

### **What is this document?**

This document provides some background information to assist the Burning Seed community members make an informed decision about the kind of entity (or entities) that they would like to run Burning Seed in the future. To that end, the document outlines how other regional Burns structure their organisations

Please note that this document does not provide background information on all aspects of the restructure, just those for which data was readily available, and which are particularly significant. The community consultation to support the restructure is canvassing a much wider range of issues than those raised in this document, and readers are advised to conduct additional research on the relevant issues.

### **How was this document developed?**

This document was compiled by the committee that is overseeing the process for the restructure. This committee (also known as the 'restructure committee' or RC) conducted a survey with other regional events to inform our understanding of how the organisations of other regional Burns operate.

### **How should the information below be interpreted?**

That is entirely up to you. The discussion below may inform your opinion about what is the best model for the Burning Seed organisation. It may prompt you to think about other ideas for the Burning Seed organisation that may not have been raised already. It may give you a 'baseline' or point of comparison to allow you to think about how you would like the organisation to be run. Alternatively, the information below might just be nice for you to know, without having any real impact. The use and interpretation is your call.

### **What do other regional burns do?**

We surveyed 16 regional Burns – 10 from the USA, 2 from Canada, and 4 from other countries. On average, these Burns had been in existence for 10 years, and had an average population of 1,750 (including children).

Responses from Burns can be grouped around the following categories:

- Governance and appointment processes
- Transparency
- Community input

Responses under these categories are provided below.

#### *Governance and appointment processes*

In terms of overall governance arrangements, Burns most commonly used a not-for-profit as their legal structure. Of the survey participants, 11 operated as some kind of non-profit in their country, 4 operated as a private company, while 1 was not incorporated in any way. On average, these Burns had operated under these structures for 7 years.

In terms of appointment processes, responses can be divided into two. On one hand are responses that related to appointment of team leads. On the other are responses that related to appointment of members of the management committees.

Most commonly, new team leads were appointed by current members of the organisation – either the management committee, or team leads, or both. For five Burns, new team leads were appointed by the management committee in conjunction with current team leads. Team leads at 4 other Burns were appointed by the management committee only, without input from current team leads. For 3 Burns, new team leads were appointed by the currently sitting team leads.

In terms of appointment of management committees, 8 Burns appointed their members following a community election process. For a further 6, new members were appointed by the current management committee, with one of these Burns working with the current team leads to appoint the management committee. The remaining 2 Burns did not have a management committee.

Only four of the 16 Burns placed term limits on the management committee membership, with the average number of years being 3.5.

Finally, Burns provided insight into methods for defining voting membership (as part of election processes). These responses varied significantly. Seven Burns decided membership based on self-nomination (i.e. 'opting in') via an email list, discussion forum, or attendance at a regular meeting. For 2 Burns, membership was provided to people with the purchase of a ticket to the event. One Burn asked for a nominal fee for membership. The remaining Burns did not run election processes.

### *Transparency*

The Burns that we surveyed demonstrated a mixed attitude about the kinds of documents that they made public. Half of the Burns (8) did not make organisational documents publicly available, while the remainder did provide this information in some way. These documents were typically limited to by-laws and constitutions. No additional information on transparency was available.

### *Community input*

Burns used a wide variety of mechanisms for gathering community input, with all of them using multiple methods. The most common methods were Town Halls (15 Burns used this mechanism) and online discussion boards (14 Burns). Online surveys (12) and email lists (12) were also popular. Less commonly, Burns employed special committees to gauge community input (8), or used formal facilitation mechanisms such as Direct Democracy (3).

Burns most commonly sought community input on significant matters that affected the community directly. This included (but wasn't limited to) major policy changes, event locations, ticket prices, consent policies, changes in legal documents (i.e. by-laws), and what projects to fund.