Disinfo Team Process and Documentation Brainstorm Doc

Overall:

Process: How might we organize, assign out, track, and incorporate documentation work from folks on the disinfo team?

- Organizing/prioritizing documentation and process work to be done
  - Currently: Operational Kanban in the Disinfo GitHub
    - Tag with process and documentation
  - Do we want to set up a public repo/kanban board or farm it out to people?
    - Having people transcribe the video conversations with technical folks
- Should everyone who is contributing documentation to the Big Book have access to the GitHub to be able to see the kanban and work directly from there or should there be a process of a core team assigning tasks out and tracking it?
  - Are there implications for access controls to other aspects of the Disinfo GitHub?
  - Preference for keeping small at first
- Implementing access controls and/or process for our important tools, docs and Drives:
  - CTI_Disinfo_Team Google Drive
    - 40 email accounts with Editor access on the CTI_Disinfo_Team Drive
  - BigBook:
    - Had 130 email accounts with Editor access on the BigBook (a few are duplicates). In terms of both process and security it makes me nervous that we have so many people who can make changes as editors.
    - Should there be a core team of 5-10 people who have edit access, with all other contributors having access as "Commenter" to suggest changes that have to be accepted by the editors? Or have folks work from another doc and submit for approval? My preference would be for moving most people to "Commenter" access.
      - Update: Everyone in triage channel is editor, everyone else is commenter

Decision-making and governance:
BigBook 3.3 says "Anybody in the disinformation team can start an incident, but the group decides what it reports on." This makes sense to me. It also forces the larger question about decision-making in the group and at what point something requires more than 1 person to move forward. A few examples are listed in 3.5 but wanted to see if there was a need for further fleshing this out now.
- What does that decision-making process look like?

- Board is mentioned but not yet listed as far as I know (maybe replace with triage team)
  - How many people?
  - Just disinfo team folks?
- Decision-making:
  - consensus, modified consensus, 50% +1?
  - How much time between posting a vote w/ @channel to moving forward?
  - Quorum?
  - Proposal: Channel message in slack, with simple majority and [Name Redacted] holding final veto?
    - If so, need to decide whether it's the managers channel or the triage channel
- Things that require more than 1 person:
  - BB 3.5: "No report goes out without at least 2 people beyond the editor going over it"

These criteria for "Is this an incident we should track" (i.e., whether something is in scope) from BB 3.3 seem like a good jumping-off place. Is there anything we want to add?
- "We don't track incidents for fun or interest. We track the ones that we have a reasonable chance of doing something useful about
- We also track and counter incidents that we believe give us the best chance of a positive effect, and in the Covid19 deployment, ideally one that impacts health.
- Yes health. We prioritise that over other incidents, although we will include disinformation around current events where they impact populations."

What do we do when Google Docs become too unwieldy?

Creative Commons for all things in Big Book
Anything we don't make is cited or adapted from with a shoutout

Give people credit within the group to keep it going

In the Big Book itself:

In Operational Kanban
- Add "What is the AMITT Framework and How do we use it to combat Disinfo" Explainer to BigBook #41 We mention AMITT and link to GitHub several times but never give a quick overview of what it is or exactly how it helps/why we use it.
- Flesh out "Disinformation" section of BB with subsections (Section 2)
-

Matters of style:
- Adding links within the Big Book through Bookmarks/ToC (in process)
- Linking out to relevant outside sources

- Many relevant sites are mentioned but not linked to. Should we add links as we see these or was it a conscious decision not to link?