independence as a charity.

Resolved, nem con: The board agreed with TechCom that the IT scoping process should include WikiRate as suggested in the CE's report.

Quarterly Report Card

The card can be viewed in full at https://wikimedia.org.uk/wiki/Strategy_monitoring_plan/Outcomes/2014_Q1

JD explained the report card to the board. SK felt that this could in the future be further broken down, but was happy with it. JD explained that the Q2 report card would be almost identical, but would include a second column for the Q2 figures next to the Q1 figures. GD felt that the 'notes' should be separate from the report card proper, which would allow it to be reformatted on an A4 portrait sheet. JD requested that any suggested improvements be sent to him directly.

The board noted that [User:Fae](#) had [opened a discussion](#) on the Engine Room regarding one of the published KPIs on the [Q1 report card page](#). In particular, he objected to the 6.5% figure quoted against the outcome measure "*Percentage of WMUK-related files (e.g. images) in mainspace use on a Wikimedia project (excluding Commons)*", this KPI itself sitting under the strategic goal "*G1.2 The quality of Open Knowledge continues to improve*".

The issue relates to the inclusion in Welsh Wikipedia articles of 'fair use' book cover images (the images themselves having been kindly uploaded by Fae).

SK expressed the view that as already indicated by the wording of the relevant KPI, the way in which the images are used does indeed contribute to the *quality* of the open knowledge Wikipedia articles even though the images themselves are not licensed as open knowledge. CK agreed, as did JS. JS's view was that, where no free alternative exists, fair use files are acceptable in the Welsh Wikipedia and it is quite right to indicate in our metrics they improve the quality of the open content text. MM also expressed his agreement and said that in his view the KPI is defined and measured correctly.

The board did not agree with Fae's statement that in doing the uploads he acted as an independent volunteer doing a favour for Robin Owain in his voluntary capacity rather than as the charity's Wales Manager (and that as a result the addition to Wikipedia articles of images uploaded by him should have been excluded from the reported KPIs).

DECISION: The board agreed, unanimously, that the use of these book cover images within Wikipedia articles does improve the quality of those articles, and that the

6.5% figure has to the best of our knowledge been correctly calculated and properly stated.

It was recognised, on the other hand, that as the images are not freely licensed they cannot in themselves contribute to the "*number of uploads*" KPI under the goal "*G1.1 The quantity of Open Knowledge continues to increase*". The images have not been included in the published upload count of 37,715 files, which is correct. In case a note saying "plus 2,891 book covers uploaded to the Welsh Wicipedia" could be misconstrued as suggesting that these are open licensed images, that note will be removed from the Results column and simply mentioned (as it is already) in the notes field.

ACTION 2014-14: MM, JD and SK to discuss an appropriate response to Fae. They are also to remove the text "*plus 2,891 book covers uploaded to the Welsh Wicipedia*" from the Results column of the quarterly report card (but not from the accompanying explanatory note).

Quarterly Financial Management Report

JD, GD and RS explained the current budget results as outlined in the QFMR. CK was concerned that there may be an end of year underspend on direct costs for the volunteer support budget. JD assured him that in the overall budget this would not be the case: it may vary slightly from project line to project line but there should not be a large underspend as in previous years. He also emphasized that spending must always represent value for money and contribute to our mission.

Risk Register

The board noted the Risk Register, and agreed that it needed to be updated to take account of the changed circumstances since it had last been considered. JD said that he would be reviewing the risks in time for the next ARC.

Understanding WMUK reporting

GD raised a question about monthly reporting: he would like us to consider stopping the monthly reports as they are unlikely to be widely read by the community and simply duplicate our other reports.

ACTION 2014-14: JD to review whether or not monthly reports are still necessary or could be reduced in size with links to our main reports.

MM felt that the FDC reports in their present form were very hard to read, and that they do not fulfil the requirements that the UK board has - they only fulfil the specific requirements of the FDC. GD suggested that, instead, the board use the report card layout as the "first port of call", and data from that should in turn be fed into the FDC reports. JS felt, and the board agreed, that our FDC reporting should be slimmed down where possible, and we should report purely on our strategic goals and KPIs that we set out at the beginning of each year, plus anything else specific that the FDC may ask for. It is not necessary to report everything to the FDC in our formal responses, and some material may be more usefully be published in different formats for the board or for our own community. JD agreed to continue his negotiations with the FDC staff regarding slimmer reporting.

Publication of expenses

GovCom had made some proposals to the board to instruct the staff as to how expenses should be published, which would require a change to the Finance Policy. MM explained these. GovCom believed that these proposals would increase transparency as they would ensure staff had clear instructions as to exactly what must be published each quarter. Historically, publication has been patchy, which is not good for transparency. MM also asked that staff should accept community requests for publication of expenses for particular events - or costs for those events - and that additional details should be made available wherever that was reasonably possible and could be done without undue expenditure of staff time.

AMC said that he would be happy with the publication of line-item expenses, and indeed would prefer this. MM said that publishing line-item expenses would be a lot of work for staff and that that work would represent an unreasonable staff cost. The idea behind this proposal was to ensure that the office had a clear expectation of what the board wanted them to do.

A vote was held on the GovCom recommendation: Expenses and individually-attributable costs are to be published in the form of a quarterly summary against named trustees/the chief executive, split into appropriate groups of travel, accommodation, subsistence, per diems, other etc. Each quarter's list will include a narrative summary to provide context, for example by identifying important events during that quarter for which significant expenses were incurred, or unusual sums. The Chief Executive's expenses will be treated in the same way as trustees.

For

MM, CC, GD, CK, JS, SK

Against

AMC

DECISION: Approved: 6 for, one against.

Board committee charters

DECISION: The ARC and GovCom charter drafts, outlined at https://wikimedia.org.uk/wiki/Governance_Committee_Charter/Draft and https://wikimedia.org.uk/wiki/Audit_and_Risk_Committee_charter/Draft were both approved unanimously.

DECISION: Honorary office roles as supplied to the board were approved unanimously.

Transparency Commitments

GovCom feels that we should be reporting on our transparency and making specific commitments. They will bring a paper to the board in due course, after further community input.

ARC Report

Staff Account

CC reported that the staff bank account is now set up and is working well. JD suggested that we update the payment limit to £500.

DECISION: To raise the spending limit of the staff account to £500. Approved unanimously.

Procurement Policy[\[edit\]](#) | [edit source](#)

The board discussed the high-level procurement policy to see if it should be approved.

DECISION: To approve the new Procurement Policy, on the basis that lower-level procurement procedures are seen by ARC.

For

MM, CC, GD, CK, AMC, SK

Against

None

Abstain

JS. JS said that he does not feel he has enough of knowledge of procurement generally to vote either way on this policy.

AGM Resolutions

MM raised the [draft AGM resolutions](#) for the board to note. The Board discussed choosing between 'option A' and 'option B' for the Registration in Scotland resolution, where option A had been drafted by a board member and option B by another member. The board agreed to put option A before members for consideration, and to remove option B as it had been overtaken by events.

There was some discussion on [simplifying part 16.3 of the Articles of Association](#). This was agreed, subject to a correction from "four" to "three". It was also noted that the Articles need be updated generally.

There was discussion about a possible motion regretting the decision of the WMF to prevent the charity from regaining the ability to payment process. Would having such a vote be helpful in achieving our goals? It was decided not to proceed with the draft resolution, and instead simply express our regret in the Chair's report to the members.

ACTION 2014-15: AMC to remove the draft motion regretting the decision of the WMF to prevent the charity from regaining the ability to payment process.

MM then led a discussion on upper limits for continuous trustee service. GD explained that the normal amount that charities have varies from three terms upwards. The board were in favour of a resolution to bring in term limits, based around a six year (or three two-year term) maximum.

After some discussion, the board decided that proposing a resolution extending trustee terms from two to three years is not the right course for the charity at the moment, regardless of whether it is considered best practice in the wider charitable sector.

ACTION 2014-16: MM to remove the resolution for three year terms, but leave the resolution for term limits.

Committee Reports

Tech Committee report

The board noted the IT development report and thanked the authors for their work.

Education Committee

The board noted the Education Committee's report and thanked the authors for their work.

GLAM Committee

The board noted the GLAM Committee's report and thanked the authors for their work.

Welsh report

The board noted the Wales report and thanked Robin Owain for his excellent work in extending the culture of Wales to other languages around Europe, including Scots Gaelic and Breton.

Grants Committee

The Board heartily thanked the Grants Committee for their excellent work, and noted that the process is now clearly working well.

Consent Items

MM indicated that the Terms of Use of the charity's websites would normally be for the Chief Executive to determine, and that a board resolution was not required. However, as these Terms are entirely new he wanted to ensure that the board fully endorses them.

DECISION: To approve adoption of the draft Terms of Use and Disclaimers.
Approved unanimously.

DECISION: To authorise the CE to seek tenders as soon as possible for the final governance review as recommended in the Hudson Governance Review report, to select a reviewer in consultation with GovCom, and to proceed. Approved unanimously.

DECISION: To amend the the charity's Conflict of Interest Policy to add these new stipulations (in bold):

*"Any board member's potential conflict of interest must be discussed **at the earliest opportunity** with the Chair or the full board before any decision is made. The Secretary must ensure the matter is noted in the register of interests **and recorded in the minutes of the next board meeting.**"* Approved unanimously.

Discussion items

Appointing observers to Board committees

MM raised with the board the question of whether we would like to appoint observers to our board committees (Govcom and ARC), such observers being possible according to the committees' charters. The charters state that such observers would be appointed by the board and that they would have to be members of the charity. They would attend committee meetings and contribute to discussion, but would not be entitled to a vote.

MM expressed the view that observers should not be considered primarily as "community liaison posts", but that the role could potentially be useful if a committee lacked a specific skill set that it felt it needed. The board agreed that if adopted these should not be considered as "community liaison posts".

ACTION 2014-17: ARC and GovCom to decide whether they need to bring in additional skills in the form of an observer, and to report back to the board at the next meeting.

International Principles on the Application of Human Rights to Communications Surveillance

AMC was against approving this, as the document argues for "the rule of law", when in matters of surveillance he believes that the appropriate argument should be an ethical argument, not a legal one. MM pointed out that there is no need for us to sign the document. As the community is split, and as the trustee are also not of one mind, the board did not feel that they could support signing the document at present.

Business cards and 'official' clothing for volunteers

The board in principle supported this idea. The ARC were asked to consider the risk, and JD and MM were asked to investigate the practical and legal issues.

ACTION 2014-18: ARC to investigate risks surrounding business cards and 'official' clothing for volunteers

ACTION 2014-19: JD and MM to investigate the practical and legal issues arising.

AOB

Right to be forgotten

CK brought up the right to be forgotten: this was referred to the ARC to consider the risks of the court decision on WMUK.

ACTION 2014-20: ARC to consider the risks of the ECJ ruling on the 'right to be forgotten' and how it might impact Wikimedia UK

GovCom changes

DECISION: AMC was appointed to GovCom in place of JS as JS's work responsibilities preclude him from easily attending GovCom meetings. Approved *nem con*.

Donations in Kind

DECISION: The draft Memorandum of Understanding for accepting a Gift in Kind was delegated to ARC for approval on behalf of the board once legal negotiations are complete. The board gave their sincere thanks to the donor in question for their generous donation.

Future meetings

ACTION 2014-21: JD to arrange that the next board meeting be changed to 4 October 2014

ACTION 2014-22: JD to arrange for the December board meeting to be a two day meeting in Cambridge on 13th and 14th December.

Minutes of 19 September board meeting

The meeting began at 10:10. Present were:

- Michael Maggs [MM], in the chair
- Greyham Dawes [GD]
- Simon Knight [SK]
- Chris Keating [CK]
- Carol Campbell [CC]

Also in attendance were:

- Jon Davies [JD] (Chief Executive)
- Richard Symonds [RS] (Minuting)
- Stevie Benton [SB]
- Daria Cybulska [DC]

Apologies for absence

Alastair McCapra, Saad Choudri and Joseph Seddon apologised for their absence. Kate West apologised for being late and was not present at the beginning of the meeting.

Matters arising not on the agenda

There were no matters arising.

Approval of agenda

MM asked if we would be dealing with the QFMR today. Greyham said that as ARC has not yet reviewed it, he would prefer not to.

As to the budget for the FDC proposal, it was agreed that since all the necessary information is not yet available, the board would sanction a provisional budget, subject to ARC approval, fundraising and tech reviews, and outcomes of discussions with the FDC. The budget will be re-reviewed in October and again in December.

Declarations of interest relevant to matters on the agenda

There were no declarations of interest relevant to matters on the Agenda.

CE reports

WMUK programme proposals 2015-16

JD explained the background for the plans. This time last year, we were still under the shadow of the governance review, and the WMF did not feel confident in any of the chapters. The new WMF ED is an unknown quantity, but the board of WMF are generally supportive. She is clearly focused on improving the reader and contributor experience through better software. She has not yet addressed chapters, but it seems likely that she will be looking for ways of reducing financial support to chapters.

In terms of funding, we do not have a funding crisis. JD explained that we can contemplate growth. We must assume that FDC funding will sooner or later reduce, especially as third world chapters are starting up. It is unlikely that we will ever be an independent banner-controlling fundraiser again. KB and JD are trying to build close links with the WMF to

mitigate the effects of that. Our work in Wales and with GLAMs is good, and we have a stable staff base. We lead the chapters in our reporting, and our financial systems are moving forward steadily – much better than the issues with previous Wikimánias, where Wikimánia was just as expensive but with less of an outcome than Wikimánia London.

JD explained the paperwork in front of the trustees. He further explained the possibilities he had planned for 2015-16.

CC was concerned that the chapter agreement was unbalanced and did not protect WMUK enough. Playing devil's advocate, MM asked: what would happen if we started fundraising very aggressively using the WMF trademarks? In all likelihood we would be stopped by the WMF. Because of the large deficit budget being proposed, it is imperative, CC suggested, that we renegotiate the chapters agreement when we can. CK felt that this is unlikely to happen, but that the realistic worst case is that our trademark agreement is updated by the Foundation in such a way that we are unable to fundraise using the Wikipedia or Wikimedia marks. We hope that will not happen, of course.

ACTION: RS to send a link to chapter agreement to CC.

ACTION: CC asked RS to produce a cashflow estimate for the next year that takes cash into account, as a significant amount of next year's expenditure is "in kind".

JD moved on to answers to some trustee questions, particularly about the two year settlement that the FDC had floated. GD felt that a two year settlement was not ideal, as the chapter is still developing its strategy and does not have time to extend its detailed plan over a second year in time for the FDC to approve it. The feeling from the board and staff present was that there is currently a lack of clarity as to what the benefits and risks to the chapter would be. GD in particular was not happy with the idea, as he felt we don't have enough information from the FDC to make an informed decision, but MM was supportive. JD was asked to seek more information from the FDC about the two year claim idea.

CK and GD were concerned about the lower level of reserves predicted with another deficit budget. The board decided that they will require a balanced budget this year, with no further deficit spending. This would mean an increase in our FDC allocation and our external funding, and some cuts in our spending. A discussion ensued on which expenditure could be cut in order to have a balanced budget.

CK proposed that we postpone hiring a developer and that, instead, we increase fundraising spending, which would be an investment for future years. The board considered how the FDC would view our fundraiser or our development posts. It was suggested that in all likelihood they would look poorly on fundraising posts, but may look more kindly on helping us to fund the development post. There was discussion about not proceeding with the proposed Programme Support Manager role, but this was opposed by JD and the staff who believed that staff were already overburdened and not funding this post would jeopardise our most successful projects. JD was quite certain that a developer was necessary given the ongoing discussions about software on external mailing lists, and the fact that the board are keen on improving our technical abilities. There was a small discussion on whether the board would be willing to accept dipping into our reserves by a small amount. The board was not willing to do so.

DECISION: The board decided not to take money from reserves. In addition, for clarity, the budget will be split into “funded from existing sources” and “funded from new external sources” streams (such as gifts in kind and new UK-specific fundraising). The board agreed an adjustment to the FDC bid amount to £405k. In addition, we will add a developer amount of £45k onto the FDC bid, and argue for that as a separate item. Finally, JD will find £22k from trimming the budget, upping the external fundraising targets (subject to approval from Katherine Bavage), and by re-estimating direct debits which the board felt were currently estimated too low.

ACTION: JD to keep the board advised on the budget progress for the October board meeting.

In camera session

There was a board in-camera session at 14.00.

2015-16 amended draft budget

				Key strategic goal (for annual programme)
	2015-16		2014-15	
Income	Existing Funding	New external income streams		
Grant from FDC	405,000	0	353,000	
UK DD income	250,000	0	240,000	
Gift Aid and other income	32,000	0	30,000	
Major fundraising	55,000	70,000	0	
Totals	742,000	70,000	623,000	
Community				
General Volunteer Support	2,000		2,000	2a
Wales	5,000	0	5,000	1 and 2a
Scotland	5,000	0	5,000	2a
Project Grants	7,000	5,000	18,000	2a
Travel Grants	9,000	2,000	12,000	2a
Wikiconference UK	3,000	2,000	2,500	2a
Wikimania	0	0	10,000	-
Train the Trainers	14,000	0	24,000	2a
Development	29,000	7,000	45,000	4
Promoting Free Knowledge				
Merchandise	5,000	0	5,000	3
Extended Reach	4,000	5,000	10,000	2a and 1
GLAM Outreach	9,000	0	10,000	1 and 3
Wikimedians in Residence	20,000	40,000	71,000	1, 2a and 3
Education	15,000	3,000	18,000	1 and 3
Fundraising				
Fundraising costs	35,000	0	28,500	2b
External Relations				
Open Space Advocacy (inc dimi and becca)	15,000	5,000	10,000	3
International Chapter Support	10,000	0	10,000	5
Finance				
Accountancy, Advice and Audit	8,000	0	15,000	
Governance, Management and Admin				

Rent	40,000	0	39,500	
Office	9,000	0	10,000	
Board	9,000	0	20,000	
Legal	4,000	1,000	5,000	
Insurance	3,800	0	3,500	
Server	0	0	2,000	
Other consultancy and Professional Support	9,000	0	15,000	
Communications & Publications	9,000	0	10,000	
Staff				
Staff travel	6,000	0	6,000	
Staff training	5,000	0	4,000	
CE	66,403	0	65,101	
Office and Development Manager	31,287	0	30,674	
Major Partnership Organiser	33,327	0	32,674	
External Affairs and Comms	35,139	0	34,450	
Fundraiser	33,213	0	32,562	
Volunteer Support Organiser	30,467	0	29,870	
Higher Education Organiser	17,443	0	17,101	
GLAM Organiser	14,926	0	14,633	
Assistant Office Manager	27,690	0	27,147	
Wales Manager	34,170	0	33,500	
Management Accountant	12,000	0	0	
Programme Organiser	30,000	0	0	
Fundraising Assistant	27,500	0	0	
Developer	54,000	0	0	
Contingency	4,500	0	0	
Totals	741,866	70,000	733,712	
TOTAL BUDGET	811,866			
Surplus/-Deficit	134		- 110,712	
Reserves at start of year	234,962		345,674	
Reserves at Year End	235,096		234,962	
Wikimedia UK's growth (according to FDC formula)	10.65%			

Risk register

<p>This is the Current, revised Risk Register for Wikimedia UK. The original risk register, written in December 2012 (https://wikimedia.org.uk/wiki/Risk_Register/2012) was based on graded levels of risk and published on the UK and Office Wikis, with risks seen as confidential kept private. Subsequently in consultation with the treasurer we converted the register to a numerically based system from Charity Commission best practice. This includes a formula based on likelihood and impact leading to a final score. The register shows risks as they were originally in 2013 and how they have been dealt with and, if possible, mitigated. The ARC reviews this quarterly based on the CEO's assessments and has historically decided upon the level at which risks should be reported to the board. This is a judgement of the ARC and currently all risks that have a score of 16 + are reported.</p>										
RISKS TO BE MONITORED QUARTERLY	ORIGINAL ASSESSMENT 2013	1. Remote 2. Unlikely 3. Possible 4. Probable 5. Highly probable	1.Insignificant 2. Minor 3. Moderate 4.Major 5. Extreme/ catastrophe	score = PxI+I	Plan	Actions to date	1. Remote 2. Unlikely 3. Possible 4. Probable 5. Highly probable	1.Insignificant 2. Minor 3. Moderate 4.Major 5. Extreme/ catastrophe		Next steps
		Likelihood	Impact	Score			Likelihood NOW	Impact NOW	SCORE NOW	
4.1 Restrictions to fund-raising by Foundation lasts beyond 2014	Probable, moderate	5	4	24	Reserve fund to soften future impact, Rebuild fences with Foundation, Maintain good governance, Diversify funding base	Have learned to live with the impact, and made many moves to improve the Foundation's confidence with WMUK. Compiling case for becoming a fundraising chapter to be submitted March 2014. Reacted to refusal to allow the chapter to be an independent fundraiser and amended fundraising strategy.	5	4	24	Maintain systems to be in line to re-enter independent fundraising after 2015 WMF board decision. Work with other chapters to influence decision of Foundation board regarding future fundraising. Review our fundraising strategy to develop more independence and find partnerships to improve impact.

6.2 Collapsing editor base	Medium probability high impact	3	5	20	Plan editor retention & development, Run train the trainers to build capacity, Monitor active editor numbers/trends	Delivering programme, but an international problem, so no measurable impact can be made on the risk by WMUK efforts alone	3	5	20	Train the Trainers courses are building new capacity. Monitor community activity and measure. Ensure our activity programme foregrounds this ambition. Use Civi CRM to reinforce support for trainees. Use Wikimania to recruit new contributors.
6.1 Insufficient volunteer capacity - difficulty in engaging.	Medium probability high impact	3	4	16	Planned development of volunteer base, Target under-represented groups, Monitor trends in numbers and profile	Our programmes are delivering more meetings more trained people in partner orgs	4	4	20	Build programmes to focus on and develop, support and retain volunteer base. Monitor impact of programmes and activities on volunteer base. Ensure all voices are heard, not just the loudest. Target hitherto under-represented groups. Target “current” topics and trends (cultural, sporting, media etc.) – may be populist but effective. Have more chances for community to meet in person. Harness energy of Wikimania.
3.2 Negative media or blog severely	Medium probability high impact	3	5	20		Action taken to control corrupt use of WP, continuing to work with Foundation to	3.5	4	18	Be pro-active in making relationships with top 20 relevant journalists. Re-

damages reputation.						rebut inaccurate reporting				assure partner organisations about progress. Last six months have been calm. Plan for Wikimania to promote positives. Re-assess after AGM responses up or down.
6.3 poor staff performance	Low probability medium impact	3	3	12		Appraisals continuing and target setting working well. Good support and performance management. Management planning systems used consistently.	3	4	16	Systems in place. Need to focus on core activities and planned programme with special emphasis on targets. Extra resources brought in to cover Wikimania. Need to review staffing in September after consultation on forward planning.

Chief Executive Quarterly Report

Prepared by Jon Davies

Executive summary

This is a narrative of the quarter two issues and should be read in association with the other documents listed above that contain the specific metrics, finances, and staff reports. There is of course significant crossover between the documents.

In summary the quarter concentrated on delivering our programme, developing our reporting and preparing for Wikimania.

Decisions and actions required, risks identified (if relevant):

Item	Explanation	Action required	Risk
2015-16 Budget	Recap on Friday 19 th meeting	None	None
Pathways report	To note as part of the agenda item. Possible £3K reduction in WMUK income.	To note and assess as part of Q3 QMFR.	Loss of income
Morton Report	To discuss as part of the agenda item. Three options proposed. CEO recommendation the option of a full time CTO if finances can be found that do not affect the delivery of the main programme.	To choose option	Continued under performing on target G4. IT issues continue that affect performance.
Reporting and recording	Headline analysis of Q2 Progress report.	To note	None significant.
Finances	To receive as part of the agenda item, see QMFR Q2.	To note	None
Volunteer development	For information	To note	None
Wikimania	To receive pending final report.	To note	None
Comms report	To discuss as part of the agenda item.	Agree recommendations.	Lack of direction.
Fundraising report	To discuss as part of the agenda item.	Agree recommendations.	Budget strategy fails and programme put at risk.

Wikimedians in Residence report	Published and distributed.	To note	None
Subject Access Request	Policy on deleting emails and documents; should we have a policy on how long to keep emails and documents	Decision on whether to formulate such a policy	We accumulate excess material that is redundant and makes SAR's etc cumbersome

2015-16 Budget

The board meeting on the 19th reviewed our budget proposals and we agreed a revised provisional budget. This will be the basis of our submission to the FDC for their part of our funding next year.

There will almost certainly be adjustments necessary at the December Board meeting when we have seen the FDC's final figure and agreed Katherine's final fundraising strategy.

The paper presented to the board "WMUK programme Proposals 2015-16" contains details of the specific proposals.

Changes agreed were:

- To increase our request from the FDC from £360,000 to £405,000 to support the provision of extra IT development. This represents a change from 2% to 14.5%
- To reflect the external funding aspirations in our revised budget by defining spend in terms of 'Existing Funding' and 'New External funding'.
- To increase the funds to be found from external UK sources from £110,000 to £125,000
- To trim programme budgets to propose a balanced budget.
- To propose a budget of £741,866, a rise of 1% from last year's £733,712.

A revised budget was prepared on Friday and circulated to the board.

Pathways project

The final report, as required by the board, from the Pathways project is included in the papers. On the whole the project has been a great success for WMUK and further built our reputation in Wales. Robin and his colleagues and volunteers have developed the Welsh community and laid the foundations for future work that will bring continuing rewards.

The advantage of such an arrangement has been to bring in extra funding for our work, in this case with the Welsh Assembly and the EU. The disadvantage is that the bureaucracy can prove challenging and leaves us vulnerable to another party. In this case the staff from the Welsh Assembly have changed three times and this has led to a dispute over the exact terms of the project which could lead to a reduced grant of up to £6,000. In such a scenario WMUK will not be receiving the expected £3000 administration fee. Robin foresaw this possibility

and stopped spending in May so there will be no other financial implications. I will report further as soon as we know the final settlement.

The Morton Report: Scoping our technical work

Tom Morton was appointed to undertake a review of our IT and software development needs.

His report offers three options. In summary:

- Tech Liaison – part time person to fill key skills gaps.
- Contractor – An extension of our current system of two contractors doing IT support.
- A Chief Technical Officer (CTO) – a full time internal post.

Having failed to appoint on the lower salary scales for two years and 'ticked over' for the last year with two 'by the hour' contractors I believe that to fulfil our commitment to encouraging and supporting technological innovation (G4) we need to take this area seriously.

I can see five advantages of employing someone with significant IT and management experience:

1. They can manage our internal IT need, probably being able to fix many of our glitches themselves, but if not being able to know how to choose and manage outside contractors to get the best results. We have relied on a variety of individual staff but this does not offer the consistency or accountability we need. e.g. as reported to trustees when our site certificate expired recently and we took over a day to renew it.
2. They can develop our community's IT aspirations such as developing the VLE and Qrpedia and bringing on new areas of work such as WikiRate
3. They can support the Technology group and offer consistent liaison with our community
4. They can offer a link to the broader IT debates that are an important part of our community and will be significant given the new Foundation ED's emphasis.
5. They can use their expert knowledge to support fundraising from the tech world to support our software development projects.

I would therefore strongly recommend the option of a full time CTO if finances can be found that do not affect the delivery of the main programme.

Recording and reporting

The FDC responded favourably to our suggestions as to how to make our reporting fit better with our strategic goals. After negotiation the format was further revised to indicate the changes between quarters.

The report card you created this quarter provided gives us -- and the movement more broadly -- a good indication of where you are making progress. We believe the format works well and appreciated the clear format very much. Well done, colleagues!

The actual report contained good news as we have been meeting our targets in the vast majority of cases.

See the report: https://meta.wikimedia.org/wiki/Grants:APG/Proposals/2013-2014_round1/Wikimedia_UK/Progress_report_form/Q2

Reading the Q2 Progress Report Form we might appear to be in danger of missing our targets in the following areas:

- Percentage of WMUK-related files (e.g. images) in mainspace use on a Wikimedia project (excluding Commons)

Wikimedians in Residence are being encouraged to promote usage of the files, for instance at CRUK we are already seeing a significant increase in the uploads.

- Number of new articles started on Welsh Wikipedia inspired by WMUK

Robin is addressing this. This shows that we need a simple tool to log this info: it's a slightly different figure to the Living Paths, which only counts articles near the path. Latest stats: Welsh Book covers: 5,685 (3,266 used on WP articles - 57.4%) English Book covers: 5,544 (still being added to WP articles; estimate: 90%) Total: 11,229, Nat Lib of Wales releases 4,500 [John Thomas photographs](#). Total number of images: 15,729. He also points out that the project also increased number of article [on other smaller language wikis](#) eg 398 on the Breton wiki.

- Progress towards full implementation of automated and manual tracking/measuring systems -delays in full implementation of Civi CRM

We are now pursuing a revised support contract which we believe will address these issues. Staff time is now being re-directed towards this post-Wikimania.

- Number of separate donors – individuals giving on a regular basis.

This is actually hard to assess as we have a variety of giving patterns and there will be a spike in Q4. KB and SP will be doing dedicated mailouts in Q3 and Q4 that will also affect this.

- Europeana has yet to deliver and this is hampering our GLAM upload targets.

The current software is very powerful, but requires both xml knowledge and an understanding of our category structure. We have a limited number of people who can use it, and are now experimenting with pairing wikimedians with techies at GLAMs. Jonathan is negotiating a training session lead by James Heald, but some of the obvious people to attend are backing out when we explain that they already need xml knowledge. Jonathan is liaising with Europeana re the next phase of the developments, they are keen for this to happen and have included me on their working group.

There are three areas we will address in Q3:

- A national attitudes poll. We will have to consider the merits of the national poll. If we choose to do it we would be making a long term commitment and would need to be convinced of its use vs its cost, at least £2,000
- A volunteer survey is imminent and may help inform statistics on volunteer drop-out rates and
- An assessment of our transparency rating through self-evaluation in the volunteer survey (partly addressed by Govcom).

Finances

The charity is financially stable with adequate resources, sufficient reserves and no cash flow problems. I cannot see any significant risks in Q3 or Q4. Please see QFMR.

Volunteer development

Katie is now off on leave and has been replaced until December by Fabian Tompsett. He has got his feet under the table quickly and is working with Carol to ensure the impact of Wikimania is not lost and the work that Katie has done continues to be developed. There will be a volunteer conference in November, date to be decided. This is a link to the latest meeting notes:

https://wikimedia.org.uk/wiki/Volunteer_Strategy_Meeting,_September_2014

Wikimania

The conference passed without any major hitches. The chapter came out of it well with a reputation for organisational ability hospitality. There is a [provisional report](#) on the office wiki.

Despite some predictions of doom and a great deal of behind the scenes work during the build-up year to ensure a smooth launch even the harshest critics in the community seemed impressed "*not too bad, actually*" [Signpost 13 Aug 2014](#)

Relations with the Foundation were excellent and a mutual respect grew during the year. Our community responded well and we were able to use extra staff resources and a key volunteer to contact all our active or recently active members, visit our meet-ups and re-establish links with people we had not met for years. The volunteer base of Wikimedians was significantly supplemented by new volunteers.

The draft report will develop over the next few months as the Foundation's feedback is published and we determine how the conference has affected our activities. The signs so far are very promising with new volunteers in the office, for example, on a daily basis.

Financially we are still letting the dust settle as more invoices or volunteer expenses come in. We negotiated a division of costs that was very sympathetic to the Chapter and represented the goodwill that our staff had built up. Richard Symonds has provided the first figures.

I would like to record my thanks to Stuart Prior who should become a diplomat and the delivery team of Fabian Tompsett, John Cummings and Chris McKenna.

We will continue to have a major influence through our support of the Mexico 2015 Wikimania and having UK Wikimedians on the Wikimania selection panel.

Comms report

Stevie has produced a revised Comms strategy. I am happy with its recommendations. In Stevie, and our comms volunteers, we have a reliable and energetic resource.

Fundraising report

As I write this our Fundraising manager, Katherine, is still completing her research paper after extensive discussions with trustees and staff which is designed to support Trustees in agreeing an overarching strategic approach. I won't therefore comment in detail on the specifics of what she is proposing until the meeting but there are some obvious lessons:

- We are unlikely to be directly managing the online banner fundraising campaign in future and so our focus will be on quickly developing own fundraising and helping build our independence.
- Our targets are ambitious and will need resources to support their implementation.
- Fundraising is not just a task for Katherine, all staff will be expected to develop opportunities to find external funding or in-kind support for our programme. This is being supported by a staff away day shortly after the board meeting itself.
- Stuart Prior's induction is ongoing and it is expected his work will help deliver outstanding gift aid claims, plus improved donor and member (via Fabian Tompsett) services and stewardship while Katherine delivers the development of the determined strategic approach into a business plan.

Review of Wikimedian in Residence Programme.

The review of the Wikimedian in Residence programme was very well received. Any trustees who have not seen the report can ask for a hard copy or find it here.

[https://wikimedia.org.uk/wiki/File:Train the Trainers report.pdf](https://wikimedia.org.uk/wiki/File:Train_the_Trainers_report.pdf) and
[https://wikimedia.org.uk/wiki/Train the Trainers consultation](https://wikimedia.org.uk/wiki/Train_the_Trainers_consultation)

Subject Access Request

A former member made a Subject Access Request which we have dealt with. This required a great deal of the Charities resources. The staff have logged 67 hours of work costing £1376 in salaries.

One issue to arise is whether we should have a policy on how long to keep emails and documents.

Wikimedia UK Communications Strategy – September 2014

Prepared by Stevie Benton

Contents

1. Executive summary, key points and recommendations
2. Introduction
3. Reputation, key messages and positioning
4. The role of volunteers
5. Press
6. Digital and social
7. Design and print
8. Policy and advocacy
9. Partnerships

1. Executive summary

Key points:

- Wikimedia UK's communications works well in parts but has room for improvement
- Our increasing involvement in policy and advocacy is of great importance to our reputation, both inside our movement and beyond
- Our new website is a good first step but needs improvement in terms of search engine optimisation and content
- Engagement on our wiki remains low but I do not view this as a priority
- Smarter, devolved use of social media can allow us to engage with more of our volunteers than our wiki and mailing list
- Our publications and merchandise are of a high quality but we must distribute them better and more widely
- Communications needs to be embedded in all roles as a matter of course
- Our coalition-building is a great success, within the Wikimedia movement and the wider open knowledge movement.
- Our communications function is well resourced in terms of budget but under-resourced in terms of people
- Our reputation is not limited to the UK – it extends internationally, particularly across Europe
- Our international reputation, especially within the Wikimedia movement, is excellent and we are key players on an EU level
- Wikimania provided a great boost to our reputation. We now must build upon this opportunity
- We have an established and appealing visual identity which reflects our work and our values.

Recommendations

- Press work to focus on partnerships and on responding to news agenda where possible
- Create a forward planning programme to find Wikimedia tie-ins with events such as International Women's Day
- A communications assistant role to be included in the 2016-17 annual plan and budget

- Continue to support the Open Coalition, both in practical terms and with bridge funding until external funds are secured
- Continue to be an active, leading chapter in EU advocacy and to make a financial contribution to the Wikimedian in Brussels
- Campaign participation and signing of campaign letters to be delegated to head of external relations (via chief executive)
- All staff to embed the use of social media and blog within their work
- Commission a reputation and awareness survey
- All press enquiries to go through chief executive as first point of call in absence of head of external relations
- All publications to feature in targeted direct mail.

In contrast to the communications strategy and review of 2012 (which ran to over 30 pages) this document takes a much more focused approach. It will review our current activity and make recommendations on how we can perform better.

The context in which the communications function of the charity operates now, compared to then, is markedly different. Gone are the days when publishing a simple blog post required a sign off from the full board. **As a chapter we have much more confidence in our work, in our voice and in our ability to communicate.** With this confidence, achieved through experience, comes opportunity and challenges. Opportunities arise because we are now recognised as an important voice in the open knowledge landscape. Challenges exist because we are trying to do a great deal with little.

In 2014 Wikimedia UK has a greater appetite for not just being proactive in terms of messaging but in participation in the areas of policy and advocacy. This is an important indicator of our progress and our growing maturity. However, this comes at a cost. Wikimedia UK has one staff member dedicated to communications to cover the functions of press, design & print, digital & social (including website), policy, advocacy and strategy. At the same time, due to stretched capacity across the charity, the comms function provides valuable support to other areas such as the programme and fundraising teams, the Chief Executive and developing partnerships.

2. Introduction

This paper is intended to provide an overview of Wikimedia UK's communications work. It will provide insights into what is working, what can be improved and will make recommendations for the future.

Wikimedia UK is a small, but growing charity. Three years on from its first staff hire the charity is emerging from a painful “storming” period, including much upheaval in the form of governance reviews, trustee controversies, disputes within the community. **We are now a stable, professional organisation which has a consistent and skilled board, a growing volunteer community and a highly competent and dedicated staff team.**

From a time in 2012 when the future of the chapter was anything but secure we are now seen as a leading light of the movement, especially in terms of our governance, reporting and advocacy. Many of those within the movement, at Foundation, Chapter and community levels, respect and admire the work of Wikimedia UK and look to it for guidance and support. We are recognised for excellence and leadership. This is a hard-won reputation, extending beyond the Wikimedia world to that of open knowledge generally, and we should protect it with care while remaining ambitious.

In the remainder of this document each area of our core communications will be broken down into some key components. A brief assessment of our current performance will then be followed by some recommendations.

A note on how this document fits in with our strategic goals. While a breakdown of each activity as it relates to our strategic goals is possible, I do not think it is desirable. What is more important is that communications is understood to underpin all of the chapter's activities and all of our strategic goals. Good communication across the entirety of the charity's work is of fundamental importance to our ambitions. Put simply: without it, we fail.

3. Reputation, key messages and positioning

Reputation

Our reputation as a UK charity is improving. Without wishing to overstate this too much, we had a torrid time in 2012 which damaged our standing in the media, in the movement and in the charitable sector. However, since then we have bounced back because of the quality of our work and our visibility.

Some of our high profile projects, such as our Wikimedian in Residence programme have strengthened our reputation. A key indication of this is that UK media outlets now contact Wikimedia UK as a matter of course where previously they would have gone directly to the Wikimedia Foundation. By providing high quality comment and observation we remain an appreciated point of contact for media interested in Wikipedia stories. Our next challenge is to extend that reputation into the sphere of open knowledge more widely. We should do this by looking for appropriate opportunities to comment, particularly in the areas of policy (tech, education, engagement and culture, especially) and advocacy (participating in campaigns that support our mission, vision and strategic goals). We should not be afraid to make relevant comment on stories that are on the news agenda, and use these to reinforce our key messages, but **for this to be effective this needs to be properly delegated to staff** (with sign-off by Chief Executive). We currently lack the flexibility to allow staff to take these actions on behalf of the charity (such as signing the Lyon Declaration on Access to Information and Development). While this doesn't happen often, the current reluctance to react to situations, or allow staff to do so, means that by the time we respond the news agenda has moved on.

We should commission a reputation survey. Some exploratory work has already been done to look at options. For a small investment we can collect some key information about how the charity and the Wikimedia projects are perceived. This provides us with a knowledge base from which to work, playing to our strengths and improving those areas where we are weak.

Key messages

Note our mission and vision below:

- **Our mission:** to help people and organisations create and preserve open knowledge and provide easy access for all
- **Our vision:** Open knowledge for all

What is very important here is that we have clearly defined our mission and vision as not solely being related to the Wikimedia projects. It is broad in scope and grand in ambition. It is for all. **We are saying that we work for the benefit of everyone.** A hard truth: This does not mean a small subset of people who refer to themselves as “the community”. This does not mean people who believe that Wikimedia UK should be a club for established Wikimedians with large edit counts. **This means we are an inclusive organisation. We seek to engage with everyone equally, regardless of their edit count, regardless of their status on Wikipedia.**

The section on digital and social will go into this in a bit more detail. This doesn't mean that we should neglect those who believe they are “the community”. But we do need to move away from the idea of “the community” and accept that we have several, with different ideas, different views and priorities. Other key messages:

- Wikimedia UK is the local charity that supports and promotes Wikipedia and the other Wikimedia projects such as Wikidata and Wikimedia Commons
- We are independent of the Wikimedia Foundation, but we work closely with them as partners
- The scope and size of Wikipedia belies the fact that we are a small charity that is almost entirely funded by voluntary donations from our supporters
- We are committed to supporting and facilitating projects that improve the quality and quantity of content on the Wikimedia projects (quality always comes first)
- We are committed to supporting the volunteers that make the Wikimedia projects so special
- We believe that by working in partnership with traditional stores of knowledge, such as libraries and archives, we can significantly enrich the amount of open knowledge available to all
- We believe that access to open knowledge is a key factor in the empowerment of people
- We don't control the content on the Wikimedia projects
- We can train anyone who wants to learn to contribute to the projects.

Positioning

We are more than a voice for Wikipedia in the UK. **We are a significant player in the world of open knowledge and the internet more generally.** Often we lack the confidence to act at a level matching our reach and influence. We should be strident and vocal in our support for open knowledge. We should be strong advocates for open content and open licences.

We seek to be the first point of contact on all things open knowledge. We should actively pursue opportunities to make that voice heard. For example, we should not shy away from challenging policies that are inimical to our mission. We should not hesitate to be vocal in our support of the values of openness, access to information and knowledge and the social importance of ease of access for all. We should likewise express our knowledge and experience on matters relating to mass engagement, such as digital democracy. We should encourage conference organisers to provide a platform on matters relating directly or indirectly to our work.

One caveat to this. We should avoid, where possible, getting into public debate on the issue of net neutrality. This is an important and significant issue on which we would normally expect to be vocal in our support. Wikipedia Zero muddies the waters here and we should refer all net neutrality debate and questions to the Wikimedia Foundation. We cannot speak clearly on this matter.

4. The role of volunteers

Volunteers are the heart of our movement and without them the Wikimedia projects would simply not exist. **It is important that volunteers are encouraged to participate in our communications work.** There have been efforts to recruit new volunteers with specific skills relating to communications to support our programme. Wikimania and outreach to MEPs are two areas where this was especially successful thanks to the efforts of volunteers like Helen Armfield, Emily Sorensen and Matthew Wood. Similar efforts are being made, with varying results, for Wiki Loves Monuments. David Gerard's excellent volunteer work with the media on behalf of the chapter and the movement always adds value and an authentic Wikimedian voice.

However, we should be cautious which volunteers speak on behalf of the charity. From experience we know that when it goes wrong, volunteers speaking with the voice of the charity can be damaging (such as with our relationship with the Imperial War Museum).

Before volunteers are encouraged to speak publicly on our behalf there should be some form of volunteer agreement, coupled with an understanding of our key messages. This may not be popular, but we are a charity with an international reputation that has been hard won and is easily lost. This is not meant to act as a deterrent to engagement. It is simply a prudent step to protect our reputation.

5. Press

Our press work has progressed well. We are now in a position where we are routinely contacted as the local voice of the Wikimedia movement. We have good relationships with several of the main news outlets including The Guardian, The Telegraph and the BBC. In fact we are developing a partnership with The Guardian which would lead to several outcomes, including hosting debates, helping them with community building, an open exhibition – all almost cost neutral and publicised by The Guardian. More on this will follow in the coming months.

Our ability to respond appropriately to press enquiries, in a timely way, has been good for our reputation. However, on one occasion a member of staff outside the comms team (who was away) spoke at length with a reporter about the copyright of the monkey selfie. The messaging was all wrong and led to the WMF needing to seek corrections. Therefore, **all press enquiries which cannot be initially met by the head of external relations or the chief executive should be redirected to nominated volunteers in the first instance, along with the Wikimedia Foundation.**

One of the challenges we face in being proactive with the media and placing stories is that while much of what we do is interesting and useful, sometimes it is difficult to pitch it as news. “People write encyclopedia” is not a headline grabbing story. However, **if we can find a way to fit in with something topical or related to current events this can be successful.** An example is the story at the beginning of 2014 that was widely picked up about the most viewed Wikipedia articles over the previous year. Similar opportunities are also available for things like World Aids Day, International Women's Day and the like. The head of external relations is to **create an annual plan highlighting events of note and identifying potential hooks for Wikimedia UK-related stories.** In reality this should have been done before but limits on capacity have prevented this.

One other area of potential press is local events. It is straightforward to get something in local newspapers about Wikimedia UK events. We should use a boilerplate press release to send to local

newspapers to raise awareness of meetups as a way of encouraging training and engagement – providing those organising meetups are happy to help newcomers.

6. Digital and social

This includes our website, our wiki, social media platforms, blog and email.

Our public facing website has been a positive improvement. We now have a modern, clean and welcoming first place for those new to us. It reflects our diversity and our visual identity effectively. While some work is required to bring it up to scratch in terms of search engine optimisation and updating content, we can be confident that it is fit for purpose and will serve us well. Feedback from the community for the most part has been good, with one notable exception. Several staff have been trained, as well as some key volunteers. Small changes can be made by these people as they are trusted with access and are sensible. Significant changes should be run by Stevie (or Jon in his absence).

Our wiki still has a low level of engagement. However, it remains a popular channel for established Wikimedians to use. **Staff should continue to use the wiki as a channel, especially for purposes of participation and transparency.** Regardless of audience, this is seen as important within the movement and is important for us. That being said we should continue to monitor the tone of interactions on the wiki to ensure that they remain cordial and welcoming. Staff should continue to post notices of new content on the water cooler or engine room. Event pages should also continue to be created.

Social media presents significant opportunities for the chapter in terms of engagement with existing and potential volunteers, much more so than our wiki. It is time to accept that while wikis are great for creating an encyclopedia that anyone can edit, they are not so good for engagement. Many of our new volunteers fall into a younger demographic (and one that is much more balanced in terms of gender) who use Facebook and Twitter as a matter of course.

The use of social media – Twitter and Facebook – is encouraged among all staff. For example, when setting up an event that is open to the public, as well as creating a page on the wiki a companion page should be created on Facebook. This is not a question of either / or – simply that we can reach more people this way and so we should. Training can be provided. Likewise, when staff and trustees find content which they feel may be of interest to the Wikimedia and open knowledge community they should feel empowered to share this on Twitter as well as by email. All staff and trustees have access to the charity's Twitter account and are encouraged to use it liberally. I do not need to act as a gatekeeper and staff are trusted to use their judgement.

Our blog is a fairly popular outlet that we use to share news, reports and profiles. Published blogs are also shared via Twitter and in high profile cases on Facebook. As a growing organisation with a lot of stories and a lot to say for ourselves, **all staff should provide one blog post per month.** A blog post doesn't have to be long, or complicated. It should be written in a personal voice and offer insight into what we do. Volunteers are also encouraged to provide content for the blog.

Our new email templates will make a positive difference to how we communicate with donors and friends. These are coded in HTML and reflect our visual identity. Responsibility for content will remain with the fundraising manager and volunteer support organiser.

7. Design & print

Our publications are widely admired and an effective use of our resources. Our annual review booklet has become a highlight over the last couple of years. The GLAM booklet has proven to be an effective showcase of how cultural institutions can work with Wikimedia UK. Our Wikimedians in Residence booklet is an excellent example of a resource that can promote the value of working with us.

Our freelance designer, Jayne Martin-Kaye, has a great eye for design and understands our visual identity. She is also very inexpensive for the quality of resources she produces.

The next booklet on the list is an updated version of the Welcome to Wikipedia booklet and a new, UK specific education booklet.

One area where we can improve is the distribution of these materials. We still have lots of stock of the 2012 and 2013 annual reviews which serve nothing more than a historical purpose. To this end, our annual review, and other booklets, should be the focus of **a targeted direct mail to potential partners, friends and donors.**

8. Policy and advocacy

This is a key area of our work. This falls into three distinct strands: UK, international and sector. Before explaining these areas, an important note: work of this nature has a long lead time. Expecting speedy and substantial change is not realistic.

In terms of UK advocacy the first step is to become more widely known in those circles and build a reputation as a charity that has something to add to the debate. This involves meeting people, building relationships with policy makers and opinion formers, and being clear about our views. We are making progress here. Our work with Demos on whether it is possible to learn about digital democracy from the norms and values of Wikipedia has been useful and led to us being involved in the debate. We have been represented at the Speaker's Commission on digital democracy. We are becoming more connected.

We are co-hosting an event in January about open policy at the London Knowledge Lab with people we met through this project. This will provide useful opportunities for us to contribute to the policy debate. We have a good relationship with the DCMS and regularly attend their round table events. We contribute to appropriate government consultations. An opinion piece making the connection between Wikipedia and the concept of social justice was published to the whole of the Department of Work and Pensions, and a speaking slot arranged for Jon Davies at the Social Justice Conference in November. **We need to continue seeking these opportunities to gain a platform for our message and to raise awareness of our work.** This is important work but takes time.

In terms of international advocacy Wikimedia UK is seen as a key participant in the Free Knowledge Advocacy Group EU (FKAGEU). This umbrella group of Wikimedia chapters lobbies on three key areas – freedom of panorama, public domain licensing for publicly funded works and the right to use orphan works. The group's founding statement was written in London. We make a key contribution to supporting Dimitar Dimitrov, the excellent Wikimedian in Brussels. **We should continue to offer our support, financially and practically.** We are arranging meetings with key figures from the European Parliament such as Vicky Ford MEP. As one of the larger chapters we have a responsibility

to show leadership in this area. After some reluctance the Wikimedia Foundation is now on board with this work and appreciates its importance.

Sector advocacy – working to promote the benefits of all aspects of open – has been an area of success for us and Bekka Kahn is doing an excellent job. The Open Coalition was based on a concept developed by Stevie, John Cummings and colleagues from Mozilla, Creative Commons and Open Knowledge Foundation and piloted at MozFest. Wikimedia UK showed great vision to seed fund the project and the group is beginning to grow in size and impact. By being bold we are seen at the heart of this international network and there is a good chance that the work becomes self-funding. In many ways the Open Coalition is the counterpoint to the FKAGEU – my vision is that the two groups will identify areas of overlap and work together for shared impact. The overarching ambition for the Coalition is to make open the new green.

Another area of sector advocacy is campaigning. While we may not be ready to do any active campaigning on our own – and we certainly do not have the staff resources for this – it is appropriate that we piggyback relevant campaigns that happen elsewhere (which can also tie in with our efforts to join up with the news agenda). However, there needs to be some degree of delegation here from the board. We do miss opportunities sometimes because of an entirely natural tendency towards caution. However, when actions are straightforward and in harmony with our values, such as apply to the Lyon Declaration, **I recommend trusting the staff team to participate appropriately and delegating campaign participation decisions to the CEO and Head of External Relations.**

Likewise, I believe that the notion of community consultation leaves us very sensitive to one or two people who can act as barriers while not being representative of the views of the charity in general. For larger pieces of work that aren't time sensitive, such as overall strategy, this is sensible but **for quick and timely responses that open up opportunities for us to speak in support of our values, this is not required.**

9. Partnerships

Developing partnerships with significant organisations is an excellent way to raise our profile. Partnerships, when effective and with clear outcomes, aren't just a good way to contribute to open knowledge. They can often become newsworthy in their own right.

While Wikimedia UK does fairly well in terms of seeding partnerships there is often a lack of capacity to see them through effectively. From the comms side a lack of time is a major barrier. This is the same from the programme side.

The appointment of the Programme Support Manager to support comms and the Head of Programmes and Partnerships will significantly ease the burden while picking up some of the potential partnerships. There are many opportunities available for our charity – those who properly understand what we bring to the table will be falling over themselves to work with us.

A cautionary note: Because staff time and resources are limited **there must be a clear and determined focus on those partnerships that are high profile and high impact.** There is a space for smaller events and partnerships – and indeed these are often very good for community building purposes. But staff time should be focused to where it has the greatest impact, which is those partnerships that are high level.

Minutes of Volunteer Strategy Meeting, September 2014

17th September 2014

Present

- Carol Campbell
- Jon Davies
- Fabian Tompsett

Apologies:

- Thryduulf

Volunteering Strategy Conference

- One day event, twice a year
- First one in late November 2014, second in March 2014
- Present ambassadors and badge proposals (see below) at these, produce postcard
- Invite other suggestions from volunteer base
- Report back on volunteer survey (see below)

Local Ambassadors

- Run in parallel to Campus Ambassadors
- Develop role for local volunteers and give them support
- Can be part of an overall community building approach

Action Point: FT consult with community to develop the concept with some data about Meetups and accredited trainers geographical distribution

Badges

Both physical and digital open badges Martin Poulter advocate for this Action Point: FT to contact Martin on this

Volunteering Survey

- Draft reviewed and amendments suggested
- Needs something to tell people how long it is likely to take them

Volunteer Joblist

- List of jobs for volunteers to do: Some online others in person

Action Point: FT to put on Wiki: see [Volunteer jobs](#)

Freebies

- T-shirts (I edit Wikipedia), mugs, postcards
- A portfolio of postcards could be developed by adding postcards as events happen

Action Point: FT to work out costing

Joint work with other charities

Wikimedia activity can be a means to achieving other charitable goals, using Wikimedia projects as the medium, i.e. human rights issues being added to pages about various countries. Then we are not diverting people from other charitable activity, but enhancing that activity. Could develop this in relationship to other charities in this building

Wikimania Report

Prepared by John Cummings, Chris McKenna, and Fabian Tompsett

Introduction

This report does not attempt to be a full account of Wikimania 2014. With so many people involved from such a diversity of perspectives it is unclear how a single document could realistically claim to offer a full account. This account is written from the perspective of the three Wikimedians recruited by Wikimedia UK (WMUK) in May 2014 to provide support to the Wikimania London Team. Our role was to provide support to them in such a way that not only was their ambitious programme realised, but also to ensure that Wikimania 2014 would leave a lasting legacy for Wikimedia UK and the UK community. This report is part of our fourth objective: “to build and develop through reflective practice”.

As far as we can determine there has been no reports produced for previous Wikimanias, and we have endeavoured to incorporate both [qualitative](#) and [quantitative](#) data herein.

We need to express our thanks for the support of our colleagues, the other Wikimedia UK staff, who from the outset welcomed us as part of the team, worked closely with us, shared their knowledge and experience with us and were an integral part of delivering Wikimania 2014. Also Declan Pattison, the contractor who handled technical aspects was amazing.

Finally, we need to say a big thank you to all the volunteers who contributed massively to making Wikimania 2014 a success. At the outset the scale of the task was quite daunting and we had cautionary tales from previous Wikimanias where volunteers had melted away during the event. We offered volunteers access to the whole event on the basis of contributing a single five hour shift. We discovered that two thirds of the volunteers worked two shifts or more with a hard core of eight volunteers working throughout Wikimania 2014: Ed Saperia, Francis Dickinson, Harry Mitchell, Hera Hussain, James Moulding, Kevin McLaughlin, Naureen Nayyaer and Tom Walker.

Wikimania London Team

Our principal partners were the Wikimania London Team, who Ed Saperia had developed from the bid team after it was confirmed that Wikimania was coming to London. They retained their independent identity but collaborated closely with Wikimedia UK and the WMUK Wikimania Support Team. At times the WMUK London offices were bursting at the seams with some staff finding space in the basement of Development House, where they could get on with some work.

The Plan

The WMUK plan highlighted five objectives:

1. That the Chapter enhances its reputation for innovation, competence and achievement
2. That the Chapter fully involves its wider community, so that they feel ownership and develop as active volunteers into the future
3. That what we do complements and enhances our planned programme and strategic goals.
4. That our programme at Wikimania 2014 allows us to build and develop through reflective practice.
5. That there is a lasting legacy for the chapter once the conference is over.

The Chapter enhances its reputation for innovation, competence and achievement

"not too bad, actually" [Signpost 13 Aug 2014](#)

Innovations

1. This report is the first report to summarise activities around a Wikimania event
2. This Wikimania was the first to have a planned social media strategy
3. This was the first Wikimania to have the highly successful [Games Corner](#) (Thanks to Adi Khajuria)

Competence

1. Wikimedia UK proved itself as competent in supporting the delivery of the largest Wikimania yet, working closely with the Wikimania London Team.

Achievement

1. Wikimania 2014 is the largest Wikimania to date.
2. Over 10,000 members of the public passed through the Community Village at Wikimania 2014.
3. Wikimania 2014 received a wealth of positive press reports.

The Chapter fully involves its wider community, so that they feel ownership and develop as active volunteers into the future

Meetups

This covers meetups in UK during the May-July 2014 period

Region	No. of Meetups	Total No. Attendees (WMUK staff attendances)	Comments
North East England	0	0	
North West England	3	12	
Yorkshire and Humber	1	8(1)	
East Midlands	0	0	
West Midlands	0	0	
East of England	1	12(2)	
London	3	35(5)	
South East England	4	17(4)	WMUK staff initiated first Portsmouth meetup
South West England	0	0	
Wales	1	5(1)	
Scotland	2	8 (1)	WMUK staff support ensured Glasgow meetup a success
Northern Ireland	0	0	
Total	15	97(14)	

Meetups are essentially products of the Wikimedia community in the UK. We did not see our role to artificially create meetups which did not have a sustainable future. Rather we wanted to make sure that we attended a large number of meetups to encourage Wikimania participation. We had a target of increasing the number of meetups by 10%. As we fully organised 1 meetup and shared in the organisation of another, this gives us a metric of 1.5, 10% of 15.

Other

- We had over 30 identified UK Wikimedians involved in the delivery of Wikimania.
- Some of volunteers were long time Wikimedians who had not previously been in touch with either Wikimedia UK or the attended any meetups

What we do complements and enhances our planned programme and strategic goals

Our activities were linked to the [Wikimedia UK Strategic goals](#):

Goal No.	Goal	Metric	Target	Achieved
G1.3	We are perceived as the go-to organisation by UK GLAM, educational, and other organisations who need support or advice for the development of open knowledge	Media Organisations attending	20	72
		Positive Media items about Wikimania	50	136
		Twitter Report	none	Twitter report : 20,488 Tweets, 3,428 contributions
G2.a1	We have a thriving community of WMUK volunteers.	Number of Volunteers for Wikimania	none	180+
		Number of Activity hours in preparation for Wikimania	none	800+
		Number of Activity hours delivering Wikimania	none	3,700+
G2.a3	We have a thriving community of WMUK volunteers	Volunteer training events	none	3
G2.b1	We have effective and high quality governance and resource management processes, and are recognised for such within the	This report exemplifies an effective resource management process	n/a	n/a

	Wikimedia movement and the UK charity sector			
G2.b2	We have a high level of openness and transparency, and are recognised for such within the Wikimedia movement and the UK charity sector.	This report exemplifies openness in sharing our data	n/a	n/a
G2.b3	We have high quality systems to measure our impact as an organisation.	This report exemplifies measuring our impact	n/a	n/a
G3.2	There is increased awareness of the benefits of open knowledge.	Number of visitors to the Barbican who will have walked through the Community Village	none	10,138
G5.1	A thriving set of other Wikimedia communities	Wikimedia organisations represented in Community Village	none	36
G5.2	An increased diversity of Wikimedia contributors	Number of countries whence attendees came	none	59
		Number of women attendees	none	725+ (36.1%)
G5.3	Wikimedia communities are skilled and capable.	Train the Trainers International attendees (2 days)	12	10
		Governance Course	20	17
G5.4	Open knowledge communities with missions similar to our own are thriving.	Open knowledge organisations represented at Community Village	none	19

There is a lasting legacy for the chapter once the conference is over

It is still too early to really assess the lasting legacy.

1. A greatly increased database of volunteers - but will they be retained?

Volunteering at Wikimania 2014

Wikimania, like the Wikimedia community as a whole, works on the basis of [co-production](#), and so in a sense everyone was a volunteer. Likewise the ethos of Wikimedia is that it overcomes the distinction between the role of professional and amateur. However, in order to provide effective

metrics, our statistics are based on recorded hours of specific volunteering dedicated to delivering Wikimania 2014. Also our statistics do not attempt to cover the amazing contribution of the Wikimania London team, who had been hard at work long before the time span of our involvement (May-August, 2014), and which continued all the way through to the actual delivery of Wikimania 2014. Our figures are based on recorded hours including a portion of Wikimania London activities facilitated through use of the Wikimedia UK London offices.

Fringe Events

The Five Weekend Events

There were five weekend events in the period May-July 2014 which provided a lead up to Wikimania itself and were aligned with the five major themes running throughout Wikimania.

Date	Title	Theme	No. Attendees	Volunteer hours
24 - 25 May	Social Machines Weekend	Social Machines	14	24
07 - 08 June	Free Culture Weekend	Democratic Media	34	27
21 - 22 June	Future of Education Workshop	Future of Education	24	24
05 - 06 July	Open Data Weekend	Open Data	15	24
19 - 20 July	Open Scholarship Weekend	Open Scholarship Weekend	19	41

Education Pre-Conference

The Future of Education weekend received substantial support from Toni Sant (Wikimedia UK's Education Organiser), [Floor Koudijs](#) (Wikimedia Foundation's Education Program Senior Manager), and LiAnna Davis (Director of Programmes) and Jami Mathewson (Educational Partnerships Manager) of the [Wiki Education Foundation](#). This meant it played a significant role in preparing for the [Education Pre-Conference](#) (6th-7th August).

Hackathon

The Hackathon is a regular ingredient of Wikimania. The WMUK Wikimania Support Team had no particular involvement in the running of this, as Wikimedia Foundation had this in hand.

GLAM Wiki Revolution

One key contribution to Wikimania 2014 was the GLAM-Wiki Revolution video, which was premiered at Wikimania and made available on Wikimedia Commons (see right) and [YouTube](#).

Metric	Target	Achieved
Attendees at Wikimania premier	140	about 100
Views online after a month	100	Commons 577
		You tube 878
		Total 1,455*
Institutional reuse	3	Translations: 4**

* As at 29th August 2014

** German, Finnish, French and Swedish completed (Italian started)

Community Village

This was a concept which was initiated at [Wikimedia 2012](#) (Washington).

Case Studies

Linked Up

by Marieke Guy

I was there representing LinkedUp and the Open Education Working group.

1. [LinkedUp](#) is an EU-funded project that aims to push forward the exploitation of the vast amounts of public, open data available on the Web, in particular by educational institutions and organizations. The Open Education Working Group is one of over 20 Open Knowledge working groups. It brings together people and groups interested in open education. Its goal is to initiate global cross-sector and cross-domain activity that encompasses the various facets of open education including open education resources, open policy, open learning and teaching practices and open data.<http://education.okfn.org>
2. I found the Community Village incredibly useful. It was well located, the tables were set out in appropriate places so there was an even footfall and we had a steady stream of people over the 4 days I was at the stand.
3. I used my community village space as a hub point for discussions about the LinkedUp Project and Open Education Working Group. I had some marketing materials (flyers, rulers, stickers) but these disappeared pretty quickly! After that it was a place to exchange business cards and chat to people.
4. I was able to talk to technical people and those interested in open data about the LinkedUp Challenge. There were also quite a few people who were new to open education, so I was able to explain ideas and concepts to them. It was great to meet such a varied audience who were often new to the project and working group. As a

result of the stand we hope to have at least 2 new entries to the LinkedUp Challenge!

5. As a result of attending Wikimania I have gained a better understanding of the breadth of the Wikimedia work. The stand gave me an opportunity to engage with the community and appreciate how diverse it is, yet how the community is also united and incredibly welcoming. Being on a stand is a great way to start a conversation with people you won't necessarily have chatted to if you'd just attended the event.
6. Over the course of the 4 days I probably spoke to over 100 people at the stand. I have contacted over 20 people since I returned to see how we can work together in the future.
7. The only thing I had a problem with was lighting - it was a little dark where we were standing! In the future it might be good to offer display screens - though there is a cost associated. Maybe there could be an opportunity to highlight all the stands on the main stage (a minute madness!).

See Marieke's blogs

- Open Education Working Group: [Wikimania 2014: Wikipedia belongs in Education](#)
- LinkedUp Project: [Wikimania 2014: Wikidata all the way](#)

Organisations with whom connected

- City of London - They provided a stall for the Community Village
- Museum of London

Wikimania financial report

Costs

A large proportion of the total costs for Wikimania 2014 are being ‘funneled’ through Wikimedia UK. This is at the request of the Wikimedia Foundation, who are not ‘agile’ enough to be able to make dozens of local purchases in bulk. These costs are being claimed back from the Wikimedia Foundation by Wikimedia UK after the event.

Direct costs to 31 July

Receipts and invoices are still being processed for August, so it is very difficult to ascertain total costs for the conference. Instead, this report will give total costs to the end of July 2014, with an estimated range for total costs and reimbursements for the entire conference.

The total *direct* costs, from 1 February to 31 July, are as follows (figures are rounded to the nearest ten:

- | | |
|----------------------------------|---------|
| • Volunteer Travel: | £930 |
| • Volunteer subsistence: | £3,830 |
| • Volunteer accommodation: | £920 |
| • Volunteer event costs: | £870 |
| • Merchandise: | £22,000 |
| • Fundraising costs: | £3,370 |
| • Staff travel: | £100 |
| • Staff subsistence: | £90 |
| • Trustee accommodation: | £110 |
| • Office Equipment & Stationery: | £570 |
| • Postage & Carriage costs: | £100 |
| • Telephone costs: | £60 |
| • IT Equipment & consumables: | £420 |

This totals £33,200.

- Of this, £26,400 will be claimed back from the Wikimedia Foundation.
- The other £6,800 will be a Wikimedia UK cost.
- This is an 80/20 split.

Staff costs

Staff costs are slightly different. These are being broken down in a pre-arranged agreement with the Wikimedia Foundation, such that two members of staff are paid for 100% by the Wikimedia Foundation, and two members of staff are paid for 25% by the Wikimedia Foundation and 75% by Wikimedia UK. The exact costs are still being calculated (due to overtime and outstanding holiday) but we expect them to be as follows:

- For the period 1 February 2014 to 31 January 2015, the cost will be approximately £30,000 (+/-£2,000).
- £19,000 (+/-£2,000) of these costs will be reclaimable from the WMF.

- The other £11,000 (+/-£1,000) will be a Wikimedia UK cost.
- This is a 87.5/12.5 split, and the most that WMUK would be liable for would be around £12,000.

Future direct costs

Costs for 1 August 2014 onwards are still being processed. At present, however, costs are as follows:

Cost category	Costs so far	Minimum future expected costs
• Gifts & prizes:	£210	£100
• Volunteer travel:	£1,100	£500
• Volunteer subsistence:	£3,750	£500
• Other event costs:	£2,020	£1,000
• Staff expenses for events:	£320	£200
• Merchandise for events:	£12,100	£3,000
• Venue hire:	£150	-
• Charitable contractor costs	£1,390	£1,000
• Staff travel:	£10	-
• Staff subsistence:	£170	-
• Office Equipment & Stationery:	£2,280	£800
• Postage & Carriage costs:	£150	£1,000
• Telephone costs:	£30	£150
• IT Equipment & consumables:	£220	£250
• Equipment repair & replacements:	£140	-

This totals £24,000 in costs incurred so far in August. In addition, we expect approximately £8,500 extra to be spent, with pending claims pushing the figure to as much as £12,000 – although it should be stressed that this figure is an educated guess! The total expected spend is therefore between £32,500 and £36,000. Assuming that the breakdown will be the same as the first six months (80/20) this would mean that the most we would spend in direct costs in Q3 and Q4 is £7,200 – the least we should expect to spend is £6,500.

In total, then, Wikimania is likely to cost us at least £23,300 and at most £26,000 in total, for the year.

Governance Committee Report

Prepared by Michael Maggs

There has been one Govcom meeting this quarter, the minutes of which can be found [here](#).

Publication of Expenses

Our new system of publishing expenses is working as requested.

Governance audit

We received three tenders for the governance audit and the committee has chosen the tender from Rosie Chapman. Rosie will be interviewing the staff and the board, and some members of the WMF.

Relationship with volunteers

A volunteer working group with KTC, CC and Chris McKenna made little progress, partly because of Wikimania. With KTC away on leave, a new group has been constructed with Fabian Tompsett and Carol Chapman. They are already making positive progress.

Non-board committees

A proposed new non-board committee charter, currently on the public wiki for discussion at [Non-board committees](#), has not been significantly commented on. This has to be part of our much larger volunteer-engagement plans, and can't be considered in isolation.

Updating the charity's Articles of Association

We proposed to undertake a comprehensive review of the Articles over the next year, with a view to presenting amendments to the members at the next AGM.

Updating the Scheme of Delegation to the Chief Executive

We now have, thanks to KW, a [table](#) which sets out examples of what is reserved for the board, and what is delegated. This is not a binding document, but simply guidance. Review of the CE's job description and the Scheme of Delegation is still not complete.

Transparency

The committee agreed to an eval score for this quarter of 4/5.

Wording: *This quarter, we ensured that our published expenses lists are clearly defined and are regularly updated, we defined formal new transparency commitments, we published an explanatory table of [Matters reserved for the Board](#) and delegated to the Chief Executive, we published old in camera resolutions of the board, and we ensured that new in camera resolutions are published as soon as possible, in redacted form if need be. Against that, the costs of the Berlin conference were not reported promptly and openly, as they should have been.*

Other points considered, but not contributing to the score

- A member objected to the lack of live streaming at the AGM. The committee considers the decision of the chair on the day not to live stream to be correct since (1) no member had asked for it in advance, and it has not been done before, and (2) live streaming could potentially have breached our 'safe space' policy.
- Some members indicated they were not happy with consultation on our new website pages (though a greater number expressed approval).

Possible co-option of new trustee

With the agreement of the board, Govcom invited Gill Hamilton to attend the October board meeting with a view to her possible co-option as a replacement for Padmini Ray Marry, who stepped down from the board on September 18th.

Membership application and renewal procedures, and rules

We need better written procedures for membership, and better renewal processes. MM has agreed to produce a short paper for the board suggesting a possible process (to be done).

The committee discussed email renewals and the quality of the reminder emails that were being sent out – Govcom was keen to impress that the standard of emails to members regarding renewals needs to improve significantly.

Annual review of trustees (incl Chair)

The annual trustee review will be bundled into the survey being carried out by Rosie Chapman. Appraisal of the chair will be done by Govcom (in MM's absence).

Govcom membership

As there are no skill shortages on the committee, it is not at present considered necessary to appoint an observer. We consider it wholly inappropriate to have observers take on a roll of “scrutineer” on such a committee.

Michael Maggs Chair

Minutes of the Audit and Risk Committee meeting, 1 September 2014

This Audit and Risk Committee meeting was originally scheduled for **1 September 2014**, but was later rescheduled to **10 September 2014**.

Present[\[edit\]](#)

- Carol Campbell
- Greyham Dawes

Also in attendance

- Chris Keating, observing
- Jon Davies, Chief Executive
- Richard Symonds (Minutes)
- Stuart Prior

Apologies

- Kate West
- Alastair McCapra

Declarations of Interest

The meeting began at 14.10. The Committee members discussed their circumstances and stated that there were no conflicts of interest.

Minutes of the last ARC meeting

There were no concerns about the minutes of the last ARC meeting, available at [ARC Minutes 21May14](#). The minutes were therefore approved.

Matters arising

The actions and decisions from the last ARC meeting were addressed.

- **ACTION 8:** Completed at last board meeting. RS confirmed that both the staff bank account and the ALTO accounts are run as imprest systems with no problems, and that the £500 limit had already been approved by the full board.
- **ACTION 12:** - Not yet completed was an in-depth check of the implementation of our procurement policy. GD was keen to discern if the system we have works correctly. For example, is uploading copies of invoices to the wiki an adequate safeguard against loss of paper copies? The ARC asked that this be completed by the next meeting by DJ.
- **ACTION 15:** - A revised FDC report was shown by JD, in which he showed the ARC the traffic light report in particular. JD said that the FDC were happy with this style, and proposed that we use it for the board as well. GD asked JD if this was creating too much extra work, as it seemed very complex: JD said that it had been reduced as much as was possible with current reporting requirements. CK expressed the view that this was the first year we had expressed targets in such a precise fashion, and that this should be seen as progress. He noted that even if the reports were all red, this would still be a move from “*unconscious incompetence*” to “*conscious incompetence*”, and so far we

have shown from our reports that we are competent! There was some further discussion about linking close with the WMF's accounting cycle, and GD noted that there could be a case for reviewing our financial year – possibly synchronising it with the WMF's year end or half-year. This is standard practice in many international charities.

- **ACTION 16:** - This action had been dealt with at the last board meeting.
- **ACTION 17 & 18:** - Although these actions had been completed at the last board meeting, GD noted that delays in reclaiming Gift Aid is causing him some concern, as there seem to be more and more of them. JD and RS explained the delays: this is largely due to technical issues with our database, which needs cleaning (and thus a proper procurement process must be worked through).
- **ACTION 22:** The ARC asked for a timetable on the gift aid reclaiming process to be completed by KB by the October 2014 Board Meeting. This should include a date for when we will be up to date on gift aid claims. The ARC were clear that we need to get to a situation where the gift aid debtor figure has a clear basis in reality, rather than being an estimated figure.
- **ACTION 19:** The Wikimania funding report will be looked at later in this meeting.
- **ACTION 20:** - The 2012 year was removed from the management letter.
- **ACTION 21:** - The ARC had previously requested a paper from JD, in which JD was to outline his concerns about board micromanagement. This was considered no longer necessary, as the problems in it had been mostly resolved by other means.

QFMR Q2 & Review of budget to match with strategic plan

QFMR is available by clicking [here](#).

JD explained that Wikimania has heavily affected our spending patterns in Q2 and will continue to do so in Q3. However, our recoveries from Wikimania are likely to be better than expected.

- **ACTION 23:** The ARC requested from JD that staff time allocation projections are included in the Q3 QFMR.
- **ACTION 24:** RS to change the QFMR cover sheet in time for 19 September Board Meeting to explain that future WiRs will often be paid for themselves – which means that we will be more likely to underspend at the end of the year.
- **ACTION 25:** Software Development budget – Chris K has made some comments on the report's page about this which he would like answering. JD to arrange answers.
- **ACTION 26:** RS to set up a “membership issues” line for the accounts which lists any extraordinary costs. This needn't be a separate budget line - a line in the accounts would be appropriate.
- **ACTION 27:** RS to provide a breakdown of current budget projections for this year to ARC and CK.
- **ACTION 28:** RS to send debtors and creditors to CC and GD for Q2 end by the October board meeting.

Review of risk register

There was some discussion over the risk of fundraising and how likely the fundraising strategy risk (4.1) is to actually occur. JD is concerned that in future the Wikimedia Foundation may dramatically reduce funding to local groups worldwide. The ARC further discussed the issue and asked JD to present the key risks, impact, likelihood and assessment of this risk in a separate

appendix to the risk register, as it is such a high risk. JD suggested that this go forward in the October board meeting as part of his report. ARC would like the top risks explained by JD in his report.

- **ACTION 29:** JD to present the key risks, impact, likelihood and assessment of risk 4.1 in a separate appendix to the risk register which is presented to the board. JD to also explain the top risks in his report.
- **ACTION 30:** JD to update the risk narrative on risk 4.2.1 (Qrpedia related risks)
- **ACTION 31:** JD to change risk 1.5 from 3/4 to 2/4.
- **ACTION 32:** Spelling error in risks 2.4, 7.2 and 5.3 to be corrected.

Volunteer business cards

JD explained that he feels that there are very few risks with volunteer business cards. He is happy to go ahead with them. The ARC were mindful of the risks – it increases the risks of a volunteer doing something which damages that chapter – but CK felt that they were a good volunteer engagement tool. GD and CC felt that they should be event-specific in order to mitigate risks,

- **ACTION 33:** JD to trial volunteer business cards for six months. They will be in limited numbers, and the person with them must be a member and a volunteer. JD to report on progress after 6 months.

Fundraising MoU from last board meeting

NB: This is a draft Memorandum of Understanding for accepting a Gift in Kind, which was delegated to ARC for approval on behalf of the board once legal negotiations are complete.

This was adjourned to the next ARC meeting.

- **ACTION:** The institution's MoU, which we will be using, will go to GD for approval. There is no need to bring a MoU to the next board meeting.

Skill review of ARC members/Hudson recommendation re members of ARC

ARC need someone with skills in information management and data protection, say CC and GD. In any case, however, any additional non-trustee members could not vote because constitutionally we cannot have voting non-trustee members on committees. Until an amendment to the constitution is made, ARC are happy to accept someone with an appropriate skillset as an observer.

Wikimania 2014 - finances and outcomes

- **ACTION 19:** The ARC thanked RS for the report.
- **ACTION 34:** RS to insert after the last line: what the original budget for wikimania was, followed by the extra amount agreed with the board up to Y for the year (circa £38k). Finally, RS to then summarise the gross spending and gross recoveries and make clear the net cost to WMUK.

CK had a few minor questions about future costs but was happy with the answers.

Staff Cover

There were no objections to the plans for staff cover.

AOB

ARC thanked JD for his "Future Plans for WMUK" document.

In camera session for Board Members

Not minuted by RS.

Request to approve restricted gift (consent item)

Prepared by Katherine Bavage

The charity has received a request from a donor who wishes to remain anonymous and who would like to make a £75 restricted donation to increase the amount of money available to purchase prizes for the Wikipeda Stubs contest.

For trustees who are not aware this is a short intensive contest, the idea is to focus on expanding as many of Wikipedia's stub articles as possible, particularly the most linked or viewed. There are prizes of between 100 and 25 euros and the donor has proposed their donation on the basis that it will allow more of smaller prizes to be awarded.

Our current donation and grant acceptance policy does not allow us to accept restricted donations under £1000, presumably to support unrestricted giving and prevent donor interests skewing programme priorities. This policy and indeed our acceptance processes will be reviewed this year as part of the strategic planning work.

However, in this instance I am requesting that trustees consent to the acceptance of this donation. It would be recorded as an anonymous donation in our database, and the budget for prize purchase would be increased by the amount of the donation and the donor informed. I believe though restricted it is strongly in line with our values and mission and creates negligible extra work to administer and deliver the donation in line with the wishes of the donor.

We have informed the donor of the policy issue and they are content to wait for a trustee decision.

Technology Committee Report

Prepared by Charles Matthews

- Harry Burt developed his prototype voice recorder, and worked on it with Andy Mabbett at Wikimania.
- Harry has also developed a prototype "safe sandbox", intended so that primary school children can do wiki article editing in an appropriate environment. The prototype, on Wikimedia Labs, has been shown to Ian Stuart, working for the Scottish government, who requested it at the Education fringe meeting in June. Harry needs to work with someone on their side on authentication; as of writing this the ball is in their court.
- The VLE launch, as agreed in discussion with Stevie Benton, depends only on sorting out the single sign-on mechanism, which needs to be patched after a Moodle upgrade. A volunteer is working on this.
- The Wikisoba project now has a proposed architecture, which can be seen at https://wikimedia.org.uk/wiki/Wikisoba_project. A main point of the proposal there is to allow participation and collaboration on educational material (as WMUK argued in its House of Lords evidence). The proposed interleaving of text and questions would handle this by two routes: text sections being on wiki pages (as in the Mark I tool), while questions would be drawn from a purpose-built repository. A volunteer group is currently working on development.

Education Committee

Note: The Education Committee has not met since the June board meeting.

GLAM Committee

Note: No report was available at the time of printing.

Grants Committee Report

Prepared by Fabian Tompsett

Executive summary

Since the last report (7th June 2014) we have received 7 applications, with 6 approved. 5 have been completed for a total of approximately £1,120.

Report content

The Grants Committee still consists of Simon Knight as board liaison, but Christopher Cooper has been the only active community member. Fabian Tompsett is covering for Katie Chan by acting as staff liaison. It does not have any formal meeting, working ad-hoc as needed as applications for project grants come in.

Grants received:

1. Providing transport in support Wikilndaba event in Africa:
£362.54
2. Scottish Gaelic Wikipedia workshop in Germany held on 29th June
£190.00
3. Mobile phone for volunteer during Wikimania
£94.95
4. Photographing UK Cathedrals (Travel bursary) £430.75
5. Railway Architecture: providing a book for a volunteer
£48.00

The other two grants were:

- Stub Contest Approved but volunteer has not implemented it (£250)
- Good Article Nomination Treasure Hunt still pending clarification (£250)

Report on work in Wales

Prepared by Robin Owain

Executive summary

This report contains information on the work done by myself up to the end of August 2014.

This quarter saw the last part of the Living Paths Project, which achieved its goals. We still await closure by Welsh Government. This also saw the last period of our Wikipedian in Residence at Coleg. A final report was produced by Marc, and in my view the project was a success, laying excellent foundation for the future. Many other plans are currently being developed with heavyweight GLAMs in Wales.

Decisions and actions required, risks identified (if relevant):

A possible shortfall of £9,000. We have bills of £3,943.54, seriously due. DTBF have offered to pay £3,600, but we believe this should be nearer £9,000, as they should fund 'objectives' as well as 'outcomes' (see below) as agreed in the signed Funding Document.

Report content

166 people have been trained by the Project and a database of another 100 who have registered for wiki-skills training has been passed on to Software Alliance Wales; this will continue for years to come. In May (11 months into the Project) the DTBF (Welsh Government) started to discuss what they would consider as part of the project and what was outside. Some new articles by newly trained editors were deemed to be outside the remit, and discussions followed eg 'releasing content' was several times mentioned in the Project as 'Objectives'. From Wikimedia's point of view all targets were surpassed, and are still being written by new editors. To quantify the exact numbers of articles, images, trainers of course is difficult.

In May, the DTBF officers informed us that they would only pay for 'Outcomes' achieved, rather than what was in the Funding Agreement; their emphasis is entirely on deliverables with no consideration given to objectives, outputs and sustainability (eg releasing open content). In other words, they refuse to pay for time spent on releasing content. Other similar issues remain unsolved. Aled, our Training Coordinator, in response to DTBF's unreasonable attitude resigned. I have faith that the issues with the DTBF will be resolved in the next 6-8 weeks.

However, the following have been achieved:

Images:

Welsh Book covers: 5,685 (3,266 used on WP articles - 57.4%)

English Book covers: 5,544 (still being added to WP articles; estimate: 90%)

Total: 11,229

Nat Lib of Wales releases 4,500 [John Thomas photographs](#).

Total number of images: 15,729

New articles:Welsh:

SSSIs (960), Wales Coast Path related (700), Books (5,685)

Total: 7,345

Other languages:

On the WCP: [20/20 Challenge](#) (278), Other languages (910), English (380) = 1568

Off the WCP: 3,750

Total: 5,318

Total new articles: 12,663

Training videos:

Total: 40 (Target: 20)

Listings on Wikivoyage:

[Gold Challenge](#) (468); trainees: (55)

Total: 523 (target: 500)

Trained editors:

166 trained in wiki-skills, with another 100 registered

Target: 180

The Project is sustained through articles on Wikipedia and work inspired by the project eg SAW continue to train new editors.

Other current projects

Wikimania was one vibrant educational session! I arranged several meetings including:

1. A discussion on Celtic languages
2. Nurturing the Scottish Gaelic WP (most editors live in Bonn)
3. A thinktank of Legal Deposit Libraries (Nat Lib of Scotland, NL Wales and the British Library)
4. Creative Commons Chief Executive Ryan Merkley, agreed to deliver the opening keynote at a Symposium of Open Ideas at the Nat Lib of Wales at Aberystwyth in Spring

My main goal is to release open content from the Welsh Government, through:

1. Bringing the First Minister and Ryan Merkley and Tim Berners-Lee together.
2. Discussions started with Marlize Palmer, Welsh Government, regarding licencing work on OGL rather than Crown Copyright.
3. Holding a Symposium targeted at main Welsh Gov officers
4. A WiR at the Welsh Government

I believe that our partnership with Coleg has laid a solid foundation to our work in Wales, our profile has been raised and our work now is much easier, as it is based on this solid foundation.

Meetings held:

May 2014

- 15 Coleg Cymraeg, Cardiff (WiR: Marc Haynes)
- 16 Meeting with DTBF officers, Trefforest
- 21 Coleg Llandrillo, Betws-yn-Rhos
- 16 David Shiel – Senior Countryside Officer for the Clwydian Range and Dee Valley AONB

June

- 2 Catherine Smith, Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru (Natural resource Wales)
- 11 Wici Cymru meeting
- 16 and 27 Sioned Huws, Saint Ffagan, Cardiff
- 27 David Anderson, National Museum of Wales
- 27 Linda Tomos, Cymal
- 4 sessions with pupils from Ruthin School

July

- 1 Osian Bowyer, Language Commissioner
- 12 Rhuthun: Family Scanning day
- 15 Llanelli: SAW Training
- 16 Catrin Hughes, HWB, Conwy
- 17 Dafydd Roberts, CE Sain Records, Caernarfon

August

- 4 Eisteddfod, Llanelli: Panel member at Coleg stand. Also in Pabell y Cymdeithasau. Discussion with Sioned Bowen and Huw Meredydd (BBC). Also Elfed Roberts (Eisteddfod Organiser) re WiR.
- 7-10 Wikimania, London
- 26 Penrhyndeudraeth: Presented to Snowdonia National Park
- 5 Marlice Palmer, Library and Archive Services, Finance and Corporate Services, Welsh Government

Wikimedia UK Technology Project Management

Prepared by Tom Morton

Executive Summary

Wikimedia UK is a charity with deep ties to technology, both as a direct part of its mission and to support its activities. From the start, this technical need has presented a problem both in resource and management. Initially contractors were employed to provide technology support, with management provided through existing staff. As the charity has matured technology needs have grown and conflicted. Despite their best efforts, staff are unable to provide expert technical support to the level required by Wikimedia UK.

This report concludes an undertaking to examine how Wikimedia UK interacts with technology, and how the charity has previously dealt with this skill gap. Though a number of methodologies input has been received from multiple stakeholders including volunteers, board members, staff and members of the charity, as well as third party stakeholders.

Views from the stakeholders were varied, but all agreed that technology is a critical part of Wikimedia UK's activities and vision. Its application ranges from supporting day-to-day work, through supporting the volunteer base to flagship community projects. However, a number of weaknesses were identified through the life of the charity.

This report details the methodologies used, the results obtained and makes a number of recommendations. Although it is critical, this criticism is used to highlight opportunities to move forward.

Finally, I would like to thank everyone that took time to speak with me (through whichever medium) for your help in making this report possible.

Aims & Outcomes

This report was commissioned to investigate how Wikimedia UK handles technology on an operational and strategic basis. It's an accepted fact that technology is critical to the charities activities, and that it has been a struggle to bring about an effective solution to all of its needs.

What is lacking is an understanding of all that has gone before, including both the good and bad, and a clear vision for improvements in the future. The aim of this report is to fill this gap in first relating the history of technology at the charity, reporting on the views of numerous stakeholders, and make broad recommendations going forward.

The outcome of this report will be a set of firm recommendations for the charity: both at a staff and board level. Following an implementation period (as yet to be determined) I have been asked to conduct a progress assessment and report on successes or failures.

Stakeholders

The first task for this report was to identify the diverse range of stakeholders. Beyond the volunteers, staff and WMUK board, there are very many areas that Wikimedia UK has interest. After some consultation I identified the following list:

- Volunteers

- Board
- Staff
- Technology Committee
- QRpedia Stakeholders
- UK Wikipedians (non-charity members)
- QRpedia users

Contacting this wide array of stakeholders proved challenging, and not all areas could be covered. However a wide sample of people were interviewed and this report reflects their views.

Methodologies

Several methodologies were used to obtain feedback. The primary method of communication was via email, either through mailing list posts or direct email. I started by inviting stakeholders to generally comment on technology in the charity. Using this initial feedback I introduced more specific questions to draw out opinions in more detail.

For some stakeholders, phone interviews were conducted to obtain more extensive and informal viewpoints. This provided a wealth of knowledge, particularly into the inner workings of the charity and the history of Wikimedia UK.

To fill out the views a survey was also distributed, with questions built on the comments previously received. Its aim was to try and draw out comments from individuals with less time for email/phone conversation. Although there was not an extraordinary response it did provide valuable insights.

My research focused on three key areas:

- The history of Wikimedia UK's handling of technology
- Suggestions for how to handle technology moving forward
- What projects the charity should be focusing on

In particular I asked questions such as:

- How important do you rate technology for the charity?
- How well do you think the charity handles technology?
- When involved in the charity, do you have an understanding of who manages technology?

Report

This report outlines my findings throughout this project. It reflects the wide ranging views of various stakeholders. I have attempted to bring together and summarise opinions with as little commentary as possible (my conclusions are detailed later in this report).

Wikimedia UK History

The history of Wikimedia UK's handling of technology dates back to 2011, when the trustees identified a need for technological support. Initial attempts focused first on hiring a Chief Technical Officer role and then a full-time developer. These were unsuccessful because the charity was not offering a wage commensurate with the position.

In response, the charity hired two contractors to bootstrap its technical needs. This solved the problem of technical capacity but left the issue of technical management. Existing staff members fulfilled the role alongside other duties, primarily Kat, but were not formally qualified to manage the contractors.

In 2014 the charity again attempted to fulfil the technical management role, but were unable to do so - leading to this report.

Day-To-Day Support

Wikimedia UK is a charity that utilises technology heavily on a day-to-day basis. This can take a number of forms:

- Technical tools needing contractor support; e.g. civiCRM, mailing lists, OTRS
- “Regular” technical tools; e.g. Google Docs/Email
- Infrequent technical requirements; Sub-contacting development projects

Of these contractors provide support for the first, but there is no formal IT support for day-to-day activities (for example, trouble using email). This is provided informally through staff with technical experience.

The final item on the list refers to technical projects commissioned by non-technical staff; there is limited capability to plan projects and approve (or even write) technical specifications for such work.

Staff identified that they would like to explore a wider variety of options for their toolset. For example, OTRS came up regularly in discussion. It was thought OTRS had been chosen because it would be familiar to WMUK volunteers who already use the Wikimedia Foundation tool. In fact, few volunteers use the tool and it may not be the best for the job.

Projects

The charity has taken on or promoted multiple projects; QRpedia and the VLE. Over the course of several years the contractors have supported these projects (mostly with infrastructure) with some externally contracted development.

One set of questions posed to various stakeholders focused on how well the charity supported existing projects, and the scope of taking on other projects. The overwhelming response was that WMUK should look for other high impact projects to support, but that it should focus on effectively supporting existing projects first.

The VLE project in particular has been a difficult process; communication has been under-effective due to lack of technical management. The VLE contractor was not supported with technical expertise at early and mid-stages of the project. As a result the tool has not been fully launched and no clear technical scaling/support plan has been implemented.

Since taking on the QRpedia project the charity has implemented a privacy policy compliant statistics tool, but not really discussed any further development of the tool itself. There were some complaints that the Piwik statistics tool was not suitable for institutions to use effectively, but discussions on a solution bogged down in details - no decision was made on what work to undertake. Most importantly, several people felt that QRpedia lacked any technical evangelist to promote its possible uses (either in new venues or with existing institutions) and manage an overall technical/logistical roadmap for the tool.

Both the VLE and QRpedia are high profile projects for Wikimedia UK, and have suffered from a lack of technical management.

Other projects that have been proposed are WikiRate and the Accessibility project. Both these projects have struggled to get beyond discussion stages due to a complex decision making structure. In the case of the accessibility project, a detailed proposal was created but failed to find a technical evangelist to drive it forward. The WikiRate project has clear support for its goals, but has failed to find a place where a decision can be made. In addition, it is the sort of project that needs a solid technical specification to move forward - and the charity lacks the capacity to undertake such work.

Technology Committee / Members

There was a broad spectrum of opinion on the topic of the technology committee and the involvement of members in technology.

The technology committee evolved during a period that the charity was hoping to involve the community in more decision-making. It started as a closed group centered around a mailing list and irregular monthly meetings. Individuals with interest in particular ongoing projects (VLE, QRpedia etc.) attended as required.

All participants agreed the current format of the committee struggles to have impact; there is no clear role of the committee (operational or strategic). Further, there is no clear route to implementing any recommendations as decisions. Originally Kat acted as the conduit taking action points for approval and then assignment to various individuals, however her position in that role was only temporary. Chairmanship of the committee has been one complex point, with the role changing frequently depending on volunteer availability - this has led to governance complexities and hampered decision making.

Broadly, everyone agreed that the committee focused too much on operational matters. This appears to have been a side effect of lacking technical project management - with the idea that the committee would be able to fill the role. Alongside this, the committee discussed broader strategies (such as projects) and helped make decisions on behalf of the community (e.g. moving the Wikimedia UK wiki to the charities infrastructure).

It has been noted that the charity has a broad resource of technically minded members and volunteers - both with formal technical qualifications and the capacity for evangelising projects. However, it has struggled to motivate them to attend committee meetings or adopt projects. Efforts have been made to solve this by opening up the technical mailing list, with limited effect.

On the topic of the mailing list, it was pointed out that dialogue tended to spark up following committee meetings and died down quickly. There is no ongoing discussion amongst members.

Importance of Technology

Everyone interviewed agreed that technology was important to the charity. There was a broad opinion on the role of the charity either as a technical or promotional role - or both. It was universally agreed that WMUK has made good progress in fulfilling a technical role, but that a firm strategy for the next few years is still lacking.

Conclusion

Firstly, thank you to everyone who responded to my emails, phone calls and surveys. The overriding view was that Wikimedia UK is at a tipping point for technology. The charity is in a position to decide if its primary focus should be technology, or whether it is only a fraction of its interest.

A fully-functional technology stream is costly and time consuming to manage. There is intense appetite to manage multiple projects, but a significant body of work required to effectively approach and manage them. It is my analysis that the Wikimedia UK staff and board needs to agree a broad strategic approach to technology. From this, the charity can recruit staff and volunteers to fulfil the identified roles.

Below, I have made some broad recommendations that I believe will help the charity move forward in obtaining a full technical capacity. It has made some key assumptions about the focus of the charity; that it wants to develop and manage a number of front-line projects, support ongoing technical capacity in the office and involve the membership more directly. I have recognised that the charity has limitations in terms of budget.

Broadly, it is my belief that the charity should hire enough project management to support existing and future projects. That individual should be tasked with instigating a set of development projects through both contractors and volunteers, akin to the Wikimedia Foundation.

Recommendations

These recommendations are broken down into broad categories for implementation.

Board

The board's role here is to publish a clear goal for the charity in terms of technology aims:

- The board to agree an overall technology aim/strategy for the charity for example, the number of front-line projects to support
- Identify ways to encourage participation of membership in technology projects

Staff

Staffing needs appear quite simple; fulfil IT support and technology management roles. However, in practice it is proving difficult to resolve.

- Write a clear outline of technology management needs at the charity (for example, a need to utilise volunteer expertise)
- Hire talent to fulfil the technology management role, previous attempts have failed so a new approach is needed. The approach chosen depends on the decision of the board as to the focus of the charity. I recommend one of three options:

Approach	Detail	Pro/Cons	Cost
Tech Liaison	Employ a member of the community, possibly part-time.	Represents lowest commitment to technology. Cheaper, fills the key skill gaps. Might be hard to recruit.	£20,000 - £23,000 pro rata

Contractor	Identify a skilled technical contractor with project management experience, for 1-2 days weekly (ideally non-remote working) to fill the role. Recommend approaching an agency for introductions.	Represents a compromise of commitment to technology. Expensive, comparatively. High skilled individual for less than full-time wage. Has the drawback of limiting how much support can be given to projects.	£450 - £1,000 per day depending on experience
CTO	Hire a Chief Technical Officer, second in command to the CEO	Represents a full commitment to technology as the focus of the charity. Cost-effective way of achieving this commitment. Overall highest cost	£40,000 - £60,000 depending on WMUK salary scale.

Technology Committee

The charity needs to empower the committee to be a full advisory body:

- Remove operational tasks from the committee's remit and bring its focus on strategic matters and interacting with community.
- Agree a formal structure, with elected or appointed chair (the chair could be offered a small stipend during their tenure to overcome the volunteer nature of the role)
- Instigate a full decision-making path; technology project management staff role is to set agenda items and push actions through the following month.
- The charity should fund quarterly in-person meetings of the committee (probably in tandem with a board meeting)

Empower the committee to conduct outreach into the community to pick up greater membership.

For decision: Board to approve Wikimedia UK acting as a signatory to the Lyon Declaration on Access to Information and Development

Prepared by Stevie Benton

As discussed on the mailing lists and the water cooler, Stevie has proposed that Wikimedia UK act as a signatory to the Lyon Declaration. This is put forward for decision at the Wikimedia UK board meeting on 4 October 2014.

There is nothing controversial in the declaration and it is well aligned with our values as a charity. It is a statement that we believe in the importance of access to information and that we believe it should be made a priority by governments.

The text of the declaration is below.

Lyon Declaration on Access to Information and Development

The Lyon Declaration of August 2014 was written in English. The wording of the English version shall prevail.

The United Nations is negotiating a new development agenda to succeed the Millennium Development Goals. The agenda will guide all countries on approaches to improving people's lives, and outline a new set of goals to be reached during the period 2016-2030.

We, the undersigned, believe that increasing access to information and knowledge across society, assisted by the availability of information and communications technologies (ICTs), supports sustainable development and improves people's lives.

We therefore call upon the Member States of the United Nations to make an international commitment to use the post-2015 development agenda to ensure that everyone has access to, and is able to understand, use and share the information that is necessary to promote sustainable development and democratic societies.

Principles

Sustainable development seeks to ensure the long-term socio-economic prosperity and well-being of people everywhere. The ability of governments, parliamentarians, local authorities, local communities, civil society, the private sector and individuals to make informed decisions is essential to achieving it.

In this context, a right to information would be transformational. Access to information supports development by empowering people, especially marginalised people and those living in poverty, to:

- Exercise their civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights.
- Be economically active, productive and innovative.
- Learn and apply new skills.
- Enrich cultural identity and expression.
- Take part in decision-making and participate in an active and engaged civil society.
- Create community-based solutions to development challenges.

- Ensure accountability, transparency, good governance, participation and empowerment.
- Measure progress on public and private commitments on sustainable development.

Declaration

In accordance with the findings of the High Level Panel on the Post–2015 Development Agenda, the post-2015 consultations of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the Open Working Group Focus Area Report, all of which identified the crucial role of access to information in supporting development, we, the undersigned, recognise that:

Poverty is multidimensional, and progress in eradicating poverty is linked to sustainable development across a variety of areas.

Sustainable development must take place in a human-rights based framework, where:

- Inequality is reduced by the empowerment, education and inclusion of marginalized groups, including women, indigenous peoples, minorities, migrants, refugees, persons with disabilities, older persons, children and youth.
- Gender equality, along with full social, economic and political engagement, can be significantly enhanced by empowering women and girls through equitable access to education.
- Dignity and autonomy can be strengthened by ensuring access to employment and decent jobs for all.
- Equitable access to information, freedom of expression, freedom of association and assembly, and privacy are promoted, protected and respected as being central to an individual's independence.
- Public participation of all is ensured to allow them to take ownership of change needed to improve their lives.
- Increased access to information and knowledge, underpinned by universal literacy, is an essential pillar of sustainable development. Greater availability of quality information and data and the involvement of communities in its creation will provide a fuller, more transparent allocation of resources.

Information intermediaries such as libraries, archives, civil society organisations (CSOs), community leaders and the media have the skills and resources to help governments, institutions and individuals communicate, organize, structure and understand data that is critical to development. They can do this by:

- Providing information on basic rights and entitlements, public services, environment, health, education, work opportunities, and public expenditure that supports local communities and people to guide their own development.
- Identifying and focusing attention on relevant and pressing needs and problems within a population.
- Connecting stakeholders across regional, cultural and other barriers to facilitate communication and the exchange of development solutions that could be scaled for greater impact.
- Preserving and ensuring ongoing access to cultural heritage, government records and information by the public, through the stewardship of national libraries and archives and other public heritage institutions.

- Providing public forums and space for wider civil society participation and engagement in decision-making.
- Offering training and skills to help people access and understand the information and services most helpful to them.

Improved ICT infrastructure can be used to expand communications, speed up the delivery of services and provide access to crucial information particularly in remote communities. Libraries and other information intermediaries can use ICTs to bridge the gap between national policy and local implementation to ensure that the benefits of development reach all communities.

We, the undersigned, therefore call on Member States of the United Nations to acknowledge that access to information, and the skills to use it effectively, are required for sustainable development, and ensure that this is recognised in the post-2015 development agenda by:

- Acknowledging the public's right to access information and data, while respecting the right to individual privacy.
- Recognising the important role of local authorities, information intermediaries and infrastructure such as ICTs and an open Internet as a means of implementation.
- Adopting policy, standards and legislation to ensure the continued funding, integrity, preservation and provision of information by governments, and access by people.
- Developing targets and indicators that enable measurement of the impact of access to information and data and reporting on progress during each year of the goals in a Development and Access to Information (DA2I) report.

For decision: Board to agree to sign the Free Knowledge Advocacy Group EU (FKAG) position paper on copyright reform.

Prepared by Stevie Benton

This paper was presented to the board at the meeting on 4 October 2014. It asks the board to agree to sign the below position paper on copyright reform. It was first shared with the board in July 2014.

The paper sets out the position of the FKAG grouping of European Wikimedia chapters, of which Wikimedia UK is an important partner. It has already been signed by Netherlands, France, Switzerland, Poland, Amical Wikimedia, Italy, Germany, Czech Republic, Austria, Sweden, Hungary and Estonia. Other fellow traveller organisations have already signed.

The FKAG is planning to publish the statement on 14 October and my view is it would be a blot on our reputation to be visibly missing from the list of signatories.

The text is below:

Position

The Free Knowledge Advocacy Group EU [1] welcomes the European Commission's recognition of the need to tackle the copyright framework in Europe and taking on the laborious task to modernise it.

However, we cannot escape the fact that there is a need of harmonisation in order to allow both European commercial and not-for profit projects to thrive in a safe legal environment and be competitive globally. Only by ensuring rules that will quickly and easily be understood by citizens and start-ups, can Europe become a hotbed for creativity and home to exciting new projects.

Examples

One striking example for the need of harmonisation is that **publishing images of buildings permanently located in public spaces** is unlawful in many EU countries, as architecture and public artworks are covered by copyright. This means that there is no freedom to use and re-use images taken in public spaces. Such examples include the Atomium in Brussels and the Centre Pompidou in Paris.[2][3]

Another example is that today Europe's laws and regulations make the **use and re-use of publicly funded works** complicated, a legal liability or even illegal. It leads to the absurd situation that virtually every single widespread image of the earth and space is a NASA product, despite Europe's tremendous space programme. In contrast to other leading economies, where such freedoms are given [4] and such content is indispensable for industry and society, within the EU it is routinely not clear what is and isn't allowed, leading to a lock-up of knowledge and information.

Therefore we recommend that:

- The Commission should clarify the European copyright framework by harmonising legislation and creating a single EU Copyright Title

- The Commission should ensure everyone has the liberty to freely use and share images taken in public spaces by introducing Freedom of Panorama universally (currently optional under Directive 2001/29/EC Article 5 Point 3.H)
- The Commission should ensure that all works created by officials within the EU administration and institutions are open for use and re-use by everyone. Such works should hence not be subject to copyright protection.
- The Commission should re-balance the current culturally and economically harmful mismatch between public commons and private property and close the “20th century gap” [6] by shortening copyright terms to the minimum term possible under existing international treaties and conventions.

Related documents

- Free Knowledge Advocacy Group EU "Statement of Intent" on policy issues
- Free Knowledge Advocacy Group EU responses to the consultation

References

- [1] [Free Knowledge Advocacy Group EU](#)
- [2] [Freedom of Panorama situation in Europe](#)
- [3] [The Atomium issue exemplified](#)
- [4] [Copyright and Other Rights Pertaining to U.S. Government Works](#)
- [5] [Value of the public domain](#), p.12ff
- [6] [How Copyright Keeps Works Disappeared](#)