

project-based funding - yea or nay?

1) What's been said?

“Move towards project-based funding rather than workgroup-based. Workgroups would still exist, and could still meet if they want; and the workgroups that someone is part of would be their network, their foundation, their family, or however you want to put it - but workgroups wouldn't have any budget per se. They would be a place to plan 6-month projects that people want to do.”

*“Introduce a quarterly, theme-based **Cycles** where all workgroups retain autonomy but commit a defined portion of capacity to jointly improve the Ambassador Program's core governance capabilities.”*

“Project Based - Voted projects which are impactful , based on our techstack , and can act as a service.”

“If funding was more project-based on a quarterly or 6 month cadence, and less focused on maintaining WGs that are not delivering anything meaningful, we could probably pay better rates.”

2) Pros, cons, and questions

- Would we lose the “culture” that has been built up in the different WGs and Guilds? Or is that well established enough now, so that it would survive?
 - How would we manage (and pay for) program-wide systems stuff like treasury, recordkeeping, etc? And for admin tasks like project management?
 - Should we assign **all** our funding (apart from maintaining systems) to projects, or use some of it to keep funding WGs too? To do what?
 - How long should projects be, how often should we select? Quarterly, half-yearly, annually?
 - How should we decide which projects to fund each Quarter (or half year, or year)? It's easy to jump to majority voting, but is that the best way?
 - What roles would we need in managing projects, documenting them, and other admin?
 - What happens to people who are not part of any current project? And how do they maintain Core Contributor status?
 - How do we manage quality control? Is there a place for mentorship in our budgeting?
- (These last 2 feel like bigger topics - maybe we have a whole session on each of them)