

What Kinds of ‘Content’ Do Grantees Produce?

What kinds of risks or opportunities arise from sharing them?

Content Types	Opportunities?	Risks?
budgets	justifying expenses better, more clearly up front	actual costs may look negative for new ideas, raising sensitive issues, routine, time sensitive, could force out of pocket spending
toolkits		used w/out sources
website content	sharing	no sources for programs, resources, papers
video / film		
informational/instructional manuals		
grant applications	orgs could see both good and bad examples	increased competitiveness (if seeing other applications in process)
opinion polls		may show results against project data, influence impressions, open to misinterpretation
displays and expos		
process / model		
research articles	general growth for entire movements	data may be hard to publish in the future (in journals or other places that have different rules)
evaluation / outcome reports	helps call out what didn't work (= more valuable learning)	sometimes won't look like they should (things went wrong/reputational risk)
networks / connections		
best practices		

certification programs		(content) stolen, or used for moneymaking activities later when not the creator
posters / presentations		
final reports		
data / databases	useful for all, via http, best in useful formats, useful if correctly formatted	PDF formats don't contribute, data may include participant data, need to be redacted
campaign ideas	content useful to replicate success	(if overused, dissipates impact)
apps / code		(how does it impact) commercial purposes?
workshops / contact info		
photos (including youth)		privacy, general media releases may not apply
arts, opera, art productions		
any knowledge product		
curriculum	educational content of any sort useful	
training manuals		
partnership models		sensitive relationships
employment design		
ideas themselves		
strategy		other groups copy good ideas & fundraising hooks (that reduce capacity in the originator)
events		
stories		
committee feedback		criticisms
jargon / acronyms		

Deeper Dive:

What other kinds of risks or opportunities arise from sharing these types of content?

Opportunities?		Risks?
no more reinventing the wheel		loss of bragging rights for creators
consistency (eg. Budgets)		all \$ asks the same - "Ask Inflation"
transparency		not liking being called out on issues (like budget justification)
explore new questions without collecting new data		loss of attribution - "WE did that!" Can affect reputation, future funding
saves resources, time, effort		afraid of getting 'scooped' while in-process
peer accountability		forced collaboration
fraud prevention		coalition destruction / tensions
sharing struggles, getting support		less applications (good and bad)
create critical mass for change		legal issues (privacy & research participation)
contribution to common good - shift mindset		loss of economic opportunities
coalition building		things used for slander / inappropriate uses
learning what doesn't get funded		plagiarism
help to create good/quality applications		possible impacts trying to cultivate social enterprise
product improvement		appropriated by others
sense of community		

How might this sharing activity impact Vancouver Foundation?

What could some of the unintended outcomes be?

at front end, of misconception of privacy rules		privacy issues go to VF
improved reputation of VF as thought leader		legal responsibilities
achieving VF strategic objectives		if publication kills economic reputation & other opportunities for grantees
more exposure for grantee projects, more exposure to donations		
changing the way the system works overall	<-->	other foundations feel pushed to participate, regardless of feeling prepared
improving final outcomes of projects would improve the VF reputation		don't want names associated with comments - would be bad for community volunteers
VF seen as the place to go for networks		some orgs with fewer competencies would have no hope against people able to use the system
boost for our mission		
more grant applications	opportunity to boost capacity?	don't want to raise the bar too high, or create 'higher and higher' expectations re: 'polish' - concept vs polish
boost to fundraising		
how it is used to build capacity		orgs look more intentionally at how the system works
applicants understand what SI looks like		

Avoiding issues...

- Provide clear criteria before people apply, manage expectations
- DON'T go halfway - it's there with few exceptions or not at all
- Flexibility based on grantee needs
- Boost awareness of copyright issues and attribution requirements in advance
- Consider fees paid to ideators/creators?
- Ensuring data anonymity / permissions
- Aggregate sharing - eg. struggles and feedback collections
- Embargoes if: economic benefit impact, offer of extra time or flexibility on requirement, help build coalitions
- Commitment by Vancouver Foundation to promote this to other foundations
- Develop risk management plan, internal conversation and unintended consequences plans, assess likelihood of issues, decide if it is worth managing, anticipate what can go wrong
- Recognize this may be another shift of power to foundations away from grantees
- Go in with eyes wide open, engage all critical voices and work with them eg. youth
- Assess how long material is valid, how soon it must go up
- No good without curation, site management

What Could Be Possible in the best case?

- Reach granting nirvana
- True accountability through transparency
 - Reduced competition
 - Reduction of unnecessary applications
- More honesty / things are public
 - Current process encourages status quo, it's okay if things don't work
 - Leads to better products (good kind of collaboration and competition)
- More focus of resources on core problem resolution other than tasks
- Use vs creating (over again)
- Reduction of reproducing, allows building on past and present
- Breaking info silos
- Community utopia
- Improved collaboration, see similar goals
- See what each other are doing, help partnership building
- Blind spots getting illuminated

- Change how we think about community, cross boundaries

What is most important for Vancouver Foundation to hear?

- Make sure you use this concept to promote the work of grantees - best practices of together
- Stay cognizant of how it impacts ability to stand out
- Great idea, whatever the boundaries, it's on the right track
- Consider implications
- Just do it
- Great opportunity to improve grantmaking process and capacities
- Ox with ruffled feathers
- Big, bold, progressive, there are risks too
- Ensure grantees to know that Advisory Committee has been consulted, that this is unfolding thoughtfully
- Innovative - data creators will want control, get buy in from data holders
- Longest applications, finest writers don't always have the best ideas
- Needs considerable support / mediation
- Awesome, AND make space at the table
- Don't be scared of naysayers for good prospects



Vancouver Foundation, 2016

© 2016 by the Vancouver Foundation. *Open Licensing Dialogue – AC Notes* is made available under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>