COOLEY LLP
MICHAEL G. RHODES (116127) (rhodesmg@cooley.com)
PATRICK P. GUNN (172258) (pgunn@cooley.com)
DYLAN R. HALE (240898) (dhale@cooley.com)
RAY A. SARDO (245421) (rsardo@cooley.com)
101 California Street, 5th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111-5800
Telephone: (415) 693-2000
Facsimile: (415) 693-2222

Attorneys for Plaintiff
WIKIMEDIA FOUNDATION, INC.

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

UNLIMITED JURISDICTION

WIKIMEDIA FOUNDATION, INC., Plaintiff, v. INTERNET BRANDS, INC., Defendant.	No. CGC-12-523971 **FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT**

Comes now, Plaintiff WIKIMEDIA FOUNDATION, INC. ("WIKIMEDIA"), and alleges as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1.   WIKIMEDIA filed this action to prevent defendant Internet Brands, Inc. ("IB") from taking actions designed to impede and suppress WIKIMEDIA's core mission: to empower and engage people around the world to collect and develop educational content under a free license or in the public domain, to disseminate it effectively and globally, and to keep such content available on the internet free of charge, in perpetuity.

2.   WIKIMEDIA is a nonprofit organization founded in San Francisco and funded primarily through small donations from individuals. Among other things, WIKIMEDIA owns,

1.

operates and promotes the development of "wikis," which as described further below are internet based collaborative reference projects.

3.   WIKIMEDIA has also developed (and offers for free) an open source software package called MediaWiki which allows anyone a platform to enable users anywhere to develop and disseminate content. By creating MediaWiki and licensing it free of charge, WIKIMEDIA supports the wiki movement and thereby promotes the free and unrestricted sharing of information by volunteers throughout the world.

PARTIES

4.   Plaintiff WIKIMEDIA is a Florida nonprofit corporation with its principal place of business at 149 New Montgomery Street, 3rd Floor, San Francisco, California 94105.

5.   WIKIMEDIA is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that defendant IB is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business at 909 Sepulveda Boulevard, 11th Floor, El Segundo, California, 90245. WIKIMEDIA is further informed and believes and on that basis alleges that IB began as the owner and operator of a commercial website devoted to the sale of new and used cars (CarsDirect.com). After several years of aggressive growth, IB now claims to own over 100 websites, each of which is a leader in "high value vertical markets." Private Equity firm Hellman & Friedman Capital Partners recently purchased IB for $640 million.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

6.   WIKIMEDIA is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that, at all times relevant to the dispute referenced in this Complaint, IB was and is doing business in the County of San Francisco, in the State of California.

7.   At all times relevant to the dispute referenced in this Complaint, WIKIMEDIA was and is doing business in the County of San Francisco, in the State of California.

8.   As a result, this Court has jurisdiction over the parties herein, and venue is proper in the County of San Francisco pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 395.5.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

9. A "wiki" is a website that allows its users to add, modify or delete its content via a web browser. The largest wiki in the world is WIKIMEDIA's Wikipedia, a free online encyclopedia with over 22 million articles and 100,000 active contributors.

10. In or about July 2003, Evan Prodromou and Michele Ann Jenkins registered the internet domain name www.wikitravel.org and created Wikitravel, a wiki aimed at creating a free, non-commercial and reliable worldwide guide to travel and tourism. Wikitravel operates much like other wikis in that members of the public are permitted and encouraged to review and edit existing content, as well as author entirely new material and post it to the site. That content is then edited, updated, modified and curated by volunteer administrators (most of whom are also authors) who donate their time to ensure the integrity of Wikitravel's contents. The administrators also ensure that Wikitravel is operating in accordance with website rules, including preventing spam or off topic, inappropriate material from appearing on the website.

11. Since its creation, and at all relevant times thereafter, the Wikitravel website has run on WIKIMEDIA's free open-source software MediaWiki.

12. Since its creation, and at all relevant times thereafter, all contributions to Wikitravel have been licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike License ("CC License"). Pursuant to the CC License, everyone who submits or edits content gives others the right to copy, distribute, sell, or modify that content in any manner they desire. The primary restrictions are that anyone who distributes the content, or derives new work from it, must (1) give proper attribution to the author; and (2) retain the work and any derivative works under the same open licensing terms. This means that so long as the author is credited, anyone can copy, publish, distribute, or modify content for any purpose, commercial or non-commercial. A true and correct copy of the CC License is attached hereto as Exhibit A and incorporated herein by reference as though set forth in full.

13. In light of the CC License, content submitted or edited by volunteer authors or administrators has never been owned by the owners of the Wikitravel website.

14. WIKIMEDIA is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that in or about 2005, IB purchased the Wikitravel internet domain name (www.wikitravel.org), the "Wikitravel" name, and servers used to operate the website from Evan Prodromou and Michele Ann Jenkins.

15. IB did not acquire any property rights or interests with respect to volunteer authors and administrators who create, curate, and edit the content which makes up the Wikitravel website.

16. IB did not purchase the content on the Wikitravel website, since, pursuant to the CC License, all such content is free to be copied, distributed, or sold by anyone who wishes to do so subject only to the attribution and re-use obligations expressed therein.

17. WIKIMEDIA is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that after assuming control of Wikitravel, IB operated the site in a manner that alienated and upset many of the volunteer authors and administrators. To extract maximum commercial benefit from the site's free content, IB began displaying intrusive commercial advertisements on the site, something that had not been done prior to IB's purchase, and something which ran afoul of the aesthetics of some of the most active volunteer authors and administrators of Wikitravel.

18. WIKIMEDIA is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that many of Wikitravel's administrators, authors, and users were disenchanted with IB's private ownership, preferring ownership by a non-commercial association. As a commercial actor motivated to produce profits for its shareholders, IB operated the Wikitravel website in a manner that became viewed as contrary to core values of the volunteer administrators who were concerned that the display of advertisements would undermine the website's neutrality and impede its community centric mission.

19. Eventually, on or about December 10, 2006, a group of volunteer administrators, authors, and users split from Wikitravel and formed another wiki travel site called Wikivoyage. Wikivoyage initially populated its new website with nearly all of the German-language content from Wikitravel pursuant to the CC License, which permitted such use. Approximately one year

//

later, an Italian branch of Wikivoyage was created, again copying content from the Wikitravel website.

20. Wikivoyage is not currently affiliated with WIKIMEDIA or IB.

21. Despite the departure of a substantial number of volunteer administrators to Wikivoyage, many administrators remained at Wikitravel and continued to donate their time which resulted in the continued viability of the Wikitravel website.

22. Over the ensuing years (representing the time period of approximately 2006 to 2012), some of the remaining volunteer administrators of Wikitravel became increasingly dissatisfied with IB's operation of Wikitravel. Their concerns primarily centered around two issues: (1) lack of support and website maintenance by IB (including failure to address bug reports, lack of new features, and failure to run and support the most recent versions of MediaWiki); and (2) the perception that IB was excessively focused on "monetizing" the content of the Wikitravel website – content which was the product of thousands of hours of uncompensated volunteer effort.

23. Several of the volunteer administrators felt that the best course of action was to create a new travel wiki, much like the administrators who left for Wikivoyage had done years earlier.

24. On or about March 15, 2012, James Heilman contacted WIKIMEDIA about the possible creation of a new WIKIMEDIA owned wiki site dedicated to travel.

25. In or about April 2012, the WIKIMEDIA community began a process called a request for comment ("RFC") to gauge overall community interest and support in expanding the WIKIMEDIA owned family of websites to include a new site dedicated to travel.

26. The RFC created by the users stated: "That we as the Wikimedia community ask the Wikimedia Foundation to approve a Travel Guide project and allocate resources to support any technical aspects of starting this new project. The project would combine efforts of free knowledge travel sites, some of which (e.g., Wikivoyage) want to migrate completely with their content and communities to the new travel guide project and others (e.g. Wikitravel) whose

community of editors wish to join the Wikimedia movement." A true and correct copy of this RFC is attached hereto as Exhibit B and incorporated herein by reference as though set forth in full.

27. The RFC asked members of the wiki community to comment on the proposal and indicate whether or not they supported the proposal.

28. In or about June 2012, Wikivoyage's general assembly unanimously and independently supported a resolution to fold in its content and resources into the proposed WIKIMEDIA site if and when created.

29. In or about June 2012, IB contacted WIKIMEDIA and proposed creating a new travel-oriented wiki that could be jointly run as a "semi for profit" company with WIKIMEDIA. WIKIMEDIA declined because operating such a commercial wiki project is contrary to its mission of disseminating free information. WIKIMEDIA is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that IB made this overture to stave off the "forking" of its Wikitravel website – if it could induce WIKIMEDIA to join forces with it in the creation of a new travel site, IB could forestall the feared loss of Wikitravel community volunteers to the new site that was then under discussion. Given its mission and charter, WIKIMEDIA had no interest in forming a "semi for profit" joint venture of any kind with IB and, rather, referred the matter to its community of users under the RFC process so that the community could speak its mind and provide direction and input to WIKIMEDIA.

30. On or about July 13, 2012, the Board of Directors of WIKIMEDIA requested that the community consider extending the RFC for an additional six weeks to ensure that all interested stakeholders had an opportunity to comment, including IB.

31. On or about August 23, 2012, the RFC ended with 540 votes cast in favor of creating a travel wiki site and 152 votes cast against the proposal.

32. On or about August 28, 2012, in a transparent effort to derail the creation of a new WIKIMEDIA sponsored travel website, IB filed a lawsuit in Los Angeles Superior Court naming as defendants James Heilman and volunteer Wikitravel administrator, Ryan Holliday. *Internet*

Brands, Inc. v. William Ryan Holliday et al., No. YC07706 (Los Angeles Sup. Ct., Filed August 28, 2012).

33. IB's lawsuit seems an obvious attempt to intimidate both the personally named defendants, and other voluntary authors and administrators, by subjecting them to the prohibitive cost of defending a lawsuit. IB apparently hopes that this tactic will intimidate other volunteers and thus prevent creation of a new, non-commercial travel site supported by WIKIMEDIA.

34. While IB's Los Angeles lawsuit does not expressly name WIKIMEDIA as a defendant, the complaint contains many implicit references to WIKIMEDIA and its involvement in what the complaint refers to as a "civil conspiracy" surrounding the events and circumstances pertaining to the proposed creation of a new travel wiki and the potentiality that freely usable content and the volunteer administrators of the Wikitravel website owned by IB might ultimately prefer the less-commercial travel site under consideration. For example, IB alleges (in paragraph 35 of its complaint) that "defendants Heilman and Holliday have not acted alone. Further investigation continues to reveal additional co-conspirators and additional tortious and improper conduct. Additional defendants and causes of action are expected through amendment, potentially including... the Wikimedia Foundation, [and] members of its Board, or other individual members of the Foundation...." Elsewhere in the complaint (*e.g.*, paragraph 31) IB reveals its lawsuit's purpose as trying to forestall what it perceives as an effort by volunteer authors and administrators to "migrat[e]" the "content and traffic" of Wikitravel to the proposed new wiki travel site.

35. Notwithstanding IB's threats (including, without limitation, statements made directly to WIKIMEDIA by IB prior to the closing of the RFC period) and litigation against individual Wikitravel volunteer authors and administrators, WIKIMEDIA plans to move forward with the launch of a new wiki website offering free user generated travel content, some of which may be copied from the Wikitravel website consistent with the express provisions of the CC License. WIKIMEDIA will offer any such content in compliance with the CC License without charge and without limitation on its republication pursuant to the terms of such license and its

core mission and charter.

36. WIKIMEDIA is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that, by virtue of the totality of conduct, acts and statements made directly to WIKIMEDIA and volunteer authors and administrators of Wikitravel and Wikivoyage, IB contends that WIKIMEDIA's plan to create and host a new wiki website devoted to travel, and its communications with Wikitravel's volunteer authors and administrators concerning this plan, constitutes unlawful and/or wrongful actions. WIKIMEDIA denies that its actions are unlawful and/or wrongful and instead alleges that it has carefully directed the discussion about the creation of a new travel wiki in accordance with the permissions, entitlements, and rights afforded under the licenses underlying the existing sites of Wikitravel and Wikivoyage. WIKIMEDIA is committed to fostering the growth, development, and distribution of free multilingual content, including travel content. Now, therefore, it seeks a judicial declaration that it may continue its mission by pursuing the creation of a new travel wiki without intimidation or interference from IB, whether directed against WIKIMEDIA or against individual volunteers who do not posses the financial means to fully and fairly defend themselves.

<center>FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION</center>

<center>(Declaratory Judgment)</center>

37. WIKIMEDIA incorporates by reference each of the allegations in paragraphs 1 through 36 of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

38. An actual and justiciable controversy has arisen and now exists between WIKIMEDIA and IB concerning their respective rights and duties under the CC License. WIKIMEDIA contends that under the terms of the CC License, IB may not restrict the use, reproduction, sale, or modification of content on the Wikitravel website in any manner other than requiring attribution to the creator of the content and that the content be maintained under the same licensing terms.

39. WIKIMEDIA seeks a judicial determination that IB has no lawful right, title or interest under the CC License to prevent use of such content created by volunteer users and

administrators on the Wikitravel website. Specifically, WIKIMEDIA desires a judicial determination that IB has no right to limit or prevent the copying of user created content on the Wikitravel website and that all such content may be freely migrated without interference from IB under the express terms of the license under which such content was created and uploaded. WIKIMEDIA is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that IB disputes WIKIMEDIA's position, and contends it has the right to limit or prevent such use.

40. WIKIMEDIA also seeks a judicial determination that IB has no lawful right to prevent authors, administrators or other individuals who have posted or who are posting content on IB's Wikitravel site from freely contributing content to a new WIKIMEDIA owned travel website. WIKIMEDIA is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that IB disputes WIKIMEDIA's position, and contends it has the right to limit or prevent such conduct.

41. WIKIMEDIA further seeks a judicial determination that it may create, freely own and operate a website which contains any or all content created by volunteer authors and administrators which is or has been hosted on the Wikitravel website, as has been publicly announced under the RFC process described herein above. WIKIMEDIA is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that IB disputes WIKIMEDIA's position, and contends it has the right to limit or prevent WIKIMEDIA from owning or operating such a website.

42. WIKIMEDIA seeks a judicial determination that it may contact, communicate with, or express support for persons who are or were authors and administrators of the Wikitravel website and who are seeking to participate in a new WIKIMDIA owned website, potentially copy Wikitravel content and migrate it to a WIKIMEDIA owned site, even if such contact, communication, or support results in the volunteer authors and administrators no longer providing volunteer services to Wikitravel. WIKIMEDIA is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that IB disputes WIKIMEDIA's position, and contends that WIKIMEDIA has no right to contact, communicate with, encourage or express support for such persons.

43. WIKIMEDIA further seeks a judicial determination that it may assist persons, including current or former volunteer authors and editors of Wikitravel, in copying and migrating content from the Wikitravel website to a WIKIMEDIA owned site or third party site in accordance with the CC License. WIKIMEDIA is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that IB disputes WIKIMEDIA's position, and contends that WIKIMEDIA may not assist in the copying or migration of content from the Wikitravel website to any other website.

44. A judicial declaration is necessary and appropriate at this time under the circumstances.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

45. WHEREFORE, Plaintiff WIKIMEDIA FOUNDATION, INC. prays for the following relief:

46. For declaratory judgment finding that IB has no right to limit the use of user created content on the Wikitravel website and that all such content may be freely migrated without interference from IB under the express terms of the license under which such content was created and uploaded;

47. For declaratory judgment finding that IB has no lawful right to prevent authors, administrators or other individuals who have posted or who are posting content on IB's Wikitravel site from freely contributing content to a new WIKIMEDIA owned travel website;

48. For declaratory judgment finding that WIKIMEDIA may own and operate a website which contains any or all content created by volunteer authors and administrators which is or has been hosted on the Wikitravel website, as has been publicly announced under the RFC process described herein above;

49. For declaratory judgment finding that WIKIMEDIA may contact, communicate with, or express support for persons who are or were volunteer authors and administrators of the Wikitravel website and who are seeking to participate in a new WIKIMEDIA owned website, potentially copy Wikitravel content and migrate it to a WIKIMEDIA owned site, even if such contact, communication, or support results in the volunteer authors and administrators no longer

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT; CASE NO. CGC-12-523971

providing volunteer services to Wikitravel;

50. For declaratory judgment finding that WIKIMEDIA may assist persons, including current or former volunteer authors and editors of Wikitravel, in copying and migrating content from the Wikitravel website to a WIKIMEDIA site or third party site;

51. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs to the full extent permitted by law on equity and such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: September 13, 2012

COOLEY LLP
MICHAEL G. RHODES (116127)
PATRICK P. GUNN (172258)
DYLAN R. HALE (240898)
RAY A. SARDO (245421)

By: _____
                              Patrick P. Gunn

Attorneys for Plaintiff
WIKIMEDIA FOUNDATION, INC.

1285695/SF

COOLEY LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
SAN FRANCISCO

EXHIBIT A

Creative Commons Legal Code

Attribution-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported

License

THE WORK (AS DEFINED BELOW) IS PROVIDED UNDER THE TERMS OF THIS CREATIVE COMMONS PUBLIC LICENSE ("CCPL" OR "LICENSE"). THE WORK IS PROTECTED BY COPYRIGHT AND/OR OTHER APPLICABLE LAW. ANY USE OF THE WORK OTHER THAN AS AUTHORIZED UNDER THIS LICENSE OR COPYRIGHT LAW IS PROHIBITED.

BY EXERCISING ANY RIGHTS TO THE WORK PROVIDED HERE, YOU ACCEPT AND AGREE TO BE BOUND BY THE TERMS OF THIS LICENSE. TO THE EXTENT THIS LICENSE MAY BE CONSIDERED TO BE A CONTRACT, THE LICENSOR GRANTS YOU THE RIGHTS CONTAINED HERE IN CONSIDERATION OF YOUR ACCEPTANCE OF SUCH TERMS AND CONDITIONS.

1. Definitions

a. **"Adaptation"** means a work based upon the Work, or upon the Work and other pre-existing works, such as a translation, adaptation, derivative work, arrangement of music or other alterations of a literary or artistic work, or phonogram or performance and includes cinematographic adaptations or any other form in which the Work may be recast, transformed, or adapted including in any form recognizably derived from the original, except that a work that constitutes a Collection will not be considered an Adaptation for the purpose of this License. For the avoidance of doubt, where the Work is a musical work, performance or phonogram, the synchronization of the Work in timed-relation with a moving image ("synching") will be considered an Adaptation for the purpose of this License.

b. **"Collection"** means a collection of literary or artistic works, such as encyclopedias and anthologies, or performances, phonograms or broadcasts, or other works or subject matter other than works listed in Section 1(f) below, which, by reason of the selection and arrangement of their contents, constitute intellectual creations, in which the Work is included in its entirety in unmodified form along with one or more other contributions, each constituting separate and independent works in themselves, which together are assembled into a collective whole. A work that constitutes a Collection will not be considered an Adaptation (as defined below) for the purposes of this License.

c. **"Creative Commons Compatible License"** means a license that is listed at http://creativecommons.org/compatiblelicenses that has been approved by Creative Commons as being essentially equivalent to this License, including, at a minimum, because that license: (i) contains terms that have the same purpose, meaning and effect as the License Elements of this License; and, (ii) explicitly permits the relicensing of adaptations of works made available under that license under this License or a Creative Commons jurisdiction license with the same License Elements as this License.

d. **"Distribute"** means to make available to the public the original and copies of the Work or Adaptation, as appropriate, through sale or other transfer of ownership.

e. **"License Elements"** means the following high-level license attributes as selected by Licensor and indicated in the title of this License: Attribution, ShareAlike.

f. **"Licensor"** means the individual, individuals, entity or entities that offer(s) the Work under the terms of this License.

g. **"Original Author"** means, in the case of a literary or artistic work, the individual, individuals, entity or entities who created the Work or if no individual or entity can be identified, the publisher; and in addition (i) in the case of a performance the actors, singers, musicians, dancers, and other persons who act, sing, deliver, declaim, play in, interpret or otherwise perform literary or artistic works or expressions of folklore; (ii) in the case of a phonogram the producer being the person or legal entity who first fixes the sounds of a performance or other sounds; and, (iii) in the case of broadcasts, the organization that transmits the broadcast.

h. **"Work"** means the literary and/or artistic work offered under the terms of this License including without limitation any production in the literary, scientific and artistic domain, whatever may be the mode or form of its expression including digital form, such as a book, pamphlet and other writing; a lecture, address, sermon or other work of the same nature; a dramatic or dramatico-musical work; a choreographic work or entertainment in dumb show; a musical composition with or without words; a cinematographic work to which are assimilated works expressed by a process analogous to cinematography; a work of drawing, painting, architecture, sculpture, engraving or lithography; a photographic work to which are assimilated works expressed by a process analogous to photography; a work of applied art; an illustration, map, plan, sketch or three-dimensional work relative to geography, topography, architecture or science; a performance; a broadcast; a phonogram; a compilation of data to the extent it is protected as a copyrightable work; or a work performed by a variety or circus performer to the extent it is not otherwise considered a literary or artistic work.

i. **"You"** means an individual or entity exercising rights under this License who has not previously violated the terms of this License with respect to the Work, or who has received express permission from the Licensor to exercise rights under this License despite a previous violation.

j. **"Publicly Perform"** means to perform public recitations of the Work and to communicate to the public those public recitations, by any means or process, including by wire or wireless means or public digital performances; to make available to the public Works in such a way that members of the public may access these Works from a place and at a place individually chosen by them; to perform the Work to the public by any means or process and the communication to the public of the performances of the Work, including by public digital performance; to broadcast and rebroadcast the Work by any means including signs, sounds or images.

k. **"Reproduce"** means to make copies of the Work by any means including without limitation by sound or visual recordings and the right of fixation and reproducing fixations of the Work, including storage of a protected performance or phonogram in digital form or other electronic medium.

2. Fair Dealing Rights. Nothing in this License is intended to reduce, limit, or restrict any uses free from copyright or rights arising from limitations or exceptions that are provided for in connection with the copyright protection under copyright law or other applicable laws.

3. License Grant. Subject to the terms and conditions of this License, Licensor hereby grants You a worldwide, royalty-free, non-exclusive, perpetual (for the duration of the applicable copyright) license to exercise the rights in the Work as stated below:

a. to Reproduce the Work, to incorporate the Work into one or more Collections, and to Reproduce the Work as incorporated in the Collections;

b. to create and Reproduce Adaptations provided that any such Adaptation, including any translation in any medium, takes reasonable steps to clearly label, demarcate or otherwise identify that changes were made to the original Work. For example, a translation could be marked "The original work was translated from English to Spanish," or a modification could indicate "The original work has been modified.";

c. to Distribute and Publicly Perform the Work including as incorporated in Collections; and,

d. to Distribute and Publicly Perform Adaptations.

e. For the avoidance of doubt:

i. **Non-waivable Compulsory License Schemes.** In those jurisdictions in which the right to collect royalties through any statutory or compulsory licensing scheme cannot be waived, the Licensor reserves the exclusive right to collect such royalties for any exercise by You of the rights granted under this License;

ii. **Waivable Compulsory License Schemes.** In those jurisdictions in which the right to collect royalties through any statutory or compulsory licensing scheme can be waived, the Licensor waives the exclusive right to collect such royalties for any exercise by You of the rights granted under this License; and,

iii. **Voluntary License Schemes.** The Licensor waives the right to collect royalties, whether individually or, in the event that the Licensor is a member of a collecting society that administers voluntary licensing schemes, via that society, from any exercise by You of the rights granted under this License.

The above rights may be exercised in all media and formats whether now known or hereafter devised. The above rights include the right to make such modifications as are technically necessary to exercise the rights in other media and formats. Subject to Section 8(f), all rights not expressly granted by Licensor are hereby reserved.

4. Restrictions. The license granted in Section 3 above is expressly made subject to and limited by the following restrictions:

a. You may Distribute or Publicly Perform the Work only under the terms of this License. You must include a copy of, or the Uniform Resource Identifier (URI) for, this License with every copy of the Work You Distribute or Publicly Perform. You may not offer or impose any terms on the Work that restrict the terms of this License or the ability of the recipient of the Work to exercise the rights granted to that recipient under the terms of the License. You may not sublicense the Work. You must keep intact all notices that refer to this License and to the disclaimer of warranties with every copy of the Work You Distribute or Publicly Perform. When You Distribute or Publicly Perform the Work, You may not impose any effective technological measures on the Work that restrict the ability of a recipient of the Work from You to exercise the rights granted to that recipient under the terms of the License. This Section 4(a) applies to the Work as incorporated in a Collection, but this does not require the Collection apart from the Work itself to be made subject to the terms of this License. If You create a Collection, upon notice from any Licensor You must, to the extent practicable, remove from the Collection any credit as required by Section 4(c), as requested. If You create an Adaptation, upon notice from any Licensor You must, to the extent practicable, remove from the Adaptation any credit as required by Section 4(c), as requested.

b. You may Distribute or Publicly Perform an Adaptation only under the terms of: (i) this License; (ii) a later version of this License with the same License Elements as this License; (iii) a Creative Commons jurisdiction license (either this or a later license version) that contains the same License Elements as this License (e.g., Attribution-ShareAlike 3.0 US)); (iv) a Creative Commons Compatible License. If you license the Adaptation under one of the licenses mentioned in (iv), you must comply with the terms of that license. If you license the Adaptation under the terms of any of the licenses mentioned in (i), (ii) or (iii) (the "Applicable License"), you must comply with the terms of the Applicable License generally and the following provisions: (I) You must include a copy of, or the URI for, the Applicable License with every copy of each Adaptation You Distribute or Publicly Perform; (II) You may not offer or impose any terms on the Adaptation that restrict the terms of the Applicable License or the ability of the recipient of the Adaptation to exercise the rights granted to that recipient under the terms of the Applicable License; (III) You must keep intact all notices that refer to the Applicable License and to the disclaimer of warranties with every copy of the Work as included in the Adaptation You Distribute or Publicly Perform; (IV) when You Distribute or Publicly Perform the Adaptation, You may not impose any effective technological measures on the Adaptation that restrict the ability of a recipient of the Adaptation from You to exercise the rights granted to that recipient under the terms of the Applicable License. This Section 4(b) applies to the Adaptation as incorporated in a Collection, but this does not require the Collection apart from the Adaptation itself to be made subject to the terms of the Applicable License.

c. If You Distribute, or Publicly Perform the Work or any Adaptations or Collections, You must, unless a request has been made pursuant to Section 4(a), keep intact all copyright notices for the Work

and provide, reasonable to the medium or means You are utilizing: (i) the name of the Original Author (or pseudonym, if applicable) if supplied, and/or if the Original Author and/or Licensor designate another party or parties (e.g., a sponsor institute, publishing entity, journal) for attribution ("Attribution Parties") in Licensor's copyright notice, terms of service or by other reasonable means, the name of such party or parties; (ii) the title of the Work if supplied; (iii) to the extent reasonably practicable, the URI, if any, that Licensor specifies to be associated with the Work, unless such URI does not refer to the copyright notice or licensing information for the Work; and (iv) , consistent with Ssection 3(b), in the case of an Adaptation, a credit identifying the use of the Work in the Adaptation (e.g., "French translation of the Work by Original Author," or "Screenplay based on original Work by Original Author"). The credit required by this Section 4(c) may be implemented in any reasonable manner; provided, however, that in the case of a Adaptation or Collection, at a minimum such credit will appear, if a credit for all contributing authors of the Adaptation or Collection appears, then as part of these credits and in a manner at least as prominent as the credits for the other contributing authors. For the avoidance of doubt, You may only use the credit required by this Section for the purpose of attribution in the manner set out above and, by exercising Your rights under this License, You may not implicitly or explicitly assert or imply any connection with, sponsorship or endorsement by the Original Author, Licensor and/or Attribution Parties, as appropriate, of You or Your use of the Work, without the separate, express prior written permission of the Original Author, Licensor and/or Attribution Parties.

d. Except as otherwise agreed in writing by the Licensor or as may be otherwise permitted by applicable law, if You Reproduce, Distribute or Publicly Perform the Work either by itself or as part of any Adaptations or Collections, You must not distort, mutilate, modify or take other derogatory action in relation to the Work which would be prejudicial to the Original Author's honor or reputation. Licensor agrees that in those jurisdictions (e.g. Japan), in which any exercise of the right granted in Section 3(b) of this License (the right to make Adaptations) would be deemed to be a distortion, mutilation, modification or other derogatory action prejudicial to the Original Author's honor and reputation, the Licensor will waive or not assert, as appropriate, this Section, to the fullest extent permitted by the applicable national law, to enable You to reasonably exercise Your right under Section 3(b) of this License (right to make Adaptations) but not otherwise.

5. Representations, Warranties and Disclaimer

UNLESS OTHERWISE MUTUALLY AGREED TO BY THE PARTIES IN WRITING, LICENSOR OFFERS THE WORK AS-IS AND MAKES NO REPRESENTATIONS OR WARRANTIES OF ANY KIND CONCERNING THE WORK, EXPRESS, IMPLIED, STATUTORY OR OTHERWISE, INCLUDING, WITHOUT LIMITATION, WARRANTIES OF TITLE, MERCHANTIBILITY, FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE, NONINFRINGEMENT, OR THE ABSENCE OF LATENT OR OTHER DEFECTS, ACCURACY, OR THE PRESENCE OF ABSENCE OF ERRORS, WHETHER OR NOT DISCOVERABLE. SOME JURISDICTIONS DO NOT ALLOW THE EXCLUSION OF IMPLIED WARRANTIES, SO SUCH EXCLUSION MAY NOT APPLY TO YOU.

6. Limitation on Liability. EXCEPT TO THE EXTENT REQUIRED BY APPLICABLE LAW, IN NO EVENT WILL LICENSOR BE LIABLE TO YOU ON ANY LEGAL THEORY FOR ANY SPECIAL, INCIDENTAL, CONSEQUENTIAL, PUNITIVE OR EXEMPLARY DAMAGES ARISING OUT OF THIS LICENSE OR THE USE OF THE WORK, EVEN IF LICENSOR HAS BEEN ADVISED OF THE POSSIBILITY OF SUCH DAMAGES.

7. Termination

a. This License and the rights granted hereunder will terminate automatically upon any breach by You of the terms of this License. Individuals or entities who have received Adaptations or Collections from You under this License, however, will not have their licenses terminated provided such individuals or entities remain in full compliance with those licenses. Sections 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, and 8 will survive any termination of this License.

b. Subject to the above terms and conditions, the license granted here is perpetual (for the duration of the applicable copyright in the Work). Notwithstanding the above, Licensor reserves the right to release the Work under different license terms or to stop distributing the Work at any time;

provided, however that any such election will not serve to withdraw this License (or any other license that has been, or is required to be, granted under the terms of this License), and this License will continue in full force and effect unless terminated as stated above.

8. Miscellaneous

a. Each time You Distribute or Publicly Perform the Work or a Collection, the Licensor offers to the recipient a license to the Work on the same terms and conditions as the license granted to You under this License.

b. Each time You Distribute or Publicly Perform an Adaptation, Licensor offers to the recipient a license to the original Work on the same terms and conditions as the license granted to You under this License.

c. If any provision of this License is invalid or unenforceable under applicable law, it shall not affect the validity or enforceability of the remainder of the terms of this License, and without further action by the parties to this agreement, such provision shall be reformed to the minimum extent necessary to make such provision valid and enforceable.

d. No term or provision of this License shall be deemed waived and no breach consented to unless such waiver or consent shall be in writing and signed by the party to be charged with such waiver or consent.

e. This License constitutes the entire agreement between the parties with respect to the Work licensed here. There are no understandings, agreements or representations with respect to the Work not specified here. Licensor shall not be bound by any additional provisions that may appear in any communication from You. This License may not be modified without the mutual written agreement of the Licensor and You.

f. The rights granted under, and the subject matter referenced, in this License were drafted utilizing the terminology of the Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works (as amended on September 28, 1979), the Rome Convention of 1961, the WIPO Copyright Treaty of 1996, the WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty of 1996 and the Universal Copyright Convention (as revised on July 24, 1971). These rights and subject matter take effect in the relevant jurisdiction in which the License terms are sought to be enforced according to the corresponding provisions of the implementation of those treaty provisions in the applicable national law. If the standard suite of rights granted under applicable copyright law includes additional rights not granted under this License, such additional rights are deemed to be included in the License; this License is not intended to restrict the license of any rights under applicable law.

Creative Commons Notice

Creative Commons is not a party to this License, and makes no warranty whatsoever in connection with the Work. Creative Commons will not be liable to You or any party on any legal theory for any damages whatsoever, including without limitation any general, special, incidental or consequential damages arising in connection to this license. Notwithstanding the foregoing two (2) sentences, if Creative Commons has expressly identified itself as the Licensor hereunder, it shall have all rights and obligations of Licensor.

Except for the limited purpose of indicating to the public that the Work is licensed under the CCPL, Creative Commons does not authorize the use by either party of the trademark "Creative Commons" or any related trademark or logo of Creative Commons without the prior written consent of Creative Commons. Any permitted use will be in compliance with Creative Commons' then-current trademark usage guidelines, as may be published on its website or otherwise made available upon request from time to time. For the avoidance of doubt, this trademark restriction does not form part of the License.

Creative Commons may be contacted at http://creativecommons.org/.

EXHIBIT B

Language select: en

Requests for comment/Travel Guide

From Meta, a Wikimedia project coordination wiki
< Requests for comment

The following request for comments is closed. **You may discuss about this proposal on the talk page.**

↑↑↑ **Please select your language from the** *"Language selection"* **menu above.** ↑↑↑

This is a subpage; for more information, see the Requests for comments page.

English: Proposal: That we as the Wikimedia community ask the Wikimedia Foundation to approve a **Travel Guide** project and allocate resources to support any technical aspects of starting this new project. The project would combine efforts of free knowledge travel sites, some of which (e.g., Wikivoyage) want to migrate completely with their content and communities to the new travel guide project and others (e.g. Wikitravel) whose community of editors wish to join the Wikimedia movement

Please be sure to read over Travel Guide and Talk:Travel Guide for more background on this proposal.

> Note that this proposal is about the creation of a new *Wikimedia* project, **not** an expansion of *Wikipedia*, which is just one of a number of projects run by the Wikimedia Movement.

Català: Proposta: que nosaltres, com a comunitat de la Viquipèdia, demanem a la WMF aprovar un projecte de **Travel Guide** (guia de viatges) i distribuir recursos per donar suport a qualsevol aspecte tècnic que pugui sorgir durant el desenvolupament del nou projecte. Aquesta obra podria combinar esforços presents en molts llocs web de coneixement lliure de viatges (per exemple Wikivoyage), alguns dels quals volen migrar completament el seu contingut i comunitat al nou projecte de guia de viatge.

Si us plau, assegureu-vos de llegir Travel Guide i Talk:Travel Guide per tenir tota la informació referent a aquesta proposta.

> Noteu que aquesta proposta és sobre la creació d'un nou projecte de *Wikimedia*, i **no pas** una expansió de *Wikipedia*, que és només un dels projectes de Wikimedia.

Deutsch: Antrag, dass wir als Wikimedia-Gemeinschaft die Wikimedia Foundation WMF bitten, einem **Reiseführer-Projekt** zuzustimmen und Ressourcen bereitzustellen, um alle technischen

Aspekte für den Start des neuen Projekts abzusichern. Dadurch würden die Anstrengungen vieler Open-Content-Reisewebsites gebündelt werden, von denen einige (z.B. Wikivoyage) vollständig mit ihren Inhalten und ihren Communitys zum neuen Reiseführer-Projekt migrieren wollen.

Um mehr Hintergrundinformationen zu diesem Antrag zu erhalten, lesen Sie bitte unbedingt Travel Guide und Talk:Travel Guide.

Beachten Sie, dass dieser Antrag zum Ziel hat, ein neues *Wikimedia*-Projekt zu schaffen und **nicht** eine Erweiterung der *Wikipedia*, die selbst nur eins der Wikimedia-Projekte ist.

Español: Propuesta: Nosotros, como comunidad de Wikimedia, solicitamos a la WMF que apruebe un proyecto de **Travel Guide** (guía de viaje) y que otorgue los recursos necesarios para los aspectos técnicos y el desarrollo de este nuevo proyecto. El proyecto tiene como objetivo combinar los esfuerzos de muchos sitios de conocimiento libre sobre viajes (por ejemplo Wikiviaje) que quieren migrar completamente sus contenidos y sus comunidades al nuevo proyecto. **Para más información concerniente esta propuesta, por favor lea los artículos Travel Guide y Talk:Travel Guide.**

Suomi: Ehdotus: On ehdotettu, että aloitettaisiin matkailuopasprojekti. Tällä sivulla kysytään Wikimedian käyttäjäyhteisöltä **Travel Guide** -projektin aloittamisesta. Lisäksi pyritään antamaan apua projektin teknisiin haasteisiin. Projekti voisi yhdistää monien ilmaisien matkustussivustojen tietoja (kuten. Wikivoyage), jotka haluavat yhdistää sisältönsä uuteen matkailuopasprojektiin. **Ole hyvä ja lue Travel Guide (englanniksi) ja Talk:Travel Guide (englanniksi) saadaksesi lisää taustatietoja tästä projektista.**

Français: Proposition : Nous, en tant que communauté de Wikimédia, demandons à la WMF d'approuver un projet de **Travel Guide** (guide de voyage) et de donner des moyens pour les aspects techniques et le développement de ce nouveau projet. Ceci a pour but de combiner les efforts de chacun des sites gratuits de voyage (par exemple Wikivoyage) qui veulent entièrement migrer leur contenu et leur communauté vers le nouveau projet. **Pour en savoir plus cette proposition : lire les pages Travel Guide et Talk:Travel Guide.**

Italiano: Proposta: Che noi, come comunità di Wikimedia, chiediamo a WMF di approvare un progetto di **Guida turistica** e allochi risorse per supportare gli aspetti tecnici dell'avvio del progetto. Questo lavoro dovrebbe combinare gli sforzi di molti siti di viaggi a contenuto libero, alcuni dei quali (p.e., Wikivoyage) vogliono migrare completamente i loro contenuti e comunità nel nuovo progetto di guida turistica. **Per favore, leggere con cura Travel Guide e Talk:Travel Guide per avere un backgroud su questa proposta.**

日本語: 提案内容：ウィキメディア財団がTravel Guide（旅行ガイド）プロジェクトを承認し、当該プロジェクトを立ち上げるのに必要な技術的支援に労力を割り当てるよう、私たちウィキメディアコミュニティが要請すること。新しいプロジェクトには、数あるフリーナレッジ旅行ガイドサイトの取り組みが集約され、Wikivoyage など一部のサイトのコンテンツとコミュニティが完全に移管される。この提案の背景は Travel Guide と Talk:Travel Guide に詳しく書かれていますので、必ずご確認ください。

Nederlands: Voorstel: Wij, de Wikimedia gemeenschap, vragen de WMF om een **reisgidsenproject** goed te keuren en de noodzakelijke middelen toe te wijzen om de technische aspecten van het nieuwe project te ondersteunen. Met dit project worden de krachten van verschillende open-content-

reisgidsen gebundeld, en zullen sommige gidsen (zoals Wikivoyage) met hun volledige inhoud en gemeenschap migreren naar het nieuwe project.

Lees Travel Guide en Talk:Travel Guide voor meer achtergrondinformatie over dit voorstel.

> Let op, dat dit voorstel tot doel heeft, een nieuw *Wikimedia*-Project te starten en **niet** een uitbreiding van *Wikipedia*, dat zelf slechts een van de Wikimedia -Projekten is.

Русский: Предложение: Мы, сообщество Викимедиа, просим Фонд Викимедиа утвердить проект **Travel Guide** (Путеводитель) и выделить ресурсы для поддержки любых технических аспектов, связанных с его созданием. Эта работа объединит усилия, которые сейчас распылены по множеству сайтов со свободными знаниями в области путешествий, некоторые из которых (например, Wikivoyage) хотят полностью перейти со своими материалами и сообществом в новый проект путеводителя. **Пожалуйста, прочтите Travel Guide и Talk:Travel Guide, чтобы более полно понять контекст этого предложения.**

Svenska: Förslag: Att vi i Wikimedia-communityn ber Wikimedia Foundation att godkänna ett **reseguideprojekt** och fördela resurser för att för att stödja alla tekniska aspekter att starta det nya projektet. Detta arbete skulle kombinera insatser på många fria resewebbplatser, varav några (t.ex. Wikivoyage) vill migrera helt och hållet med sitt innehåll och communitys till det nya reseguideprojektet. **Läs igenom artikeln Travel Guide och dess diskussionssida för mer information om bakgrunden till detta förslag.**

Tiếng Việt: Đề xuất: Chúng ta, tức cộng đồng Wikimedia, yêu cầu WMF phê chuẩn một dự án **Travel Guide** và cung cấp tài nguyên để hỗ trợ về khía cạnh kỹ thuật để khởi động dự án mới. Dự án này sẽ bao gồm đóng góp từ các trang kiến thức du lịch mở (như Wikivoyage) muốn sáp nhập nội dung và cộng đồng của họ cho dự án mới. **Xin hãy đọc trang Travel Guide và Talk:Travel Guide để biết các thông tin chi tiết về đề xuất này.**

中文: 提议：作为维基百科社群，我们建议WMF（维基媒体基金会）通过**Travel Guide**（旅游指南）这一计划。与此同时对所需的资源进行定位和估计，从技术层面上做好开始新计划的准备。我们可以整合许多自由知识旅行网站上的资源，而这些网站中的一些（比如Wikivoyage）希望完全把它们的内容和社群迁移到这个新的旅游指南项目中。 请额外阅读完**Travel Guide**和**Talk:Travel Guide**（英文）这两项，以便获得更多关于这一提案的背景知识。

Contents

- 4 References

Votes/Discussion

Initial votes and comments moved from Talk:Travel Guide. (Initial votes yet to be moved from Travel Guide/supporters)

The discussion closure time was 0:00, 23 August 2012 (UTC)

The state of the discussion at that point in time was: [1] (https://meta.wikimedia.org/w/index.php?title=Requests_for_comment/Travel_Guide&oldid=4059415) .

Feel free to continue discussing, but your points may not be taken into account when opinions are tallied. --Kim Bruning (talk) 00:09, 23 August 2012 (UTC)

Commenters composition

Documentation from key groups:

- An official Internet brands response to this RFC
- Migration FAQ by Wikitravel admins (http://www.wikivoyage.org/general/Migration_FAQ) on why they're migrating. (Hosted at WikiVoyage).
- Wikimedia movement/discussion: you're in the right place right here.

Support

1. ⊕ **Support**, though it seems that more should be thought out about how this would be integrated. I think there would be substantial benefit from a careful integration with Wikipedia content and figuring out what to use from Wikipedia, but obviously keeping it separated. In an article that I wrote on Wikitravel from scratch, I leveraged a huge amount of the data that was in Wikipedia to improve the article (Aphrodisias, in Turkey). There are important POV concerns that have been raised in the opposition comments, since a travel guide I think is benefitted from POV comemnts, and is sometimes essential for the best advice on what to do/see in a place, but Wikipedia is not benefitted by that. I also think the barrier for contributors should be lowered, since learning the format/syntax of how to do updates/make a new article/integrate with other articles is a bit time consuming and not standardized. If new editors are to be found, this should be considered. Younger internet-ians are less willing to put up with clumsy editing UIs and non-intuitive editing may be a deterrent. Tylcole (talk) 23:16, 28 July 2012 (UTC)
2. ⊕ **Support** What are ya waiting for? Start the travel guide!--Nairmayukh (talk) 09:57, 26 July 2012 (UTC)
3. ⊕ **Support**--HCa - Suécia Boa ideia!.
4. **Strong** ⊕ **Support** I sometimes use and edit WT, but to be a truly educational resource, it needs more users and to be more global in nature. I often check it for travel instead of Wikipedia because it covers different topics, includes different sites, and is often more up-to-

date. (It may bring in a different editor base to Wikipedia, which would be great!) I think it's possible to do this in a factual, educational, reference-oriented way, and doing just that would be an excellent service. Currently, people looking for travel information online drown in novelty-oriented review sites and gripe boards instead. We can do it! --Wintersweet (talk) 03:10, 25 July 2012 (UTC)

5. ⊕ **Support**--Elisato-Spain Do it.
6. ⊕ **Support**--Io' (talk) 19:43, 24 July 2012 (UTC) (Italy)
7. ⊕ **Support**--Travpeter-Sweden Travel Guides get old fast and with the possibility to make pdf -books on Wiki this would really be a hit since the data will be updated almost constantly. 20:23, 24 July 2012 (Sweden)
8. **Strong ⊕ Support** I think there are some interesting ramifications and possible repercussions to other entities (Wikitravel being one) if this project goes through, but ultimately I think that breadth of knowledge should outweigh capitalist aims and that we should therefore move forward with this project. Some people have said that either the project is too big to succeed or that a Travel Guide is not a reference type of material (which Wikipedia seems to focus it's effort on creating) however I disagree on both of these points. This project is indeed a large project, but inevitably it will succeed due to the crowd-sourcing potential that is offered to us by the community of Wikipedia editors. Merging information from other sources is **what we do** at Wikipedia. There won't be any damaged or half completed projects that come from this, in my opinion. A travel guide is exactly a reference material. Travel books are listed in the reference section of libraries and bookstores. We're creating a corpus of knowledge about fascinating and unique places to see, eat, stay, and experience with this project. This is definitely reference material, and I strongly support this project. Robotunicr0n (talk) 17:08, 24 July 2012 (UTC)
9. ⊕ **Support**--Highten31
10. いいんじゃないですかね。日本には「地球の歩き方 (http://www.diamond.co.jp/arukikata/)」（ダイヤモンド社）なるガイドブックが刊行されてますし。ウィキでネット版のガイドブックを作ればなかなか面白いと思いますが？ -- 219.41.204.2 05:37, 24 July 2012 (UTC)
11. ⊕ **Support** --EleoTager (talk) 23:49, 23 July 2012 (UTC)
12. ⊕ **Support** (Charlie22712 (talk) 16:58, 23 July 2012 (UTC))
13. ⊕ **Support** Adnanrail (talk) 08:24, 23 July 2012 (UTC)
14. ⊕ **Support** Long overdue L-Bit (talk) 02:07, 23 July 2012 (UTC)
15. **Support**. Antoinetav (talk) 15:38, 21 July 2012 (UTC)
16. **Support**. Martin Herbst (talk) 11:03, 21 July 2012 (UTC) It's definitely a good idea
17. **Support**. ExplosionRadiative (talk) 16:43, 20 July 2012 (UTC)
18. **Support**. - Mirajbibi (talk) 05:52, 23 July 2012 (UTC)
19. **Support**. Why not? Isn't a travel guide in book form a similar form to books, we are using for creating our articles for example in the german topic biology. So I cannot imagine not taking those travel guides in book form and bringing it to a similar form like wikipedia articles. Of course we can also add information not mentioned in those books, and that's what this platform will be. But on the other hand we do not want to advertise specific hotels and other accomodations. So it should be a short description about the place. Currency, language, maybe some sentences and words, dangers, sights, maps, climate, history, just the most important information needed for traveling there. But there should be no prices at all. --Marco74 (talk) 23:32, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
    1. I see great potential, but I think we should allow articles about hotels. Personally I don't see it as advertisement if there is relevant information and both positive and negative information (like "the hotel is located next to a noisy road" or "The rooms are cleaned only once a month"). Imagine if you can get information about nearly every hotel in the world! And with free photos of the rooms. I agree about the prices, but there could

maybe be some sort of scale so that you can compare other hotels in the area, like *cheap, expensive*, or somewhere in between. /**abbedabb**^{talk} 09:24, 20 July 2012 (UTC)

2. There is discussion on how Wikidata could help organize this sort of content. **Doc James** (talk · contribs · email) 16:32, 20 July 2012 (UTC)

3. I have some reservations about including Hotels. It's very open to abuse, both positive and negative. I'm also reminded of the old customer service maxim, 1/10 happy customers will say so - often simplistcally while 9/10 dis-satisfied customers will complain to excess. It's human nature but leads to misrepresentation. Would that possibly lead to slandering? L-Bit (talk) 02:07, 23 July 2012 (UTC)

20. **Support** and Suggestion as we merge WikiTravel and WikiVoyage, we could also make use of google maps when we develop contents for different travel destinations. Apart from images or videos ... the google3d maps features will greatly improve the user virtual travel experience. Guitaristrock (talk) 14:12, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

     1. I have to object to the suggestion of using Google maps. Geo-tagging is one thing and using that data on Google maps is the reader's choice, but if an online map is to be used, I think OpenStreetMap makes more sense because of its (CC BY-SA) licence. I personally **support** this idea in part because I see it as having a great deal of potential for reinforcing existing WM activities, such as *WikiProject Geographical coordinates, Wiki Loves Monuments* and others. There is also the benefit of consolidating more *wikipower* under one roof. This could certainly make the next Wikimania more interesting. (I am user U5K0 on english wikipedia) --84.41.86.38 20:21, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

     2. Yes, Images from Google Maps are not free, but Open Streetmap is. It would be great to implement geotagging, just as on Wikipedia, so that the articles pop up as icons in a layer on Google Maps or Google Earth. /**abbedabb**^{talk} 09:27, 20 July 2012 (UTC)

         Yes travelers love maps and hopefully this new initiative will lead to improvements to Wikipedia's maps as well. Are that we should use open maps.**Doc James** (talk · contribs · email) 16:34, 20 July 2012 (UTC)

21. **Support** A good sister project that a lot of Wikipedia articles should be able to link to. Wikipedia editors who add content more suitable for a travel guide than an encyclopedia won't need to be directed towards a non-Wikimedia wiki (Wikitravel) anymore. Images from Wikimedia Commons should make it look attractive. I am curious about whether it would be expected to have a NPOV and if more informal language than is permitted on Wikipedia would be allowed.--Simon Peter Hughes (talk) 09:31, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

22. **Support** A very useful project would be! A wonderful idea!--Илья Яковлев (talk) 07:33, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

23. **Support** It must be a great program for people who love travelling!--**Jack No1** (中文/English) (talk) 07:11, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

24. **Support** This will be a great successful and useful wiki. Travelling is one of the best methods of learning. If supported by a Travel Guide, the trip will be really great. Though there are many existing travel guide web portals, one like wiki is necessary for a relaible and expanded information. I hope it will be successful like wikipedia. There are many encyclopedias online, but there is no match for wikipedia. It can help in learning about various specialities of different locations and chosing the correct destination that suits the user. All that is needed is support from the people and active contributors. At the same time we should ensure that it doesn't become an advertisement site. Let us do this. --Jayabharat (talk) 04:16, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

25. **Support** This proposal will have benefits for the WM movement through expanding our community. As travel is educational in nature and thus a travel guide an education resource

this is in line with our mission to: " empower and engage people around the world to collect and develop educational content" --**Doc James** (talk · contribs · email) 02:16, 18 April 2012 (UTC)

26. **Support** Humans are natural explorers. We read and contribute to WM in order to explore new ideas and learn about new people, artefacts and places. But sometimes reading is not enough and the only way to truly understand a subject is to experience it first-hand. en:Great Barrier Reef is a good article, but what will it cost me to see this wonder for myself, how do I get there, where do I stay, who can I trust to take me on a diving tour that will not damage the reef? Those are questions that an encyclopaedia can never answer, but a travel guide can. -- NJR ZA (talk) 05:20, 18 April 2012 (UTC)

27. **Support** WM is a natural home for a wiki-based travel guide, and the Internet community is not well-served by having such an educational resource hosted in less-friendly hands. -J1729 (talk) (Wikitravel admin (http://wikitravel.org/en/User:Jonboy)) 10:52, 18 April 2012 (UTC)

28. **Support** A travel guide wiki certainly fits into the Wikimedia Foundation's mission of making educational content available worldwide and for free. WMF gets an existing and mature wiki with a well-developed culture that is compatible with Wikimedia's own. The Wikitravel and Wikivoyage communities get the benefit of an established host, and the sum of the world's knowledge is improved in the process Ravikiran r (talk) 17:06, 18 April 2012 (UTC)

29. **Support**, provided that the new project be founded in a way that makes it possible for the Wikivoyage community to join in a merger of equals. By and large, I think Wikimedia projects could gain a great deal by including a travel guide. As "Wikitravel" already is a registered name, I suggest to call the new project **"Wikimedia Voyage"**, or **"Wikivoyage"**, if the Wikivoyage community agrees.--Aschmidt (talk) 21:40, 18 April 2012 (UTC)

> Yes would be happy with Wikivoyage and definitely see the two groups joining as equals.--**Doc James** (talk · contribs · email) 22:05, 18 April 2012 (UTC)
> I don't think we are discussing naming yet, but I would be quite happy is we simply call it *Wikimedia Travel* with travel.wikimedia.org as url. --NJR ZA (talk) 16:20, 19 April 2012 (UTC)

30. **Support**. As has been pointed out by others, a travel guide is complementary to the educational mission of WMF and fills a niche that falls outside of the encyclopedic goals of Wikipedia. -- Wrh2 (talk) 02:32, 19 April 2012 (UTC)

> *Note: I am an admin and bureaucrat across 5 language versions of Wikitravel [2] (http://wikitravel.org/shared/User:Wrh2) . -- Wrh2 (talk) 17:27, 18 August 2012 (UTC)*

31. **Support** I really need dumps of WT, and the current host of WT does not want (http://wikitravel.org/en/Wikitravel:Database_dump) to release dumps. Nicolas1981 (talk) 05:24, 19 April 2012 (UTC)

32. **Support**. No doubt, that travelling is education. Why so many people watch documentations about foreign cultures? And I strongly agree Wrh2. There is a niche in the WP content. We often see discussions about content that should be removed from WP and fits better to a Travel Guide. Can not estimate how many usefull information are shredded already. The WT/WV contributors are keen on providing geo referenced information as well. This can be an important input for the Wikipedia and Wikidata. I would love to se **Wikivoyage** as the project's name. -- DerFussi (talk) 06:00, 19 April 2012 (UTC)

33. **Support** As mentionned above, I believe a travel wiki brings a new perspective to Wikimedia's educational purpose and that it definitely falls under our mission of making knowledge accessible. notafish }<';> 08:14, 19 April 2012 (UTC)

34. **Support** I think User:Ravikiran r set out the reasons perfectly for why this is a good idea. Mike Peel (talk) 08:15, 19 April 2012 (UTC)
35. **Support** As mentioned above, travel information is practical knowledge and education. This is also the reason why the Wikivoyage association is supported by the German tax authorities. -- RolandUnger (talk) 09:31, 19 April 2012 (UTC)
36. **I support** the proposal based on the arguments I gave on the wikimedia-l mailing list. Travelling is one of the ways, if not the most important ways, of acquiring and dissemination of free knowledge, and in this perspective a travel guide fits well into our Mission. I had specific objections which may be relevant for the realization (for instance, I do not believe in the universal travel guide which is equally useful for everyone, in real life one always have different types of the guides which target specific audiences), but I do not think we should discuss these objections at this stage.--Ymblanter (talk) 09:49, 19 April 2012 (UTC)
37. **Support** I see a fit in our missin and a huge benefit for all involved parties here. I already look forward having Collection Extension available on the new wiki-based travel guide... --Manuel Schneider(bla) (+/-) 11:27, 19 April 2012 (UTC)
38. **Support** Clearly within the scope of the Wikimedia movement, and the benefits for all the involved would be many: the project would get a world-leading hosting platform and a continuously up-to-date mediawiki installation; two communities with the same goal could be re-joined to work together, making the whole endeavor more efficient and productive; the community could grow with a fresh influx of new editors; Localization support would be greatly improved, leading to a truly global wiki travel guide project; not to mention the other benefits listed at Wiki Travel Guide#Benefits --Waldir (talk) 14:08, 19 April 2012 (UTC)
39. **Support**. A major lump of knowledge that is not covered by any other Wikimedia project at present, and an extremely useful one at that. **SpinningSpark** 16:50, 19 April 2012 (UTC)
40. **Support** The communities of Wikipedia and Wikitravel have strong links for a long time. Wikitravel Admin on Nl: and Fr:. Rein N. (talk) 21:23, 19 April 2012 (UTC)
41. **Support**. The project is in scope for Wikimedia and seems to have good potential, especially with the freely-licensed material that is already available. Jafeluv (talk) 07:56, 20 April 2012 (UTC)
42. **Support**. I would also support this including guidebook-type information for locals and citizens of communities, as well as for travellers. Let us assimilate the city wikis!--Pharos (talk) 19:35, 20 April 2012 (UTC)

    Yes! Great idea. NYCwiki has been mentioned at Wiki Travel Guide#Educational in nature, but making this more explicit and generic, inviting all city wikis to join, would be great. --Waldir (talk) 09:24, 21 April 2012 (UTC)

43. **Support**. Absolutely, this seems like it would be beneficial to everyone. the wub "?!" 20:00, 20 April 2012 (UTC)
44. **Support**. Contributors, readers, and re-users of Wikitravel (which of course includes many Wikimedians) will benefit from accelerated feature development, bug fixes, and database dumps; Wikimedia will benefit from an enlarged contributor base and readership; and there are tons of potential synergies to exploit (collaboration on map-making is a great example—check out all the original maps (http://wikitravel.org/shared/Category:Maps) being made at Wikitravel!). As Wikitravel and Wikivoyage are established, mature wiki communities, this project should be a guaranteed success in terms of organization, content, and contributor base. And for lovers of warm fuzzies, moving forward with this proposal would offer us the happy possibility to reunite our splintered communities, and forge a new, stronger one in the process. --Peter Talk 21:25, 20 April 2012 (UTC)

Note: I am an admin and bureaucrat across 7 language versions of Wikitravel [3]
(http://wikitravel.org/shared/User:Peterfitzgerald) . --Peter ^{Talk} 16:25, 18 August 2012
(UTC)

45. **Support** With a travel and aviation background, it has always miffed me why WMF projects didn't tackle this area long before. Well-travelled people are generally well-informed people, and this goes to the very basis of what WMF projects are about -- encouraging people to be better informed. So absolutely support. Russavia (talk) 22:33, 21 April 2012 (UTC)

46. **Support** I think this is the best solution for all three communities concerned. (I'm a Wikitravel admin, and have been active [since the very beginning (http://wikitravel.org/wiki/en/index.php? title=Special:Contributions&dir=prev&limit=500&contribs=user&target=Mark)]) -- MarkJaroski (talk) 04:50, 23 April 2012 (UTC)

47. **Support** As others have said, travelling and travel information is educational, and there are existing communities and information to get this off the ground and make it a success. - Shaundd (talk) 04:46, 23 April 2012 (UTC)

48. **Support**. The existing WT/WV content is a great educational resource not only on travelling, but also about culture, history and geography. - Cardboardbird (talk) 14:03, 23 April 2012 (UTC)

49. **Support** If the existing WT/WV communities like the idea of joining us, we should welcome them! --trm^{ger} 19:20, 23 April 2012 (UTC)

50. **Support** Travel is definitely educational in nature, and this will be a great complement to our existing geography coverage. Calliopejen1 (talk) 03:37, 24 April 2012 (UTC)

51. **Support**. Wikitravel fits into the Wikimedia Foundation's mission: educational content available worldwide and for free. And whoever visit other countries before know that traveling is knowledge! Benoit Rochon (talk) 05:00, 24 April 2012 (UTC)

52. **Support**. Mutually beneficial, especially considering the spinoff effects to other Wikimedia projects. MER-C (talk) 11:58, 24 April 2012 (UTC)

53. **Support**. This proposal would greatly enhance the Wikimedia family. Yann (talk) 12:42, 24 April 2012 (UTC)

54. **Support**. Would be great if this could help to integrate WT/WV and bring them back together; the project fits well with our other projects. —NIGHTSTALLION *(?)* 12:58, 24 April 2012 (UTC)

55. **Support** A welcome member of the family. Main concern is the reliability of the info, knowing how dodgy a site as tripadvisor is. Night of the Big Wind (talk) 17:17, 24 April 2012 (UTC)

56. **Support** I'd always hoped this day would come, and am glad to see it might arrive soon. PhnomPencil (talk) 20:23, 24 April 2012 (UTC)

57. **Support** for many of the above reasons. It will enhance the diversity of "products" and opportunities in the WM family of communities. Imzadi1979 (talk) 20:44, 24 April 2012 (UTC)

58. **Support** Hopefully the new travel wiki community will grow fast as soon as all Wikimedia sister projects will be interconnected for everyone's benefit. Fogg (talk) 00:13, 25 April 2012 (UTC)

59. **Support**. As a longtime bureaucrat/admin on Wikitravel who has pretty much given up editing due to the current owners' neglect of the site and a Wikipedia user of nearly 10 years' standing, I fully welcome this long-overdue move. Jpatokal (talk) 11:50, 25 April 2012 (UTC)
    - Wikitravel is very glad to have you back, now that the 1.17 site upgrade is complete and new features are being added. If you have any concerns about the site, please feel free to contact an active admin -- I'm sure they will tell you how well the site is running!--IBobi (talk) 20:45, 6 July 2012 (UTC)

60. Support. I think it's a useful complement of existing wm projects. --ArséniureDeGallium (talk) 16:06, 25 April 2012 (UTC)

61. I Support the proposal, first and foremost as an avenue to save Wikitravel, which has been running on fumes for quite some since the brand owners lack even the most basic understanding of how the collaborative web works, and besides doesn't seem to be all that interrested since the expected revenue streams have not materialized - This has cost the project some its of most valued editors and adminitrators. Coming under the Wikimedia umbrella is the only avenue I see where we can escape the current mismanagement with meaningful editor retention, and hence save thousands of hours of work voulenteers have contributed to the project in the exact same spirit as most of us to do other wikimedia projects. Secondly two quotes from these discutions clearly shows why a travel wiki has a place under the said umbrella; "Travel is an avenue of education, possibly a more important one than an encyclopedia" and "Frankly, every single time I've read a travel guide.... I've learned something". Besides as administrator on wikitravel I have read more wikipedia city articles than most, and there clearly is a need for an alterntive place to put destination related content than in the current encyclopedic form of those articles. Stefan Ertmann (talk) 21:02, 25 April 2012 (UTC)

62. Support. A wonderful complement to the existing Wikimedia projects. Fits well and there is certainly no good reason not to. Serves the Wikimedia Foundations Goal and Vision. Plus it's been far too long since a new project has been started :-) Dovi (talk) 10:17, 26 April 2012 (UTC)

63. Support. I don't find the arguments about NPOV that convincing and they smack heavily of Wikipedianism (at Wikinews and Wiktionary and other projects, eager Wikipedians have to be reminded that they are no longer at Wikipedia!). I'm a big fan of inter-wiki collaboration (when it works), and building out a travel guide is something where being tied in with the other wikis is useful. Think of it as tourism-related portals onto the existing wealth of Wikimedia content. Take a city like London or Paris and think: we've got interesting Wikipedia articles about that city, we've got a whole wealth of photos, we've got work being done by the GLAM partners, we've got Wikinews, we can link it into Wiktionary for local dialects... a non-commercial port/fork/recasting of Wikitravel that melds more freely into the other WMF projects could be extremely useful. The other way to deal with the NPOV concerns is like this: think of the articles as a series of if-then statements, and just apply something like Wikipedia's UNDUE weight. "If you are a business traveler, then x", "if you are an impoverished student, then y", "if you love art, go to museums a, b and c" etc. That doesn't eliminate the NPOV issues, but it certainly reduces them quite substantially. Then you develop community consensus on what are 'valid' if-then statements that the guide answers. Travel guides that exist on the market already cater for different types of people: there are budget or student travel guides, gap year travel guides, walking or cycling guides, guides for people who want to party, guides for people who love bookshops and culture, guides for gay/lesbian travellers... you name it, there's a different frame you can put on the concept. — Tom Morris (talk) 22:29, 27 April 2012 (UTC)

- Wikiravel uses a price index for hotels, restaurants etc. How about Budget, midprice and luxery as index? --Rein N. (talk) 06:52, 1 May 2012 (UTC)

64. Support. I know very well from running my own Mediawiki projects that 1. a few people systematically maintaining many such projects requires much less work/overhead than many people managing many projects; 2. WMF's people are much more skilled and professional at it than a random webmaster, especially when it comes to scaling; 3. WMF projects naturally get more editors and more interwiki links than external wikis, because of global accounts, because editors trust them more, and because editors get a greater boost to their reputation for editing a WMF project than an external one. These are all very good things for Wikitravel. Will it "save" Wikitravel from falling into decay? That remains to be seen, but I think if they promote

some good admins and get cooperation from devs on necessary settings changes, they can take any necessary measures to preserve the active content. Dcoetzee (talk) 23:27, 27 April 2012 (UTC)

65. **Support**; this is an opportunity to reduce some of the duplication of effort (vis a vis images and maps, and technical improvements) on Wikitravel. How many times have I wished I could just link to a Commons file instead of downloading and uploading it? Technical support from the site's current owners is sparse at best, and they are learning MediaWiki as they go. Waiting for them to figure out how to operate a wiki is killing the community. LtPowers (talk) 01:19, 28 April 2012 (UTC)
   - Small note: including Commons files in any Mediawiki wiki is as simple as turning on InstantCommons (http://www.mediawiki.org/wiki/InstantCommons) . Dcoetzee (talk) 20:32, 29 April 2012 (UTC)
      - Sadly, Wikitravel is currently running under MediaWiki: 1.11.2 (r24791), not MediaWiki 1.16 (r59428). Slow updating of Mediawiki is only one of our problems with our current host, IB --Rein N. (talk) 06:09, 1 May 2012 (UTC)
      - Yes, what Rein said. IB claims to be in the midst of an upgrade, but we'll all believe it when we see it. If we can get InstantCommons turned on, great. LtPowers (talk) 14:32, 2 May 2012 (UTC)
         - Next week we can try it out after the update to Mediawiki 1.17. Rein N. (talk) 15:26, 5 May 2012 (UTC)
            - The upgrade was completed and Commons is active and functional, as is the rest of the site!--IBobi (talk) 20:41, 6 July 2012 (UTC)

66. **Support**. As a WT admin (:ru) and contributor (:en), I feel that joining WM would be an excellent opportunity for invigorating the very idea of free travel guide. The detailed reasoning has been laid out earlier in this thread, so I simply add my voice and look forward to working on the new project! Atsirlin (talk) 15:21, 10 May 2012 (UTC)

67. **Support**. I'm one of two founders of Wikitravel, and I think the project would do well with the WMF. --Evan (talk) 12:20, 12 May 2012 (UTC)

68. **Support**. Agree with most that has been said above :-) --Globe-trotter (talk) 23:56, 16 May 2012 (UTC)

69. **Support**. Very interested in the possibility of a Wiki Travel Guide among WMF projects. One question is what kind of technical support it really will get? Obviously, I think it would be much better than the current situation, but then sister projects like Wikisource sometimes get a bit neglected when it comes to tech support and especially feature requests. But then volunteers can get involved with the tech stuff and I think there are number of Wiki Travel techies and others who can help. Aude (talk) 16:35, 17 May 2012 (UTC)
   - I've noticed some technical issues on Wikitravel, such as the API disabled and no user css / js or alternative skins allowed. Even if a Wikimedia Travel Guide doesn't get much/any dedicated staff tech support, just having it run on the newest versions of MediaWiki, having the config stuff in Gerrit, extensions open source, etc. will be a huge improvement and allow the community to step in and improve/maintain things. I've found WikiTravel content very useful and educational and would like to see the project continue to thrive, and not convinced the current situation allows for that. Aude (talk) 15:30, 18 August 2012 (UTC)

70. **Support**. As a new contributor to the Wikitravel community, I can see how IB is tearing the place apart. Their tech support is abysmal, and it's causing the wiki to lose many editors/admins, which will result in the loss of viewers. This is a great opportunity to save the ailing Wikitravel content and community. JamesA 11:30, 2 June 2012 (UTC)
   - I hope you have a chance to test drive the new site, and view firsthand how quickly and comprehensively technical issues and feature requests are being responded to; in fact

this has been the case for over a year, but now that the MW upgrade is complete I think you'll see a whole new site. Enjoy it.--IBobi (talk) 20:49, 6 July 2012 (UTC)

    1. Yes, I have had a chance, and I have experience the usual slow loading speeds. I have also noticed nothing being done about the feature requests, plus the huge number of bug reports, especially the login/create account issue which really irritates me. JamesA (talk) 10:59, 8 July 2012 (UTC)

71. **Support.** Author on german Wikipedia and german Wikivoyage. --Dirk Schmidt (talk) 12:32, 11 June 2012 (UTC)

72. **Support** Sounds like a useful complement for the Wikimedia universum. Raymond (talk) 14:28, 11 June 2012 (UTC)

73. **Support.** Author on german Wikitravel - The german Wikitravel has no aktiv Admins since January 2012 -- Knut (http://wikitravel.org/de/Benutzer:Knut) 84.58.154.137 20:13, 12 June 2012 (UTC)

74. **Support** Ruud Koot (talk) 00:04, 13 June 2012 (UTC)

75. **Support** Let's create a Wiki Travel Guide that's really good. Grauesel (talk) 08:16, 13 June 2012 (UTC) (WP:de and WV editor)

76. **Support** A good complement to the existing Wikimedia projects. --Wvk (talk) 20:58, 13 June 2012 (UTC)

77. **Support** (lately rather inactive) admin on WV and member of Wikivoyage e.V. - Having been at WV almost since the beginning and being aware of the situation at WT, I think becoming part of the WMF would be beneficial to all involved parties. It would re-unite WV and WT, allow to complement each other as far as language versions are concerned and allow a more direct and efficient collaboration with WMF projects. This of course just in addition to all other main advantages already mentioned. --Mulleflupp (talk) 13:13, 14 June 2012 (UTC)

78. **Support** Sounds like a fine complement to our projects. --Holder (talk) 18:53, 14 June 2012 (UTC)

79. **Support** - a dream can come true. We hoped for years to be able to create a travel guide that is not only free but also part of the wikimedia movement. So why waiting any longer. Admin on Wikivoyage - we are ready. --Der Reisende (talk) 11:15, 21 June 2012 (UTC)

80. **Support** - finally! I'm one of two founders of Hitchwiki (http://hitchwiki.org/) and asked for a database dump of Wikitravel back in 2004 :) Guaka (talk) 21:01, 25 June 2012 (UTC)

81. **Support:** Good to see this possibility coming to light. This is a chance to save wikitravel that struggles under the management of it's commercial owners. It makes sense for a wiki travel guide to exist under the Wikimedia umbrella. Having a wiki based travel guide would also be well within wikimedia's educational mandate. --Keithonearth (talk) 19:40, 30 June 2012 (UTC)

82. **Support** Admin on Wikitravel en:, pt:, and es:. I've been hoping for this for years. IB's neglect has caused Wikitravel's once vibrant communities to largely fall apart. It will be great to have a fresh start in a more supportive environment.Texugo (talk) 03:41, 2 July 2012 (UTC)

83. **Support** I was a very active admin and supporter of the project, and left entirely due to the project falling into the hands of Internet Brands. Stuck it out for a good while, but it quite simply isn't going to ever flourish in its current setup. Let's change that. – cacahuate ^{talk} 03:50, 2 July 2012 (UTC)

84. **Support** - Semi-regular user on Wikipedia and Wikitravel. Agree with everything above. Eco84 (talk) 04:26, 2 July 2012 (UTC)

85. **Support with a reservation** - I am an administrator on Wikitravel and a longtime user and sometime editor on Wikipedia. I approve of the Wikipedia project, which I see as a revival of the medieval concept of collective authorship for the computer age, complete with marginalia (the talk pages), and I definitely see the advantages of Wikitravel being brought under the Wikimedia umbrella. However, I do not think making it NPOV would be useful to travelers. So let's please talk more about NPOV. Wikitravel does not have an NPOV policy, nor do I

think one would be beneficial. Travel guides have to have some degree of appraisal built into them, in terms of which things are deemed as attractions (e.g.: the Raffles Hotel in Singapore gets a photo, whereas the Holiday Inn does not) and which restaurants and hotels are and are not listed. If Wikitravel is taken under the Wikipedia umbrella, would we have to use some circumlocutions - "if, then" statements as per Tom Morris' remarks - to get around an NPOV policy that would be imposed on Wikitravel? Ikan Kekek (talk) 04:49, 2 July 2012 (UTC)

> See #NPOV below: Wikimedia has made it clear that Wikitravel will be allowed to retain existing policies, including "the traveller comes first". Jpatokal (talk) 23:42, 2 July 2012 (UTC)

>> Thanks. Reservation withdrawn. **Fully support**. Ikan Kekek (talk) 02:33, 3 July 2012 (UTC)

86. **Support** - Quite new contributor on Wikitravel. Would love to see the guide as part of WM. Jjtk (talk) 07:15, 2 July 2012 (UTC)
87. **Support**. Waiting for this for a long time. Admin on Wikitravel en:, Vidimian (talk) 20:56, 2 July 2012 (UTC)
88. **Support**. I have come very close to walking away from WT many times due to considerable frustrations with the functionality of the site. A considerable body of contribution time has been lost to server errors and similar frustrations. It is a great project in principal and offers a considerable asset to travellers. However we must be careful to ensure the outcome, (or the quest for it) does not break the project. The proposal may offer the opportunity to improve or enhance both the WP and the travel related project. Some discussion might be appropriate in regard to the different culture of consensus and conflict resolution apparent in the two separate domains. WT and WP have a quite different *culture* in that regard and I am sure other editors here who contribute to both projects will be familiar with the different outlooks and style in seeking 'consensus'.-- Felix505 (talk) 07:59, 4 July 2012 (UTC)
89. **Support**. Formerly an active admin and contributor to Wikitravel en:. Basically, what cacahaute said above. Gorilla Jones (talk) 15:00, 4 July 2012 (UTC)
90. **Support**. Former admin on Swedish Wikitravel (http://wikitravel.org/sv/Anv%C3% A4ndare:Jonas_Ryberg) who dropped out when WT has handed over to Internet Brands, currently adding information regarding rail travel to English site. I fully support this move, it's long overdue. Jonas Ryberg (talk) 20:21, 4 July 2012 (UTC)
91. **Support**, It will be pleasant to work with upload times that don't allow me to make a cup of tea while I wait, or crash and lose my edits. Ok to be fair that can also happen on WP, but the difference in speed and frequency is very noticeable when uploading large files. Also I prefer to upload only once to Commons. Cheers! Pbsouthwood (talk) 15:15, 5 July 2012 (UTC)

> Using files that are available on Commons is already possible after the resent Mediawiki upgrade on Wikitravel, without the need of reupload. Rein N. (talk) 10:43, 6 July 2012 (UTC)

> ■ Read and upload times are very good since the upgrade, actually.--IBobi (talk) 20:53, 6 July 2012 (UTC)

92. **Support**, Emperyan-message/ileti-WMTR (http://gel.io/Baia) 13:00, 6 July 2012 (UTC)
93. **Support** Amazing idea. W.D. (talk) 14:01, 6 July 2012 (UTC)
94. **Support** Very good idea. I am in support if it should there enough potential contributors to such a wiki. **LouriePieterse** 15:03, 6 July 2012 (UTC)
95. **Support**- A great idea and useful project. I have no problems with this. Bzweebl (talk • contribs) 15:05, 6 July 2012 (UTC)

96. **Support**. A Wonderful project to start.--Shijualex (talk) 17:03, 6 July 2012 (UTC)
97. **Support**. Complements existing Wikimedia projects, large potential to further mission&vision moreso than would occur if main forks outside Wikimedia. Mike Linksvayer (talk) 17:18, 6 July 2012 (UTC)
98. **Support** Absolutely! --Iketsi (talk) 17:22, 6 July 2012 (UTC)
99. **Support** Ja natuurlijk/selbstverständlich!, Oui biensur!, Sì va benissimo!, Yes of course! etc. Kind regards, Klaas V 18:18, 6 July 2012 (UTC)
100. **Support** This seems like a great way to complement Wikipedia. Argos'Dad (talk) 19:40, 6 July 2012 (UTC)
101. **For.** I've been lookin' for free travel guides for a while; this is pretty much it. 68.173.113.106 21:55, 6 July 2012 (UTC)
102. **Support**, as proposed. Craig Franklin (talk) 00:17, 7 July 2012 (UTC).
103. **Support** - there are things existing projects say they're "not", and travel guides is one of them.--Jasper Deng (talk) 01:53, 7 July 2012 (UTC)
104. **Support** - So long as Wikitravel is the project being absorbed - would not support a duplication. --108.80.181.47 15:29, 7 July 2012 (UTC)
105. **Fully support**. Saint Johann (ru) 21:22, 7 July 2012 (UTC)
106. **Support** - sounds like a project perfectly matching our designs. Pundit (talk) 21:45, 7 July 2012 (UTC)
107. **Support**. mabdul 21:51, 7 July 2012 (UTC)
108. **Support**, with Philippines backing up. --Exec8 (talk) 02:32, 8 July 2012 (UTC)
109. **Support** --Dede2008 (talk) 05:44, 8 July 2012 (UTC)
110. **Support** This is definitely more than a travel guide on Wikibooks. :)--Nickanc (talk) 18:22, 8 July 2012 (UTC)
111. **Support** I like using WT I think its a great site, but I have only ever edited there half heartedly because I hate the idea of a for profit organisation benefiting monetarily from something I'm giving for free to other readers, and from the reaction from the WT community commenting here that others feel th same.--KTo288 (talk) 19:36, 8 July 2012 (UTC)
112. **Support** sounds good to me. --Claritas (talk) 19:45, 8 July 2012 (UTC)
113. This has long been the most obvious hole in the family of sister projects. Courcelles 22:02, 8 July 2012 (UTC)
114. **Support** A great positive step forward for everybody. -- Elelicht (talk) 23:03, 8 July 2012 (UTC)
115. **Support**, and I intend to be an active member of the project.-Gadfium (talk) 23:41, 8 July 2012 (UTC)
116. **Support** as it falls within the scope of our movement -free [travel] knowledge for everyone in their *own* language. --Jewbask (talk) 02:11, 9 July 2012 (UTC)
117. **Support** This would be a great contribution to the Wikimedia community, only strengthening it as a whole. -- Forty Seven Nine (talk) 01:03, 9 July 2012 (UTC)
118. **Support** - our two communities evoluated until now quite independantly but by sharing the same vision, so it's great to fuse. By seeing some comment about city wikis, I'm not sure it would be desirable for all city wikis (I'm thinking for instance to Wiki-Brest or Wiki-Rennes who are acting as a *local* website for local history). ~ Seb35 [^_^] 07:07, 9 July 2012 (UTC)
119. **Support**. A quick look around on Wikitravel shows that its community morale is low, and spam is rife. I think that a Wiki Travel Guide project on WMF will be a great addition to our family of projects, and what's more, it will hopefully bring with it not just one, but *two* existing communities of editors. Much better than starting from scratch! This, that and the other (talk) 07:26, 9 July 2012 (UTC)
120. **Support**, per many of the arguments above. WT/WV and its community have achieved good things, and supporting them to do more is well within the scope of our mission and a worthwhile use of our resources. Andrew Gray (talk) 10:50, 9 July 2012 (UTC)

121. **Support.** Wikitravel is a great resource, and if the community behind it thinks this is a good move, I can't see any reason not to do it. -98.209.136.52 12:57, 9 July 2012 (UTC)
122. **Support** - we need a new project after about 7 years. This will be a valuable addition. WikiTravel has lots of valuable content.--Kozuch (talk) 15:38, 9 July 2012 (UTC)
123. **Support** I think rejoining of wikitravel and wikivoyage and geting it truely free is a good case. --Saehrimnir (talk) 15:47, 9 July 2012 (UTC)
124. **Strong Support.** Suspending the issue of technical limitations, this would be an amazing addition to the WMF family. The travel resources currently available on the Internet are highly commercialized, so a freely licensed travel wiki with a NPOV policy would be a great asset to Wikimedians and society in general. As an expert in travel & tourism, I would personally be interested in contributing to such a project (currently I'm turned off by the commercial nature and administrative neglect of WikiTravel). As for naming, my !vote goes to **WikiVoyage**, since the word "voyage" lends itself to multilingualism better than "travel." Jmajeremy (talk) 19:11, 9 July 2012 (UTC)
125. **Support** Will be a great addition to the WMF projects. David1217 (talk) 15:19, 10 July 2012 (UTC)
126. **Support**, as a non-commercial, global travel guide is highly useful. Hope to see parallel versions in *all* the languages of other Wikimedia projects. A. Mahoney (talk) 19:24, 10 July 2012 (UTC)
127. **Support**, and also particularly endorse taking a more generalized "location guide" approach.--Pharos (talk) 20:11, 10 July 2012 (UTC)
128. **Support** - this will definitely benefit a lot of people who don't know where to go for travel tips. I'm just a tad bit worried about how editors will be neutral enough on travel guides, though. The only thing not to be neutral about are travel advisories, but we'd seriously need some NPOV users. --Jeffwang (talk) 20:40, 10 July 2012 (UTC)
129. **Support** - as a way to reunite Wikitravel and Wikivoyage under the WMF, in order to create a repository for travel information.Yutsi (talk) 01:14, 11 July 2012 (UTC)
130. **Support** - For myself, i will be more than happy to contribute to a travel project on WWF and write about place i've visited. I will never do that on web site like WT, for the obvious commercial reason. -- ChristianT (talk) 15:51, 11 July 2012 (UTC)
131. **Support** This would be great. I am a wikitravel admin and have been contributing since 2004 Elgaard (talk) 20:46, 11 July 2012 (UTC)
132. **Support**—this just makes sense to me. Imzadi1979 (talk) 06:57, 12 July 2012 (UTC)
133. **Support** of course Przykuta (talk) 12:07, 12 July 2012 (UTC)
134. **support** MichChemGSI (talk) 14:13, 12 July 2012 (UTC)
135. **Support** Seems a good idea. ᴱᵐᵃⁱˡ **Vaibhav** ᵀᵃˡᵏ 16:15, 12 July 2012 (UTC)
136. **Support.** Win-win outcome. Don't worry about editorial viewpoint after the merger: each Wikimedia project is allowed their own set of content policies anyway. Deryck C. 16:16, 12 July 2012 (UTC) ((Edit conflict.) This is so popular that I got an EC while voting.)
137. **Support.** Seems like a very interesting project, and Wikimedia Commons could benefit from the content of the Wikivoyage media repository (and possibly WikiTravel Shared). InverseHypercube (talk) 16:45, 12 July 2012 (UTC)
138. It has only to be free content! Who says, free content must be follow the NPOV? Wikitravel is not Wikipedia. Marcus Cyron (talk) 00:59, 13 July 2012 (UTC)
139. **Support.** Win/win/win (for Wikimedia/Wikitravel/Wikivoyage). This should help resolve an already existing fork, and fill a major gap in the Wikimedia stable. Without meaning to cast aspersions on the existing content, I think the most important thing Wikimedia stands to gain here is the communities of editors who have decided (and may yet decide) to move over, and their years of experience building such content. --Avenue (talk) 05:26, 13 July 2012 (UTC)
140. **Support.** A WMF sponsored travel site will be a useful addition. At Wikipedia, it is impossible to recommend hotels, restaurants, places to see etc. in a tourist article, without

risking a violation of NPOV, NOR, (insert a 3 or 4 letter policy here), etc. EngineerFromVega (talk) 07:24, 13 July 2012 (UTC)

141. **Support.** Travel is a domain where good information is really useful, even if when we start out it is piecemeal. I'm really interested to see if we can achieve a broad perspective on what it means to visit a place. For example, in Baltimore, I encourage tourists to go anywhere but the tourist district, since they pay their employees badly and a lot of the money doesn't filter back into the city. This is the kind of information I'd hope we could include. Some POV might be inevitable and we need to be prepared to handle that. Groupuscule (talk) 12:30, 13 July 2012 (UTC)

  - Have you checked out Wikitravel:Baltimore#Districts? I've been doing a ton of work on that lately, but am a little burnt out. We could use help especially with the North and Southeast articles for information on Hampden, the Johns Hopkins area, and Greektown in the Southeast. Check the other adjacent district article maps for an idea of what the boundaries are. This is all if you're interested, of course ;) The site does seem to be down right now, though—sigh... --Peter ᵀᵃˡᵏ 14:15, 13 July 2012 (UTC)

142. **Support.** A travel project fits well into the WMF mission. --denny (talk) 14:18, 13 July 2012 (UTC)

143. **Support.** I'm a normal editor on Wikitravel (not an administrator). Used to be more active but lost interest due to constant technical problems as well as too far-going commercialisation plans. I always loved the idea of an open, free travel guide and Wikimedia seems like the perfect environment. I've always considered traveling one of the most educational activities possible. As a traveler, I keep switching between Wikipedia and Wikitravel, in order to have both the practical (tourist) information and the deeper knowledge and backgrounds on places and sights. It will be great to have them closer together and I'm sure it will encourage people to learn even more about the places they visit. Justme2 (talk) 14:21, 13 July 2012 (UTC)

144. **Support.** Das fehlende Puzzleteil. Liesel (talk) 14:30, 13 July 2012 (UTC)

145. **Support.** Willkommen in der Familie. ;) MichaelSchoenitzer (talk) 14:35, 13 July 2012 (UTC)

146. **Support** I'm really looking forward to become a contributer to the Wikimedia Travel Guide. --David Ludwig (talk) 15:30, 13 July 2012 (UTC)

147. **Support** Chaddy (talk) 17:19, 13 July 2012 (UTC)

148. **Support** Another kind of knowledge collected in a collobrative process. Perfectly fits the Wikimedia Movement. Sebastian Wallroth (talk) 18:05, 13 July 2012 (UTC)

149. **Support** --Michail (talk) 18:22, 13 July 2012 (UTC)

150. **Support** - don't see any reason to oppose if those communities are sure about their favourite future -- Achim Raschka (talk) 18:40, 13 July 2012 (UTC)

151. **Support** --Wvk (talk) 19:27, 13 July 2012 (UTC)

152. **Support** --El Grafo (talk) 19:33, 13 July 2012 (UTC)

153. **Support** --Jan Luca (talk) 19:43, 13 July 2012 (UTC)

154. **Support** --Joergens.mi (talk) 22:19, 13 July 2012 (UTC)

155. Strong **support** --Morten Haan (talk) 22:26, 13 July 2012 (UTC)

156. **Support** --Mauerquadrant (talk) 00:41, 14 July 2012 (UTC)

157. **Support** --Prolineserver (talk) 01:23, 14 July 2012 (UTC)

158. **Support** --Peter.C (talk) 02:16, 14 July 2012 (UTC)

159. **Support** - It will be interesting to see how we can maintain a neutral POV on this project, but it's worth trying at least :-) Ajraddatz (Talk) 04:07, 14 July 2012 (UTC)

  Yes agree there are a number of challenging including this one ahead of us. However if we have a large community of people using common sense and consensus I am sure that it can be overcome. Wikipedia too only works in practice and not theory.**Doc James** (talk · contribs · email) 10:58, 14 July 2012 (UTC)

Yeah, and I'll also do whatever I can to help. As someone who does travel often, this project interests me and I'll gladly contribute to it. Ajraddatz (Talk) 19:48, 14 July 2012 (UTC)

160. **Support** --Ayacop (talk) 06:44, 14 July 2012 (UTC)
161. **Support** -- Balou46 (talk) 09:47, 14 July 2012 (UTC)
162. **Support** --Timmaexx (talk) 10:51, 14 July 2012 (UTC)
163. **Support** --Tobias talk · contrib 12:17, 14 July 2012 (UTC)
164. **Support** The project will fill an information gap that we currently can't address on other project. Yes, there are issues but they're not impossible to overcome. --Dimi z (talk) 15:43, 14 July 2012 (UTC)
165. **Support.** It would be a great idea and helpful in may ways. It will increase the mobile users of the Wikipedia as well. Waiting for the approval, and will contribute the to the Bengali version. Cheers. Nasir Khan Saikat (talk) 16:53, 14 July 2012 (UTC)
166. **Support.** Overlaps a bit with Wikipedia and is too big for Wikibooks. Nice pictures are also good for Wikimedia Commons. The project will get more public attention. --Headbreak (talk) 18:15, 14 July 2012 (UTC)
167. **Support.** as Wikivoyager. --J. Patrick Fischer (talk) 19:08, 14 July 2012 (UTC)
168. **Support** --Patkenel (talk) 23:46, 14 July 2012 (UTC)
169. **Support.** There are people who are enthusiastic about joining and sharing their content with us - we would be quite stupid to turn them and their content down.--Poupou l'quourouce (talk) 00:32, 15 July 2012 (UTC)
170. **Support.** How often do we have to revert in Wikipedia telling the contributor "WP is not a travel guide!" Now we know where to send this contributor to the benefit of both sides. Wikitravel won't be the first NPOV project. Wikiversity, or Wikibooks aren't either. I would even like to see differnt POVs presented in Wikitravel, because not all travelers are alike or have the same preferences. --Wuselig (talk) 01:35, 15 July 2012 (UTC)

Exactly and one of the proposals is the use of Wikidata to allow travelers to sort listing based on what kind of traveler they are.**Doc James** (talk · contribs · email) 12:07, 15 July 2012 (UTC)

171. **Support.** you're welcome. --NatiSythen (talk) 04:39, 15 July 2012 (UTC)
172. **Support.** --Don-kun (talk) 09:01, 15 July 2012 (UTC)
173. **Support.** Good idea. -- Alan ffm (talk) 09:49, 15 July 2012 (UTC)
174. **Support** Andim (talk) 10:56, 15 July 2012 (UTC)
175. **Support** Krokofant
176. **Support** --Stillhart (talk) 14:08, 15 July 2012 (UTC)
177. **Support** --ST o 15:36, 15 July 2012 (UTC)
178. **Support** --Digr (talk) 18:00, 15 July 2012 (UTC)
179. **Support** -- Common Good (talk) 18:30, 15 July 2012 (UTC)
180. **Weak support** People have been comparing Wikitravel with Wikipedia, but I think that this is wrong: Wikitravel should be compared with Wikibooks instead. In Wikitravel, you get instructions on what to do as a tourist at a specific location. In Wikibooks, you get, for example, instructions on how to use a specific product. I have compared a Wikitravel page (wikitravel:Stockholm) with a Wikibooks page (b:A Beginner's Guide to MS Windows Optimization) and both seem to contain the same level of w:WP:OR and w:WP:NPOV. I guess that this is the way you would normally write an instruction manual: you have to violate some *Wikipedia* policies. However, Wikipedia policies are designed for Wikipedia, and I assume that it is fine to violate them on other projects. Thus, Wikitravel seems to fit the Wikimedia concept of educational websites. I am concerned about the performance of Internet Brands'

server: I often notice that it is extremely slow when I try to access Wikitravel. I rarely make any edits there, but when I have tried doing so, I have sometimes noticed that I am suddenly logged out without notice and that I am suddenly editing as an IP. Then I go to wikitravel:Special:UserLogin and try to log in only to notice that I am already logged in, so I click on "Show preview" in the edit window. Oops, logged out again! Not a big issue for me, but Wikitravel admins might not be happy if lots of users accidentally end up using IP sockpuppets due to server errors. I feel that something has to be done, but I am also afraid that the community might split so that some users remain at the old site whereas other users move to Wikimedia. --Stefan2 (talk) 21:50, 15 July 2012 (UTC)

181. *Conditional Support* -- I think it may be true that we will get more editors, and it is definitely true we will get more content and make travel information on the Internet not suck. I am concerned that the Wikimedia Foundation appears to have ignored their little projects such as Wikibooks, Wikiversity, Wikisource, Wikiquote, Wikispecies. This project will probably in short order joint them. If they are to be brought into the fold, I propose they be added to the goals for 2015 for the foundation, that they all have their own individual plans for development and growth for the future, and that funding and technical resources be allotted to them for their further development, which will inevitably bleed over into Wikipedia improvements.Judgesurreal777 (talk) 14:18, 16 July 2012 (UTC)

> At last check 32 Wikitravel admins and a whole lot of Wikitravel users have committed to moving over, so there will most definitely be new editors joining. Jpatokal (talk) 03:21, 17 July 2012 (UTC)

182. **Support** -- Avantenor (talk) 23:43, 15 July 2012 (UTC)
183. **Support.** I'm a long term contibutor to Wikitravel. I strongly agree with what Wuselig said. --Inas66 (talk) 00:22, 16 July 2012 (UTC)
184. **Support** -- Hubertl (talk) 05:29, 16 July 2012 (UTC)
185. ⊕ **Support** --Berthold Werner (talk) 09:31, 16 July 2012 (UTC)
186. **Support** Hinkelstein (talk) 11:25, 16 July 2012 (UTC)
187. **Support** --Enst38 (talk) 12:28, 16 July 2012 (UTC)
188. **Support** There are serious costs to this but the benefits far outweigh them. I am particularly persuaded by the opportunity to attract new users from existing travel projects. **Blue Rasberry** (talk) 14:32, 16 July 2012 (UTC)
189. ⊕ *Support* This is a great initiative -- Pranavaswaroop (talk) 13:33, 25 July 2012 (UTC)
190. **Support** This could be a great addition to the WMF projects --Michael Sch. (talk) 14:54, 16 July 2012 (UTC)
191. **Support:** This projet will be a great addition for Wikipedia, because many aspects of travel guide are misplaced in Wikipedia and would violate the WP:NOT rule. Wind (talk) 15:45, 16 July 2012 (UTC)
192. **Support:** I'm convinced by the proposal analysis of the educative value of the project. The set of rules and the licensing policies are correct and in adequation with other Wikimedia projects standards. A discussion is needed for a standard domain name. --Dereckson (talk) 17:48, 17 July 2012 (UTC)
193. **Strong support:** There is no sense in having various projects - Wikipedia anyway is mostly the starting point for many tourists to search information about destinations (talking about experiences in the travel business). It is better to keep one strong project than various weaker ones. We are considering to create a group within a motorbiker's network that would be interested in exactly such a project to support, so learning about Wikimedia talking about a travel guide was really good.--Sabine (talk) 09:07, 18 July 2012 (UTC)
194. **Support** --gildemax (talk) 10:30, 18 July 2012 (UTC)

195. **Support**: A travel project would fit well into WMF, and there are historical ties between the projects anyway (see Evan's vote). --zeno (talk) 13:17, 18 July 2012 (UTC)

196. **Support** - Here is my thinking. Wikitravel (http://www.alexa.com/siteinfo/wikitravel.org) is HUGE—more popular than Wikiquote (http://www.alexa.com/siteinfo/www.wikiquote.org) , Wikibooks (http://www.alexa.com/siteinfo/www.wikibooks.org) and Wikisource (http://www.alexa.com/siteinfo/wikisource.org) . The increased viewership could be a huge asset for increasing Wikimedia's brand awareness. Marcus Qwertyus (talk) 19:33, 18 July 2012 (UTC)

197. **Support** - God, I dread this. The multiplication of sub-guides will almost certainly make rabbits look like monks. But I can also easily see that it might draw a few more people to become editors in general, probably including a fair number of people from smaller areas, and that would probably be a good thing. And, yeah, if other existing sites want to merge into one here, that will provide a reasonably sound basis for a start. But this might make the English wikipedia look like an easy project to manage. John Carter (talk) 00:51, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

198. **Support** simply, it will be very useful for people around the world , so i'm supporting it . —*The preceding unsigned comment was added by* Mr AkRaM (talk • contribs) .

199. **Support** - It will be better if the local designation will have an allowance by supplying mapping and facts. However, will make disadvantages through misguidance. **Jonas'VM** ☼ 9:18 19 July 2012 (UTC)

200. **Support** - I hope to be a quality such as Wikipedia. --Vhorvat (talk) 01:57, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

201. **Support** - I can understand opponents' concern for this proposal. But, I believe in power of this community. We can do it.--かぬま (talk) 02:01, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

202. **Support** - Would be a great addition to the WMF. --J36miles (talk) 02:05, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

203. **Support** --Jivee Blau (talk) 02:11, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

204. **Support** -Jean.julius (talk) 02:19, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

205. **Support** - --Soyescritor (talk) 02:27, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

206. **Support** - Evad37 (talk) 02:47, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

207. **Support** - Umarfarooq111 (talk) 02:58, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

208. **Support** Not so bad, do it. but I have no money to travel to other country. :P --Yodamgod (talk) 02:54, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

    We hope to also have content to help people travel around their own communities. **Doc James** (talk · contribs · email) 03:05, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

209. **Support** - This is a nautral way. Vinicius Siqueira (talk) 03:33, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

210. **Support** - I like the idea behind Wikitravel, and I like the WMF. Join alliances. Maximilianklein (talk) 03:38, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

211. **Support** The project would attract lots of people from the tourism industry. Karthikndr (talk) 03:57, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

212. **Support** Would be a good addition. -- Laberkiste (talk) 04:17, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

213. **Support** I like travel.--Qa003qa003 (talk) 04:19, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

214. **Suport**—I don't think it is relevant whether we can import WikiTravel and WikiVoyage with the click of a button. The simple fact is, there is a sector of knowledge not covered by our existing projects, and this is our chance to cover it. If the new project garners the expected interest, the editors will be able to import WT and WV manually over time, if necessary. — Ynhockey (talk) 04:22, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

215. **Support** as it really bugs me that the existing Wikitravel is a for-profit entity. I'm reluctant to contribute to that site when I know that someone is profiting off of my work.--Bdell555 (talk) 04:29, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

216. **Slight support** - Yeah, it can be helpful and gives a completion to WMF projects, particularly related articles in WP. Though we already have links to it, wikification of WT is necessary and becomes possible quickly when it comes under the WMF umbrella.

>WMF has about 9 content projects. They have one thing in common - all are educational. I am pretty convinced that a travel guide would also be educational. But please note, a travel guide is more than that - it is a *guide*. None of the nine project is completely a guide (of course we have recipes in WB). This would be a **stepping stone** for WMF to produce more guide related projects. One day, I hope, a more general Wikiguide would engulf this WT into it (similar to WData and WSpecies). Also, to meet WMF's goal, it may start some open educational institutions (say, the WMF International Open University). It may take years but, anyway, I would welcome it. Some of the arguments given by the opposing users are cleared just by pointing that a similar thing is existing in another project. Well Wikipedia:Other stuff exists may not apply here. This will strengthen the possibility of having a wide variety of *happy to hear* projects to come in future :). If we accepts travel guide now, a general guide will be proposed in future; claiming - an identical project (WT) exists, is educational and NPOV doesn't matter.
>I have worries about the following,

>- I hope that the info given in WT would be reliable enough. We can give WB as an example for not having refs, but things are slightly different there.
>- This is about personal experiences and will provide a good mask for efficient trolls. This can be experienced *effectively* as the project gets bigger and bigger. Strict reviewing will be required.

>**Vanischenu**^Talk 04:25, 19 July 2012 (UTC) modified at 03:44, 21 July 2012 (UTC)

217. **Strong support** We are utilizing existing infrastructure of WikiTravel, WikiVoyage, and NYCwiki. This project is completely in line with the foundation's mission and could quite possibly increase editorship in other projects.Ryan Vesey (talk) 04:42, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

218. **Support** - But Wiki should not compromise with its reliability quotient and it should not be a advertisement platform. Appropriate rules should be made. Anyway Travel wiki is a welcome step ahead.--Bharathiya (talk) 05:01, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

219. **Support** Good idea. --Stryn (talk) 05:14, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

220. **Strong Support** This is a great idea. A travel guide would be a great expansion to the Wikimedia Foundation. Hadger (talk) 05:55, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

221. **Support** Good idea, since ad-free. --Olli (talk) 06:31, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

222. **Support** --DILIN (talk) 06:47, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

223. **Support**.amazing idea.--Geronimixxx (talk) 06:57, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

224. **Support** Let's make something really good!! Octavius 909 (talk) 07:06, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

225. **Support** High demand, good synergies with other wikimedia-projects, opportunity to win more participiants also in other projects.--Karsten11 (talk) 07:56, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

226. **Support** All my articles about roman and italian buildings and churches could be packed together in a good way for travellers. --Capaci34 (talk) 08:11, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

227. **Support**: As active user both in ru.WP and WT.ru, I believe that it would be a much needed and useful addition to WP and other WMF projects. --Л.П. Джепко (talk) 08:55, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

228. **Support** Good idea. --**ElmA** (Talk – My contributions – E-mail) 09:01, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

229. **Support**. I've consulted Wikitravel fairly often, and I've even edited it a few times. For all its shortcomings, Wikitravel does have some excellent content and a fairly active, if small, editor

base. Thus, we've seen that a wiki travel guide can work. A Wikimedia-backed project would be far more technically reliable than Wikitravel, and would attract more editors from the various other Wikimedia communities. In particular, the new project would need experienced administrators, bureaucrats, and other functionaries, which Wikitravel seems to lack. szyslak 09:04, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

230. **Support** Good Idea and helpful in many points of view. --IlSignoreDeiPC (talk) 09:18, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
231. **Support** Good idea.--David1010 (talk) 09:57, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
232. **Support** Good idea to put information inside that is not "relevant" as most says for articles -- P.oppenia (talk) 10:03, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
233. **Support** It will be really helpful for traveling... Slaven Kosanovic (talk) 10:09, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
234. **Support** Very-very good idea! --▶**Safir yüzüklü Cekli**^mesaj 10:28, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
235. **Support** --Hydriz (talk) 10:28, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
236. **Support** Traveling is best education for understanding the world and its people. --Benreis (talk) 10:44, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
237. **Support** Travels are a part of the culture. It is important to join force to do the best. Pamputt (talk) 11:21, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
238. **Support** Noritaka666 (talk) 11:23, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
239. **Support** *Travellation*. Great idea. Wish we've done this a long time ago yet and of course to quote a famous American leader: "Yes, we can!"
Kind regards, Klaas V 11:34, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
240. **Support** Go ahead!! rursus (talk) 11:36, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
241. **Support** Good idea! Yes, of course! Rajasuu
242. **Support** Wikipedia cannot cover every possible tourist destination in minute detail. - Presidentman (talk) 12:31, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
243. **Support** Grekube (talk) 12:59, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
244. **Support** Atlasowa (talk)
245. **Support** Thumbs up! As mentioned above, travel information is practical knowledge and education. I never learned so much other than during my travels. Benoit Rochon (talk)
246. **Support** LightBringer (talk) 13:34, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

> ~~Support I would support this project, as a tourism lover and as a Tourism student. Maybe local tourist boards want to dump some of their info into this new site and, anyway, W'pedia already hosts a lot of tourist vaulable information. Schumi4ever (talk) 13:38, 19 July 2012 (UTC)~~ Sorry, changed my mind...

247. **Support** I will support and defend this project because I believe it would be great for the community. It will also, I hope, expand the Wikipedia/Wikimedia project, make it better.Steve92341 (talk) 14:00, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
248. **Support** Very good idea!Duval (talk) 14:05, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
249. **Support** If the WT and the WV communities want to merge into a new Wikimedia project, I think we should welcome them. I vote for "Wikivoyage" to name the project, it's more multilingual than using "travel". Surt Fafnir (talk) 14:06, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
250. **Support** as a major contributor for articles about American places on jawp. Yassie (talk) 14:08, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
251. **Support**. --פדיחה (talk) 14:37, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
252. **Support**.--🚂 **Cyrax** *(Comando)* 14:47, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
253. **Support**. בנימין (talk) 15:22, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
254. **Support**.-- Thumbs up.Sounds like a plan.BrightStarSky,19 July 2012

255. **Support**.-- Sounds great! --92.73.192.149 15:38, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
256. **Support**. Excellent idea!! --Arzino (talk) 15:46, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
257. **Support**. --Netha Hussain (talk) 16:04, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
258. ⊕ **Support** Cool idea... long as everyone who are giving support, be future editors :) -- ProtoplasmaKid (talk) 16:08, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
259. **Support**, as long as neutrality is enforced. --NaBUru38 (talk) 16:23, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
260. **Support** -- Milad A380 (talk) 16:47, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
261. **Support**. It's a great idea. This site will increase the world's knowledge. Gullit Torres (talk) 17:06, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
262. **Support**. Bogdanpax (talk) 17:11, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
263. **Support** A very logical step. Joadl (talk) 17:16, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
264. **Support** interesting proposition. --Ne0Freedom (talk) 17:39, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
265. **Support** —Derschueler 17:43, 19 July 2012 (UTC) good idea!
266. **Support** B1mbo (talk) 17:46, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
267. **Support** it'll be a very useful project.--Alex (talk) 18:00, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
268. **Support** Find it a very interesting idea (as a former contributor on WikiTravel besides) -- Floflo (talk) 18:04, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
269. **Support'** WikiTravel should have been assimilated by WMF long time ago. --Piotrus (talk) 18:06, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
270. **Support** - I peek at Wikitravel occasionally, but it could really use some love; far too often, it's outdated, incomplete, or (if you're looking for accomodation, pubs etc.) biased towards a few businesses that you can't help but feel inserted themselves into the pages. Having a project like this under the WMF umbrella could bring in new contributors (and bring back old ones) and increase the content's quality, thus ultimately benefit everyone who makes use it. -- Schnee (talk) 18:21, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
271. '''Support'''- Would be very helpful and educational. If kept to the standards of the WMF and Wikipedia community, I'm definitely in. -- Edgehead1212 (talk)
272. **Support** --Nicor (talk) 18:50, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
273. ⊕ **Support!** Long overdue IMHO! It fits thematically and would be a strong statement against misguided commercial interests on the back of a volunteer community. --Boris Marinov (talk) 18:55, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
274. --Pelz (talk) 19:08, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
275. **Support** --Derzno (talk) 19:11, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
276. **Support** Broaden the community! Bill D (talk) 19:16, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
277. ⊕ **Support!** the arguments of the opposers let me say yes. A Travel Guide is good for education. The influence of Advertisement is overestimated.--Mdarge (talk) 19:44, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
278. **Support** --Skizzik (talk) 19:48, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
279. **Support** --Bin im Garten (talk) 20:20, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
280. **Support** Very interesting idea!--Алексей Гоманков (talk) 20:47, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
281. **Support** --Kdkeller (talk) 20:54, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
282. **Support** -- 05ترجمان (talk) 21:13, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
283. **Support** Very good idea --Mbs z (talk) 21:18, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
284. **Support** ToBeFree (talk) 21:26, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
285. **Support** I was going to oppose this as a duplication of Wikitravel, but if a majority of that project's admins and all its contributors who responded are interested in migration to WMF, that's a very good thing. The project is already developed, and its content can be moved here without substantial licensing issues. Why not? Nyttend (talk) 21:29, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
286. **Support** - Would by very helpful to have one strong base for all the active editors --Wivoelke (talk) 21:34, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
287. **Support** - Kpjas (talk) 22:16, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

288. **Support** --LZ6387 (talk) 22:17, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
289. **Support** - Intriguing idea, very logical, Wikipedia is filled with pages of villages and townships and places people would never search for on an encyclopedia, such as this town (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Uher_%28village%29) , or this one (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pokr%C3%B3wka) or this little village (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Horodyszcze-Kolonia) , most of these would seem more belonging in a project dedicated solely to the topic. Pluto and Beyond (talk) 00:00, 20 July 2012 (UTC)
290. **Support** --Generous (talk) 00:37, 20 July 2012 (UTC)
291. **Support** This will be a massive project, we are in we support it.--Maxwell gauss (talk) 01:47, 20 July 2012 (UTC)

> **Support.** I'm a co-founder of Wikitravel, a longtime MediaWiki developer and Wikipedia admin, and I support this proposal. --EvanProdromou (talk) 01:22, 20 July 2012 (UTC)

> Oops, you seem to have commented twice? --Kim Bruning (talk) 23:13, 16 August 2012 (UTC)

292. **Support** FrankyLeRoutier (talk) 02:01, 20 July 2012 (UTC)
293. **Support** Denis Barthel (talk) 02:53, 20 July 2012 (UTC) Co-founder of German Wikitravel, Wikipedian, Wikimedian. Denis Barthel (talk) 02:53, 20 July 2012 (UTC)
294. **Support:** Why not? --MadriCR (talk) 03:33, 20 July 2012 (UTC)
295. **Support:** Not only be a support to all users of wikimedia, if not all travel agents who want to contribute their bit this project. It's a great idea. I fully support. --Juancameneses11 (talk) 06:44, 20 July 2012 (UTC)
296. ⊕ **Strong support:** Its a great idea. Hindustanilanguage (talk) 07:12, 20 July 2012 (UTC).
297. **Support:** Good idea --Feuerst (talk) 07:32, 20 July 2012 (UTC)
298. **Support** --9xl (talk) 07:46, 20 July 2012 (UTC)
299. **Support** - Good Move ---...Captain......Tälk tö me.. 09:23, 20 July 2012 (UTC)
300. **Support** - C'est une très belle idée. Mulunda Selenge Bienvenu (talk) 09:29, 20 July 2012 (UTC)
301. **Support** --BambooBeast (talk) 10:49, 20 July 2012 (UTC)
302. **Support** -Stauffenberg (talk) 11:12, 20 July 2012 (UTC)
303. **Support:** Sounds like a great new idea and it goes well with the WMF's other projects. Spread the knowledge, even if it's in a travel guide format. --Rev-san (talk) 11:16, 20 July 2012 (UTC)
304. **Support:** --Tkarcher (talk) 12:24, 20 July 2012 (UTC)
305. **Support':** after careful consideration of arguments on the talk page Teemeah (talk) 12:37, 20 July 2012 (UTC)
306. ⊕ **Support.** 88.176.129.199 12:40, 20 July 2012 (UTC).
307. **Support':** Somebody read my mind! --Sefer (talk) 12:42, 20 July 2012 (UTC)
308. ⊕ **Support** good idea. *Ramesh Ramaiah* [talk] 12:59, 20 July 2012 (UTC)
309. ⊕ **Support** Yes, strengthen the Wikimedia super-community. Good prospects for success. --Ettrig (talk) 13:42, 20 July 2012 (UTC)
310. ⊕ **Support** Have always wished that this community was part of Wikimedia. +1 for new blood :) Seddon (talk) 14:35, 20 July 2012 (UTC)
311. ⊕ **Support** why not. Lukas[23] (talk) 14:42, 20 July 2012 (UTC)
312. ⊕ **Support** I am looking for a useful wiki travel guide for long time, Wikivoyage just has Germany and Italin version; Wikitravel is not so active as wikipedia. It looks like a difficult project to integrade Wikivoyage&Wikitravel into wiki Travel Guide, however, there some non -profit(or half)wiki sites have collapsed so as to waste plenty wonderful resources. It's worth

starting the project by WMF rather than other wiki communities going to be in a dilemma. We deeply need nature knowledge as well travel guide.----Davisan (Talk留言) 14:57, 20 July 2012 (UTC)

313. ⊕ **Support** As a long-time bureaucrat/admin/contributor to Wikitravel and Wikitravel Shared, I can only support this idea. Internet Brands haven't been able to take care of the site, and the stalwart users, such as myself, are rapidly loosing interest. The recent MediaWiki upgrade was a welcome action by Internet Brands, but I fear it is a bit late. Actually, I suggested a move like this last year (http://wikitravel.org/wiki/shared/index.php?title=Talk:Advertising_policy&diff=141767&oldid=141761) . Riggwelter (talk) 15:12, 20 July 2012 (UTC)

314. **Strong Support**. Most of the people who will write in such a project are not the same as those who are writing in wikipedia just now. But if they get involved in one of the wikimedia projects it is more likely they will get involved in other wikimedia projects. Additionally they will advertise for wikimedia distribute the understanding what's going on here. Greetings from Germany Lutz Hartmann. 217.245.252.81 15:16, 20 July 2012 (UTC)

315. ⊕ **strong support** --Katarighe (Talk) 15:29, 20 July 2012 (UTC)

316. ⊕ **strong support** - Фаренгейто (talk) 15:31, 20 July 2012 (UTC)

317. ⊕ **Support** The fit is quite good - we have wikipedia and wikibooks already, in style this could fit between the two, and this should be a good way to gain contributors for both projects. ChrisHodgesUK (talk) 16:04, 20 July 2012 (UTC)

318. ⊕ **Support** Shoot, why not, especially if we are capturing all of those volunteers and content. Thats a way to add another part of to the community that will have interest in the movements success, Sadads (talk) 16:08, 20 July 2012 (UTC)

319. ⊕ **Support**, it's a great opportunity both for WikiTravel/WikiVoyage and for the Wikimedia projects. Cdlt, VIGNERON * discut. 16:11, 20 July 2012 (UTC)

320. ⊕ **Support**. I have always been reluctant to contribute to WT, because of its commercial purpose. A Wikimedia-supported travel site seems to be a good idea. BrightRaven (talk) 16:18, 20 July 2012 (UTC)

321. ⊕ **Support** --MichaelK (talk) 16:29, 20 July 2012 (UTC)

322. ⊕ **Support** because it would be a much more acceptable place for certain kinds of content that people feel iffy about in Wikipedia, like minute trivia about places, information about famous local personalities and all those local businesses. Everybody wins! --*wwwwwolf* (barks/growls) 17:26, 20 July 2012 (UTC)

323. ⊕ **Support** --PAC2 (talk) 17:37, 20 July 2012 (UTC)

324. ⊕ **Support** Can be very intressting with combination with **Google Project Glass** --Richard Reinhardt (talk) 17:42, 20 July 2012 (UTC)

325. ⊕ **Support** For Poland I can take part. --Pablo000 (talk) 18:10, 20 July 2012 (UTC)

326. ⊕ **Support** It can be a good reason for others to start editing and make the WMF projects even bigger. I can take part for Bolivia--Jduranboger (talk) 18:22, 20 July 2012 (UTC)

327. ⊕ **Support**: At first I thought, what, another small startup languishing forever with startup problems? And another tourist wiki competing against the established ones? But no, you mean the biggest of those others have asked to be swallowed alive into our Wikimedia empire. Yummy; at last a good place to put bicycle tour turnsheets that are properly out of place in Wikipedia! Jim.henderson (talk) 18:22, 20 July 2012 (UTC)

328. ⊕ **Support**: As a long-time Wikipedia contributor (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/User:Jdlh) and Wikitravel contributor (http://wikitravel.org/en/User:JimDeLaHunt) , I support a unified home for freely-available travel content, and I'm wary of the danger of badly executed forks. I've been away from Wikitravel for a while (due to my schedule, not Internet Brands), so I've missed the decline in service. However, I'm persuaded by Wikitravel contributors whom I respect who say that Wikitravel is languishing at InternetBrands. Rather than let the free

content wither there, since WMF believes it can provide a good home, let's fork. I expect to put my efforts into the WMF fork rather than the Internet Brands fork. Jdlh (talk) 18:51, 20 July 2012 (UTC)

> Before casting your vote, you may want to visit Wikitravel and see how the site actually is now. Many "support" votes were cast months ago, prior to the completion of the MW software and hardware upgrade, which dramatically improved performance, look & feel, and features, as well as addressing nearly all reported bugs. There has been for a while now a renewed cooperation between the host (IB) and community, meaning objections on those grounds voiced months ago are quite out of date today. Also, just a short note: Wikitravel.org is the actual site; the WMF site would be the fork. Thanks,--IBobi talk email 19:54, 20 July 2012 (UTC)

>> IBobi, thanks for your response. However, reading the threads on your WT user page about "Deleting discussions (http://wikitravel.org/en/User_talk:IBobi#Deleting_discussions) " and "Rogue admin? (http://wikitravel.org/en/User_talk:IBobi#Rogue_admin.3F) ", I'm afraid I'm losing confidence in your credibility. Jdlh (talk) 09:03, 21 August 2012 (UTC)

329. ⊕ **Support** --Dr.Haus (talk) 20:03, 20 July 2012 (UTC)
330. ⊕ **Support** Good Idea جولد (talk) 20:04, 20 July 2012 (UTC)
331. ⊕ **Support** AlexKazakhov (talk) 20:24, 20 July 2012 (UTC)

> I thought we already had WikiTravel? I'm confused. I don't see the point in having another project which is basically the same?

332. ⊕ **Support** Excellent idea!!! Sajad (talk) 21:09, 20 July 2012 (UTC)
333. ⊕ **Support** of course! It's a wonderful idea! Support for a 146%! Matty Dean (talk) 21:53, 20 July 2012 (UTC)
334. ⊕ **Support** I'm Japanese. If it is also created if the Japanese version, I can participate. Even if not, I think what this project is useful. --MIKADO,Sakura (御門桜) (talk) 00:11, 21 July 2012 (UTC)

> Check out Wikitravel Japanese (http://wikitravel.org/ja) . In addition there are 20 other languages already represented at the original Wikitravel site.--IBobi talk email 01:25, 21 July 2012 (UTC)

335. **support** - One of the best ideas ive ever heard TheChampionMan1234 (talk) 03:53, 21 July 2012 (UTC)
336. **support** 위키여행이 만들어지면 여행지를 위키 형태로 수록해 자유롭게 이용할 수 있다고 봅니다. --아라는 다 알아 (talk) 04:49, 21 July 2012 (UTC)
337. ⊕ **Support** Very good idea. It will soon become a reality! JuventiniFan (talk) 05:03, 21 July 2012 (UTC)
338. ⊕ **Support** Also opposed to contributing to WT, due to its commercial nature, but would contribute to a travel project on WMF regularly. Holgs (talk) 05:20, 21 July 2012 (UTC)
339. ⊕ **Support** A very good idea.--Gauravjuvekar (talk) 06:34, 21 July 2012 (UTC)
340. **Support** Anubhab91 (talk) 07:55, 21 July 2012 (UTC)
341. ⊕ **Support**, of course, though I won't help mainting it, I'm afraid. H. (talk) 10:18, 21 July 2012 (UTC)

342. ⊕ **Support** I think this could lead to great improvements over the current state of wikitravel. Especially access to wikimedia commons would make a lot of sense. --Gidoca (talk) 10:22, 21 July 2012 (UTC)

343. ⊕ **Support** Assume good faith (http://translate.google.co.jp/translate? sl=ja&tl=en&js=n&prev=_t&hl=ja&ie=UTF-8&layout=2&eotf=1&u=http%3A%2F% 2Fja.wikipedia.org%2Fwiki%2FWikipedia%3A善意にとる) --MOTOI Kenkichi (talk) 10:41, 21 July 2012 (UTC)

344. **Support**: Why not? Riley Huntley (talk) 10:55, 21 July 2012 (UTC)

345. ⊕ **Support** Great idea! Jacopo Werther (talk) 11:09, 21 July 2012 (UTC)

346. ⊕ **Support** Very good idea! :) Gálaniitoluodda (talk) 11:27, 21 July 2012 (UTC)

347. **Support** good opportunities for sharing content, effort and editors. Advertising problems seem no greater than those on wp. JMiall (talk) 11:52, 21 July 2012 (UTC)

348. ⊕ **Support** Would be much appreciated addition to the existing Wikimedia projects.— M*Zaplotnik* (contribs) 12:42, 21 July 2012 (UTC)

349. ⊕ **Support** I thought this isn't a good idea because I considered establishment of some technical linkages between Wikimedia and Wikitravel is a better idea and the new travel wiki can cause inefficient fragmentation of information among similar wikis on the web. However, I changed my stance after reading the page Travel Guide. Many members of travel-related wikis want a completely free travel wiki and the existing Wikimedia Projects have huge information related to it. Therefore, the new Wikemedia Project for travel guide should be created. I think the new wiki will be able to make synergy with the GLAM Wikiproject. -- Yes0song (talk) 13:27, 21 July 2012 (UTC)

350. **Support** Berek (talk) 13:47, 21 July 2012 (UTC)

351. ⊕ **Support** --S.Didam (talk) 13:52, 21 July 2012 (UTC)

352. ⊕ **Support** Bernhard Wallisch (talk) 16:37, 21 July 2012 (UTC)

353. ⊕ **Support** --Gribeco (talk) 17:26, 21 July 2012 (UTC)

354. ⊕ **Very Strong Support** --DavidL (talk) 17:36, 21 July 2012 (UTC)

355. ⊕ **Strong Support** Great idea as long as the rules and guidelines are well thought-out. -- Wikitiki89 (talk) 18:44, 21 July 2012 (UTC)

356. ⊕ **Support**--Rataube (talk) 21:47, 21 July 2012 (UTC)

357. ⊕ **Support** why not? --Guerillero 22:25, 21 July 2012 (UTC)

358. ⊕ **Support** why not? --İncelemeelemani (talk) 22:40, 21 July 2012 (UTC)

359. **Weak support** I personally believe that Wiki Travel is less relevant to Wikimedia Foundation's mission than other current projects. There is a significant element of 'entertainment' in travel though one might say it is also about knowledge. However, I sign my name here to support the proposal based on its merit. I am convinced that the proposed project will greatly expand our readers/editors/reputation at a relatively small cost. Our movement can do it and it has a great benefits for all parties involved. --Taweetham (talk) 22:55, 21 July 2012 (UTC)

360. ⊕ **Support** Sammy pompon (talk) 23:33, 21 July 2012 (UTC)

361. ⊕ **Support** --Nkansahrexford (talk) 00:59, 22 July 2012 (UTC)

362. **Support** -- Dr. Loo^Lets talk about it 01:16, 22 July 2012 (UTC)

363. **Support** -- Perrak (talk) 01:19, 22 July 2012 (UTC)

364. ⊕ **Extremely Strong Support** -- Ian159 (talk) 03:04, 22 July 2012 (UTC)

365. **Support**. User:Karthim02 08.42, 22 July 2012(UTC), it is a useful project. I support this.

366. ⊕ **Support** ZackMartin (talk) 03:26, 22 July 2012 (UTC)

367. ⊕ **Support** Hannibal 06:40, 22 July 2012 (UTC)

368. ⊕ **Support** Zeman (talk) 08:52, 22 July 2012 (UTC)

369. ⊕ **Support** I think it would be a nice idea. --Homer (talk) 09:53, 22 July 2012 (UTC)

370. ⊕ **Support** Non-monetized travel content, well-managed with Wikimedia's guidance won't hurt. Romilsworld (talk) 13:11, 22 July 2012 (UTC)Romil
371. ⊕ **Support** Bacus15 (talk) 13:17, 22 July 2012 (UTC)
372. ⊕ **Support** -- ൫ෙ෮ඩ (talk) 13:29, 22 July 2012 (UTC)
373. ⊕ **Support** Information in each form deserves its own space in Wikimedia.--Alperen (talk) 13:43, 22 July 2012 (UTC)
374. ⊕ **Support** It's about to get organized, up-to-date, free information. Definitely a project for Wikimedia. --ElfQrin (talk) 14:41, 22 July 2012 (UTC)
375. ⊕ **Support** as it's a natural fit. Although more thought needs to be given on the advertising implications. I think that there will be a lot of effort aimed at including hotels, bars and restaurants from local SEOs. This could be a good thing (if rules are set down for this content) but could lead to a lot of wasted time if the Wikipedia non-commercial rules are adhered to. Perhaps this one should be advertising supported to cover mobile development? Also there should be a great deal of encouragement for feedback (eg adding photos, comments, etc). JASpencer (talk) 14:48, 22 July 2012 (UTC)
376. ⊕ **Support** I am also a contributor at [[4] (http://wikitravel.org/sv/Anv%C3% A4ndare:Johan_J%C3%B6nsson)] /Johan Jönsson (talk) 15:24, 22 July 2012 (UTC)
377. ⊕ **Support**: Why not? For me it's a good idea. --Antichitera (talk) 16:35, 22 July 2012 (UTC)
378. ⊕ **Support**: an important step for wikimedia taking over the Internet. -- Taku (talk) 18:32, 22 July 2012 (UTC)
379. ⊕ **Support**, and I want this will be not only in English, like Wikipedia. --Brateevsky (talk) 19:23, 22 July 2012 (UTC)
380. ⊕ **Support** אבנר (talk) 19:40, 22 July 2012 (UTC)
381. ⊕ **Support** Yes - and I expect that both the local languages at the destination and the inhabitants are fully included - the spirit of Wikipedia! --Hellsepp (talk) 19:59, 22 July 2012 (UTC)
382. ⊕ **Support** I think this is a very good idea and would help to enhance Wikipeda and it's community. TheIrishWarden (talk) 21:17, 22 July 2012 (UTC)
383. ⊕ **Support**: Why not? --Alma Pater (talk) 21:41, 22 July 2012 (UTC)
384. ⊕ **Support**: why not?? 93.130.145.132 22:56, 22 July 2012 (UTC)
385. **Support** DangSunM (talk) 00:47, 23 July 2012 (UTC)
386. **Support**.Vigorous action (talk) 01:26, 23 July 2012 (UTC)
387. ⊕ **Support**. Good proposal, workable integration, concerns addressed. Wittylama (talk) 05:14, 23 July 2012 (UTC)
388. ⊕ **Support** This would be ideal. Wikipedia is often used as a travel guide, but it lacks any opportunity to add essential traveling information (which, admittedly, is not encyclopedic). Wikitravel and Wikivoyage have been created outside the WMF in response to frustration with Wikipedia. Using Wikibooks is not an adequate replacement. Wikibooks does works when a textbook has a limited (say 5-20) number of chapters; reworking any chapter link into the special slash-structure required by Wikibooks is workable then. However, where the subject is handled through thousands of topics rather than book-like chapter headings, it quickly become a major pain. Many projects that have started on wikibooks have failed to gather support because of this and other inconveniences. WMF can add organisational support, long-term perspective, and public relations to such a project. Moving this project to WMF does make a difference. --G.Hagedorn (talk) 06:48, 23 July 2012 (UTC)
389. ⊕ **Support** Nelson Burgos (talk) 06:57, 23 July 2012 (UTC)
390. ⊕ **Support** Karan Kamath (Karan Kamath) 7:00, 23 July 2012(UTC)
391. ⊕ **Support** Brethrickacey
392. ⊕ **Support** Why not... Marcin Łukasz Kiejzik (talk) 11:24, 23 July 2012 (UTC)

393. **Weak support** Bonne idée, mais à repenser. Good idea, but the project must be thought again, with some strong objective rules, not just this subjective "The text should be fair.". Especially, the aim should not be to forge a promotional tool. Negative as well as non-mainstream opinions should be allowed and protected. Grasyop ✉ 18:50, 24 July 2012 (UTC)

394. **Weak support** On one hand, IB just not doing enough to keep WT editors at bay, and after reading Wikitravel editors abandon Internet Brands, join up with Wikipedia (http://gyrovague.com/2012/07/12/wikitravel-editors-abandon-internet-brands-join-up-with-wikipedia/) , I sympathized the editors there, but on the other hand, I'm not sure how subjectivity would fit in. Nevertheless, I'd like to see it hosted here rather than dying a slow death or becoming a ghost town. (Hey, isn't that what happened to a lot of wiktionaries and wikisources?) I can also see the prospect of it being translated into more languages, if only it doesn't have to go through Incubator. *sigh*. ⚫ Bennylin 11:29, 23 July 2012 (UTC)

395. ⊕ SupportGuoyunhebrave (talk) 11:36, 23 July 2012 (UTC)

396. ⊕ **Support** --2.225.116.57 11:57, 23 July 2012 (UTC)

397. ⊕ **Support** --Jesusosm (talk) 12:27, 23 July 2012 (UTC)

398. ⊕ **Support** Why not ? Romuald 2 (talk) 14:14, 23 July 2012 (UTC)

399. ⊕ **Support** Why a great project like this had to be "evilized" by those advertisements? Kenrick[95] 14:20, 23 July 2012 (UTC)

400. ⊕ **Support** Un wikivoyageur (http://wikitravel.org/fr/Utilisateur:Emmanuel_legrand) --Manu (talk) 14:30, 23 July 2012 (UTC)

401. ⊕ **Support** We can try. --Nouill (talk) 14:38, 23 July 2012 (UTC)

402. ⊕ **Support** I will help ALLiGaToR144 (talk) 14:43, 23 July 2012 (UTC)

403. ⊕ **Support** Regardless of any gripes about Wikipedia's scope, and the difficulty of the port, I think this would create a more than valuable resource. However, I imagine it will take a lot of policing to prevent it filling with adverts from resorts etc. Regardless, a good and ambitious idea. Bennydigital (talk) 12:38, 26 July 2012 (UTC)

404. ⊕ **Support** A natural scope – esp. avoiding how-to information on place pages, and I've lamented the non-free policy of WikiTravel in the past; would be delighted to welcome these projects to Wikimedia. —Nils von Barth (nbarth) (talk) 16:51, 23 July 2012 (UTC)

405. ⊕ **Support** An interesting suggestion, to different mysteries--GoShow (talk) 17:13, 23 July 2012 (UTC)

406. ~~Be bold ! Trizek~~ ~~ʰᵉʳᵉ ᵒʳ ᵒⁿ ʷᵖᶠʳ~~ ~~17:22, 23 July 2012 (UTC)~~ Be bold, without forgetting this **Trizek** ᶠʳᵒᵐ ᶠᴿ 07:30, 27 July 2012 (UTC)

407. ⊕ **Support** Love the idea. It would enrich wikipedia and help to focus articles better to the need of the person who is seeking for information --Schlaier (talk) 18:16, 23 July 2012 (UTC)

408. ⊕ **Support** Tiago Abreu (talk) 18:26, 23 July 2012 (UTC)

409. **Weak Support** I think this is only viable/advisable if the main push continues to be from the Wikivoyage side. Reade (talk) 18:46, 23 July 2012 (UTC)

410. ⊕ **Support**, strong support. Wikitravel should be part of the wikimedia project which can only help to build it further and breathe new life into it. It fills in gaps in knowledge which are not encyclopedia appropriate.81.105.63.121 18:53, 23 July 2012 (UTC)

411. ⊕ **Support** I think that it's a good idea. We will see.--Morphypnos (talk) 18:54, 23 July 2012 (UTC)

412. ⊕ **Support** I think Wikipedia is already a bit used as a travel guide, a complementary project like this seems to me natural. --Agregateur (talk) 19:13, 23 July 2012 (UTC)

413. ⊕ **Support** Seems like a lot of people support this and it would be great to crowdsource a travel guide that will be the most accurate of any in the world as Lonely Planet gets updated every few years while we could be updated during people's vacations today and now.Luciferwildcat (talk) 19:28, 23 July 2012 (UTC)

414. --Bobodu63 (talk) 19:38, 23 July 2012 (UTC)

415. ⊕ **Support** Convincing arguments for, not convincing arguments against, mutually beneficial for contributors in both camps, within the scope of WMF and beneficial for our readers. Arsenikk ^(talk) 19:42, 23 July 2012 (UTC)

416. ⊕ **Support** One of the underlying themes of Wikimedia sites is that they're practically useful, or at least intended to be. This simple practicality is a major part of our success and impact and WT can contribute more of that. In terms of basic education and practical usefulness WT already outdoes many of our projects like Wikinews. WT would benefit from moving more in the direction of neutrality and becoming a little more resistant to exploitation by commercial parties, improvement which the greater Wikimedia community could contribute to, since it seems that the WT contributors are also open to evolving... but WT's short-comings in this regard hardly seem serious when compared to some other Wikimedia projects. WT is practical, educational, and has a living community and. I think these are substantial pieces of evidence for likely success and that closer together we can better educate the world than further apart. -- Gmaxwell (talk) 20:04, 23 July 2012 (UTC)

417. ⊕ **Support** getting wikitravel and wikivoyage on board at wikimedia sounds good to me. - Bemoeial (talk) 20:30, 23 July 2012 (UTC)

418. ⊕ **Support** --Shujenchang (talk) 22:27, 23 July 2012 (UTC)

419. ⊕ **Support** It seems clear from my quick review of WikiTravel that the danger of censorship exists there, if contributors there flock to a wikimedia project as soon as there is an alternative, then we'll know. If they don't then the wikimedia project will serve as good healthy competition for wikitravel. Bloodzeed (talk) 23:12, 23 July 2012 (UTC)

420. ⊕ **Support** Because i don't want to see anyone editing Travel Guide related on wikipedia ever again, we must make this clear, we have different project regarding everything that related to travel guide. Ald™ (talk) 04:23, 24 July 2012 (UTC)

421. ⊕ **Support** - [[5] (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/User:Scottthezombie%7CScottthezombie)] ([[6] (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/User_talk:Scottthezombie%7Ctalk)]) 05:37, 24 July 2012 (UTC)

422. ⊕ **Support** -- TrSqr (talk) 06:48, 24 July 2012 (UTC)

423. ⊕ **Support** -- Alzwded (talk) 07:44, 24 July 2012 (UTC)

424. ⊕ **Support** -- Some aspects of a "Travel guide/ How to" are impossible to maintain up-to-date by voluntary work, others are already available on Wikimedia/ Commons. --Chris.urs-o (talk) 07:47, 24 July 2012 (UTC)

425. ⊕ **Support** --Nhasive (talk) 07:59, 24 July 2012 (UTC)

426. ⊕ **Support** --Tmin10 (talk) 08:28, 24 July 2012 (UTC)

427. ⊕ **Support** -- Forzaruvo94 (talk) 09:05, 24 July 2012 (UTC)

428. ⊕ **Support** A community driven page is the perfect shape for a travel guide. Fixing WV & WT is more than necessary, and if WM can genuinely get this running it will provide very good value for the global populace. --Detailtiger (talk) 10:35, 24 July 2012 (UTC)

429. ⊕ **Support** Andreas Sihono (talk) 11:02, 24 July 2012 (UTC)

430. ⊕ **Support** Dlaczego nie, mamy turystyke zrobmy cos z tego, wszyscy polacy pomoga!!! -- Legion Polone (talk) 11:14, 24 July 2012 (UTC)

431. ⊕ **Support** --Omondi (talk) 11:45, 24 July 2012 (UTC)

432. ⊕ **Support**--*South_Sniper*_{Talk(中文)} 12:31, 24 July 2012 (UTC)

433. ⊕ **Support** --Lionratz (talk) 12:39, 24 July 2012 (UTC)

434. **Weak Support**. While the WikiTravel editors and WikiVoyage group wishes to move over (and a place to send travel style edits from WP), I see that other wiki projects have not been used well together. For example, WikiNews (WN) articles even though must be review for accuracy via the sources to stay on the site (within 3 days) cannot be used as a source on Wikipedia. When those news sources used for WP articles then are gone form the internet, it is difficult to verify any more the WP article. Allowing WN verified articles to be sources for

WP would thusly easier verifiable and encourage more WN editors (thus hopefully more reviewers) and less discarded articles which discourages WN editors (Yes, I have been through this). Second, the WN is under a total free license for other site -- even comerical sites -- which I suspect Wiki travel guide (WTG) to be under. These (WN, WTG) could be a revenue source if they were under a CC license that allows non-commerical use and a have some sort of fixed commerical license as there are a number of news sites and travel sites that may pay for this information. After all Internet Brands, Inc. can just dump the new travel guide to WikiTravel and still use their WikiTravel editors work. Third, I don't necessarily see that we have the tools to maintain ratings for hotel, resturants, venues, etc. So in addition to the written reviews, the WTG should encourage linking to yelp, chow and other such rating sites. I would say ChefMOZ too but they have been shut down; perhaps we should request their data and/or source code. Spshu (talk) 14:35, 24 July 2012 (UTC)

435. ⊕ **Support** Finally, the The Hitchhiker's Guide to the Galaxy! --TMg 15:06, 24 July 2012 (UTC)

436. ⊕ **Support** --Der Spatz vom Wallraffplatz (talk) 16:16, 24 July 2012 (UTC)

437. ⊕ **Support** --Michael Hobi (talk) 18:32, 24 July 2012 (UTC)

438. ⊕ **Support** per Travpeter and Detailtiger. Whoop whoop pull up (talk) 19:49, 24 July 2012 (UTC)

439. ((Support)) It looks like there are a good deal of benefits compared to the costs. (Not sure if I am eligible to write here as I am not very active as of late.) --Kushal one (talk) 20:47, 24 July 2012 (UTC)

440. ⊕ **Support** Wikitravel has its own community that can probably attract supplemental donations to the WMF, making most of the arguments of the opposants irrelevant.--Strainu (talk) 20:54, 24 July 2012 (UTC)

441. ⊕ **Support** Mayank Abhishek (talk) 21:45, 24 July 2012 (UTC)

442. ⊕ **Support** JFRNwiki (talk) 23:29, 24 July 2012 (UTC) i think that can be awesome

443. **Strong** ⊕ **Support** We can to bring a new energy in user-generated travel guides and make free licenses usage wider in non-English languages. Only Wikimedia movement will be able to give travel guide to people in their own native language. --TarzanASG (talk) 02:23, 25 July 2012 (UTC)

444. ⊕ **Support** איתי טיומקין (talk) 9:13, 25 July 2012 (UTC) It will be amazing!

445. ⊕ **Support** Nihalh55 It is a reall y good idea

446. ⊕ **Support** If Wikivoyage (http://www.wikivoyage.org) want to migrate completely with their content and Wikitravel editors wish to join the Wikimedia movement, then it is a great opportunity to create a free Travel Guide for the world, but strong measures should be put in place to guide against ~~advertisement~~, especially malicious or deceptive ~~promotional~~ contents. —JOHNMOORofMOORLAND (talk) 09:29, 25 July 2012 (UTC)

447. ⊕ **Support**--Malheureux (talk) 10:23, 25 July 2012 (UTC)

448. ⊕ **Support**----Alza08 (talk) 10:45, 25 July 2012 (UTC) Do it. It's a really good idea, and I would look forward to contributing to it.

449. ⊕ **Support** — Марк Башловка 14:25, 25 July (UTC) Of course, it's wonderfull idea. It'll be so useful for an avrage traveller, who want personaly choose his route and be independent from travell agencies and guides. So, do it. I'll do what I can to help. For example: I can make translations into Russian and Hebrew.

450. ⊕ **Support** – Liam987 13:18, 25 July 2012 (UTC)

451. ⊕ **Support** - Wikitravel is a fairly useful resource with a lot of potential, but it is dying. Reunion with Wikivoyage under the Wikimedia umbrella will bring in a useful, sustainable project. Existing policies and the opinions of the proposers suggest that it can uphold Wikimedia's core policies. Warofdreams (talk) 15:24, 25 July 2012 (UTC)

452. ⊕ **Support** I think that it's a good idea. We will see... --Nelson Teixeira ^{msg} 15:44, 25 July 2012 (UTC)

453. ⊕ **Support** Cela me semble être une bonne idée. Toutefois, comme relier un guide de voyage à un article encyclopédique?Malosse (talk) 19:41, 25 July 2012 (UTC)

454. ⊕ **Support** WMF is the best possible home for the reunited WV and WT and communities. All existing WMF projects can benefit from WV/WT content. And they can receive the content that is banned out from WP because its not encyclopedic enough but nevertheless usefull and educational as well. -- Jr7 1 (talk) 19:52, 25 July 2012 (UTC)

455. ⊕ **Support** on the grounds of "why not?" The resources involved would be little affected whether this were a project or an import to Wikibooks (and probably won't be much either way). There are a lot of neglected projects and the Foundation sometimes appears to only care about Wikipedia but as long as a project has it's own editors and admins it doesn't really *need* the Foundation's attention. That seems to be covered. While I personally have no need for Wikitravel on Wikimedia I have no opposition and I'm OK with it joining the family. - AdamBMorgan (talk) 20:55, 25 July 2012 (UTC)

456. ⊕ **Support** I had the feeling someting is rotten with WT "owner" for some time. Idea of reuiniting free travel guide under WMF umrella sounds good to me. --Wikimol (talk) 21:04, 25 July 2012 (UTC)

457. ⊕ **Support**Peter in s (talk) 22:09, 25 July 2012 (UTC)

458. ⊕ **Support**דוד (talk) 23:49, 25 July 2012 (UTC)

459. ⊕ **Support** Our ideas are well suited to the idea of free tourism. Pozdrawiam. MOs810 (talk) 23:59, 25 July 2012 (UTC)

460. ~~Oppose - My feeling is that such a project is out of the wikimedia philosophy. Its relevance would be to remove promotional content to WP articles. But in my humble opinion, it would be more valuable to link relevant content (educational ones like small places, monument, etc) from the WikiData project (which was launched some weeks ago by the german WP HUC ?) in each WP article ...... Genium (talk) 09:33, 19 July 2012 (UTC)~~ ⊕ **Support** - The Guedieiros article has been deleted from the French wikipedia without any redirect to the Sendim or Tabuaço pages, so the WikiTravel project probably makes sense. Genium (talk) 00:14, 26 July 2012 (UTC)

461. ⊕ **Support** RaymondSutanto (talk) 09:35, 26 July 2012 (UTC)

462. Jafeluv (talk) 10:08, 26 July 2012 (UTC)

463. ⊕ **Support** I mantain a web about tourism in my region and the contents are already licensed under CC, so they could be directly incorporated into the project. Saforencus (talk) 10:16, 26 July 2012 (UTC)

464. ⊕ **Support** OriumX (talk) 17:38, 26 July 2012 (UTC)

465. ⊕ **Support** Wikitravel will be improved, and donations should go up with traffic. Hopefully it will be self-sufficient. Explorativecreator (talk) 17:53, 26 July 2012 (UTC)

466. ⊕ **Support**. Wikitravel as it was will die. The only question is who will host the community when it moves. The wiki travel community is uninterested in any commercial host. The site is mature and hypothetical objections have not been observed in practice. While there will continue to be a system for altering policy, the existing site seems to work well. -- Wikitravel admin Colinmjensen (talk) 17:58, 26 July 2012 (UTC)

467. ⊕ **Support**. Being under the roof of Wikimedia, I hope a travel guide project will get additional attention from potential contributors. So far it has been sort of a niche with too little good contributors and too little readers. It has been argued that a travel wiki would attract spam, but I have contributed a lot to Wikivoyage and never found any obvious self-advertising there. If such spam ever will begin to happen, this might also show that the project is good and important. --Stilfehler (talk) 18:18, 26 July 2012 (UTC)

468. ⊕ **Support**. Говно ваш айпад! Doff (talk) 18:24, 26 July 2012 (UTC)

469. ⊕ **Support**. Je suis pour ! And from this project and also from Wikipedia and Commons, compilations for whole country could be great travel guides into Wikibooks ! Falcoperegrinus (talk) 20:11, 26 July 2012 (UTC)
470. ⊕ **Support** I see no problem with this. Captain panda 21:17, 26 July 2012 (UTC)
471. ⊕ **Support** I hope everything will work fine. :) | Raoli | 23:32, 26 July 2012 (UTC)
472. ⊕ **Support** I see no problem with this. Uživatelům (talk) 06:40, 27 July 2012 (UTC)
473. ⊕ **Support** Albertus Aditya (talk) 09:41, 27 July 2012 (UTC)
474. ⊕ **Support** I used to be an active WT and later wikivoyage editor and I fully support this idea. Srml (talk) 17:52, 27 July 2012 (UTC)
475. ⊕ **Weak Support** if wikitravel users find it necessary.--Jsjsjs1111 (talk) 04:35, 28 July 2012 (UTC)
476. ⊕ **Support** --Stanqo (talk) 09:51, 28 July 2012 (UTC)
477. ⊕ **Support** Very good idea. Wikitravel is a commercial website and that's why it's under-used (and crap).--Xania (talk) 19:29, 28 July 2012 (UTC)
478. ⊕ **Support** --Singsangsung (talk) 10:41, 29 July 2012 (UTC)
479. ⊕ **Support** --Reinhard Kraasch (talk) 19:43, 29 July 2012 (UTC)
480. ⊕ **Support** all arguments have been mentioned above already. I am an admin of the WT:de, (currently not active) but willing to help again in this new project! Strong support also for using the name "WikiVoyage" if IB does not release the rights on the name Wikitravel. -- Flip666 (talk) 16:42, 31 July 2012 (UTC)

> The discussion of what name the English version uses will take place right after the new site is up and running. Hope to see you their weighting in. The German and Italian version will be using WV :-) **Doc James** (talk · contribs · email) 16:43, 31 July 2012 (UTC)

481. ⊕ **Support** alkab ᵀᵃˡᵏ 02:29, 1 August 2012 (UTC)
482. ⊕ **Support** I too have long been a Wikitraveller and urged good faith in IB after it purchased Wikitravel. The Wikivoyage people and I had disagreements over their fork, which I felt had been extremely too early. Clearly, they had better foresight than I did, but I believe the opportunity for maintaining good faith has since passed. On Wikitravel, I am a bureaucrat and administrator and, like Jani, have had felt unmotivated to contribute much after IB failed to respond to the community's important requests in a timely fashion. For example, the IB employee in charge of liaising between the company and the community has changed several times and on a few occasions the person replacing the previous community liaison has failed to introduce himself to the community. I would be more than happy to see the Wikitravel project continue to grow - after all, I did dedicate a few years of hard work to the project - but, I am convinced that the project will falter unless it is forked. With the backing of the WMF, I believe it would be possible for the project to continue to grow under a new name. -- Sapphire (I can't login) 178.73.50.7 21:25, 1 August 2012 (UTC)
483. ⊕ **Support** --Raboe001 (talk) 10:12, 2 August 2012 (UTC)
484. ⊕ **Support**, really would like to have such a project in ukrainian language --Formiate (talk) 09:00, 3 August 2012 (UTC)
485. ⊕ **Support** --VH18 14:05, 4 August 2012 (UTC)
486. ⊕ **Support**,--Lamontse (talk) 06:53, 5 August 2012 (UTC)
487. ⊕ **Support**, but same name in every language please! --Pilettes (talk) 12:57, 5 August 2012 (UTC)
488. ⊕ **Support** I contributed to Wikitravel and would appreciate to see it continue as a Wikimedia project Lionel Allorge (talk) 13:00, 5 August 2012 (UTC)
489. ⊕ **Support** --Paulv 16:00, 7 August 2012 (UTC)

490. ⊕ **Support**, as a contributor to WM projects and to WT. --Túrelio (talk) 06:15, 7 August 2012 (UTC)
491. ⊕ **Support** --LimboDancer (talk) 07:20, 7 August 2012 (UTC)
492. ⊕ **Support**--2011wp (talk) 08:16, 7 August 2012 (UTC)
493. ⊕ **Support**, this is really needed. With the same name in every language, it can become a "big name" for traveling information, and as there is the opportunity not to start from scratch, why not take it? --Cnb (talk) 10:10, 7 August 2012 (UTC)
494. ⊕ **Support**--Jorges (talk) 11:44, 7 August 2012 (UTC)
495. ⊕ **Support**--der Ruhri (talk)
496. WikiMedia Travel guide is an excellent idea, most of the sites of travel the reader cannot edit or respond, and that stay only with the information of the original writer, and mostly don't up to date. I support the combine Wikitravel.org to wikimedia. בנימין (talk) 05:43, 8 August 2012 (UTC)
497. ⊕ **Support**--ArishG Relatively new in travel wikis I left Wiki Travel because of organisational difficulties there and came to Wikivoyage. This felt good. As I put my travelling fotos on Wikimedia it would be great, to use one repository for the media and the articles..
498. ⊕ **Support** Would be an excellent supplementation for the Wikimedia projects. Raymond (talk) 10:03, 9 August 2012 (UTC)
499. ⊕ **Support** adds new aspects and forms of knowledge to the Wikimedia world. --Elya (talk) 18:03, 9 August 2012 (UTC)
500. ⊕ **Support** good idea. --Dirk Schmidt (talk) 06:54, 14 August 2012 (UTC)
501. Heh, I still had an old account on WT with a handful of edits in 2004 [7] (http://wikitravel.org/en/Special:Contributions/Kim_Bruning) . I could still log in! I decided to take up IBobi on his offer to log in, make some edits and see what's up. It's actually a really nice small wiki, where even simple folks like me can still make big contributions. It would be great, except that the techs are not very competent. The wiki is V.E.R.Y. S.L.O.W. (database issues?), and they didn't manage to get eg. svg support working correctly. Very shoddy, especially since Mediawiki is so easy to maintain to begin with. Size is no excuse, it's a small wiki to begin with. I support moving to anywhere-but-Internet-Brands. (and/or Internet Brands hiring competent MW techs. That'd work too. :) --Kim Bruning (talk) 08:09, 14 August 2012 (UTC)

> In IBobi (Paul's) favour I think he probably is competent to do a good job if IB would give him the necessary resources. That's not going to happen though. They've made it very clear that Wikitravel is money loser for them, which is probably why only IBobi is fighting at all to keep us. -- MarkJaroski (talk) 20:37, 14 August 2012 (UTC)

>> That's not exactly true—IB's CMO told me that they think Wikitravel, in the long run, has the potential to be the #1 travel info site on the web. It does, but in my opinion, that will require leaving IB behind. IB's stated position on Wikitravel financing is that it is *currently* basically a wash in terms of costs and revenue. Given that they haven't spent much money working on the site infrastructure, I tend to think that is just a manufactured excuse to keep ignoring requests for any sort of competent tech support, or opposition to new monetization schemes, while profiting off the hard labor of Wikitravel's beleaguered community. --Peter ^{Talk} 20:52, 14 August 2012 (UTC)

502. ⊕ **Support** –Sumone10154 (talk) 21:14, 15 August 2012 (UTC)
503. **Very strong** ⊕ **Support** - it's a nobrainer. Once this is done, I hope WMF will encourage a **PR campaign** highlighting how this event proves how truly unique (and important) the

foundation is. If done properly, a successful PR campaign could help encourage more donations - which will be much needed if the new WT is to succeed. Oncenawhile (talk) 01:34, 16 August 2012 (UTC)

504. **Strong ⊕ Support** this is a quite good project to be done--79.90.237.161 09:40, 16 August 2012 (UTC)

505. **⊕ Support** I am user of Wikitravel, and well, everything that I want to say has been already said. --edsonaoki --130.89.224.159 11:30, 16 August 2012 (UTC)

506. **⊕ Support** The evidence in the proposal, and a reading of some representative comments below (a few based on mis-assumptions), suggests that this is likely to be a net-positive change, for all. Quiddity (talk) 05:11, 18 August 2012 (UTC)

507. **Very strong ⊕ Support** --Vlad (talk) 13:42, 18 August 2012 (UTC)

> You are an admin on Wikitravel yes? **Doc James** (talk · contribs · email) 14:00, 18 August 2012 (UTC)

> Yes, on Romanian WikiTravel. --Vlad (talk) 14:04, 18 August 2012 (UTC)

508. **⊕ Support** I'm an admin at Wikitravel and a very strong supporter of this move. IB neglects WT and a Good online Travel Guide is always needed. Jc8136 (talk) 13:56, 18 August 2012 (UTC)

509. **Support** I believe this will be a useful adjunct to Wikipedia. Travel information is a very useful thing in this global world but a lot of it has verification issues and cannot be included on Wikipedia. The ability to separate out travel stuff into a separate site will help keep Wikipedia clean and will provide useful information to our users. Wikitravel, as it is now, is a backwater with few editors and messy information and bringing it into the wikimedia fold will help clean it up. Disclosure: I'm a no longer contributing admin on Wikitravel and an admin on Wikipedia.--RegentsPark (talk) 17:43, 18 August 2012 (UTC)

510. **Support.** Gmaxwell, among others, puts the case for it well.--Ragesoss (talk) 18:45, 18 August 2012 (UTC)

511. **Support** enthusiastically. - Andre Carrotflower (talk) 21:57, 18 August 2012 (UTC)

512. **Very strong ⊕ Support** - As an infrequent editor of Wikitravel and a few Wikimedia sites (very active on the Icelandic Wikipedia in its early days), I've always wondered why Wikimedia doesn't have a travel wiki and always been dissatisfied with Wikitravel being owned by Internet Brands. A migration of this sort would strengthen both, Wikimedia and the Wikitravel community (editors and users). --Sterio (talk) 01:41, 19 August 2012 (UTC)

513. **Support** – Sounds like ccommon sense to me; it would mutually benefit all parties involved. Graham87 (talk) 01:55, 19 August 2012 (UTC)

514. **⊕ Support** Complements Wikipedia's factual information about places. As RegentsPark says, this is a way to share valuable information that doesn't belong in WP. It's great to read a WP place article, but visiting requires a different set of often rapidly changing info. --SHCHF

515. **⊕ Support** Many good reasons have been put forward for this project. As a WikiTravel contributor I fully and strongly support this proposal. Moreover, it seems that the opposing voices are from the current provider, Internet Brands, and from people not familiar with what WikiTravel, Wikimedia and Wikipedia is all about. I see no valid arguments against this proposal. It's simply noise by a few biased and uninformed individuals. --Robert B (talk) 02:35, 19 August 2012 (UTC)

> One valid oppose reason I have seen is that some people would prefer as many wikimedia projects as possible to be NPOV. WT obviously can't quite be NPOV, but it does seem to be somehow objective. Could you help formulate an answer on how this is achieved? --Kim Bruning (talk) 04:41, 19 August 2012 (UTC)

516. ⊕ **Support** I am a contributor, and I generally support this move. I'm not really comfortable with the current advertising, and by not releasing full database dumps I'm always uneasy about what happens if IB would disappear. However the execution of the migration to the new system must happen quickly and effectively. —*The preceding unsigned comment was added by* 121.203.77.26 (talk · contribs) .

517. ⊕ **Support** --Valmi Dufour (talk) 08:51, 19 August 2012 (UTC) (en:User:Valmi)

518. ⊕ **Support** I am thrilled to see a move to WMF being discussed. I was a Wikitravel contributor (http://wikitravel.org/en/User:Fridday) but lost interest when it went commercial. I would definitely start contributing again if WMF hosted the travel guide. --213.114.74.64 09:42, 19 August 2012 (UTC)

519. **Weak support** - I've been contributing to Wikitravel for quite a while and I admit that things are looking pretty bad over there. The question is whether Wikimedia would be the *best possible place* for Wikitravel to move to. Would we have to change the WT policies in order to fit into the WMF family and so on? And really... while not knowing very much about how things are done over here, reading the opinions in the "Oppose" section below makes me think whether we should rather move to Wikia for example. Ypsilon from Finland (talk) 11:03, 19 August 2012 (UTC)

520. ⊕ **Support** I have an account on there, but I wish to not identify it because it makes it obvious where I live. I got an email from wrh2 about this and fully support it. I originally thought that Wikitravel was part of Wikimedia, but found out it wasnt a few years ago. Ive contributed to a few articles on there, corrected and updated things, and even created my own articles, and still have some more to work on when I get time. I see no reason to oppose this at all. Itll only make wikitravel more accessible and more complete. Metallurgist (talk) 14:26, 19 August 2012 (UTC)

521. ⊕ **Support** - I've contributed to the English Wikitravel since 2007 and more recently on the German version of Wikivoyage (using the same user name as here) and I hope that there will be an improvement in both server speed and the technical tools available. Wikimedia would be the *least worst alternative* **if and only if** *we are not hobbled by rabid NPOV and "No Original Research" policies - that would kill the utility and timeousness of a travel guide! Would we have to change the WT policies in order to fit into the WMF family?* W. Frank (talk) 16:35, 19 August 2012 (UTC)

> I dunno, are you proposing we create a travel encyclopedia instead of the current wikitravel site? ;-) NPOV is important for encyclopedias and news reporting. NOR is perhaps important for an encyclopedia. But Wikimedia runs several kinds of project, of which only one is an encyclopedia, and one is a news site. If one is to run a travel site, one must have policies suited to a travel site. I think the wikitravel and wikivoyage contributors have the most experience running that kind of wiki. So how about we start by just importing what WT and WV are already doing? ;-) (which is de-facto what will happen). --Kim Bruning (talk) 17:09, 19 August 2012 (UTC) *Though we may have to worry about folks from other wikimedia projects dropping in to help, and not being entirely aware of the differences in rules. WT admins and regulars will have an interesting job at first, explaining to all the new/not-so-new folks!*

522. ⊕ **Support** - I have worked over there, but I always found them to be a bit "sniffy". Changing the "Eat - Get in - Get out" headers would be a relief.--Andreasegde (talk) 17:56, 19 August 2012 (UTC)

> Sniff ;) Funny you should mention that, because we're actually going to "get rid" of that awful "Get out" heading and replace it with something clearer during the migration! --Peter ^{Talk} 18:11, 19 August 2012 (UTC)

523. ⊕ **Support**, It's a good idea. --Mojo Dodo (talk) 18:09, 19 August 2012 (UTC)
524. ⊕ **Support** as administrator of Russian Wikitravel and as wikimedia procjects' contributor. -- Sergey kudryavtsev (talk) 19:04, 19 August 2012 (UTC)
525. ⊕ **Support**, Wikitravel admin (http://wikitravel.org/en/User:Pashley), Citizendium & sometimes Wikipedia contributor. Pashley (talk) 04:43, 20 August 2012 (UTC)
526. ⊕ **Support** Seascapeza (talk) 05:29, 20 August 2012 (UTC)
527. ⊕ **Support** Epolk (talk) 06:19, 20 August 2012 (UTC)
528. ⊕ **Support** -- 27.32.253.217 12:40, 20 August 2012 (UTC) (User:dmolla in WikiTravel and Wikipedia) I'm a Wikipedia and WikiTravel user and I like the idea of merging and creating a stronger community. Some degree of opinion should be tolerated as long as it is informative. Good travel books show that one can write good travel descriptions and be opinionated and useful. It's very easy to detect when someone writes something for promotion.
529. ⊕ **Support** - Have been a regular contributor to Wikitravel in the past, an occasional contributor now. Also an occasional Wikipedia contributor. I have some experience of the frustrating lack of support from Internet Brands for the project. I also have some awareness of the unnecessary additional work that Wikitravel Administrators have been caused by Internet Brands. It's amazing that Wiktravel still functions at all, and testament to the dedication and patience of those administrators. Bring the project into a supportive environment and it will flourish. Making those dedicated administrators part of the wider Wikimedia community can only strengthen that community as well. Tarr3n (talk) 15:14, 20 August 2012 (UTC)
530. ⊕ **Support**. I'm Wikitravel admin (http://wikitravel.org/en/User:DenisYurkin) , and contributing to the project since 2005. --DenisYurkin (talk) 19:46, 20 August 2012 (UTC)
531. ⊕ **Support**. I've done a fair bit of WikiTravel editing (User:Nojer2 (http://wikitravel.org/en/User:Nojer2)) Probably more than wikipedia actually. I was a bit put off when they added banner ads, and now it seems their monetization plans are killing it for other reasons too. If a move under the wikimedia umbrella is something the WikiTravel community are happy with, then I hope wikimedia will be able to do it. Running another project is a stretch, but it comes with its own community of contributors, so it's not like starting a new project -- Harry Wood (talk) 23:16, 20 August 2012 (UTC)
532. ⊕ **Support**. Former Wikitravel editor (User:nickpest (http://wikitravel.org/en/User:Nickpest)) who left because of the crappy experience when Internet Brands took over. 74.73.104.81 04:05, 21 August 2012 (UTC)
533. ⊕ **Support**. Another WT contributor and admin (http://wikitravel.org/en/User:Dguillaime) (for now! (http://wikitravel.org/wiki/en/index.php?title=Special% 3ALog&type=block&user=IBobi&page=&year=&month=-1)), looking forward to working productively with WMF rather than banging my head into the unresponsive brick wall that is IB. -- D. Guillaume (talk) 07:27, 21 August 2012 (UTC)
534. ⊕ **Support**! as a WT contributor (http://wikitravel.org/en/User:Arne_Brasseur) I would be more than happy to see it managed by a non-commercial entity. -- Arne Brasseur
535. ⊕ **Support** I'm another long time Wikimedian who has also been a WikiTravel contributor. -- Infrogmation (talk) 18:32, 21 August 2012 (UTC)
536. ⊕ **Support** -- Schönitzer (talk) 20:50, 21 August 2012 (UTC)
537. ⊕ **Support** To maximize benefit to all, WT should be run on a non-commercial basis and offer regular data dumps for third party re-use; Wikimedia has the resources and infrastructure; synergy between Commons and WT is likely to be considerable; the project agrees with the WMF's mission; the contributors want to switch. AxelBoldt (talk) 18:27, 22 August 2012 (UTC)

> I am sure that IB has the resources as well. The difference is one of philosophy and we within the WM movement generally have a very open one **Doc James** (talk · contribs · email) 03:41, 22 August 2012 (UTC)

538. ⊕ **Support** I've been a Wikitravel user since 2008 (here (http://wikitravel.org/en/User:AHeneen)). I prefer to stay out of politics—a reason I haven't been an active contributor on Wikipedia and related wiki bureaucracy(this (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/User:IBstupid) has been my WP account that I've yet to merge...IB is for the International Baccalaureate program I was in, not Internet Brands!!!). I have long desired for WT to be a Wikimedia project, mainly to gain a larger editing based (due to perceptions about its for-profit owner) and advertisements. However, the recent actions by IB to stem dissent make it all too clear that IB is a very bad host for the Wikitravel project. The reasons I support a WM travel wiki (a continuation of the Wikitravel project) is that the wiki serves a good purpose: providing a guide to the world free of commercial interests and bias from commercial entities (book publishers, travel agents, local/regional tourism promotion agencies, etc.) that anyone can edit or contribute to. Travel isn't merely commercial (with few exceptions like Las Vegas or Ibiza), but exploring the world and the great aura of cultures around the globe is very important for society...and certainly educational! There are often many years between editions of guidebooks. WT allows anyone to contribute useful information, providing instant feedback useful to travelers—a restaurant has moved, border crossing hours have changed, a hotel offers wifi, a national park now offers guided tours, prices of admission have changed. It's true that most of this is readily available in developed countries (US, Europe, Canada, Australia). However for much of the world (including regions I'm interested in such as Africa, the Caucasus, & Central Asia) the continuous user feedback WT provides is incredibly valuable. Language barriers may also hinder the availability of such info to travelers. To those concerned about forking the wiki, consider the sheer amount of WT admins & contributors have voiced there support (or more telling...how many have voiced opposition) and since nearly all the admins and regular users are fed up with IB, the future of WT is bleak and without constructive edits/discussions and regular policing of edits the quality, credibility, and usefulness of WT will decline anyways (to those concerned about forking a good wiki). The few reservations I hold against a move of the wiki to WM are related to new policies created by WM & WP users who may flock to the travel wiki shortly after launch and create policies resembling those on WP, giving little thought to the excellent policies WT has come up with over the years. It is very difficult to implement NPOV, mainly excessive negative remarks. For example, a mention critical of tourism on the environment is perfectly ok with me, but having 5 paragraphs on how the local government has polluted a forest & how Western tourists have commercialized natives on a National Park page is overkill. But a greater concern regards the negative views of commercialization voiced by opponents of a WM travel wiki. It is necessary to list businesses such as hotels, restaurants, attractions, taxi/bus companies and more as part of a travel guide. I feel current WT policy deals with "touting" effectively, by limiting the amount of fluffy language used in listings and the external links policy. A quick look at the Wikitravel:Welcome, business owners (http://wikitravel.org/en/Wikitravel:Welcome,_business_owners) page provides a good overview. The current WT community is small and it is difficult to police edits (especially in over-commercialized destinations like Orlando) to ensure all meet these criteria, although I think we've done a decent job with what few contributors there are. However, in time as the community grows larger it should get easier to police and remove all edits that run contrary to our Manual of Style. And finally, it is very difficult to provide references for everything on a travel wiki. Although not an issue in developed nations, mentioning that the only banks that there is only one bank that exchanges traveler's checks or the location of the only three ATMs in a city in a 3rd world country like Chad or Angola is very useful and should be included in the wiki, yet also hard to provide quality Wikipedia-level references. A good example would be Niamey, Niger (http://wikitravel.org/en/Niamey) . There's lots of necessary and useful information that would be hard to provide references for: porters & currency exchange at the airport; details on taxis; descriptive writing about markets & restaurants; and most of the info

in "respect" & "stay safe" It might be a good thing to start the wiki, but set aside 1 month or so to work out policies before jumping into editing/creating destination pages. There are likely to be many differences between the small group of ex-WT editors accustomed to & understanding the reasoning behind WT policies and those used to WP & other WM wikis. AHeneen (talk)

539. ⊕ **Support.** WT was actually my introduction to the wonderful world of wikis. And although I eventually ended up on WP:EN and havn't done any substantial edits on WT in years, it has pained me the way it seems to have stalled. If WikiMedia can help it rescue itself, I'm in favour. Chris j wood (talk) 18:39, 22 August 2012 (UTC)

540. ⊕ **Support** It would be great for Wikimedians who love to travel. --Rangilo Gujarati (talk) 20:40, 22 August 2012 (UTC)

541. ⊕ **Support** I feel that such kind of tourism website should be controlled by wikimedia foundation rather than some company only trying to make money. I have a strong feeling that more people would contribute to a travel guide controlled by wikimedia because wikimedia has a reputation of providing free information and this is one of the biggest reason why people donate their time for websites controlled by wikimedia. One of the biggest problem with current website wikitravel is that the data is provided by volunteers but the owners of the website make huge money and don't even update the website. Most of the people who contribute to wikitravel do it only because they think that this website is part of wikimedia foudnation which is an Non Profit Organization. As soon as it becomes known to people that wikitravel is not controlled by wikimedia they would stop volunteering. If wikimedia foundation controls the website then more and more people would contribute to it and it will also become as good as wikipedia. I know it very well that wikimedia foundation is always trying to make their website better, they have recently started an office in India and have organized conferences and advertisements motivating people to become part of wiki family so that more and more information could be provided but I have never heard of any such movement being organized by wikitravel which clearly means that they have nothing to do with what is happening with their website or what kind of information is being provided on it. I hope that wikimedia will start the website soon. Nandanupadhyay (talk) 04:56, 23 August 2012 (UTC)

542. ⊕ **Support** I am not a very technical person hence I don't know the technical reasons why WM controlled websites look better in technical terms but just as a regular user of WT and WM websites I would like to mention a few reasons why I think this project should be accomplished-

1)At first we all like to keep our place clean which is not the case at all with WT because there are advertisements everywhere and of course we don't want to see them. Its just like getting unwanted SMS on mobile phones. 2)I have a strong feeling that if WM hosts a travel guide then it would be much bigger, better and reliable comparing with WT. We could easily see it by checking articles for same place on WT and WM websites both. There are places which have an article on WM but not on WT. There are so many beautiful and interesting places where tourists would love to go but they don't have any article on WT whereas WM has got an article for those places. It clearly mean that more people have interest in WM than WT. Once WM starts hosting such articles more and more people would contribute and we will get good travel related articles. And it won't be a lot of work because we could easily sync some information from WM and other travel guide websites which have already agreed on helping with this project. 3)The quality of articles will be much better than ones on WT because we will be able to use the pics and videos which are already uploaded on WMC. 4)We will get a lot of new articles on new places because WM motivates people to contribute for their websites. They organize conferences which are followed by a lot of people and once people hear about this project they will be more likely to make new real travel related articles. 5)I see a few

people being concerned about starting a new project which will take years to complete but I think such project just could not be finished, its an ongoing process forever. Could we say that WT is complete now? Since there are already so many people working on WM, I don't really think that it will take much time for us to go bigger and better than WT. 6)And finally I think that such websites like WM or WT are supposed to be for people and we could easily see that more people have interest and faith in WM. We have already seen how everything has always been better on WM websites than WT so we should definitely support WM for this project. Nandanupadhyay (talk) 06:17, 23 August 2012 (UTC)

Oppose

1. ~~Oppose~~ **Very strong Oppose** This isn't as simple as changing the URLs and calling it a day. I don't see it as being possible to do a seamless import, i.e. bring over all of the content, all of the editors, all of the policies, all of the page histories, etc., and leave nothing behind at the old domain. If that's not possible to do, then we're going to end up not doing an import, but a fork. In my opinion, forking a functional project at best creates one mostly functional project and one heavily damaged project, and at worst, creates two heavily damaged projects. Let's not break things that work. All of that being said, if this does go forward, I'd be willing to help coordinate the integration of Wikitravel Shared with Wikimedia Commons. Sven Manguard (talk) 04:15, 24 April 2012 (UTC)

   > The reason why this proposal exists is that WT is not functional. Yes we do not want to create two heavily damaged projects. We will hopefully be bringing in WV. Thus we will hopefully be bringing together a broken project, integrating it with a non-broken one and helping them both grow from there.--**Doc James** (talk · contribs · email) 06:25, 24 April 2012 (UTC)

   > The fork already happened when Wikivoyage started and Wikitravelists were pissed off by Wikitravel hoster. What we can do here is bring the dissolving community back together in one place. I read the comments from Wikivoyage folks here that way that if we do it right with Wikitravel then they would come and join us, too. So in the end we create a fork with people who want to fork *anyway* plus we may integrate another, already existing fork. If someone can do this, it is Wikimedia — of course it only works if the WT/WV community really want and support that. But it has been their initiative so far to contact us. So we should give them a warm welcome. --Manuel Schneider^{(bla) (+/-)} 06:31, 24 April 2012 (UTC)

   > > By all means, I'd be quite happy if you prove my cynicism on this matter unfounded. Rarely is it unfounded though. Sven Manguard (talk) 17:58, 24 April 2012 (UTC)

   > > > I can vouch that it is near certain that WT admins will fork independently if this proposal falls through, as we were planning to before it became evident that moving to Wikimedia was a possibility. So yes, wikitravel.org will continue to exist without its defectors (and I think virtually all regular contributors will leave if a) this move happens, and b) they are aware of this move). The current hosts will likely lock down editing, chop articles into bits to improve SEO, increase space dedicated to advertising, and generally see the state of things degrade, as it has been even in spite of the effort we, the contributors, continue to put into the site. But, the choice is between welcoming the WT and WV folks to Wikimedia, offering the potential to re-

unite those communities, increasing the likelihood that the WT crowd keeps its contributor base intact in the move, and to join them with Wikimedia's own—or seeing the travel wiki communities further fractured and with ever less support. --Peter Talk 19:25, 24 April 2012 (UTC)

@Manguard: When we decided to leave WT years back we wanted to keep the original spirit. We still might be a fork, but in the meantime most content is genuine WV (statistic in german (http://www.wikivoyage.org/de/Spezial:Statistik)). So we think that migrating our project (as we tried to suggested to WMF back in 2006)is not supporting a fork but integrating at least two communities into WMF projects. Therefore we bring a domain, a community and a large site under the roof of WM. WT de is without any administrator for months now. A lot of language versions just exist because they have been started once but are not living any more. Unfortunately so far none of the en WT community has joined our project before. But this time can be a major step forward to reunite the communities. Technical support on WT has been poor at least. We know that there seem to be old issues of the founding community which are based on our fork. But hurt feelings should not stop the project from beeing started. --Der Reisende (talk) 14:30, 1 July 2012 (UTC)

I find it disturbing that only one of the fifteen opposes tendered thus far has not solicited some sort of response from the support camp. On the projects that I'm active at that's called badgering, and it's looked down upon because of the chilling effect it has on discussions. The vast majority of the people commenting thus far have supported the proposal. You don't need to continue to respond to every single oppose, it's not helpful, it's not polite, and to me, it's not remotely acceptable. Therefore I've upgraded my opposition to very strong oppose. Sven Manguard (talk) 01:00, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

This is a public discussion, and in public discussions it is expected that users will discuss the topic at hand. RfCs are not just a strict vote, they are a request for comments from a wide variety of perspectives - and as such, it is expected and normal that people of opposite viewpoints take time to refute arguments presented by the other side. Thank God that not all Wikimedians share enwiki's unproductive view on discussions occurring with these sorts of things. Also, I hate to mention this, but adding the word "strong" to before the oppose changes absolutely nothing about the argument you presented and won't be counted any more than it would have been before. Ajraddatz (Talk) 01:33, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

There's a huge difference between discussion and what you all are doing. Badgering isn't discussion, it's borderline harassment. If I wasn't convinced that you all are acting in good faith (but are just overzealous and unable to realize the negative implications of your actions) I'd be making a much bigger deal of things than I am. Sven Manguard (talk) 03:38, 21 July 2012 (UTC)

As Ajr said, this is a discussion, not a vote. Just because there are 10 supports to every 1 oppose, it doesn't mean one side is "winning". We are simply trying to discuss the issues the opposition has and point out our opinions. We are not copying

and pasting the same response every time. If the opposition feel the burning desire to respond to some of the supporters comments above, nothing is stopping them. JamesA (talk) 06:37, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

2. ⊚ **Oppose** wikitravel: exists. I see no need to replicate something that already exists within wikis. — billinghurst *sDrewth* 13:52, 7 July 2012 (UTC)

All of Wikitravel's most active users see a very real need for just that. Have you spent much time on Wikitravel? LtPowers (talk) 17:30, 7 July 2012 (UTC)

Then why is that information omitted from the RFC? The RFC is pretty blank about why not enhance one of the existing travel sites, or what is the enhancement over the existing wikis. If the part of the argument is about either the unsustainability or the issues of other ventures, then it would have been helpful to have these raised in the RFC. My opinion/vote is solely based on the existing proposition and my use of the existing site that I quoted, and my perception of the benefits of another travel wiki. — billinghurst *sDrewth* 11:33, 8 July 2012 (UTC)

We would be rejoining two communities of editors (WV and WT) and the subsequent site would be free of adverting. WV split off because of the commercial issues. I know that I myself would not be here writing for Wikipedia if it was run by a for profit company.**Doc James** (talk · contribs · email) 12:30, 8 July 2012 (UTC)

3. ⊚ **Oppose** - Don't see the point of a whole new project. Why not set up a travel guide section on Wikibooks, and migrate their content to that instead? Seems like a waste of resources to have 2 wikiprojects with content that could happily fit into one. BarkingFish (talk) 19:06, 7 July 2012 (UTC)

One could say the same thing about Wikipedia and Wiktionary. Why not set up an encyclopedia section on Wikibooks? LtPowers (talk) 02:21, 8 July 2012 (UTC)

Have you discussed your idea with other wikibooks editors to see how they feel? The German Wikivoyage project is 60% the size of all of German Wikibooks. Travel doesn't obviously fall within the wikibooks notion of 'textbook'. I see that you have worked on 'edge case' projects within Wikibooks: the cookbook and wikijunior. Both are cool, but have at times had their status on the project debated. –SJ talk 20:51, 8 July 2012 (UTC)

4. ⊚ **Oppose.** One point that people don't seem to have brought up is that the WMF, as it stands, has scaling difficulties supporting the projects we *do* have. This is a natural outcome when you have so many variations on a theme run by such a small org. During his Board of Trustees Q&A at last year's Wikimania, Jimmy made the point that he doesn't think we should add additional projects until we can support the ones we have, and I agree with him. Wikitravel will invariably have individual and independent developer needs that the WMF will be expected to meet, and we can't promise they will be met. Ironholds (talk) 19:16, 7 July 2012 (UTC)

At their meeting this Wednesday (July 11), the Board will decide whether they are willing to support the project. Opposing this just because you think they might say no seems a bit odd. Jpatokal (talk) 11:22, 8 July 2012 (UTC)

> You don't seem to have read my comment; I'm not opposing because they say no. I'm opposing because if they say yes, we have another project to add to the list that cumulatively outstrips our ability to technically support. Most of our developers are focused on the Wikipedia model, which is understandable, because it's our flagship project and is currently in the doldrums, technically speaking. This is great. I think we *should* be focusing on Wikipedia. But I also appreciate that there are a lot of other projects that are also worthy and will need technical support and customised software, and that we don't have the resources to support all of them. Until we do, adding another one seems silly. Ironholds (talk) 12:09, 8 July 2012 (UTC)

>> A number of people who are with WT have programing skills so hopefully they will join our volunteer programing team to improve Media Wiki. This new site also has a good possibility to bring in extra funding and thus allow the WMF to increase technical support for all projects.**Doc James** (talk · contribs · email) 12:30, 8 July 2012 (UTC)

5. ⊜ **Oppose** 1) Per Ironholds, and 2) Doesn't seem like the kind of project the WMF would want anyway... Everything else is verifiable, encyclopedic, news worthy, etc. but Travel stuff could be so opinionated. Further, if this is just supposed to be a database of places and attractions, it may serve better as a WikiProject on ENWP, not its own Wiki. AndrewN (talk) 06:47, 8 July 2012 (UTC)

> A Wikitravel travel guide is considerably more than a "database of places and attractions", and even for those places and attractions Wikipedia's goals explicitly rule out core travel information like prices, opening hours, directions for getting there, contact information, etc. Also, the vast majority of the world's hotels, restaurants, nightclubs etc do not meet WP's notability requirements. Jpatokal (talk) 11:22, 8 July 2012 (UTC)

>> I invite you to glance over these examples; The Star Articles (http://wikitravel.org/en/Wikitravel:Star_articles) , our Destinations of the Month (http://wikitravel.org/en/Previous_Destinations_of_the_month) , or the Off the beaten path (http://wikitravel.org/en/Previously_Off_the_beaten_path) places, for a taste of the aspirations. It is not just a database of places, many sites do that, probably better than Wikitravel too, its writing true travel guides anyone can edit that is the unique part of wikitravel. Sertmann (talk) 18:06, 8 July 2012 (UTC)

6. ⊜ **Oppose** Unfortunately. A travel site would fit nicely in the WMF remit. However *this* travel site is not a good fit for our culture; there is resistance to basic things like removal of advertising (I suggested to a secondary reviews portal on the mailing list, where it would be more utile, but to no avail), increased use of (or encouragement of) source material. WikiTravel, in these circumstances, would not be a useful free resource. In addition I have read the talk page discussions related to this proposal; I am concerned that the WT people are interested in the WMF for its technical support (which is fine) but are unwilling to adopt some of the basic tenets of the movement - particularly worrying was the discussion over "BLP" which is such a core facet of our movement, but which they seem to have no understanding of in context, nor how it would apply to WT. There seems no established mechanism for

investigating copyright violations. The WT admins who are pioneering this movement have made claims that most of the users will move to this new project; but have not substantiated this with any explanation. Details on how many active users there are, how aware they would be of this change, etc. would be critical for my support. Looking over the recent changes; a lot of contributions seem to be spam or advertising - and there is no apparent strategy to combat this in the future; a critical tenet of the movement is that there is no advertising. --ErrantX (talk) 08:49, 8 July 2012 (UTC)

> The horrendous spam and advertising is a result of the poor technical support of the current host, Internet Brands. For awhile, there was no CAPTCHA mechanism when signing up for an account; the block tool didn't even work for a few days! A WMF-run site would allow the introduction of bots to prevent obvious spamming, along with a multitude of other basic ideas that IB never bothered with. Plus, there would also be an influx of returning admins (who've voiced their support and interest) to the WMF-run site to help with maintenance and vandalism-removal. JamesA (talk) 11:11, 8 July 2012 (UTC)
>
> I presume that by "advertising" you mean spam? The Don't tout (http://wikitravel.org/en/Wikitravel:Don%27t_tout) core policy addresses this head on. The present problem with spam being entered faster than it can be reliably removed is partly because Wikitravel's present owners have managed to drive away most of the active users who used to do the janitorial work, but mostly because they have been extremely slow in implementing any of the countless technical anti-spam measures pioneered by Wikipedia. Shifting to the WMF and simply applying the same filters, bots etc that are used for other WMF wikis would drastically cut down on the problem.
> Also, BLP has not been much of an issue on Wikitravel to date, simply because individual living people are virtually never covered by its articles. But as already stated in the discussion (http://meta.wikimedia.org/wiki/Talk:Travel_Guide#Pillars.2Fprinciples) , Wikitravel admins have no objections to applying the policy to the Wikimedia fork. Jpatokal (talk) 11:20, 8 July 2012 (UTC)
>
> Patrolling WT is a nigtmare due to slow speed. This makes getting rid of the advertising more difficult, so in spite of the policy against it it has become more difficult to keep up with the touting. Blaming the editors and admins for this is not particularly fair, and there has been a decline in numbers due to burnout and frustration with the (lack of) support. BLP is pretty much a non-issue, so has never really needed to be addressed. The no-recognizable photos of people rule is probably far more restrictive than the BLP policies on Wikipedia. Adding BLP rules would have about as much impact as forbidding fish the use of bicyles. 41.243.200.45 18:16, 12 July 2012 (UTC)

7. We have enough neglected, inactive projects. Let's focus on what already needs to get done. Our limited resources, in my opinion, could be directed toward more worthwhile endeavors. **Blurpeace** 17:36, 8 July 2012 (UTC)

> As all of the Wikitravel and Wikivoyage admins would be signing up to the new project, the resources would come right along with them. One of the exciting things I see happening is the rejoining of those two communities, and the return of former invaluable contributors who have been driven off by advertising, poor tech support, and other concerns about hosting and data integrity. They (er..., we) also would become much more involved in helping out with the other WMF projects,

especially Commons, which is what I was getting at in mentioning synergies above. Expectations for what tech support looks like are not high, only because the bar has been set so low in the past, and we'd be thrilled just to have the permissions so that skilled members of our community could work on feature development. --Peter Talk 21:59, 8 July 2012 (UTC)

> There is increased efficiency in volume which is why we see corporations involved in similar businesses merging. A travel guide would hopefully improve our revenue and thus result in better technical support for all projects.Doc James (talk · contribs · email) 23:12, 8 July 2012 (UTC)

8. Wikimedia struggles to maintain most non-Wikipedia sites, such as Wikinews, Wikisource, et al. I cannot see how WMF will manage to make this last much longer than a couple years before the entire structure of a travel wiki fails. Frood (talk) 23:37, 8 July 2012 (UTC)

> I guess I have more faith in the abilities of the WMF than you :-) I think these non Wikipedia sites are having trouble maintaining their communities of editors rather than their infrastructure. And it is the community of editors that makes a site succeed or fail. **Doc James** (talk · contribs · email) 00:24, 9 July 2012 (UTC)

>> So, by that logic, if somebody were to build a store, and provide basic utilities, customers would go to the store and put their items on a shelf. WMF needs to try to get editors, not just provide the bare necessities of technical stuff. Frood (talk) 01:42, 9 July 2012 (UTC)

>>> The Wikimedia movement is the one who needs to get the editors. While the WMF may be able to help with this I do not see it as their primary purpose. The WMF is to keep the lights on. Getting editors is exactly what this proposal is going to accomplish. What we have here is at least another 50 dedicated contributors who wish to join the WM movement. **Doc James** (talk · contribs · email) 01:52, 9 July 2012 (UTC)

>>>> If a WMF travel site languishes in the future then by all means a discussion should take place about whether it should be transitioned to another hosting provider (after all, the content is open source). However, your opposition (and that of several others here) seems to pre-suppose failure, and given that the project has already survived for nearly a decade it seems that the existing evidence is that it stands an excellent chance of being successful. -- Wrh2 (talk) 03:40, 10 July 2012 (UTC)

>>>>> We already have at least 40 people willing to contribute to the English-language version. That makes it a more worthwhile endeavour than a couple hundred small projects. Besides, if it isn't active, we can close it down. Projects are closed all the time around here... Why not even give it a try? Ajraddatz (Talk) 04:31, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

Mild oppose. The Travel Guide strikes me as a great project that's beyond the immediate scope of the WMF; I also have concerns about NPOV and resource allocation. GChriss (talk) 16:55, 9 July 2012 (UTC)

Undecided. More discussion needed + a revised, comprehensive proposal. I like the idea of a location guide + wikidata. GChriss (talk) 04:58, 12 July 2012 (UTC)

> Additional explanation here. Sincerely, GChriss (talk) 02:02, 10 July 2012 (UTC)

9. **Oppose** - Against further Wikimedia scope creep and empire building. Wikimedia runs on donations, it's lean enough as it is, and I'm not convinced that the proposed travel vertical would bring in any significant new audience, engagement or revenue for other Wikimedia projects. The argument for would be more convincing if Wikitravel/WikiVoyage came from a position of strength. They don't. The WMF is not in the business of catching falling knives. People donated to keep Wikipedia free, not to bail out/subsidise travel guides.

> And it's not one wiki fits all, you can't just throw WMF/mediawiki at it and expect it to be a success - just look at wikinews. Travel is so clearly not served by mediawiki software, to get travel right requires mapping, recommendations, localised listings, booking/payment systems. Mediawiki software is so deficient in this regard, and it always will be if its main concern (which it will be) is Wikipedia.
> There's an argument about commercialisation above, but that's just totally irrelevant. I really couldn't care less that editors would be put off editing a travel guide if it were run by a for-profit enterprise, no one should. Wikia has clearly shown that there are legions of editors out there who would, and it continues to innovate (such as the editing interface) without having to deal with the red tape consensus that plagues WMF projects. Wikipedia doesn't even allow users to sign in with Facebook (due to NPOV/advertising issues I assume) regardless of its benefits, yet Wikia does.
> In conclusion, Mediawiki will not serve the travel vertical well, and so the audience will remain negligible. A travel project would be better served by a for-profit company which is free to innovate and deliver the features that vertical needs. If the Wikitravel guys had any sense, they'd be cap in hand on Sand Hill Road, not at the WMF's doorstep. And if they can't do it, Wikia should. - hahnchen (talk) 03:05, 11 July 2012 (UTC)

> > Wikitravel *is* owned and operated by a for-profit company, which has focused for the past 5 years on maximizing ad revenue at the expense of everything else, and the whole reason for the fork is that it's quite demonstrably not working out at all. As for "negligible audience", Google's estimates for Wikitravel traffic in May 2012 are as follows:

> > > Unique visitors (estimated cookies): 4.6M
> > > Unique visitors (users): 2M
> > > Page views 8.3M

> > By most measures this is larger than all existing WM projects except Wikipedia, Wiktionary and Wikibooks, plus there's an untold number of websites that mirror or remix Wikitravel content (Triposo, Offbeat Guides, you.travel, etc etc). Jpatokal (talk) 06:42, 11 July 2012 (UTC)

> > > If the Wikitravel and Wikivoyage editors wanted to edit under Wikia's terms they would already be doing so. Your advocacy lacks understanding of the people involved. We do not want a commecial host, we have been tolerating it for want of something better, It has become almost intolerable, and as a direct result, WT has been losing

editors and admins. Your suggest that the donors to WMF would not want the money spent this way, but how many have you asked? I have donated to WMF and I suppoort this proposal. I guess you also donate to WMF and dont support it - that balances us out. The others have not been consulted as far as I know. 41.243.200.45 18:29, 12 July 2012 (UTC)

Wikitravel was acquired by Internet Brands 5 years ago; advertisements were not even placed on the site for 3 years after that, and have not changed since. Meanwhile over the past year-plus, feature requests have been completed, and an enormous software, hardware, and database upgrade has just finished, resulting in a Wikitravel that is the best it has ever been, by a significant margin. There's daily engagement between the WT administrators and IB technical and community support teams.
It's unfortunate that the timing of this upgrade coincided with the WMF fork proposal, which was first made two months after the upgrade began; this has resulted in a number of "support" votes that are based on outdated information about the site's technical capabilities. It's simply a different situation now, and presumably the WMF board will take this into consideration. Thank you.--IBobi talk email 18:49, 11 July 2012 (UTC)

The advertisements have changed since their introduction. I took the lead personally in pushing for a durable consensus to introduce Google text ads, as we hoped that ad revenue might lead to an interest on the part of IB to take tech support and feature development seriously. That engagement did not happen, and IB unilaterally, overnight, without any advance notice or discussion introduced image ads, which remain in violation of our advertising policy. IB maintains plans to introduce further commercialization over community objection. Even the ads that the community have approved have turned away would-be contributors uncomfortable with the for-profit status of Wikitravel's host.

The clash of a closed, secretive, corporate culture with our open, pro bono publico culture has been nearly as big a problem as neglect and restricted access. This is why we think the WMF is a much better fit, as we share the same ethos as the various Wikimedia projects—indeed, our project was inspired by them and directly modeled after them. --Peter Talk 19:56, 11 July 2012 (UTC)

10. ⊜ **Oppose** A travel Wiki would be an open forum for promotion of commercial interests (spam) personal opinions (POV), and as such, would be impossible to police as the commercial interests of travel and hospitality sector would likely to conflict with the non-commercial mission of the Wikimedia Foundation. There is already an going conflict between these interests in Wikipedia, where there is an ongoing debate on whether topics or content should be allowed to be added on the basis of "notability" (where significant coverage from reliable secondary sources is required) or some other inclusion criteria, such as the desire to provide a comprehensive coverage of every single aspect of human existence (such as the travel). Limiting the inclusion of topics and content on the basis of notability has the effect of excluding content that is purpose is purely to promote a political, commercial or personal interest, whereas it is not possible to exclude promotional content such as spam or private fueds about hotel service if the criteria for inclusion are not objective enough to be applied in consistent way that results in balanced coverage. --Gavin.collins (talk) 14:31, 12 July 2012 (UTC)

11. ⊜ **Oppose** Wikipedia and its sister projects like Wiktionary, Wikibooks, Commons and so on (except of Wikispecies, which I don't support either) are not dedicated to one single field, but rather are different *forms* of presenting knowledge about various topics. To me, this integrative aspect seems to be crucial for Wikipedia and its sister projects. With establishing a travel wiki this strategy will be abandoned. This probably will give rise to a lot of other topic-related wikis under the umbrella of Wikimedia. Everyone has to judge by himself or herself if this is a desireable way. I don't think so. --OnkelDagobert (talk) 09:06, 14 July 2012 (UTC)

> I tend to disagree that a WMF travel wiki would be a "topic-related" wiki and not fit in with the Foundation's scope and direction. Although it is true that Wikitravel is about travel, it is not merely a travel encyclopaedia where we have hundreds of articles about travel-related things. The site is designed to provide information to benefit the traveller, and this is done through listing practical information, experiences and listings. This is a unique way to present knowledge, and is different to the thousands of wikis you see on wikifarms like Wikia who simply write all the info they can think of about particular topics or items. JamesA (talk) 03:18, 15 July 2012 (UTC)

12. Oppose, unless some very stringent rules are put in place to restrict what can be included. A travel guide is inheretently littered with opinion, which wikiprojects have been very bad at handling at. I can see value in making available on a wiki actual travel information: public transport, roads, public healthcare information, locations of government owened tourist information. This is only part of a travel guide. The important parts are opinions on quality of hotels/hostels, restaurants, which are the 'good' sights to see, what are the 'fun' things to do, where to go for drinks, where you can find good private tour operators etc. etc. These are all POV, and - apart from the spam problem it would have - it would also have a large foundation in opinion. Keeping all opinion in sets some serious challenges for what to include and what not to include on a policy level. Leaving it out leaves you with a crippled and virtually useless travel guide, being better served by other sources. This is a project I don't think the foundations knowledge model can accomodate. Martijn Hoekstra (talk) 11:34, 14 July 2012 (UTC)

> The model has been successful so far. And WMF already has wikis that don't have an NPOV policy. LtPowers (talk) 11:52, 14 July 2012 (UTC)

13. ⊜ **Oppose** for the reasons stated by *OnkelDagobert*. The proposed project is strongly thematic and belongs to places like Wikia, not Wikimedia. --eugrus (talk) 19:31, 15 July 2012 (UTC)

14. **Oppose** All the Wikimedia projects have a somehow educative, scientific or rational - however you prefer to call it - approach. A travel guide is the opposite of that. Policies like NPOV which are good guidelines for those science-based projects are at least meaningless for a travel guide. The wikimedia projects so far reproduce kind of canonical knowledge, that's why i call it "scientific". A travel guide however ist based on highly personal evaluations of "good", "nice" or whatever leisure-related categories. I really don't seeany affinity between wikitravel/Wikivoyage and the wikimedia projects beyond the technology used. Btw: Anybody remembering the ban of videogame guides from wikibooks? Quite similar to this case i think.--Wiggum (talk) 20:19, 17 July 2012 (UTC)

> The content of a travel guide is rational. Where a hotel is, how much a hotel costs, and if a hotel is open is all factual content and are the key components to a travel guide. No personal evaluation needed.**Doc James** (talk · contribs · email) 13:25, 18 July 2012 (UTC)

>> No it is not. Open a travel guide, you'll have plenty of subjective comments wherever people liked or not the place for different reasons: too dirty or really

clean, staff welcoming or not depending of the mood of the traveler, good drinking atmosphere,... When I open a travel guide, I don't want a Encyclopedia with rational stuff, I want advices and tips from people who did travel their on their own.Kormin (talk) 02:11, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

> Also, which hotel should be chosen if there are many in an area? I can see this potential project as creating so much chaos and argument that the negatives far outweighs the positives. Sp33dyphil (talk) 07:38, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

15. ⊜ **Oppose** There is already Wikibooks for that --★ ↦ Airon Ĉ 00:49, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

> Given the nature of the proposed content, it would be highly subjective. If it only consisted of hotel names and prices that would be great, but it's not going to happen. Travel opinions will abound and I for one believe that is beyond the scope of Wiki. FoCuSandLeArN (talk) 00:52, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
>
> > The travel guides are not only hotel lists. The main aim is to help and explain sites for travelers of all kind. See for instance: Bashandi (http://www.wikivoyage.org/de/Baschandi) . Bashandi itself is a really small village unimportant for an encyclopedia (not yet mentioned at any Wikipedia language branch). But we give here a complete explanation of the Greco-Roman tomb chapel which goes fare behind the needs of an encyclopaedia. That's my idea of travel guides. --RolandUnger (talk) 05:32, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
> >
> > > In response to Airon, I believe this has already been discussed; this sort of travel wiki does not fit into Wikibooks at all. WT gives destinations their own articles, whereas Wikibooks attempts to merge them into one big book. We have over 25,000 articles at WT, and it'd be a disaster merging them into Wikibooks. Already, the travel guide genre has proven to not work on Wikibooks; from looking around the site, I can count the travel destination guides on one hand, and they are not structured well at all. JamesA (talk) 06:32, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
> > >
> > > > Don't care: POV opinions/spam is not tolerated in Wikimedia's projects. NPOV Travel guide book should stay in WB (even if there are more than one billlion pages). Leave this project to wiki farms as Wikia (which have a wiki for everything useful and useless) --★ ↦ Airon Ĉ 11:43, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
> > > > Spam isn't tolerated at WT either, but we find it hard to get rid of it when IB provides such poor support. POV opinions are also discouraged per "Don't tout", as travellers write from their experience. We work constantly to remove touting from articles. And what do you mean a NPOV Travel guide should stay in WB? From what I've heard, WB opposed this motion, and adding Wikitravel and Wikivoyage to WB would simply be a disaster for the whole of the Wikimedia project. And we're not leaving it to Wikia; part of the reason we're proposing a move is due to commercialism and advertisements. Wikia

would be 10 times worse... JamesA (talk) 11:34, 26 July 2012 (UTC)

16. **Oppose** Per Ironholds. And as for the argument that it'll get more editors, well, we need to focus on keeping the editors we have right now instead of putting a lot of effort into gaining new ones. --**Kangaroopowah** 01:57, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
17. **Strong Oppose** Like Wiggum and FoCuSandLeArN: a travel guide isn't for educative purpose. A travel guide is ALWAYS subjective, depending on the person who used the service, their experience, the moment they used it, the condition, etc... This project is a good idea, but I do not think it should join Wikimedia projects. --Kormin (talk) 02:06, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
18. **Strong Oppose** Waste of time and money. Articles will always have an opinion bias, and interest groups will attempt to hijack it. Travel experiences always also depend on the money spent, respectively one intents to spend. Then there is the issue of providing references, ... Not worth the trouble. 121.218.143.50 05:20, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
19. **Oppose** I strongly believe that this proposal falls outside of the scope of Wikipedia. Furthermore, absorption of such a project would only bring unnecessary complexity to the foundation. Hence, I am VERY opposed to the "Travel Guide Project". Ltr,ftw (talk) 05:51, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
    - Just to be clear, do you mean "outside the scope of Wiki*media*"? Wikipedia's scope is not relevant to this RFC. This, that and the other (talk) 07:24, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
20. **Oppose** subjective (en:Travel literature), too many variables (money spent, services chosen, weather), plus, as mentioned above, biased groups will surely attempt to promote their products and/or services. Also mentioned by Blurpeace, let's channel all the funds into some of our inactive projects. Sp33dyphil (talk) 07:34, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
21. **Oppose** No open doors for promotion of commercial interests and personal opinions (POV), no support for tourism, which is simply a branch of economic activity not interested very much in the locals. Wikimedia is a means of education. - All in all contradictory to our aims, which hopefully are still the same. Admin and author, german Wikipedia, --Hans-Jürgen Hübner (talk) 07:43, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
22. **Oppose** I just oppose for setting up any new project now, even the wikipedia project isn't active enough. In Chinese, a word called "heat for three minutes" (meaning brief period of enthusiasm).--Wangxuan8331800 (talk) 08:26, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
23. **Oppose** I don't think a travel guide is within the scope of the Wikimedia project; also I think the efforts ought to go towards other stuff nowadays. Also I'm worried about neutral POV. Finally, I agree with a comment above: "Wikimedia is a means of education" - Wikitravel is not.--Arnaugir (talk) 08:53, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
24. **Oppose**. Per Hans-Jürgen Hübner. Bibi Saint-Pol (talk) 09:30, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
25. ☺ **Oppose** As a casual user I found Wikitravel most helpful when I needed it and therefore oppose any website infringing on its terrain. It's a point of not fragmenting knowledge across the web. --User:BjKa@Wikipedia-en/de 09:30, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
26. ☺ **Oppose** All the Wikimedia projects, at least in theory, are educational and neutral. Once we start writing tour guides, we're explicitly making ourselves a repository for the value-judgements of anyone who happens to come by, quite aside from the spam implications. To be frank, this proposal looks like English Wikipedia trying to create a fresh dumping ground for their problem editors, now that Wikiversity and Simple English Wikipedia have finally begun refusing to act as en-wiki's penal colony. Mogism (talk) 10:22, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

    Thank you a lot for this insightful comment. I suspect that a travel site would be more popular and therefore better policed than Simple and Wikiversity, so I am afraid that this

project would be more likely to attract convicts for transport to other projects than receive them. **Blue Rasberry** (talk) 23:37, 26 July 2012 (UTC)

27. (⊕ **Oppose**) **Very strong Oppose** Wikimedia is a non-profit-organisation. Each person, which will travel round the world, in a country, is able to look into WP and will get all informations, which is needed. Wikimedia is to give informations into the project-sites. More than only travel-informations. Zabia (talk) 10:48, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

28. ⊕ **Oppose** As has been stated many times above, a travel guide is always going to be a collection of subjective viewpoints. Putting aside the issue that this would lend the authoritative weight of Wikimedia to the viewpoints put forth, the very nature of the subjectivity would undoubtedly cause much heated debate as to each entries content and validity. Entries would be constantly edited to remove contentious opinions, which would undoubtedly harm the reputation of Wikimedia as reliable reference source. Jim0thy (talk) 11:59, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

    1. **Agree:** What if a place wants to be in the routine? If I add my home in the Beijing Travel Guide, will wikitravel accept that? --王小朋友 (talk) 12:08, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

29. ⊕ **Oppose:** Wikimedia should concentrate on more educational projects. Don't be like MS and Google. They tried to occupy every eara. Now Google is deleting it project and try to concentrate on search and social metworks. Entertainment, like Travel, is a Wikia thing. Rather than Travel Guide, I will support if wikimedia import more educational projects like rationalwiki (http://rationalwiki.org) . (I don't mean science. Religous wikis are OK.) But if Travel Guide is established, I will take part in too.--王小朋友 (talk) 12:08, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

30. ⊕ **Oppose** Waste of time and money. SallesNeto BR (talk) 12:36, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

31. ⊕ **Oppose** No comercial support in WP. Why we shold help traval & tourism? Their are already many platform within the www. --194.113.59.80 12:52, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

32. ⊕ **Oppose** Waste of money.--TheAnnoymousUser (talk) 13:10, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

33. ⊕ **Oppose** Bad idea, difficult to implement. We will face a lot of spam and we will have to dedicate resources to a failing project.--Louisbeta (talk) 13:16, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

34. ⊕ **Oppose** At first sight, it looked a marvelous idea to me. But WikiTravel gives only a very restricted choice of adresses etc. and therefore adresses chosen are publicity. If the choice means a judgment of quality, that is also not for encyclopedia wikipedia. And what is good today, is bad tomorrow. Or does wikipedia want to turn commercial? --Havang(nl) (talk) 14:09, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

35. ⊕ **Oppose** --[[kgh]] (talk) 15:45, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

36. ⊕ **Oppose**, for the same reasons as all the other opponents. Wikitravel is perfect enough. Why can't anybody *ignore* the ads? And besides, Wikitravel can get rid of it's own spam, but good editors leaving the site just exacerbates the spamfest. Wikitravelers who want to leave, leave. I don't care. I think this project is going to be a problem. I may be wrong, though. (Note: I am Wikipedia contributor Hillcrest98) 174.95.254.215 15:57, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

    Yes however this is an opportunity to bring Wikivoyage and Wikitravel editors back together and improve the non commercial philosophy of the editing community. **Doc James** (talk · contribs · email) 16:33, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

    In point of fact, nobody even needs to ignore the small number of advertisements on Wikitravel; since the moment they were added to the site a few years ago, a user preference "Do not show ad column" has been available to all users. You can just turn the ads off and you will never see them.--IBobi talk email 21:29, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

37. ⊜ **Oppose** I think the WMF could over-stretch itself with this. Cloudbound (talk) 17:52, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
38. ⊜ **Oppose** Why is this even being debated? This is outside the mission statement of the WMF to "develop educational content". A Travel Guide will fundamentally involve the organization and processing of opinionated statements. Jason Quinn (talk) 18:22, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
39. ⊜ **Oppose** In my opinion a travel-project doesn't fit with WMF / Also this project opens doors to advertisment / It cannot be objective. Bodhi-Baum (talk) 18:52, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
40. Yes, let's try to become the only site on the 'net! - Nabla (talk) 19:18, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
41. ⊜ **Oppose** Besides the already mentioned problems ("Out of wikimedia's educational scope", "May lead to fragmentation", "Costs too much ressources") of the previous opponents I think that Wikipedia contains already far more touristical information than the two "old" wikis Wikivoyage and Wikitravel - and IMHO also more information that the new wiki will ever have.

> Wikitravel english version has currently 26'000 articles, German wikivoyage (the largest language version there) has 12'000 articles. For comparison, if you search in en:wikipedia for tourism, you get 45'000 hits ("Tourism in Israel", "Ecotourism", "Climbing", "Tourism in metropolitan Detroit" are some of the top 50 hits).
> Most of the articles in both wikivoyage and wikitravel seem to be places (countries to towns). Quite many of these containing only a table of contents or general information which can also be found in wikipedia. For comparison: en:wikipedia contains alone 140'000 articles about cities (tool "categorycount" on category "cities by country" with search depth 4). Even if you count only every fourth article (to exclude double entries and touristically irrelevant cities) you would have more articles than wikitravel with all its additional articles about counties and countries.
> And the wikipedia articles are often already quite useful for planning a vacation. For example I used it for planning a trip to London. In wikipedia you find the climate diagram, information about how far the airports are from the city centre and how to get from there to the centre, as well as information about when the Birmingham Palace is open to the public.
> So either the new Travelguide wiki would copy all this information (and every future change would have to be done twice: in wikipedia and travelguide). Or you try to separate the content - touristically relevant information in travelguide, other information in wikipedia. But how would you define "touristically relevant" and how would you enforce wikipedia editors to not enter "touristically relevant" information?
> And even if you decide that travelguide shall only contain information that is irrelevant for wikipedia, it won't work. For example if you decide to turn travelguide in a hotel database, it is hard to offer more entries than commercial sites. For comparison: wikivoyage has information about 10 hotels in London with one rating per hotel. booking.com has 1000 hotels in London with more than 100 ratings per hotel.
> So the main question is what travelguide really should become and how it will differ from wikipedia and its city articles on the one side and commerical rating sites / hotel databases on the other side. I think between these two poles there is only few space for project travelguide.
> A first step could be to create a special wikibook ("Travelguide to England" or an equivalent to "1000 places to see before you die") to get a feeling for the

complexity of creating a free travelguide for the whole world in more than 10 languages. --Torsch (talk) 19:55, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

42. Travel guides? Aren't they all about personal preferences and tastes? The Wikipedia can strive for functionality since its ideals would be stripping the contributors off their irrational likes and dislikes. Travel guides wouldn't. The point of a travel guide is deciding someone else's course of action. Such project begs for being overtaken by some segregated group of pov-pushers, by definition. 128.72.151.88 20:13, 19 July 2012 (UTC)this comment was written by ru:Участник:Легат Ская

> No, they are not "all about personal preferences and tastes" There may be some content that is personal preference or taste, but most of WT and WV is factual, though often not citable, as there is a considerable amount of original research, which is not allowed on WP, but is allowed on some wikimedia projects. The point of WT and WV is to provide information to allow the traveller to make their own informed choices. That is the whole point of this proposed project. Peter (Southwood) (talk): 10:17, 20 July 2012 (UTC)

43. Per reasons outlined above, just doesn't seem like it would work. Things about scope are more iffy, but without the resources to support existing projects effectively, adding another is a pile of unfortunateness waiting to happen. —— Isarra ༆ 20:24, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

44. **Very strong oppose/Tre forta kontraŭstaro**: It is better to integrate the travel information into the existing Wikipedia than to use ressources for a new mostly redundant project/vojaĝinformojn en la ekzistantan vikipedion ol foruzi energion kaj fortan por nova plejparte redundanta projekto!DidiWeidmann (talk) 20:45, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

> Much of the most valuable travel information can not be integrated into Wikipedia as it is in conflict with No Original Research. Original research is vital for a travel guide, otherwise it will always be out of date. Peter (Southwood) (talk): 10:17, 20 July 2012 (UTC)

45. **Oppose** Wikipedia is not a manual, **guidebook**, textbook, or scientific journal (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:What_Wikipedia_is_not#Wikipedia_is_not_a_manual.2 and Wikipedia should not be the one and only guide for everything. --Arcy (talk) 21:42, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

> Note that the proposal is to migrate content (and communities) from the existing Wikivoyage and Wikitravel projects to a new WMF site (similar to wikinews or wikiquotes); nothing has been proposed that would change Wikipedia in any way. --Wrh2 (talk) 22:07, 19 July 2012 (UTC)
> Wikipedia is not a collection of quotes, but *Wikiquote* is. Wikipedia is not a dictionary, but *Wiktionary* is. The proposal is about starting a new project, not about changing Wikipedia in any way. /**abbedabb**talk 10:50, 20 July 2012 (UTC)

46. *Oppose* Empires fall when they extend their reach further than they can handle. WikiEditor709 (talk) 00:10, 20 July 2012 (UTC)

> By that logic, we're already extended too far (take a look at hundreds of inactive projects), so we might as well take on an active project which would only further Wikimedia's readership. It also really doesn't take much resource-wise to run a wiki... The big issue is editors, and we have plenty of those planning to join. Ajraddatz (Talk) 00:14, 20 July 2012 (UTC)

47. **Oppose.** A travel guide would not fit well at all as a Wikimedia project. Adding this would eliminate boundaries to what could become a Wikimedia project. Right now we have a reasonable number of projects dealing with large categories of education content. (Okay, we also have Wikispecies, but I think it's a reasonable expectation that that will be merged with Wikidata or something at some point.) A travel guide would simply be a collection of opinions about a small area of knowledge, unlike the other Wikimedia projects. --Yair rand (talk) 22:11, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

> Have you actually looked at the content of the better travel guide articles? Peter (Southwood) ^(talk): 10:17, 20 July 2012 (UTC)

48. **Oppose.** Wikipedia has enough problems keeping the main site running. And why should I donate money to help tourists? I would support it if it would finance itself, but not if it's based on donations like Wikipedia now! --Newsflash (talk) 22:40, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

49. **Oppose** : from France ==> Wikipedia est une encyclopédie ! Pourquoi en faire un guide de voyage ? C'est ridicule ! Sg7438 (talk) 07:04, 20 July 2012 (UTC)

> Il ne s'agit pas de Wikipédia. Le but de e vote est d'ajouter un nouveau projet soutenu par la fondation Wikimédia. On aurait ainsi Wikivoyage à ôté de Wikipédia, du Wiktionnaire, de la Wikiversité, de Wikinews, ... Pamputt (talk) 08:02, 20 July 2012 (UTC)

>> Aucun intérêt : qu'un site, une agence de voyage s'appuie sur wiki et son encyclopédie, cela se comprend mais s'appuyer sur la communauté pour faire un projet distinct est un non-sens (à moins qu'il s'agisse de *préparer le boulot* pour une future agence de voyage "en mal" de petites mains ? Sg7438 (talk) 09:40, 23 July 2012 (UTC)

50. @ **oppose:** there is Wikivoyage (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikivoyage) with a free license. --Dktz (talk) 08:58, 20 July 2012 (UTC)

> The Wikivoyage people decided that they want to join Wikimedia. So all existing Wikivoyage content as well as the community would be part of this new project - it might be even named Wikivoyage. -- Arne (akl) (talk) 09:45, 20 July 2012 (UTC)

51. **Oppose.** I think that a new project should not be created unless the answers to these questions are "Yes": Is there already some content which will be moved to the new project? Does the Wikimedia Foundation already own the domain where the different language editions will be located? (In this case the answer to the last question is certainly "No" because the name of this Travel Guide is still under discussion.) For example, Wikijunior (a collection of textbooks for children until the age of 12) might be created right now because there is already some content for it (see here for the English language, but also note all the interwikis) and because the Wikimedia Foundation seems to own the domain wikijunior.org (http://www.wikijunior.org) .--Erasmo Barresi (talk) 09:28, 20 July 2012 (UTC)

> In answer to your questions:

>> Yes there is already some Wikipedia content which would fit better in a travel guide. Why is this relevant? There is also a very large amount of information available from other travel guides which is far more relevant.
>> Several possible domain names are already owned, but why is this relevant?

What has this proposal to do with other possible proposals? All should be judges on their own merits.Peter (Southwood) (talk): 10:17, 20 July 2012 (UTC)

52. ~~Oppose~~ **Very strong oppose**: Undoubtedly is an awesome project. But visibly the Wikimedia hasn't a clear plan to improve, and even to think of improvements to other projects outside Wikipedia[1] (with the exception of commons which has direct link to wikipedia). Wikimedia is good at creating a free encyclopedia, but was not successful in other segments which was proposed. If keep a multilingual project is summarized just to give some money to maintain the servers, leaving the rest with the editors and continue thinking about improvements only for Wikipedia. So no, thanks. And this election is rhetorical, because who does not know the stance of wikimedia when it comes to think of improvements for projects not related to Wikipedia(wikibooks, Wikisource, Wikinews, wikivercity, Wikiquote etc) will vote positive, then this is already a question answered. --Raylton P. Sousa (talk) 13:23, 20 July 2012 (UTC)

53. **Oppose**: At first I voted for the Travel Guide, but after a deeper look into the topic, I have decided to change my mind. I guess the plans are creating a new W'media site, which would use economical and technical resources. Given the World's economy, I do not think W'media should spend money on that when, if we/they want, it is possible to dump Wikitravel's information into W'pedia. Wikimedians also should look for their/our interests, Wikipedia already hosts far more tourist info than Wikitravel. If I look for Wikitravel page about my city, I can only find a Tourist's Yellow Pages. Given the fact that both licenses are nearly the same, I think Wikitravellers should just dump missing yet adequate and relevant information into the different Wikipedia language editions. I think that would make everyone happy. --Schumi4ever (talk) 13:41, 20 July 2012 (UTC)

~~Oppose Users must improve their articles, not a new travel guide. --Nightfly85 (talk) 13:59, 20 July 2012 (UTC)~~ opinion changed --Nightfly85 (talk) 08:36, 24 July 2012 (UTC)

54. **Oppose**: Out of the scope of the Foundation, imho. Pymouss Tchatcher - 16:04, 20 July 2012 (UTC)

55. **weak oppose**: the travel projects will not become better under the roof of the foundation. I do not see there much specific travel guide content like route planning, rather just a collection of information about places, cities, which is already better in Wikipedia, and should not be doubled. For a specific travel guide on a region or on moutain climbing etc. wikibooks is fine.--Bocardodarapti (talk) 17:45, 20 July 2012 (UTC)

56. **Symbolic oppose.** Although it will not mean much. WMF has to do the project anyway because they have rightly figured out that it is where the strength lies, and where "user engagement" will help the foundation survive. It is a great business move, and will ensure the survival of the foundation. But is it "encyclopedic"? It will be a cold day in July in Orlando when this can be considered encyclopedic. The key to it is that no one wants to say that the "scientific encyclopedia" is failing - but most people know it. I do not know of the biochemistry parts, but the computer science parts are best 20% correct (and riddled with blatant COI) and the correct parts are getting to be out of date as we type. I wrote to the exec director over a year ago and asked her to do something about it... No response. So the hand writing is on the wall. This is what is going to happen: Wikipedia will still be "positioned" as an encyclopedia for some time, but in reality will tilt towards a new form of social media. There is a tremendous business opportunity for a Facebook type Tripadvisor.com with Wiki features, maps, video, etc. The one part in Wikipedia that has really succeeded and is the geographic information. I absolutely, absolutely trust that part. If I want to know about any town in New York, I know can rely on Wikipedia. I have only 10% confidence in what I would read about biochemistry (given what I have seen about computer science or physics) but that is another story. The real question is: who will gobble up whom first. There was talk of

buying WikiTravel. But it can also happen the other way. The great siphon off (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Google_Knowledge_Graph) has already started. So either Google Facebook or someone will take the best of Wikicontent (say geography) and use it. The rule in the valley is: innovate or die. So it is just a question of time before one of those companies siphons of the geographic contents of Wikipedia, merges it with hotel information and gets going that way. There are, as always, some elements of chance. Will the new Yahoo CEO see this as a ticket to Y-redemption? Time will tell.... But anyway, WMF will try this project, but only time will tell what will happen next.... Yet one thing is certain: *Times, they are a'changing*: a new form of "semi-encyclopedic social network travel guide" is being born here. Could someone help deliver it please? History2007 (talk) 21:19, 20 July 2012 (UTC)

- If I had a clearer mind and a better pen I would have written this. I hope. And if I had not already opposed I would now. Tks. - Nabla (talk) 22:26, 22 July 2012 (UTC)

57. ⊜ **Oppose**: If it is a project, then it is heavily industry driven, but only by a few competitors. Checked some places in the area, always the some hotel group and none of the others. Restaurants seem to be all Chinese though I myself certainly prefer European kitchen in these places. in German wie have the nice legal term "Marktverwirrungsschaden" (I dont know the exact translation ...). Integration of these projects in our encyclopedic world will cause a severe „Marktverwirrungsschaden" for the WP-project...--Kresspahl (talk) 23:05, 20 July 2012 (UTC)

58. **Oppose**. WT does not have a NPOV policy that all other WMF projects pretty much have (and no, "be fair" is not good enough). Also, the "lively writing" style policy has no place in a WMF project - it is akin to literature, and WMF projects are about factual and reference material, not collectively edited works of literature. As these policies seem firmly established in the WT community and I don't foresee them changing, I vote against. Also, I find it questionable that WT would increase WMF funding enough to be able to support itself (despite claims, no proof has been presented), and frankly, Wikipedia is more important. Silver hr (talk) 02:11, 21 July 2012 (UTC)

Wikimedia Commons or Wikiversity doesn't have a NPOV policy. Commons hosts map showing a partisan point of view of frontiers for example, which is often found strange by some Wikipedians which would like to delete such map with a NPOV rationale. On Wikiversity, it's possible to present original search, with the author POV. --Dereckson (talk) 12:55, 21 July 2012 (UTC)

As I'm sure you're well aware, Commons is not independent, but serves as a media repository for other projects. As such, it makes no sense for it to have its own NPOV policy. Rather, the NPOV policies of the other projects that use Commons carry over to Commons such that a NPOV project's content can't use POV content from Commons.
And as I'm sure you're also well aware, Wikiversity does indeed have a general NPOV policy, but it allows for exceptions in certain well-defined circumstances: "when academic freedom leads Wikiversity participants beyond the restrictions of the traditional Wikimedia Foundation Neutral point of view (NPOV) policy, the Wikiversity pages that are exempted from NPOV must be marked as such and include a disclosure of the limitations on perspective and points of view that are being explored. Only Wikiversity participants who have explicitly affirmed their personal commitment to the Wikiversity Scholarly ethics policy are allowed to edit Wikiversity pages outside of the restrictions imposed by NPOV policy.".
So as you can see, NPOV is indeed a staple of WMF projects and it needs to stay that way. Silver hr (talk) 19:51, 22 July 2012 (UTC)

59. **Oppose**. Wikitravel is good enough. This gives me the impression that WMF is abusing the community to "dominate" free knowledge. By the way, I would appreciate if anybody can leave me a message and let me know how I can turn off the "banner" displayed on top of Wikipedia pages, which links here.--Dingruogu (talk) 04:53, 21 July 2012 (UTC)

> Wikitravel isn't good enough for its community, as can be seen by the fact that every active administrator wishes to fork to the WMF. In future, it won't be good enough for readers when the content begins to degrade due to the poor technical support. To turn off the "banner", there should be a hide link on the right-hand side. Hope that helps :) JamesA (talk) 10:00, 21 July 2012 (UTC)

60. **Oppose** - per Ironholds. Arcandam (talk) 14:34, 21 July 2012 (UTC)
61. **Oppose**—I don't see how the Wikimedia Foundation could host its own clone of Wikitravel and do a better job of it. If Wikitravel were financially imperiled and we had the option to take it over that'd be one thing, but for the time being we are better off contributing to the extant project. harej (talk) 15:13, 21 July 2012 (UTC)

> I understand that there may be gaps in my reasoning above. I'd like to also express my concurrence with User:Ironholds' sentiment. harej (talk) 15:15, 21 July 2012 (UTC)

62. ☺ **Strong Oppose** Given the current guidelines and principles of Wikimedia/Wikipedia, I find the new travel project (or whatever it will be called) not to be able to suite the very restrictive guidelines, compare to the nature of the Travel Guide itself. --G(x) (talk) 16:18, 21 July 2012 (UTC)
63. Cedalyon (talk) 19:42, 21 July 2012 (UTC)
64. ☺ **Strong oppose** Per others. Wikitravel is great, but IMHO is out of scope for the Wikimedia Foundation, and as Sven Manguard said: « *let's not break things that work* ». Also someone said that the Foundation is not good to run their projects that are not Wikipedia or Commons, and actually it's somehow true. I think both communities will end up damaged, and Wikitravel guide will end up heavily damaged. If Wikitravel needs money for the servers, just ask a donation, and maybe the Foundation can help it, also advertising in some way. Forking is a bad choise, and here there are pre-existing rules that will make difficult to build such a project like Wikitravel, also because of hosting on the Foundation servers duplicate content. --Phyrexian φ 19:51, 21 July 2012 (UTC)
65. a travel guide without specific tips to the best hotel, bar or event at one place is useless. I do not like to have commercials of any kind in any project of Wikimedia. --Feba (talk) 00:38, 22 July 2012 (UTC)
66. **Oppose** It will be nothing more but a list of hotels and hostles and I'm against commercials at Wiki. --Grisznak (talk) 11:11, 22 July 2012 (UTC)
67. ☺ **Oppose**: I agree with Gavin.collins, Wiggum, Bocardodarapti and others. I have strong concerns about POV and advertising issues. Any notable NPOV information can be inserted on Wikipedia. In my opinion it does not deserve resources by Wikimedia. --BASILICOFRESCO (msg) 09:30, 22 July 2012 (UTC)
68. ☺ **Oppose**: Waste of WMF money and time. --Silesianus (talk) 10:22, 22 July 2012 (UTC)
69. ☺ **Strong Oppose**: This is destroying years of work by the WikiTravel community just to inagurate a TRAVEL PROJECT, completely for leisure purposes, to a serious foundation. I don't want to see more wikis chomped by Wikimedia so more people get fine-printed by the dozens of policies and then blocked unjustly. Sometimes, I think Wikimedia is just a plain old bureaucracy. Just make another project, okay? Then we'll figure it out. We can't just get a suggestion of a new WM project and then grab the whole consensus of the English Wikipedia so they can (blindly) say yes. Oh yeah, WM uses extremely persuasive (and aggressive, I could

say?) ways to pass a policy. So Wikimedia found a dying wiki, and it wanted to grab it in while the admins were saying yes. Here goes the Administrator's Noticeboard, NPOV, no CC-BY-NC, and more blocks and regulatory authorities. And no, I'm not conspiring against anything, and yes, most arguments I say end up sounding like rants. On a less ranting note, I agree with Ironholds here. If we don't improve the projects we already have, we don't get a new project. If you don't eat your food, you don't get more to eat and waste what you have on your plate. Longbyte1 (talk) 16:08, 22 July 2012 (UTC)

> Another point: if the Wikitravel community migrates to an equivalent WM project, they have the risk of being overturned or betrayed since we're now turning to the WMF's vision/mission, not the WT community's vision. Also, travel sites can sometimes be completely promotional and may defame some places if it's not edited correctly. Longbyte1 (talk) 16:56, 24 July 2012 (UTC)

70. ☺ **Oppose:**Travelling an economic activity in nature. So I consider very difficult to keep this project free of advertising, biased contributions, copyright issues. More attention should be paid to already existing projects. --$$$Marlon$$$30 (talk) 16:15, 22 July 2012 (UTC)
71. ☺ **Oppose**. Per others. JukoFF (talk) 19:20, 22 July 2012 (UTC)
72. ☺ **Oppose** NPOV is one of the most important points in all Wikimedia Projects, and this is something a travel guide can't deliver (or it won't be read) Maclemo (talk) 20:18, 22 July 2012 (UTC)

> Commons and Wikiversity projects do not have NPOV policies. LtPowers (talk) 00:21, 23 July 2012 (UTC)

73. ☺ **Oppose** I oppose because I not understand nothing of the all to the text--Jean-François Clet (talk) 21:14, 22 July 2012 (UTC)
74. ☺ **Oppose** A great idea, but... I'm not sure that it is relevant, but the tool server replag looks like [this (http://toolserver.org/~bryan/stats/replag/s1-monthly.png)]. Let's get what we've got working reliably before go expanding any more. Dcshank (talk) 00:29, 23 July 2012 (UTC)
75. ☺ **Strong Oppose:** I'm fed up w/ utopia and dreams. There's only one and only goal: improve the present contents thru finding (other) ways to retain reliable contributors. Everything (and anything) else is fake and dishonest, especially for the readers. --Bibliorock (talk) 02:32, 23 July 2012 (UTC) see my personal page on wp:fr or :en

> ~~☺ Oppose I don't think we have the necessity to compete with Wikitravel. For me it is a waste of time. --Zhxy 519 (talk) 05:08, 23 July 2012 (UTC)~~

> As you said, Wikitravel's community is going to join us. Then I would be neutral.--Zhxy 519 (talk) 06:07, 23 July 2012 (UTC)

76. ☺ **Extremely Incredibly Crazy Strong Oppose** the travel guide is wikipedia. Deansfa (talk) 06:27, 23 July 2012 (UTC)

> Wikipedia is not a travel guide. LtPowers (talk) 15:30, 23 July 2012 (UTC)

>> I can use wikipedia as a travel guide if I want. It is not, you're right, but the usage of Wikipedia are diverse : if I want to discover all the national monuments of a country, I am sure Wikipedia will give me the neutral, factual and exhaustive list I need, with geolocalisation, pictures and lots of interesting informations. 1000% better than any travel guide in the world. To me, the Wikipedia encyclopedia itself can be used as a neutral and exhaustive travel guide, as it can be used as a music

encyclopedia, as it can be used as lots of different things. Deansfa (talk) 17:11, 26 July 2012 (UTC)

77. ⊛ **Oppose** Not convinced this would be a viable project. The type of material involved would be hard to revise and improve. In any case, I don't think there is a place for a project that is half way between Wikipedia on the one hand, and purely commercial sites like Trip Advisor on the other. --Kleinzach (talk) 08:04, 23 July 2012 (UTC)

> The project has been viable for several years already. Not sure what else you're looking for? LtPowers (talk) 15:30, 23 July 2012 (UTC)

>> Your definition of 'viable'? That it's still online? WikiTravel editorial standards are far below those of Wikipedia and (perhaps more important) the content is seldom interesting. --Kleinzach (talk) 01:03, 24 July 2012 (UTC)

>>> Wikitravel is, today, one of the top comprehensive travel guides on the Internet, consistently ranked highly in Google search results, with very healthy viewership numbers. Some of our best guides have been published and sold as physical books, and at least one of them may be the best guidebook to that particular city ever published. The only obstacle to viability has been declining contributor numbers and rates, but we expect both to tick up to prior levels after getting out from Internet Brands' ownership. LtPowers (talk) 13:21, 24 July 2012 (UTC)

78. ⊛ **Oppose** We already have many projects which are quiet empty of contributors (Wikispecies, Wikiversity...). Why would we add an other one ? Why this one will be different of the other ? --Woozz (talk) 08:26, 23 July 2012 (UTC)
    1. Because this project comes with an established user base, as well as a stable of former editors who have pledged to return to editing should the project be accepted by WMF. The community already exists; we just need a host. LtPowers (talk) 15:30, 23 July 2012 (UTC)
79. ⊛ **Oppose** Generally also a Travelguide-Wiki under Wikimedia-Structure would be a possible project. But I sea big problems in conversing this plan: First of all the POV-debate: Touristic information is highly subjective work with a strong commercial character. Its almost impossible to find a neutral way of displaying sights, ancient places with a bad background. It's often a really personal rating, making it hard to generalize, so as needed in a Wiki Project. A further big problem is the aspect of manipulating the contents: Every player in the tourisms industry will be editing the TG in the way for his own profits, perhaps even not only pushing the own articles but also damaging the opponent ones. In this field the work of quality management is much more important than in other wikis, if you want to have reliable contents. And at least i think this project will be more commercial than our encyclopedia is at the moment - this would be a system change with impact on the whole Wikiversum and this should be considered very well. --Krassdaniel (talk) 08:47, 23 July 2012 (UTC)
80. ⊛ **Oppose** Rubietje88 (talk) 09:41, 23 July 2012 (UTC)
81. ⊛ **Oppose**. Clearly out of scope of what an encylopedical projet should be. NPoV infringement furthermore. WP can't be an advisor. Long-term objectives are not clear : free up to what point or date ?--LPLT (talk) 10:52, 23 July 2012 (UTC)
82. ⊛ **Oppose**, no it will not work. There are inherent POV issues in establishing a travel guide. I also don't see how a travel guide falls under the WMF's purpose and remit or core/founding

principles. How does advising someone where they should/shouldn't go fall under that umbrella? —**ANCIENT APPARITION** 11:02, 23 July 2012 (UTC)

83. ⊛ **Oppose**. Fsojic (talk) 11:15, 23 July 2012 (UTC)
84. ⊛ **Oppose**. WMF must maintain focus, not overextend. Current activities can be much improved rather than sprawling, which divides your attention. JMK (talk) 11:32, 23 July 2012 (UTC)
85. ⊛ **Oppose** --Lomita (talk) 12:21, 23 July 2012 (UTC)
86. ⊛ **Oppose** --Tyll Leyden (talk) 13:41, 23 July 2012 (UTC)
87. ⊛ **Oppose** --Paralacre (talk) 17:37, 23 July 2012 (UTC)
88. ⊛ **Oppose** - when I was editing Wikitravel (http://wikitravel.org/en/Main_Page) , I didn't notice it is not a WP project. So, another very similar page with very similar contents... Better try to cooperate with wikitravel. Avjoska (talk) 17:40, 23 July 2012 (UTC)
89. ⊛ **Oppose** The principle of neutrality as described in Wikitravel is not restrictive enough: the restaurateur may qualify its restaurant "excellent", "surprising". I would have added the prohibition to qualify, either positively or negatively, a place to profit.--Yodaspirine (talk) 18:50, 23 July 2012 (UTC)
90. ⊛ **Oppose** RoyTek (talk) 19:41, 23 July 2012 (UTC)
91. ⊛ **Oppose** There's already a quite (eventhough not really encyclopaedic, but traveller-friendly) good travel guide on the internet, wikitravel. So it's more or less a waste of money and useless work. People should try to make wikitravel better instead of creating their own travel guide (and I'm not even sure people would use it, as most travellers are already used to using wikitravel) Enine9 (talk) 19:52, 23 July 2012 (UTC)

> Note that this proposal involves moving the Wikitravel community and content (although unfortunately not the domain name), as well as the Wikivoyage fork of Wikitravel, to a new WMF project. After many years of "trying to make wikitravel better" every active admin on English Wikitravel has expressed a desire to leave the current commercial host of Wikitravel to form a new site, and Wikivoyage has also said they would join in a migration to WMF. -- Wrh2 (talk) 20:14, 23 July 2012 (UTC)

92. ⊛ **Oppose** wikitravel exists. if someone would like to aggregate the links from the various wikis into a site that displays them as a front-end that makes sense to me. but this is wasted effort and duplication, to boot. Avriette (talk) 20:03, 23 July 2012 (UTC)
93. ⊛ **Oppose** WT will continue to exist regardless of a new project. Storing the same content in multiple places is meaningless effort.24.24.230.95 03:59, 1 August 2012 (UTC)
94. ⊛ **Oppose**. Per LPLT. SM ** =∧∧= ** 21:28, 23 July 2012 (UTC)
95. ⊛ **Oppose Rastrojo** (D·ES) 22:14, 23 July 2012 (UTC)
96. ⊛ **Oppose** As stated above, we need to focus on already existing Wikimedia projects and Wikidata. We shouldn't waste resources at maintaining a travel guide. Each year Wikipedia gets bigger, and probably will keep increasing its size and so will the money to maintain it. Will donations still be enough to keep the servers running? Why do we want to increase the costs by getting another project? David0811 (talk) 02:43, 24 July 2012 (UTC)
97. ⊛ **Oppose** Don't see the benefits at all, will only be a distraction from Wikipedia and not to mention editorial problems with PoV and Advertising, and will be competing in a busy marketplace with the established guide books and of course TripAdvisor. Warren Whyte (talk) 07:55, 24 July 2012 (UTC)
98. ⊛ **Oppose** This seems like it will always be an inherently POV and commercially-bent enterprise. A travel guide is not a reference work like an encyclopedia, atlas, dictionary, collection of source documents, textbooks, etc. I am in favor of linking to well-written travel guides throughout the existing projects, but I feel like actually integrating these into the

Wikimedia fold undermines the spirit of most (if not all) of the other projects (Wikinews being the odd duck.) —Justin (koavf)♥T⊕C☺M☯ 08:02, 24 July 2012 (UTC)

99. ☺ **Oppose**--CHensel (talk) 08:17, 24 July 2012 (UTC)

100. ☺ **Oppose**Damicomat (talk) 14:49, 24 July 2012 (UTC)

101. ☺ **Oppose** 95.176.66.71 16:33, 24 July 2012 (UTC)

102. ☺ **Oppose** Se puede emplear wikibook con el contenido de commons y referencias a wikipedia para crear una guia de viajero petrohs (gracias) 17:17, 24 July 2012 (UTC)

103. ☺ **Oppose** In view of the trends of the participants activity we should rather consolidate our efforts, not distract. Kenraiz (talk) 17:44, 24 July 2012 (UTC)

104. ☺ **Oppose** We can write those informations in Wikipedia or Wikibooks. Daniel Message 17:48, 24 July 2012 (UTC)

> Daniel, do note that what you propose has been historically rejected by the Wikipedia community (and more to the point, ro.wp). I personally moved a few KB of wikitext from ro.wp to Wikitravel at the request of the community--Strainu (talk) 20:52, 24 July 2012 (UTC)

105. ☺ **Oppose** --Bultro (talk) 19:23, 24 July 2012 (UTC)

106. ☺ **Oppose** Kelam (talk) 22:29, 24 July 2012 (UTC)

107. ☺ **Oppose** --EoWinn (talk) 04:12, 25 July 2012 (UTC)

108. ☺ **Oppose** per strong promotional concerns and impracticality in implementation (per Manguard). IShadowed (talk) 06:28, 25 July 2012 (UTC)

109. **Very strong opposition.** What about the first sentence of the **Mission statement**?

> "The mission of the Wikimedia Foundation is to empower and engage people around the world to collect and develop educational content under a free license or in the public domain, and to disseminate it effectively and globally."

Where is, in this project of travel guide(s), the **educational content** collecting and developping goal? I have a lot of difficulties to see any clue of it. Hégésippe | ±Θ± 07:44, 25 July 2012 (UTC)

> The best place for this project, with no real educational scope, should be on **Wikia**, and has not to be hosted by Wikimedia Foundation. Hégésippe | ±Θ± 10:18, 25 July 2012 (UTC)

110. ☺ **Oppose**: I would consider this a case of mission creep. O.Koslowski (talk) 08:40, 25 July 2012 (UTC)

111. ☺ **Oppose**Ther should be enough information for travelers in Wikipedia. We do not need a branch for POV and advertising.--Koppchen (talk) 08:44, 25 July 2012 (UTC)

112. ☺ **Oppose** Such a project scorns our values, especially regarding neutrality matters. --Koui² (talk) 09:17, 25 July 2012 (UTC)

113. ☺ **Oppose**: Waste of effort. I fear it will be overloaded by commercial interests and/or (hidden) advertising --137.248.1.25 09:32, 25 July 2012 (UTC)

114. ~~Oppose~~ **Very strong oppose**: This is a slippery road to fragmentation of a great encyclopedia. Wikipedia is great because it is all-inclusive. I am vehemently against the proposal. What next? For example, since there is also a great demand for music information as strong as for travel information... Suddenly we will get a proposal for a separate Music Guide where we have only singers and bands, albums and singles and record labels and migrate information to that guide? There is huge demand for education information... So yet a third layer called Education Guide for schools, colleges and universities... I am against Travel Guide, Music Guide, Education Guide, Whatever Guide.. Keep it all under one project and let the reader

search within the confines of a great all-inclusive database rather than just consult "some other guide" which what this new proposal boils down to. 70.27.237.45 13:23, 25 July 2012 (UTC)

We have a number of sister projects. Wikipedia is not a dictionary thus we have Wikitionary, Wikipedia is not a collection of quotes thus we have Wikiquotes. Wikipedia is also not a travel guide [8] (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:NOT#Wikipedia_is_not_a_manual.2C_guidebook thus we have this proposal.**Doc James** (talk · contribs · email) 16:21, 25 July 2012 (UTC)

■ Of course, similar *guide*-like educational projects would be proposed by someone (at least me) if this WT becomes a success. And it *will* be educational. Supported by WP and WB and with all those helpful wikimedians, an educational project (or a subproject of Wikiversity), if launched, can be very successful and directly assumes fulfilling the goal and the vision. :) **Vanischenu**Talk 23:38, 25 July 2012 (UTC)

115. ⊜ **Oppose** Reasons are eloquently given above. Mugginsx (talk) 16:17, 25 July 2012 (UTC)
116. ⊜ **Oppose** This should go to Wikia--Biggerj1 (talk) 18:51, 25 July 2012 (UTC)
117. ⊜ **Oppose** Already possible to run in Wikibooks. --Höyhens (talk) 20:13, 25 July 2012 (UTC)
118. ⊜ **Oppose** I read the and no-goals (http://wikitravel.org/en/Wikitravel:Goals_and_non-goals%7Cgoals) of wikitravel. I don't see how it will be possible to avoid the meeting of the non-goals. It becomes a kind of Yellow pages and avertisers will fight to update the pages eacht against the ohers, for instance. Salignac (talk) 20:49, 25 July 2012 (UTC)
119. ⊜ **Oppose** That would be like a promotion and according to our principles of wikipedians, that would be a "promotion".--Ansemolu (talk) 01:03, 26 July 2012 (UTC)
120. ⊜ **Oppose** Why? There are already similar sites and it has nothing to do with the wikipedia. IPWAI (talk) 03:20, 26 July 2012 (UTC)
121. ⊜ **Oppose** This could be integrated into Wikibooks. There are certain overarching policies at What is Wikibooks? that all books must abide by, such as having a neutral point of view. Content at Wikibooks does not always meet a strict definition of a textbook (note the Cookbook for instance). The content under discussion is not unlike what we have at Subject:Tourism. I'm not sure why some think it'd all have to be in one book. It could take a few forms. Articles all related to one location could be placed under one book with that location's name, like what we already have. Pages like http://wikitravel.org/en/Texas could be the root of a book, with regions and cities and other destinations as subpages. Alternatively, a new namespace could be created, analogous to the Cookbook namespace, if content can be considered to be all part of one larger book but lacks the ability to be organized into subpages or you require greater separation and configuration based on namespace (with 30,000+ pages that might be preferable, for recent changes patrol and so on). – Adrignola talk 11:49, 26 July 2012 (UTC)
122. ⊜ **Oppose** commercial brand. Problems with POV and advertising unforeseeable. Alexpl (talk) 15:29, 26 July 2012 (UTC)
123. ⊜ **Oppose** I think? it's not good idea? we can find fresh travel guide in internet, in search machine Dreikhem (talk) 16:47, 26 July 2012 (UTC).
124. ⊜ **Oppose** I don't think we need a Travel Guide. It's here and it's called "Wikitravel"! So I think we'd rather start a campaign which would help "Wikitravel" grow. yavor18 (talk) 17:40, 26 July 2012 (UTC)

The proposal to move to Wikimedia comes from the Wikitravel community! Jpatokal (talk) 05:33, 27 July 2012 (UTC)

125. Oppose I don't think we need a Travel Guide. I agree with yavor18 . —*The preceding unsigned comment was added by* Itsmyworld (talk • contribs) .

126. **Oppose** Travel guides are by their very nature promotional at least in part. That conflicts with the wider project's neutrality goals. *Anything* that compromises neutrality harms the whole project even if only by association. Crispmuncher (talk) 18:44, 26 July 2012 (UTC)

127. **Oppose** Wikimedia is losing credibility for me. These are Wikia things, and we shouldn't divide the community even more. We should improve the existing abandoned projects instead —Fitoschido [shout track] @ 26 July, 2012; 22:22

128. ☺ **Oppose** Focus on the basics 83.250.92.82 22:25, 26 July 2012 (UTC)

> How? The basics (sans celebrity items) have now lost most of their sex-appeal and are getting to be pretty boring. There are 4 million articles out there now, and most of what remains to be done is less than exciting clean up work. The mid-level scientific topics are the worst off in many cases - but the tremendous amount of janitorial work needed to make an encyclopedia of them is not happening. I see outdated and error-ridden scientific articles that have been sitting there for well over a year (sometimes two) and no one fixes them. Not one single edit is made to improve those. Of course if Charlie Sheen does something spectacular tomorrow, that page will be updated in a few seconds, in real time. So reality must be faced: users are bored with basic encyclopedic work and "engaging projects" like this will come in sooner or later. And I predict that this will not be the last of them. More excitement is already being planned, I bet. Some of us may see that as the betrayal of the ideal of a great encyclopedia, but this is the real world after all. Idealism loses in most cases. History2007 (talk) 14:30, 27 July 2012 (UTC)

>> I guess the IP means your time would probably be better spend correcting those "outdated" and "error-ridden" scientific articles you noticed. Alexpl (talk) 08:27, 28 July 2012 (UTC)

>>> I stopped fixing those a months or so ago (after 5 years). There are just too few people fixing them, and I see no hope the scientific items will ever get fixed - if anything WP:COI is getting added to them now by mid-level researchers. So my point was that WMF may have seen the handwriting on the wall too and a new era will start where "exciting and engaging" endeavors will trump encyclopedic content. The travel guide is just the beginning. History2007 (talk) 10:17, 28 July 2012 (UTC)

129. ☺ **Oppose** per LPLT. Udufruduhu (talk) 21:10, 28 July 2012 (UTC)

130. ☺ **Oppose** I work on wikivoyage, the german/italien fork of wikitravel. In former times I work on wikipedia, never again. I lost my mind in fighting with admins. I do not need this crazy guys in my life again. They should stay where they are. 84.62.135.56 22:09, 29 July 2012 (UTC)

> We will be a separate project in the huge WMF family. Wikipedian admins will stay at the Wikipedia. They even have no admin rights at the new project. The community and the name and the admins and the contributors will be the same as before. Of course there will be a closer collaboration between the projects because in the WMF family we will

be found easier and people know that we will offer real free content. Wikipedians will take a look at the travel guide and we will take a look and work at one of the WMF projects. But that's what we want. We will get more readers and more contributors. What do you think will change then? And some of these - you call it "crazy guys" can work on WV right now as well. We are open to everybody. As Sue Gardener has noticed in her speech at Wikimania, there is a lack of communication especially to new and less experienced users. Maybe there are some guys playing a kind of god there but it's our duty as the WV guys to support our users. And you know, if we are getting bigger - even as a project as we are now - it will become more difficult do handle all these (sometimes crazy some times easy going) guys. -- DerFussi (talk) 05:16, 30 July 2012 (UTC)

131. ☻ **Oppose** With all due respect I can't see why this can't be done in Wikibooks. Wikibooks already exist, in several languages as can be seen in Special:SiteMatrix. Most of them are abandoned. Why can't we use first what we have, rather than to create new separate projects, disregarding what we already have? Regards, — MA (audiencia) 09:19, 31 July 2012 (UTC)

132. ☻ **Oppose** I am a long-time contributor to Wikipedia and Wikitravel and oppose this project for many of the reasons stated in the opposition comments-- not much to add. Judging by the intensity of comments here, Doc_James you seem to be spearheading this organizing effort? What are your qualifications for that? Ihdj (talk) 01:24, 1 August 2012 (UTC)

> That is strange because this user name has made a total of 1 edit across all projects and that is this edit to meta.[9] (http://toolserver.org/~quentinv57/sulinfo/Ihdj) And there is no account by this name on WT.[10] (http://wikitravel.org/en/User:Ihdj) My qualifications are that I am a long time Wikipedian/Wikimedian and of course I love to travel. **Doc James** (talk · contribs · email) 02:13, 1 August 2012 (UTC)

>> I wouldn't want you to find it strange that I want to protect my privacy. I can assure you that I've been active on both sites. I'm delighted that you love travel-- me too. I'm curious and was asking about your personal level of intensity about this project, since I don't recall seeing you make contributions on WT or seeing you on the site at all until recently. Am I mistaken? Ihdj 00:40, 2 August 2012 (UTC)

>>> Yes have never really edited WT as I do not like the fact that the site is owned by a for profit instead of a not for profit. **Doc James** (talk · contribs · email) 00:42, 2 August 2012 (UTC)

>>>> Yeah, some people really hate ads. You might not be aware that the host allows users to turn off the ads? Ihdj 00:40, 2 August 2012 (UTC)

>>>>> Yes I am aware of that but my concern regarding commercial influence is greater than simply the ads. I would not be hear volunteering at Wikipedia if it was run by a for profit company.**Doc James** (talk · contribs · email) 01:42, 2 August 2012 (UTC)

>> This is simply a weird *ad-hominim* attack. To my mind the argument is disqualified. Many of us as long-time Wikitravel admins and contributors were looking for somebody to help bring this idea up with the Wikimedia foundation.

James offered, so we said OK, let's go for it. MarkJaroski (talk) 21:18, 6 August 2012 (UTC)

Ihdj if you are a long time contributor to WT and WP why did you create a brand new user account just to vote here? You must admit that this is strange behavior and raises concerns. Do you mind mentioning your main account? **Doc James** (talk · contribs · email) 23:42, 13 August 2012 (UTC)

I'm a bit disappointed with the discourse here. My simple question about Doc James interest in the project and qualifications as a leader of the project were not some large "attack", as has been construed. They were simply questions-- perhaps questions rooted in some concerns, but polite questions nonetheless. Given his remarkable level of advocacy for the project, I thought they were logical questions and respectfully phrased. My request for privacy was also simple, but has been labeled "strange" (twice), and "of concern". I thought the right to and respect for privacy was fairly universal, especially when it comes to voting. In recent days, I have come to know many, many others in the community who are afraid to speak out and vote "oppose" here for fear of retaliation. Ihdj (talk) 02:00, 14 August 2012 (UTC)

That would be a cause for concern. What form would this retaliation take? --Kim Bruning (talk) 04:09, 14 August 2012 (UTC)

He's not the *"leader"*. He's carrying water for us, the admins and long-term Wikitravellers who have become disenchanted with the management of the site under IB. By carrying water I mean to say that he's been doing the go-between work between us (the admins and users) and WMF. It's an important job, but it doesn't make him the leader. Someday, maybe, this kind of task can evolve into leadership but not just right now. How he does it and maintain a medical practice is beyond me, but there it is. Anyhow, it's still useless, weird, and purely ad-hominim as a course of argument. James could decide to wash his hands of this any old time, and one or more of the rest of us would step up, because at this point we've just really had it with IB. -- MarkJaroski (talk) 19:11, 14 August 2012 (UTC)

133. ⊜ **Oppose** Too much problems with advertisings and other commercial interests. -- Wahldresdner (talk) 11:17, 1 August 2012 (UTC)
134. ⊜ **Oppose**. "Most would accept that travel is educational in nature" : what a cliché ! An open mind is the key to education. You can travel as much as you want, if you don't want and search for it, you will learn nothing. Moreover, is there something educational in lists of hotels, pubs and restaurants, in advices like "Walk away from a situation that could lead to fights or worse", or in generalisations like "There is a large problem with youths from the depressed suburbs causing trouble with the police" ? Spam, cliché and POV, from the begenning to the end. --Indeed (talk) 11:56, 1 August 2012 (UTC)

135. ⊛ **Oppose** As a long time user of WikiTravel (since 2006, used in planning several trips) this proposal has high risk of negatively impacting my experience coupled with low probability of improving on the existing property. --76.167.153.64 15:25, 2 August 2012 (UTC)
136. ⊛ **Oppose** importants problems on the future with commercial interests--Remy34 (talk) 20:44, 1 August 2012 (UTC)
137. ⊛ **Oppose** Some of the very useful travel information would be edited out by Wikimedia due to its requirement that the content come from a neutral point of view. —*The preceding unsigned comment was added by* 76.95.1.130 (talk • contribs) .

> NPOV is a Wikipedia policy, not a Wikimedia policy. See
> Talk:Requests_for_comment/Travel_Guide#NPOV. -- Wrh2 (talk) 17:41, 2 August
> 2012 (UTC)

138. ⊛ **Oppose** As one of the earlier comments mentioned, I see an extremely high probability of ending up with two damaged properties rather than any true improvements coming out of this fork. The mission of a travel guides wiki also seems to be a bit too far outside of the stated mission of the WMF; a very slippery slope to go down imo. Bottom line, I think a very coordinated and active effort to improve WT from within the WT community itself would deliver better results for everyone (the users, the people we're trying to help/educate), rather than this split/fork/import project. —*The preceding unsigned comment was added by* 67.121.110.182 (talk • contribs) .
139. ⊛ **Oppose** Agreeing with several contributors above this action is completely unneeded given that Wikitravel is already in existence.--98.154.135.180 03:31, 4 August 2012 (UTC)
140. ⊛ **Oppose** Wikitravel suits the current needs. I'm concerned about splintering the information into multiple sites and how it will be handled on Wikimedia side.--76.171.30.1 16:08, 4 August 2012 (UTC)
141. ⊛ **Oppose** I'm worried about neutral POV and commercial interests. --Davidpar (talk) 11:36, 5 August 2012 (UTC)
142. ⊛ **Oppose** I'm a graduate student in Tennessee and I love to travel. I really like the Wikitravel site the way it is and I don't understand the need for this proposal. It's been fun to watch the WT content on the site grow over the years. I'm not sure of the politics involved here, but this whole thing seems really strange. We have a saying in the South, "Don't fix it if it ain't broke". --184.174.172.170 15:18, 5 August 2012 (UTC)

> If you read the comments by the Wikitravel administrators you might notice that they
> think it is broke. 41.145.142.31 19:50, 6 August 2012 (UTC)

143. ⊛ **Oppose** I have several established community member relationships that I have come to rely on and would like to continue to foster. This new wiki travel site is going to separate and isolate former and future members to my detriment. I strongly oppose this proposal.--64.183.42.67 19:16, 6 August 2012 (UTC)

> Could you explain what you mean? 41.145.142.31 19:50, 6 August 2012 (UTC)

144. ⊛ **Oppose** Wikitravel is a wonderful site already. Why waste the effort to try and build a competing site? Energies should be focused on other subject matter that is not already covered. This proposal could end up ruining a great site in wikitravel and replacing it with a less desirable alternative. Ironically, when I tried to save this comment on wikimedia, it said that the wikimedia site was experiencing technical problems which proves my point. --71.118.174.102 15:58, 7 August 2012 (UTC)

Wikitravel was a wonderful site once upon a time, but it simply has no technical support whatever, at least not competent technical support. Many of us who have been active since the beginning of the site have simply given up on its ever being properly supported at IB. I know I have. It's particularly sad for me because I was originally supportive of the idea of a commercial operation hosting the site, but IB has proven that I was wrong. -- MarkJaroski (talk) 19:38, 7 August 2012 (UTC)

145. ⊕ **Strong Oppose**: For anyone with a question about the full functionality of Wikitravel, including its software, infrastructure, community and host, my response is simple: go visit. http://wikitravel.org/en/Main_Page Make some edits. Add content. Come to the world's largest travel wiki, and see why seven million other travelers will do the same this month, viewing and printing 18 million pages to take on a trip, adding listings of their own and contributing to this unique resource. This community ought not be deprived of some of its finest administrators, editors, curators and writers. The Traveler Comes First.--IBobi (talk) 00:13, 29 June 2012 (UTC)

> (Note: IBobi is one of the employees at Wikitravel) **Doc James** (talk • contribs • email) 01:04, 29 June 2012 (UTC)

> > Clarifying: ibobi is an employee of Internet Brands, rather than an active WT community member – cacahuate ᵗᵃˡᵏ 03:52, 2 July 2012 (UTC)

> > > (Note: clarifying: ibobi is an employee at Internet Brands and user of Wikitravel)--IBobi (talk) 19:19, 2 July 2012 (UTC)

> > > > I invite readers to examine IBobi's contributions on Wikitravel (http://wikitravel.org/wiki/en/index.php? title=Special:Contributions/IBobi&limit=500&target=IBobi) and decide for themselves. Jpatokal (talk) 04:25, 4 July 2012 (UTC)

> I think he made IB's point of view clear to all. Literally censorship is on the way (understandable for a company who might loose the cow that can be milked). --15:02, 4 July 2012 (UTC)

> > In reviewing this RFC, I thought to respond to IBobi's suggestion to check out the Wikitravel site. Thinking I would create an account and make a few edits to get a feel for what they have, I decided to login using OpenID. Unfortunately, the response after following the provided link (http://wikitravel.org/wiki/en/index.php? title=Special:UserLogin&returnto=Main_Page) said "No such special page" (http://wikitravel.org/en/Special:OpenIDLogin) . With all due respect, something is definitely not working over there. Cindamuse (talk) 13:32, 12 July 2012 (UTC)
> > **ADDENDUM TO MY VOTE 8/13/2012:** In the interest of more finely delineating the opposition of Internet Brands -- the host of Wikitravel -- to this fork proposal, please see Talk:Requests for comment/Travel Guide#Internet Brands Response --IBobi talk email 18:12, 13 August 2012 (UTC)

> > > By the way Wikipedia is more than twice as fast as Wikitravel (1.19sec verses 2.78sec). Wikivoyage is also significantly faster than Wikitravel at 0.901 sec. [11] (http://www.alexa.com/siteinfo/wikitravel.org) **Doc James** (talk · contribs · email) 02:35, 18 August 2012 (UTC)

> And btw this doesn't mean anything, see talk
> (//meta.wikimedia.org/w/index.php?
> title=Talk:Requests_for_comment/Travel_Guide&diff=prev&oldid=404
> --Nemo 09:46, 18 August 2012 (UTC)

146. ⊛ **Strong Oppose**: This project doesn't make sense. Either Wikipedia provides the travel information needed or a travel project would need to have a POV in order to provide any differentiated information. Either way it doesn't make sense for the community to support this project because of our commitment to NPOV and also because it is another mouth to feed. Finally I agree with points above that this looks more like a take-over than a new project.-- NCOBX (talk) 2:02, 13 August 2012 (UTC)

> The WMF community as a whole does not have a "commitment to NPOV". As documented at NPOV, there are a number of projects without NPOV policies. The travel guide would be a separate project from Wikipedia and not subject to Wikipedia's rules on perfect neutrality. LtPowers (talk) 20:48, 14 August 2012 (UTC)

147. ⊛ **Oppose**:Bad idea__Cesco42 (talk) 14:11, 15 August 2012 (UTC)
148. ⊛ **Oppose**:Bad idea. Risks of conflicts with commercial interests. ABACA (talk) 21:15, 15 August 2012 (UTC)
149. ⊛ **Oppose**: Seems like a hijacking, makes me very uneasy. 192.204.79.85 03:59, 16 August 2012 (UTC)
150. ⊛ **Strong Oppose**: I've been traveling (ironically) and am just learning of this forking plan. I really prefer to leave well enough alone. 05:36, 16 August 2012 (UTC) 192.204.67.212
151. ⊛ **Oppose**: While some of my friends here don't agree with my position, I do not think this should be a priority, as there is so much else to be done. 192.204.70.114 13:00, 16 August 2012 (UTC)

> So you 3 folks on the 192.204.* anon proxy all know each other, and called each other on the phone or something, right? (just checking, else it's a huge coincidence). You're also not WM folks (since you don't have an account). <scratches head> We can't count your position on the merits of *who you are*, since you can't show standing of any kind. But, if you each expand on your arguments a bit (tell us a bit more about what you mean, and why those concerns are important), we can still weigh your comments *on their own merit.* --Kim Bruning (talk) 14:26, 16 August 2012 (UTC)

152. ⊛ **Strong Oppose**: I strongly object for two reasons. First as has been mentioned many times, we need to focus and WMF does not need another project. Second, why is WMF attacking an existing wiki project? The motivation of the WMF appears to be a need to show growth (and justify its existence) as opposed to wanting to satisfy a genuine need (since wikitravel is already fulfilling the need). Also, I find the supporters' commenting on many of the Opposes heavy handed and counter-productive --NATSYR (talk) 2:58, 19 August 2012 (UTC)

> Hmm, if you look at the RFC, the question being asked is whether the WMF should assist WT in their move away from IB. This requires consent from both WT and WM communities, and eventually Wikivoyage besides. In the (now unlikely) event that the RFC ends up in the negative, Wikitravel would move to Wikivoyage servers instead. If things go to the positive, Wikitravel and Wikivoyage will both be joining WM(F), including most of their devs and other infrastructure. The new merged wiki will mostly be looking after themselves, so you don't need to help out with unless you insist. WMF can handle 800+ wikis, they can handle a few more. ;-)

This is a structured discussion, if you have concerns, then we'll try to answer them as best we can. I'm also poking some supporters now. But just like at say wikipedia RFA, convincing opposers is generally more productive, so one always gets more attention if one opposes. It's up to you to (ab)use that in a positive way! ;-) --Kim Bruning (talk) 04:50, 19 August 2012 (UTC) *the trick is to go 'I'm going to have to oppose unless we manage to fulfill x,y,z'. If your demands are reasonable, your odds of getting x,y,z as concessions is pretty high. If/when x,y,z are fulfilled, you can switch to support*

153. **oppose** – not interested by a duplicate version of Wikitravel (same content, just different hosters amd sites). Furthermore, the fact that Wikitravel uses the same CC-by-SA licence as Travel guide, makes me fear that there would be massive content dumping between the two projects. We have Commons as media repository, but that wouldn't change anything except that we would have more images and media. Wikimedia volunteers should be more inventive than this. -- Jagwar 交談 homewiki (http://mg.wikipedia.org) 21:48, 23 August 2012 (UTC)

Abstain

- I don't quite understand what's being proposed here, several projects are mentioned but what would actually happen to them? Are they really willing to merge (including who administers the domains etc.) and how's possible? What overlaps are there between the projects? How many extensions and other non-Wikimedia supported code do these websites need? What's the proposed interaction/synergy between this new sister project and the others (I don't see any)? As it is, it seems a way to either kill the project by adding yet another wiki with specific needs which will never be addressed, or to spend an unknown amount of resources on it while we don't even manage to give basic support to the projects we already have. Nemo 11:08, 19 July 2012 (UTC)

  Comments in Talk:Requests_for_comment/Travel_Guide#Abstention

- **Abstain** - This could be a good project, considering that another group is interested in joining efforts with Wikipedia. However, it seems a massive project and could result in conflicting info between the travel guide and Wikipedia. Remember, all new projects take loads of time and effort. I want to see more where this is headed before voting for or against it. Wpollard (talk) 07:05, 25 July 2012 (UTC)
- Keep in mind that this new project would be populated with both content and contributors from existing, active non-WMF projects. Startup costs will be significantly reduced. If you want to know where it's headed, simply take a look at Wikitravel today, and imagine it with more content of even higher quality. As for conflicting information, I'm not sure that's a huge problem; consider that Wikinews and Wikispecies also contain a lot of information overlap with Wikipedia, but that hasn't been a barrier to their establishment and use. LtPowers (talk) 15:50, 26 July 2012 (UTC)

- **Abstain** - I also worked at Wikitravel, but meh. We could name the Wikimedia Tavel Guide as the *Wikivacation* (is that taken?). --Lo Ximiendo (talk) 21:17, 25 July 2012 (UTC)

- **Abstain** - I belong to the people who are not interested in traveling. -- Ksenom_O 10:25, 26 July 2012 (UTC)

  Eh? Is that your reason? Would you mind either changing your reason or striking this comment out? You don't control the world, and just because you don't like it doesn't

mean you should abstain. Please be a bit more neutral. --Jeffwang (talk) 04:14, 31 July 2012 (UTC)

> What kind of place is this, in which an abstention is "not being neutral"?--Strainu (talk) 09:02, 31 July 2012 (UTC)

> > About as neutral as you can get I would say, though why one should bother to say so is not clear. 41.145.142.31 19:44, 6 August 2012 (UTC)

- **Abstain** - I believe that for any wiki the strong networking effect is the must. So I will move to the community (wikitravel/or wikivoyage) which will win more audience of contributors and readers Maloff1 (talk) 08:38, 20 August 2012 (UTC) (Maloff@wikitravel)

Comments

Discussion about this RfC should take place in the talk page

Summary of arguments

Many users have voted and given rationales for their votes. Many users' reasons for voting were the same as other users. What follows is an attempt to summarize every rationale proposed for the creation of a Wikimedia travel wiki and every rationale proposed in opposition of the creation of a Wikimedia travel wiki.

Support

1. Wikitravel.org, the most developed English-language travel wiki, is a commercial website which runs ads. Users would prefer to contribute to a project which does not commercially enrich a company or request readers to view advertisements.
    1. Readers like Wikitravel.org user-generated content, but think that the project would benefit users more as a Wikimedia project
    2. Internet Brands, the company which owns Wikitravel.org, is disliked by some people
    3. Some Wikitravel users make the assertion that Wikitravel.org's major drawback is lack of the kind of structure which the Wikimedia community can provide
    4. Wikitravel is a commercial site and content contribution to them enriches individuals who sell advertising, and this is discouraging to contributors
2. Wikimedia owns, develops, and manages the software which Wikitravel uses, and therefore will always be better able to deliver the best possible technical support
    1. Various users assert that Wikitravel.org historically unable to provide technical functionality to meet community demands
    2. Despite Wikitravel users contributing their content under a free license, the current host of Wikitravel will not provide data dumps of the kind that Wikimedia projects provide
    3. Constant technical problems on Wikitravel would not exist on any project managed by Wikimedia Foundation
3. Many members of the Wikitravel.org community are requesting the creation of a Wikimedia travel wiki
    1. All active Wikitravel administrators and all inactive administrators who have been reachable (34 in total), and all confirmed registered users who are aware of this proposed move support migration to the Wikimedia community

2. there is no identified community of experienced, active wikitravel.org users who oppose migration
3. User:Evan (http://wikitravel.org/en/User:Evan) , one of two founders of Wikitravel, supports the founding of a Wikimedia travel wiki
4. User:Denis Barthel, cofounder of German Wikitravel, endorses the migration
5. Wikitravel as a community is dying anyway; the Wikimedia community could save, support, and strengthen it

4. There is demand for an ad-free, non-profit travel wiki
   1. People are demanding travel information online; this project would meet that demand for information
   2. This sort of project does not otherwise exist in on a free non-commercial platform

5. A Wikimedia travel wiki would be great way to merge Wikitravel and Wikivoyage projects into a central, Multilanguage, non-commercial platform
   1. Merging existing content from Wikitravel.org and Wikivoyage onto a Wikimedia platform is feasible and not difficult
   2. In the Wikimedia community there is a likelihood of expansion into many languages, as Wikimedia sites tend to do. Wikitravel.org currently exists in only 20 languages and with limited activity in all projects

6. A travel wiki would complement, enhance, promote, and support other Wikimedia projects and the Wikimedia community
   1. A travel site would be a great accompaniment to other Wikimedia content
   2. Many editors on Wikipedia add good content which is not appropriate for Wikipedia; these editors could be directed here instead of to an external site
   3. A travel site within the Wikimedia umbrella would benefit from its closeness with other Wikimedia projects in a way that it never could outside of the Wikimedia project base
   4. The creation of a travel wiki is within the scope of the Wikimedia movement
   5. Existing Wikimedia projects are explicitly not travel guides, so this project fulfills that demand
   6. The Wikimedia community is very good at managing spam and a Wikimedia travel wiki would manage spam better than any other wiki
   7. It has been about 7 years since the last new Wikimedia project, so enough time has passed to justify trying something new
   8. A travel project would result in an influx of media to Wikimedia Commons
   9. Wikitravel gets more traffic than other projects such as Wikisource, Wikibooks, and Wikiquote – attracting this traffic would result in greatly increased Wikimedia traffic and contributions
   10. Wikipedia is used as a de-facto travel guide; having a real travel guide would compliment location articles
   11. Many Wikimedia community members have requested a Wikimedia travel wiki for a long time

7. Travel is educational and the support of travel is the support of education
   1. Travel asserted as one of the best methods of learning; this project supports educational mission of Wikimedia
   2. A travel wiki would enhance the educational experience which travels have while touring
   3. Travel is an educational experience and a Wikimedia project which supported travel would do a great service in promoting learning during travel
   4. Travel is fun and this project would make people's lives more fun

8. Wikitravel's success proves that there is already demand for a travel wiki
9. There are reasonable arguments for doing this and no strong arguments for not doing it

Oppose

1. The website Wikitravel.org already exists and is serving everyone's needs sufficiently
    1. Creating a Wikimedia travel wiki is unfair to the wikitravel.org community
    2. This action would deprive Wikitravel of its community, which will disrupt travelers and upset people
    3. The Wikimedia community should support the Wikitravel community instead of trying to capture their position
    4. Wikipedia administrators are crazy and their madness will spoil the integrity of any travel project which moves into the Wikimedia domain
    5. The management of Wikitravel.org just updated the software and are continually adding new features
2. The Wikimedia community is not a suitable place for a travel wiki
    1. Various people assert that the Wikimedia Foundation is in opposition to this
    2. Wikimedia projects should be educational; a travel wiki would overall not be an educational project
    3. The Wikimedia Foundation's mission is to "empower... people... with educational content..." and there is no educational content in a travel guide
    4. Any travel wiki ought to be commercially-managed
    5. A travel wiki necessarily supports commercial interests (the travel industry) and no Wikimedia project should support commercial interests
    6. The travel wiki should instead be a project on Wikia
3. A travel wiki would be redundant in the Wikimedia community
    1. All significant travel information is already in Wikipedia
    2. Wikibooks could serve the same purpose and is an existing project
4. The plan for creating a Wikimedia travel wiki is technically unfeasible
    1. Difficult to merge content from Wikitravel and Wikivoyage
    2. Insufficient planning or proof that project will be developed
    3. The Wikimedia Foundation is insufficiently resourced/incompetent to run anything except Wikipedia and Wikimedia Commons
5. The creation of a Wikimedia travel wiki would disrupt other Wikimedia projects
    1. People would spend time developing other Wikiprojects if a new travel wiki were not created; the creation of a travel wiki will distract those users and harm all communities with division
    2. A travel wiki would attract negative commercial influence
    3. The creation of a travel wiki would waste time and money
    4. Bad users on Wikipedia projects get banned then often go to other Wikimedia projects. The travel wiki would become a penal colony for bad users.
    5. Any travel guide will be a collection of subjective viewpoints, and as such, is contrary to Wikimedia culture
    6. A travel wiki would be burdened with spam and all Wikimedia projects will be crippled by spam attacks to this project
    7. Fewer people will donate to the Wikimedia Foundation if it is associated with the travel industry
    8. A wiki travel site would not enforce NPOV, and this ought to be necessary for all Wikimedia projects
6. The creation of a travel wiki would have no conceivable benefit to anyone
    1. A travel wiki would give dumb advice
    2. Other people say this is a bad idea
7. Community relationships have already been established and will be more difficult to facilitate with an additional wiki travel site

What does this actually mean? Peter (Southwood) [talk]: 06:29, 7 August 2012 (UTC)

References

1. ↑ this can be confirmed here
   (http://strategy.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:WMF_StrategicPlan2011_spreads.pdf) , where the
   name Wikipedia is quoted several times while the other projects are rarely mentioned.

Retrieved from "http://meta.wikimedia.org/w/index.php?
title=Requests_for_comment/Travel_Guide&oldid=4062404"
Categories: Requests for comments (resolved) | Requests for comments in 2012
| Proposed projects - travel