

## PESTELI

All stuff outside our control but which has a profound impact on our strategy

### Political

Organisational politics (FDC, WMF)

EU/EC - Single market

TITP - USA

Other countries way ahead on open, such as the US, Poland, Germany, and Scotland and Wales making strides

Small state, pro-industry government

Devolution/language/culture

Minority groups tend to be more open to open

Open government/Government digital services

### Economic

Open as an economic proposition

Market disruption

Digital economy

Big business interests

Poverty and inequality (Equalities Office is great!)

Research and economic growth through referencing

### Social

Technology mainstreaming

Ageing population/digital disadvantages (silverwissen)

Diversity and multiculturalism

digital literacy - recruitment, radicalisation

understanding bias

everyone is a publisher

cyberbullying

children and young people

### Technological

Mainstreaming

Digital divide

Wifi everywhere

Social media

smart cities

IOT

Personal data

Legal consent

### Environmental

COP21

WMUK's use of resources  
Digital less impactful than physical  
Scale and access

Legal  
Copyright reform  
Data protection  
Licensing  
Public sector information  
Knowledge of IP  
Equalities act 2010  
Charity law and public benefit  
EU legislation and lobbying

Industry  
development House  
Brand identity and reputation  
Partnership opportunity  
ethical business and CSR  
Digital skills e.g. Barclays  
What about the sector?!

Who do we serve and what would they ask us?

Public - english gaelic, welsh  
to provide a public benefit  
open educational content  
how do we obtain access? diversity

Volunteers - I need resources to support? Ref works, equipment  
Do we need to focus beyond Wikipedia

Institutions  
How do I make content open? No single point of failure!  
Provenance? Help with advocacy, best practice, copyright/licensing  
- a pack on openness

SWOT

### **Strengths**

Committed staff, board and volunteers  
professionalism  
brand - global reach  
resources - funding, volunteers  
Track record - projects, experience, reputation  
internal structures

## **Weaknesses**

Internal focus

lack of external identity/visibility

Lack of strategic focus - sharpness - linkage between high level strategy and deliverables

lack of diversity

lack of ambition - need to punch above our weight

low volunteer engagement

low membership (compared to size of movement and governance risk)

(Need to grow 'friends')

## **Opportunities**

Huge and growing network of potential partners

Timely social and technological environment

Physical location and language

Legal and social environment conducive to mature collaborations with higher education and heritage sector

10k plus editors in the UK

digital literacy

media profile

opportunity to influence EY and UK legislation

## **Threats**

Resources are limited

Community backlash against the Foundation

Reliance on Foundation

Media scandals and attacks on the open movements (and wikipedia and WMUK in particular)

Litigation

economic pressures in sector

competition

legal environment - copyright restrictions

security threats

Key Themes Emerging

## **DIVERSITY AND EQUALITIES**

Diversity of content producers as well as consumers

digital literacy and access

## **LEARNING**

Higher education represents untapped potential

formal education sector - secondary and 16 - 18

Digital access and literacy

## **PARTNERSHIPS**

GLAM, education, CSR, big focus of next year

## ADVOCACY

legal environment and influencing legislation

Nervous about that

Should be about relationships and partnerships

need to map and develop intelligence

## COLLABORATION AND VOLUNTEERING

Activating and engaging the volunteer community in order to maximise impact

## PROFILE AND COMMUNICATIONS

open is ambiguous, needs, mainstreaming, global brand but lack of WMUK profile and identity

Other issues

Tension in supply and demand (mission)

Huge benefit of open (case for support, fundraising, communications)

Too much internal focus (delivery)

collective vs corporate (values and principles)

huge untapped potential (self-limiting) - delivery

technical innovation - currently don't have expertise or resources. It's also about delivery not strategy

What do we want to change?

is it the principle of open content and knowledge we're an agent for that, using wikipedia as a channel

what we've done is to be the agent for wikipedia

develop own knowledge and reduce barriers (through wikipedia and other barriers)

far broader sense of people creating knowledge - inclusive activism, people, cultural heritage every 16 year old understands and uses open knowledge

The organisation that people turns to when they want to know about open knowledge and wikipedia

eradication of inequality and bias on the English, Welsh and Gaelic Wikipedias

establishing YJ as the recognised lead on advocacy, cultural heritage, diversity?

Change the world through access to knowledge

association with Wikipedia

Supporting educational content with UK including Wikipedia

The UK's Wikipedia Charity

## MISSION

Where is advocacy?

Partnerships

Diversity

Creating both the supply and demand

Support about accessibility of digital materials

equality and focus on diversity

Equalism, democratic, breaks down barriers, accountability

Diversity - geo, gender, language etc.

Diverse membership

We need to explore and develop the means to present open knowledge, develop the skills and knowledge needed to do that

That we have remit both in releasing content and distributing/promoting it

building and providing access to knowledge

it means we're seeking to create both the supply and demand - which is hard

that advocacy doesn't directly fit into it, but is still instrumental

anything supporting gaelic culture and life (to help sustain this culture)

spread the word high level partnership

effective and mutually beneficial partnerships

## VISION

including children and young people

ensuring diversity in the creation of knowledge

empowering people

ambition worth striving for

no barriers

hard work (convincing others)

'all' is a big audience

this is an input not an outcome - what happens when knowledge is open?

People can access knowledge with no barriers

Knowledge and access to it is a human right\

Open knowledge for all means that we have to ensure that open knowledge is accessible to every person regardless of income, location, disability or age

## WMUK

realising potential

Huge untapped potential

Lack of focus now is a problem

Motivated and skilled staff

The success of WiR

WMUK/Wikipedia/Open knowledge - what's here?

3 different stakeholders

biggest resource is potential volunteers

Track record  
Agility

realising potential  
Leading in partnership on open

Massive potential

Huge potential  
lack of focus

motivated and skilled staff  
agility  
track record

Open Knowledge

Volunteering  
Collaboration  
Ambiguous - needs unpacking and cultural heritage needs support in understanding  
needs to be mainstreamed  
huge benefits, empowering to all

Detailed:

Cultural heritage needs support in understanding its role in open knowledge  
open is ambiguous. there are restrictions to open and freely available.  
what is open knowledge - do others understand  
open needs to be unpacked - it's not axiomatic  
it's so open it's hard to get into and impossible to control  
Empowering, vital  
it's creation, use and reuse

Need to make mainstream in UK legislation and in society  
Not in conflict with commercial aims - not scary

Needs to be mainstream  
Huge benefits

**Collaboration**  
**Volunteering**

**Random notes and questions**  
Are we empowered by the community to do this?

Stakeholder analysis - who are these aim actually hitting  
identify critical issues  
Scottish funding  
funding cuts  
ethics in person  
competition from open movement  
theme unlocks potent in world changing business

### **What happens when knowledge is open**

disrupting our partners business model (e.g. museums)  
can be so much you need curation to find out what's good  
neutral, unbiased filter  
democratic creation and distribution of knowledge  
you can add to knowledge  
You can be more creative - as there is stuff to use!  
education and learning  
throw a light on primary and secondary sources - enablers of people to build on their  
knowledge  
democratise knowledge  
not an objective thing - people can challenge and discuss it  
get a better society - more tolerant, integrated, democratic  
unlocking the potential value of intellectual assets for the collective good (some of which can  
be economic)  
social and economic good  
giving people control over knowledge is inherently positive  
challenge prejudice, which thrives on lack of knowledge  
open access to knowledge is a fundamental human right  
knowledge is power - giving back to the many and not the few  
democracy