1 Comments from Michael (datendelphin) on the AGM transcript

I was present during the AGM. A lot of questions were raised during the AGM which needed more than a few seconds to answer. I tried to provide the requested information here, and commented on a few statements from MWG perspective. The Text below mentions who posted, at what time (CEST) and the original statement.

> Message at 18:41 from **courtneyc[m]:** Sorry to be behind in the thread, but I had trouble voting, and just because people who reported problems, got their problems fixed, doesn't mean that the problem is solved. It just means that the people who. noticed the problem got it solved. I remain concerned about people who didn't get to vote, who should have had the chance.

Note: 2024 was quite a bad year for the membership working group, we fought with several different problems. Referring to "the problem" is ambiguous and might be misleading, as most people got their membership status resolved properly, independent of if they put the burden on themselves to reach out to the membership working group or not.

> Message at 18:43 from **James_E_A:** I see the voting e-mails did not have Read Receipt Requests turned on, but that they did have some remote images embedded. Were any of those tracking pixels, and if so will that data be made available?

Note: Yes opa vote reports how many messages got opened and of course how many votes were cast. But the number for messages opened can't be reliable, as it depends on the settings of the mail client if those tracking pixels get loaded or not.

> Message at 18:43 from **courtneyc[m]:** arnalie: I'm deeply concerned because you all worked really hard, and yet there are still issues. To me, this is a huge priority else, how can we trust our voting process?

> Message at 18:43 from **courtneyc[m]:** I will happily volunteer to work on the CRM - it really just seems unacceptable to have a voting process with this many errors

Note: unclear if this refers to problems which were properly fixed before the vote started, or the ones we needed to correct afterwards. Our notes show that we corrected 19 entries in the register after the voting started and before the AGM. 17 of them were due to problems in the special active mapper plug in we use to automatically verify the 42 mapping days with calls to the OSM api.

Message at 18:44 from **mvineetmenon:** There are 23 empty votes, it might be considered that all were because of technical issues.

Note: For clarity: empty votes, if a problem, are a problem with the voting platform opa vote, which is completely independent of the membership register which the previous complaints were seemingly targeted at. We have no indication on those empty votes being technical problems. Empty votes can be a valid form of protest vote. We did not get any complaints this year, and due to an anonymous vote we can't follow up with the voters who voted empty.

Message at 18:45 from **courtneyc[m]:** What percent of the votes are those 23?

Note: There were 1971 voters, and 740 votes cast. 1% of voters or 3% of votes

Message at 18:45 from **arnalie:** my personal opinion would be, and it would be an unpopular one, is to explore other platforms. CiviCRM has failed us twice in a row now.

Note: The platform needs to accomodate our active mapper membership, it needs to be customizable to the point of making custom api calls during sign up or renewal.

Message at 18:45 from **courtneyc[m]:** And those are just votes that weren't successful? Do ywe have anyway to track how many people received a notice that they were not allowed to vote, even though they were eligible? That is what happened to me.

Note: Courtney probably refers to people who got a message that they are a new member of the OSMF, that they joined in the last 90 days and that they are not yet eligible to vote. It is possible to some extent, going through each of those memberships manually and interpreting the activity log.

Message at 18:48 from **courtneyc[m]:** 740 ballots sent in, correct? Do we have a count of # of incorrect "you are not eligible to vote" notices that were sent?

Note: We do have a count of how many reached out to us correctly and got a ballot afterwards: 18. Mails sent to people who appeared as new members in the last 90 days in the register: 122

Message at 18:50 from **mvineetmenon:** @courtneyc, what are the reasons for not allowing a member to vote?

Note: There are two reasons: One, if the member is in arrears with renewal. We require that the member is fully paid up by the time of the AGM. For active contributors, this still means they need to renew, an action they need to actively take, even if they fulfil all conditions. Two is for new members, members who joined or rejoined the foundation in the last 90 days are also excluded. This was

put in place to give enough time to investigate hostile takeover attempts right before the elections.

> Message at 18:50 from **James_E_A:** It would definitely be interesting to get as much data on this as possible when it comes to looking into how to revamp the voting system for next time. The specific datapoint of how many false ineligibilty notices were sent seems important

Note: This comment seems to conflate the voting system with the membership register. Those two systems can be evaluated and changed independently.

> Message at 18:50 from **courtneyc[m]:** Hi - I got a notice that said I wasn't elibible. But I was eligible. So, I asked the membership committee and they corrected it. But how many other people got an incorrect notice like that? They might not know to question it. We shoul d be able to know that numbers. What if it is statistically meaningful?

> Message at 18:51 from **courtneyc[m]:** Just b/c we corrected the ones that were flagged doesn't mean its fixed. How many were incorrect, that were not flagged?

> Message at 18:51 from **James_E_A:** dorothea, is that data currently available from the raw data download, or could it be made available?

Note: It is unclear what raw data is requested here. But in the context of checking for remaining errors in the register, the relevant data will include personal, private data. So it can not be made public. But we can have a group of volunteers, who will agree to keept the personal data private, inspect the register for more problem cases.

> Message at 18:51 from **amapanda:** (FYI I got also told my membership renewal had failed)

Note: Failing renewals were taken care of and corrected before the voting started.

> Message at 18:51 from **courtneyc[m]:** Right - so amapanda you knew that was wrong, so you probably emailed the membership committee too.

> Message at 18:51 from **courtneyc[m]:** But what if you didn't know it was wrong?

Note: This particular case would have been corrected anyway

> Message at 18:52 from **courtneyc[m]:** There must be a way to pull a report on who got inaccurate notices.

Note: Unfortunately, pulling is not an option, this requires hard manual work.

Message at 18:56 from **matkoniecz[m]:** Note that we already got external help to get CiviCRM more working.

Message at 18:56 from **courtneyc[m]:** This problem is a year in the making. How will it get handled if we do not hire someone?

Note: We did hire someone to write the custom plug in that does the verification of active mappers. We tried to get the original author to fix that particular problem which caused most of the late vote admissions this year. However, the contractor stopped responding at some point. We are in contact wiht another contractor, but this is now draging on as well.

Message at 18:58 from **courtneyc[m]:** So of that 1971 who were eligible, how many got an initial email that said they were not eligible. This should not be hard to discover.

Note: Indeed we kept notes. However, this is still took an hour or two to go through all the notes to get the number, see note above for the number.

Message at 19:01 from **SK53bis:** It seems to me that the issue might be whether OSMF is keeping to the terms of the Companies Acts wrt maintaining a list of members. Can I go to St John Innovation Centre and view the current list? Note this does not apply to 'associate' and 'actie contributor' memberships which aren't coverde by the legislation.

Note: The membership working group does have a process for such requests. Not many such requests were ever made. No visist in person is necessary. Members may see the list of associate members, but of course not share it to protect the privacy of associate members.

Message at 19:01 from **James_E_A:** ceyu It was brought up during the meeting, before the votes were closed.

Note: No, this was brought up here after the voting was closed and after the results were announced.

Message at 19:01 from **courtneyc[m]:** It's a data management problem.

Note: More specifically it is a problem with custom software required by our unique membership payment rules.

Message at 19:04 from **drolbr:** We do have the data in principle. I've a pile pf Paypal reciepts for people that have paid. Mappers with 42 days can be found from the map data except that they might have need to request membership. Everybody else is in a circular.

Note: As far as we know, all paid memberships were fixed. As stated, there is the bank statement. We could identify potentially missing renewals and had only few cases that turned out to be actually missin transactions in agreement with the bank statement. The active contributor plugin on the other side needs lots of manual work and lacks an independent source like the bank statement.

Message at 19:06 from **courtneyc[m]:** drolbr: If you don't know you got a notice in error, you don't know to complain.

Note: The notice does clearly state the reason being a new member in the last 90 days. It is quite obvious that that is not true because those members are members for at least one year.

Message at 19:09 from **drolbr:** There is definitely benefit in having a proper report. In my understanding the actual question in the room is whether CiviCRM has a log of sent email.

Note: Some sent mails are recorded, others are not. It varies by type of mail. The ineligibility notice for example is recorded.

Message at 19:10 from **courtneyc[m]:** As well, it is amazing that Arnalie was so good at messaging about this. But as someone who. has studied the channel data I can tell you that many many people do not see the messages that go out on the listserv

Note: The messages informing affected members were sent the same way voting or ineligibility messages are sent. There should be no difference. If they did not see the info, they would also not even see the voting mail. The member choose their email provider, we can not influence that.

Message at 19:14 from **das-g[m]:** How does such a non-eligibility notice look? Does it include the reason(s) of why one is not eligible? Does it state where to intervene if one deems the assessment false?

Note: It does include the reason. It did not include a sentence where to intervene unfortunately. However, simply replying to the mail will reach the membership working group and the address membership@osmfoundation.org looks reasonable.

Message at 19:18 from **Nakaner2:** aye * 8

Note: Just for the record: There was a public viewing of the election at the Karlsruhe hack weekend, and there were that many members present, who were not themselfs logged in to irc like me, and who raised their hand to adjourn. Ceju likely missed the announcement by Nakaner2 that many members are participating via his session.

General remark: The possibility of human error can not be completely elim-

inated. Therefore, we employ a system that needs two people for an error to go uncorrected. The membership working group on one side, and the member on the other. Each member gets informed that there will be a confirmation mail. And the mail lists the details. But the member needs to do her or his duty and check it. Only that way we can have a reliable system