

Internet Society
Board of Trustees Meeting 159 - Day One
31 July 2021
Transcript

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Hello, I'm Andrew Sullivan, President and CEO of the Internet Society and this is my report to the Board of Trustees at the 2021 Annual General Meeting on our Action Plan 2021 success measures progress.

A couple of years ago, we started work on improving the way that we report on our activities, and there are two different ways that we do that. One is success measures where we report on the extent to which we are achieving the things that we set out for ourselves in a project or in an initiative. The other is impact indicators which have to do with whether we change the world, whether we make an effect on it. That comes in an annual report that we put out every year. The one for 2020 was put out a little while ago. This update is really about success measures, the measures that the projects are doing, and I really, really appreciate the work of my colleagues in Planning and Reporting who prepared this report for us.

You will remember that we have three broad areas of work at the Internet Society. We have two kinds of projects. We have projects that work on making the Internet grow, and we have other projects that work on ensuring the strength of the Internet, and then we have initiatives which are really about our community and things that we're doing within the organization. These are all things that we're going to talk about today.

So, first of all, we'll talk about the projects to do with growing the Internet. The first of these is building community networks. Community networks are efforts for alternative kinds of connectivity in places that are generally not well served by traditional connectivity answers. And so, we have a number of these success measures. As you can see, we are making some progress on all of them.

So, the first one was a goal of 10 new and existing community networks deployed, either through our direct engagement or through our partners. The aim of those was 10, and, so far, we've managed to do 7, so we believe that we're pretty much on track in order to achieve this in 2021.

Similarly, we wanted to work on countries because, generally speaking, one of the barriers to a lot of community networks has to do with spectrum regulation. And so far - so far, we have so far managed to make changes in four of the countries that we were intending, three of them in the last quarter. The total for the year is - we're aiming at is five, so we believe that we're in good shape for this.

We also have a lot of work to do with training the community to make sure that the community actually can achieve these things. Obviously, you can't have a community network without an effective community, so we are aiming at 300 individuals trained. We're just a little under half of them. There are more trainings planned for Q3 and Q4, so we believe that this will be successful this year.

So far, we have not talked about the leaders. We have not done that work yet. That is all scheduled for the second half of the year.

Finally, we have this work that we're doing with new partners. So, it's generally the case that the Internet Society cannot work on its own. Instead, we need to work through partners and other organizations, various groups of people who work with us. We signed a new partnership with UNESCO in the second quarter of this year, and, so far, this year we have managed to work with four of the five targets for the year, so we believe that this is on track for the year as well.

The next project is the project Fostering Infrastructure and Community Development. This has really two components. One is infrastructure, particularly Internet exchange points, but not only that, and the second part is the community around those Internet exchange points. It is no use having a big Internet exchange point if you don't have a group of people there to operate it, and so we work on both things at the same time.

So, the first of these was working on new and existing Internet exchange points. We want to make sure that these are in good shape. So, the aim was to get five new IXPs in the course of the year and to work with 15 existing ones in the course of the year. So far, this year, we've managed to start with three new IXPs and we believe that there are a couple more that are coming within the year, so we anticipate that we will achieve this goal.

We have worked with eight of the IXPs that we were already working with, and we continue to work with new ones. We think that this is going to be successful, but we still have some work to do to connect with some of the IXPs that are out there that maybe can use our help. This is a little bit more difficult due to the ongoing pandemic restrictions, so that is one of the things that is possibly a drag on this. But at the moment, we believe that we're on track for this.

We also entered into a number of partnerships. We track that as well. Our goal was to either continue or to start five partnerships. We've already achieved eight this year, so this is a goal that is well and truly in hand.

We wanted to work on the number of people taking the NetOps training. We had an original target of 500 people. This has been enormously successful. The training and e-learning part of the organization is, as you know, ramped up - ramping up this year. There is new work going on within that, and a new learning management system that just went live, so we've had more than twice as many people have taken this course as we aimed for, so it's really been a very, very successful - successful effort so far. And what this means, of course, is that we're going to be able to continue to expand that outreach and that outreach develops the communities who can build the Internet themselves in their locations.

Finally, we have on this slide, we have this number of countries that are engaged to support IXPs through their policies, and this is actually an important thing. A lot of countries are suspicious of Internet exchange points, or they want to control them. They don't want them to be neutral. We're working with countries in order to make sure that the policies do not discourage this kind of development because it is really, really good for local access to have Internet exchanges within various geographic and political boundaries. So, we aimed to work with five such countries. So far, we've managed to work with four this year. There was one engagement that is notable with the government of Kuwait, so we find that we are having positive effects within the government realm as well.

The last project in this area is measuring the Internet. This is our measurement platform which used to be called Insights, but we've rebranded that as Pulse, so that's still on here noted as the - as one of the activities that we undertook this year. Version two of this platform is targeted for this year. So, the platform initially launched only a year ago. We knew that it was

a sort of an early version. We're going to have version two of it. That is on track. We're working away, but, of course, we haven't actually delivered the new code yet. We need - we are not actually doing the measuring, and this is an important part of this project. What this really is is a sort of clearing house of existing measurement sources that are in the world, so we're trying to work with others, and we need partnerships in order to do that. The goal for this year was three. We've got two of them so far, so we're working away. We believe we're going to have another data source in Q3. And if that happens, then we'll hit this target easily.

We've got two new focus areas intended for the year. We worked on it in this year, but we haven't actually done any of this. We haven't launched these yet. So, so far, that is at zero, but that's because the release of them is slated for later in the year.

The next area for projects is strengthening the Internet, and the first of these is promoting the Internet Way of Networking. It's important to remember that there are lots of ways to build networks. You can build the network in a very centralized way. You can build a network in a way built on treaties, just as the telephone system worked. But the Internet Way of Networking is to use the open, globally connected, secure, and trustworthy Internet and connect things using the voluntary measures that are the hallmark of the way that the Internet is built, and so that's what this is about. We promote this way of networking because we believe that this delivers the best value for everybody in the world. It has given us all of the marvels that the Internet has brought to us. And so, we continue to promote this. We are engaged with external entities, that includes chapters, who produce additional use cases with this framework. So, we have a framework, we released it, and we're continuing to refine it, but that framework was released last year and we're continuing to push people to do this. We aimed to have five external entities working with this framework and using it and developing it themselves. So far, we've had two. But we have had - we've had some success, particularly with the two chapters who have picked this up and really worked hard with it.

We also have a training course that we continue to push, and we were aiming to train 200 people on this framework. It's a, you know, it's a sort of specialist topic, so it's not a huge number of people, but it's also a very small community. So, we were aiming for 200. We've so far managed to train 169 people on this. This was the enrollment. We haven't had a completion rate

because that feature is missing. We will have it in the future, so we don't exactly know how many people completed the course. But we've had 169 enrollments so far.

Another project has to do with extending encryption. Encryption, of course, is really important to the Internet because, without encryption, you can't have certain kinds of security, and this is security against tampering with flows of data, it's also security of the data within it, and so we're working very hard with a lot of partners to extend encryption and to get people to understand what an advantage and boon encryption is to everybody on the Internet.

The first target that we had was to grow the Global Encryption Coalition membership. We set this coalition up with some other partners last year, and we've had quite a lot of success. The target for the year was to add 200 new members. We are already - we've already added 180 people. The Internet Society Latin America and Caribbean chapters have mostly joined. It's a steady pace each quarter. So, we are confident that this is a goal that can be met.

We've also done some training of people on encryption and advocacy, and we've already exceeded our target for the year on this. We anticipate that there will probably be some more. This is really a fundamentals kind of issue. And this is really the goal that we have.

Finally, we've got this extension of the reach. We want to reach a lot of people with this message. So, we were aiming to reach a million people this year, and, so far, we've only reached 4,500, so this will seem like a low number. We believe, however, that we are still on track to achieve this because we have a Global Encryption Day that is coming in October, and we anticipate that that will be where most of the audience comes from. So, we're still optimistic about this and believe that we will achieve it.

The next project is securing global routing. This is related to the MANRS project. MANRS is intended to be an independent organization that allows interested parties to gather together in order to ensure mutually accepted norms for routing security. So, we have a number of success measures for this. The first is an increase in route origin authorization creation by the existing MANRS participants. So, we want participants to increase their use of ROAs. ROAs are the mechanism by which you indicate that somebody is authorized to originate routes for

your IP range. The idea here was to increase this by 10%. We've already got better than that, so we've achieved this.

The other part of route origin authorization, the other part that you need, of course, is validation of those things. So, what we want to do is make sure that existing MANRS participants start to do this, and our target for this year was about 5%. This is, we think, it's on track, but we don't know exactly whether this is going to be possible because it's hard to measure. We're working on the measurement. We think we've got a plan. We believe it's on track, but we don't have anything that's actually operating yet.

We are also hoping to see greater conformance improvement from before people joined the MANRS project. So, the early days of MANRS, a lot of the people who joined were actually very, very well operated networks, they generally didn't have problems and so on, and people were keen not to join if they weren't up to snuff. Some of the people we're attracting now are less capable or have been less capable, and what we are doing is, you know, through the community, making improvements in their networks. And so, what we see are people who, you know, three months before they join, they're at one level, and then we evaluate three months after and see what their conformance improvement is. We've got about 30% here. So far, in Q2, we had about 37% in ROA use, so this seems to be a real improvement. There have only been two bogon incidents among members in Q2, so that was really good. In Q1, there were none. On the whole, I think this is achieved and we hope to continue on this pace.

Finally, as I mentioned, this is supposed to become a community operated service. It's something that the community desires to do independently, and so the question is is the community ready to do that. We want to make sure that they're ready. This year, we've completed a community consultation on this. We've also got a charter ready to go. So, we believe that, in fact, the community is ready to do this. We still have to work out some details of the organizational structure, whether this is going to be a disregarded entity inside the Internet Society or whether it will be an independent non-profit or so forth, so that's still a detail to be worked out. But on the whole, we believe that this is on track.

We also have a number of activities that are not exactly projects in that they don't have an end. Right? The goal of projects is really to have a beginning, and then you do some work, and you measure that in the middle, and then when you're

finished with that, when you've met all your goals, the project is completed, and then you can move onto another project. Other kinds of activities that the Internet Society does are not really like that. They are initiatives, they get things started, and then that activity continues and continues to operate, or there are simple operational things that we have to do that ensure that our community is lively and in good shape, and that's what the rest of these are about.

So, the first of these has to do with supporting community participation, and the first of those is the engagement of individual members. So, we're trying to improve the individual member - the individual member experience at the Internet Society. So, what we wanted to do was increase it. We know that the - we have to start with a baseline, so this is going to take a little bit of time. So far, what we've got is this baseline of 5,000. We want to increase the number of individual members participating in our activities, and our aim here is 5,000 individual members. So far, this year, we've had 3,214, so we believe that we're on track to achieve this because, of course, that's more than half of our goal. If we can achieve this baseline, then we'll be able to build in the future.

We've also been working on improving the fundamental information we provide to our chapters, so we want to make sure, for instance, that chapter members are trained in our mission. For 2021, we had a plan of 500 chapter members who would participate in this. We've had 526 unique participants in these trainings, so we have achieved this. What is not clear is how many different chapters were involved. So, of course, multiple people from the same chapter all count in this total, and we are pretty sure that it's a wide variety of chapters, but we're actually currently working on that, so I don't have that answer for you right now.

We also want chapters to implement an activity, and we want that activity to be related to the mission. So, the goal here is to say, okay, how many of the participating chapters that were involved in this, how many of them then created an activity locally that was in line with the training? So, the deadline for submission of these activities was extended. It was extended to the beginning of the month. So, we haven't updated this because I don't have the answers yet, but we believe this is on track. We've had very, very good response from chapters, so we believe that this is on track.

We've also tackled the issue of Special Interest Groups at the Internet Society. This has been a long-standing problem the way with the special interest groups. They were originally structured as sort of similar to chapters, but because they're not in a place, they didn't have bank accounts, it was all very complicated, so we're trying to fix that. And so, we have this plan, have a new structure in place by the end of 2021, and then ready to operate in 2022. This is ongoing. We believe that it's in progress. We believe we will be ready by the end of the year.

In order to make this new plan work, we need topics, particular topics that are going to be identified by the community. The plan is basically that the community will have five special interest groups that it picks every two years, and so that's the way that this is going to work. We've got to identify those topics. And so, we need to identify those topics for 2022. We need to do that now in order to be ready to run in 2022. We're working on it. It appears that things are in good shape. We've had a lot of topics submitted. We want to get five. We had 123 submissions. So, this is going to involve quite a bit of work in order to pare this down.

The goal has been to keep the number manageable because, you know, it's a lot of work to manage a whole lot of these things. The way this is going to end up working is that instead of the special interest group having to operate independently the way chapters do, they will be folded inside the Internet Society, and it will be an Internet Society activity, very much the way the IETF used to work. So, for that reason, we want to keep the numbers relatively small because we don't have a huge staff that can look after this. One hundred and twenty-three is definitely too many. It might be that five is too few and we might have to - we might have to accept that. I would like it to stay around five because I don't think that much more than that is really manageable. But given the community response, it's pretty clear that there's a wide variety of things that people want to do. So, we believe that this is going to be selected. We'll get this buttoned up by the end of the year.

We also want to have a growth in the ISOC members who participate in this consultation. It's really important, actually, that, you know, this not be a tiny group of people who all have the - who are all talking to each other. What we really want is this to be a vibrant part of the Internet Society community and to make sure that individual members really take advantage of this benefit of membership. So, what we're trying to do is make sure that we've got a baseline number that we set

in 2021, and then we can make that grow in the future. So, obviously, the consultation is going to close. It has closed, in fact. It closed on the 12th of July. So, we'll know what that number is by the end of the year, and we will have this baseline.

We also want to strengthen community connections. So, we want to improve our software. Some of our software has been problematic for the community, and we recognize that, and so what we're trying to do is fix this. We had a big consultation that we've been trying to work on. In order to improve this software, we wanted to talk to people. We wanted 80% of our community to be consulted on this. There have been very wide consultations with chapters, with org members, and individual members that have been contacted. We think we're going to get to 80%. This is scheduled to be completed by the end of the month, so we don't actually know yet whether we're done and whether we achieved that, but we'll know what the number is before the end of the year for sure.

We want to select the vendor this year. We want to do it by the 31st of August. So, that's a tight timeline because the consultations finish in July, but we want to select some vendors based on the criteria by the end of August, so that's really the plan. The whole thing we want to get going, we want to have a complete implementation plan schedule ready by the 31st of October, and that will mean, of course, that then that will give us the planning necessary in order to do the implementation next year. So, this is not, of course, started because we really need to work on the vendor selection first in order to start this.

We've been working very hard on content to improve our content this year. Content has been traditionally a little bit of a problem at the Internet Society. We have too much content on too many topics. It's very difficult to find things. So, what we're trying to do is whittle this down in a way so that the audience can be satisfied, they can understand this, and they can say, oh, yes, this is good. So, the big target here is measuring the content, the audience satisfaction. So, that's really the big first problem, we have to understand what the audience is, what they want, and how satisfied they are. We're about 40% of the way through this and then we will have a picture of what the audience satisfaction rate is, and then, of course, we can tell whether it gets better.

The other thing that we want to do is really make sure that the things that are on our website are really strategically

aligned with our strategic objectives and with our content strategy, so the goal is to make sure that 50% of our web content is actually related to the things we say we're working on. There are reasons why content might not be aligned. For instance, it might be aligned to something that we had in the past. It might be - it might be, you know, things that are just legal requirements, for instance, so our 990s, that's part of our content on our website. They're never going to be strategically aligned with us in the sense that, you know, they're a report. But what we want is 50% of our content is really about our topic. And so far, the analysis of this is we're through at 40%, so we'll get 40% of the content to do the evaluation of this. That's where we are in the progress. We think that this will be done by the end of the year.

What this is going to involve is a fairly aggressive archiving strategy afterwards, and this will mean that, you know, we will put in tombstones and so on for our content, not that it's removed, but we will put in redirections so that it goes into the archive on-site instead, and that way we can keep the live website active on the current things, and we can put archives off to the side of content that is, you know, not necessarily up to date, maybe not relevant today, maybe not the things that people are looking for. This will improve the experience of users on the site because they will be able to find the information that they're looking for and they will be able to be connected to the activities that we're currently working on.

We also need to build the expertise and capacity of the organization in order to do all of this support, and so that's this category of measure. We've been trying to make sure that we have good training for the community, and you will recall that last year in the budget request - well, those of you who were here - will recall that we had this fairly large board designated fund for training and e-learning activities. That is what we are delivering on right now, and that's what this is all about measuring. So, we've had - we aimed to have 30 online learning activities this year. We've managed to do 33 already. And we do all of these in all three of our supported languages, so this means that we're doing a lot of work to make sure that this is happening. In the first quarter of the year, we only offered courses in English, so we had to undertake a lot of translation, so that lowered demand in the first quarter, but we find that we've actually had a lot of uptake on this.

We want to reach 10,000 people with our training this year, and so far we've reached 3,511. But the number of courses is expanding and also we have the new platform that we have just launched, so there were some courses that were not developed and were not released into the old platform because we didn't want to put effort into a platform when we knew we were shutting down. So, the new platform has launched. It is much more dynamic. It has better measurement techniques in it, so we'll be able to offer even more courses. We believe we're on track with this, even though that isn't - we're halfway through the year and we're not 50% of the way there.

We wanted 90% of the people who took these things, that rated the course, we wanted 90% of them to give, you know, to have a high value. What we've had instead is 95% rating, so we've had overall course satisfaction. This was only in the Q1 courses. Not all of the data has been tabulated for Q2 yet.

We also wanted some partners to help on our revenue generation. So, the goal with the learning activities is that it becomes a self-supporting activity, that it becomes self-sustaining, and that does not mean, of course, that everybody who takes a course has to pay us for it. There are lots of ways to make things sustaining, and one of those is sponsorship, so we needed some partners who would help us with that. Our goal was to get two partners who would help us with that. We have, in fact, managed to sign up two partners, including the Organization of American States who just signed up in this quarter. So, we believe that we're on track in this. Not all of the agreements have been signed, but we believe that we're going to get there.

We also want to prepare future Internet advocates. So, in the past, we had a fellowship program that some of you will remember we thought didn't actually have clear, measurable goals. What were these fellows doing? So, we decided to redesign the fellowship program and we broke it into two parts, one for early career people and another one for mid-career people. The early career fellowship activity was to be launched this year. That was achieved in the first quarter. And we wanted to make sure, of course, that we got a baseline established for the number in each. So, we established that we're going to have 164 candidates. We got 164 candidates, and so this is in progress because the fellowship is now running.

We also wanted the plan for the mid-career fellowship to be built. So, we're not launching this fellowship this year. We

just wanted the plan to be developed. That has happened, so this is now rolling ahead.

And then finally, again, we need partners to help us support this because this is an expensive activity and we can't pay for it all ourselves, so we need to make sure that we've got partners who are involved. The other reason, of course, we want partners to be involved is because if you have partners involved in a project, then you are sure that this is an activity that is valuable to those other people. So, we don't do it all ourselves. We're not off in some echo chamber. And our goal was to secure four partners for that, but we've already got five signed up. We've also had four sponsors who are helping us to pay for it, but are not actually participating in the activity, and that's also a very good sign because what that means is the people think what we're doing is valuable.

We're trying to foster information exchange among researchers, and this is a goal that we share with the Foundation. The Foundation, of course, does this by direct funding of researchers. What we try to do is ensure that the collaboration space is available, and we do this primarily through the Network and Distributed System Security Symposium, or NDSS. This year, it had to go online, but our goal was to make sure that we continued to have NDSS ranked in the top five. That ranking hasn't been announced yet, so we don't know, but we are cautiously optimistic because we had a very successful program this year.

We also wanted to make sure that we have a collaboration between the research community and the open standards community. One of the reasons that we want to participate in this is, of course, not just because it's a nice activity. It is a good activity on its own. But research without effect is perhaps less valuable, so we're trying to make sure that there is a collaboration between people who are researchers and the people who are building the open standards. This year, we wanted to aim for one of those - one such collaboration. We haven't achieved it yet, but we believe that we probably will.

We need to - in order to do all of this, we have to secure resources. The organization needs to have money and people, a community of engaged people, to help us - to help us do that, and that's what this is about.

Our first big issue, of course, is on diverse revenue sources. This is a long-standing issue. The Internet Society

gets a lot of money from one source, and that is not really a healthy thing for the organization, so we want to make sure that we don't have that kind of problem. So, what we're trying to do, first of all, is have an active memoranda of understanding with partners, engage them on various projects and so on. This makes sure that the projects are viable and that they are diverse in how they are funded. We wanted to aim for 50 such memoranda of understanding. We've got 38 so far, so we think we're going to be in pretty good shape. We've got some new partners both in Q1 and Q2, so we believe that this is probably active.

We've been looking for new sources of funding. In securing those sources of funding, we wanted to make sure that we got ten new sources of funding. We've so far managed to get eight, so I believe that this is really on track.

The revenue target that we have for this is \$500,000, so we want half a million from these sources of revenue. So far, we have managed to raise \$139,800, so we are not really halfway there. Nevertheless, we believe that some of the activities that are coming in the latter half of the year are probably places where we're going to find a lot of support. So, we think that this is on track, but I recognize that if you look at that target number and the progress number and you look at the calendar, you think, well, this isn't really on track. I believe it is, but that's mostly because some of the activities that are coming later in the year are really some of the opportunities that will allow us to get closer to this goal.

So, I hope that this gives you a pretty good picture of what's going on within the Internet Society, that you have an idea of how the activities are and how we're meeting our targets for the year. We will update you again when the year is over because that way you will know how we're doing on these things. Thank you very much. I look forward to any questions the trustees may have at the meeting.

>> RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Hello, everyone. I'm Rinalia Abdul Rahim, Senior Vice President for Strategy, Communications, and Engagement at ISOC. This is a presentation for the ISOC Board of Trustees about the findings from our consultation with the ISOC community regarding priorities for the 2022 Action Plan.

Every year, as part of our planning process to produce the Internet Society Action Plan, staff would carry out a consultation with members of the ISOC community. The intention is to gather feedback about priorities for the upcoming year.

The priorities are determined by the senior executive team, and they are based on our long-term 2025 strategic objectives that focus on building, promoting, and defending the Internet.

Having taken into consideration the broader Internet environment through trends analysis as well as progress achieved towards 2025 targets, the Internet Society leadership determined that it would prioritize four strategic objectives for the year 2022. Number one, extend the Internet to communities that do not have it and need it most. Number two, promote the Internet model of networking as the preferred model. Number three, counter attempts by leading government to undermine encryption. And number four, defend against shutdowns by increasing cross-border connectivity and resiliency. Our community members were invited to take an online survey. In addition, top tier organization members were invited to a one-on-one consultation meeting.

Via the community consultation, our community members were asked three questions, how important to you are each of the 2022 priorities, how likely are you to become involved in the 2022 priorities, and are you already doing work related to the priorities, and if so, which ones? The purpose of asking these questions is to understand community alignment on the priorities and to identify opportunities for collaboration that would enhance our collective impact on the Internet or staff who are working with community to achieve this impact. The results gained from the responses would inform the design of 2022 projects and initiatives by Internet Society staff.

So, the survey spanned three weeks. It went out to all our community members who were contactable. There are more, but they chose not to be contactable. It had a blend of qualitative and quantitative response types, and the survey was done in three languages, English, French, and Spanish. The exception is that the organization members received the English version only. The survey required authentication for the first time to improve data integrity to support better analysis. Quantitative data was analyzed according to community segment and region, and this is standard practice for us. Also, qualitative data was analyzed for common phrasing, unique themes, and emerging patterns.

So, here's the response rate. We received 509 responses from individual members. That's less than 1% of total recipient, but it's actually better than last year's response rate. We also received seven responses from organization members. That's 8% of total recipients in that category. In terms of regional breakdown of respondents, Africa had the most respondents and

Middle East had the least. This is consistent with the global distribution of our overall membership. Europe and North America were the only regions represented by organization members which is where a combined 69% of organization members are based.

And so, we come to the findings of the consultation. Finding number one, individual members regard the priorities as important, and they are likely to become involved. Finding number two, organization members regard the priorities as important as well, but they are not as likely as individual members to become involved. And here's finding number three, our community is already doing interesting work related to the priorities, 36% of individual member respondents are already doing work related to at least one of the priorities, and 57% of organization member respondents are already doing work related to at least one of the priorities.

Other takeaways. Overall, respondents find all four priorities to be important. Individual and organization members find extend as the most important and promote as the least important. Overall, our community is already involved or wants to become involved in our priorities. Although individual members were least likely to become involved with extend, it is the priority for which the highest percentage of individual members are currently doing work at 24%. In terms of promote, there is lack of clarity about the Internet model of networking. Many survey respondents asked for a clearer description. This survey was the first use of authentication in a survey to community members. The extra step needed to provide feedback may have affected the response rate.

And now we go into the findings of whether respondents believe the priorities are important to them. It's just a slight elaboration of what you have just heard in terms of the findings. On how important to you are each of the following priorities for 2022 for individual members, the results are extremely positive with 80% and above finding each priority to be extremely or very important. For individual members, most important priority is extend, least important priority is promote. For organization members, the results indicate that they align with our priorities with promote as the outlier. The most important priority is a three-way tie between extend, counter, and defend, and the least important priority is promote.

And now we go into the findings on whether respondents are likely to get involved in the priorities area of work. And

again, it is just a slight elaboration of what you have just heard earlier. On how likely are you to become involved in the 2022 priorities for individual members, overall they are interested in becoming involved with nearly the same level of interest across priorities. They are most likely to become involved in counter and least likely to become involved in extend. For organization members overall, the results indicate organization members are more likely to be involved in extend and counter, promote is the outlier. They are most likely to become involved in extend or counter - it's a two-way tie - and least likely to become involved in promote.

And here is the key findings on work already being done, and you have already heard the statistics, 36% of individual members are already doing work related to the priorities, most of them are working on extend, and they are least working on promote. Work already being done by organization members, 57% of all respondents are already working or involved in areas related to the priorities.

Now we come to the key themes from open-ended responses, and this is where it gets quite interesting. Now these comments are highlighted by the analysis team as most frequently mentioned or popular among the respondents. The differing points of view within our community on aspects of extend, promote, counter, and defend are key reflection points and need to be discussed among staff, particularly the points about the Internet model. There is also this doubt in the community among some members that ISOC may not be able to make much of a difference in connectivity in extending the Internet to communities that need it most, and I think that requires a discussion. Under counter, which is countering the efforts of leading government in countering encryption, there are various points of view in terms of how that needs to be done. And also, under defend, there are also various points of view from the community on how that should be approached.

And here we come to key findings from organization members in the top two tiers. Four organization members participated in the one-on-one consultation. They are Ripe NCC, Donuts/Afilias, this is how they usually refer to themselves when their representatives are participating in our meetings, Ericcson, and Amazon. Here are the key findings from the one-on-one consultations with organization members. The four organization members had mostly positive reactions to the priorities. They want more than the action plan process or consultations as a feedback mechanism, and they prefer two-way discussions between

the Internet Society and its members. In their view, the action plan should be where ISOC designs its priorities with its members. Ripe NCC acknowledges that it needs to address the impacts Internet policy and regulations have on its organization and members, and this ties in with what the Internet Society is working on. Donuts is focusing on DNS security and Internet abuse and sees opportunities for ISOC to grow in that space. They are also looking to build synergy, have more interactions and discussion, and listening sessions between members and the Internet Society. Ericsson would like to have more clarity on Internet Society's project narratives and scope of work to get buy-in from management, maintain ISOC membership, and create opportunities for future collaboration. And finally, Amazon would like to explore more collaboration between the Internet Society and their Amazon Kuiper team and growing the globally connected Internet. In terms of organization member priorities, the four participating organization members also shared their corporate priorities that are in line with ISOC's 2022 priorities, and you can see them on this slide.

And finally, we reached the appendix which contains the email that was sent to the ISOC community by our CEO, Andrew Sullivan, regarding the 2022 priorities.

And this is the end of the consultation findings report. Thank you for listening. And I look forward to discussions with the Board on the Action Plan 2022 Priorities.

>> JOYCE DOGNIEZ: Good morning, afternoon, evening, everyone. I hope you're all doing well. First of all, a very warm welcome to our incoming Board members. I'm looking forward to seeing you soon. And a heartfelt thank you to our outgoing Board members as well.

In this presentation today, I will talk you through a proposal for changes to the individual membership model, along with the prerequisites, dependencies, as well as a road map for implementing the proposed changes.

This proposal is an iteration from a previous one that was presented to the Board in 2020 and incorporates the feedback provided by the Board at that time. Before diving in, let me give you a little bit of context and some of the background.

In 2020, the presentation to the Board represented options for a paid individual membership by offering dedicated new services, and the feedback we received at the time was that we

needed to reassess the proposition and not create any additional products or services to recruit individual members, that complex membership structures that would require expensive governance and compliance operationalization should be avoided, and that - and finally that an initial focus should be on increasing participation and engagement of members.

Since then, the Community Engagement team has focused on identifying and carrying out some quick win improvements to the current membership experience whilst we were carrying out some further consultations and assessments to revise the proposition for individual membership. The main changes that we carried out have included an improved member join experience, the implementation of better member support by deploying Freshdesk ticketing system to improve handling and tracking of inquiries and requests from our members, an improved newsletter, which I hope you all have seen and are receiving, which is also improving our communication experience, and lastly, the implementation of analytics and feedback loops to constantly improve communication in general, but newsletters in particular and content going forward.

One thing we really focused our efforts on was to listen to our members and to really get a better understanding of our current membership base, their needs, but also to comparatively look at understanding our membership model. So, a couple of things have happened to address this. Last December, we conducted a community communication audit. This audit has highlighted the need for better planned and coordinated approach to community communication, including to our members. And as a result of this, we've improved internal coordination, but also the planning of inner communication to our members and chapters. Since January, we are consulting our memberships through a number of channels. One is a quantitative survey which was launched in - was conducted in January, which is currently being complimented with qualitative interviews that are actually happening just as I record this presentation. We also conducted a benchmarking research and landscape analysis to look at other membership structures. We are finalizing the report, but already some of the findings are reflected in this proposal.

As you probably have seen, at least I hope you have seen, we have also updated our data privacy program which is currently in consultation phase with our chapters, and these changes will allow for better communication with members. We also did the initial analysis of the pre-requirement of joining global membership before being able to join a chapter. There are lots

of dependencies with the data privacy programs, so we will share this with you and with the community probably September-October timeframe. So, after the completion of the data privacy policy updates. So, this is high level where we are today. I'd like now to take you to the proposed strategy going forward, as well as the proposed model.

So, I wanted to start with actually looking at what the issues are that we're actually trying to solve. So, what we see is that we don't really have a cohesive community as such, but rather a lot of individuals in our database. So, Internet Society currently has nearly 80,000 global members, but many current members have signed up because membership is a pre-requirement qualification for other programs or processes with an unclear value proposition for incoming members who are currently unable to offer really a positive experience that fosters that feeling of community and creates this community that is engaged with our mission, but also with each other in pursuit of that mission. So, the lack of a clear value proposition also reflects in the lack of an organized and coordinated cross-team approach to the membership base, so we see that current interactions with individuals, so the individual members in particular, are not coordinated across the teams which results in patchy engagements that doesn't really build up on previous engagements to deliver consistent community experience. Often, there is also no real differentiation between a member and what we could call an unidentified audience or non-members basically.

So, based on that, let me tell you what our mission statement really is for individual membership. We're looking at creating an engaged and vibrant global movement of motivated members that help Internet Society achieve its goals. Now how do we get there? Internet Society has a great and inspiring mission. We hear that a lot in the feedbacks that we've done through the survey, but now also through the interview sessions. The work we do really makes a difference globally, and people see that. It makes a difference in people's lives. Members recognize that. And because of that, or I should say thanks to that, we already attract a wide range of people globally. What we do see is that through several consultations done over the past few years, including the one earlier this year, the individual members have repeated the same expectation again and again and again. They desire more engagement and involvement with Internet Society and with our work. It is contingent on Internet Society to provide our members with the right conditions but also the right spaces and real opportunities to engage with our work as well as with

each other. The outcome we are looking for is a membership base that feels genuinely connected to our mission with a community that helps each other and is ready to contribute to Internet Society's projects, initiatives, and ultimately also revenue.

Now to get to the outlined mission statement, we outlined the goals for membership. And so, we're looking at keeping the membership base informed, motivated, and interested in Internet Society's work, to change the passive engagement to active engagement and meaningful engagement, to match members to peers on topics or themes of mutual interest, to match members to Internet Society's work that is of interest to them, to help various Internet Society teams achieve their goals and targets, and important to note that, at this stage, we are looking mostly at engaging current members, and so that recruitment is really a secondary goal.

To achieve these goals, we will need to provide a number of benefits. The main promise is really a curated, tailored, and service-oriented experience. We need to provide great community features that allow for easy discovery of and interaction with like-minded people. We need to have a two-way conversational engagement with members and not just talking at members but really listen to and actually have a two-way engagement set up. We need to deliver content and interactions specifically tailored to members. And we need to create opportunities to contribute to Internet Society's work, so that is looking at volunteer engagements, but also looking at how people can contribute at local level to Internet Society's work.

In terms of model, we actually recommend to have a free membership. Now we had discussions - we looked at options of paid membership as we discussed it in the last Board meeting in 2020, but there are a number of reasons for which we came back from that. So, paid membership plans raise expectations of services and products that have exclusivity and premium attached to them. So, taking the Board's feedback into consideration, creation of new products and services were not really an option. And so, simply putting a pay wall to information, content, or features that are currently available for free would not be received well by our community. Another option that we looked at is to offer discounts on value-added services like, for example, training courses or have paid member only courses; however, what this would mean is that we would have quite a heavy reliance on other teams to deliver what the paid members would value and that would affect the main goals of those teams.

So, the other challenge we saw for paid membership is that our volumes actually don't justify the investments, so setting up a paid membership model comes with high initial costs that would include additional personnel on top of what will be needed for a free membership model to provide service, to provide supports to paid members. It would imply additional costs for handling payments, renewals, transactions, account management, and it will also include overhead surpluses like compliance and cost attribution. So, the additional resources would not only be on the community engagement side, but also from other teams like finance, collaborative systems, IT, legal, so it would actually increase the resource costs quite extensively. And based on the current level of our membership base, it would be very difficult to break even and making this profitable - making this profitable. So, our conclusion and recommendation is to have a simple offer of free membership which in turn we can then use as a resource to help other Internet Society teams achieve their goals.

Free membership still creates the need and an expectation of certain membership benefits. If not, there is no reason for members to actually join. So, we looked at the needs and wants of members and have organized those along four categories which would cover the interests of a wide variety of target audiences, and that is really what together that actually articulates the value proposition for membership. We then looked at existing features to offer. And even if some may need to be tailored to the membership audience, they would not require heavy benefits or feature developments as advised by the Board last year.

So, the four benefit buckets, if I can call them like that, are creating a sense of community and a sense of belonging, features and efforts for members to connect, collaborate, exchange, and learn from peers with similar interests and passion to create a sense of belonging. On this slide, as well as in the written document, you will be able to find some examples of the features that actually we are considering under each of those benefits. The second benefit is delivery of curated, relevant, and timely content for the individual member community. The third bucket is opportunities to participate and contribute to a movement that creates impact for the good of the Internet. And last but not least, opportunities that would help individual members improve their career prospects.

And so, while recruitment is not the main priority, I still wanted to touch upon who our target audience for membership would be as that will define the makeup and the level of

engagement of our individual community. So, our primary target audience for membership and for the membership team would be those who are already interested in Internet Society's work, that are already persuaded by what we are doing, and that are showing high levels of interest and/or engagement. And so, we will rely on the Marketing Communications teams to increase awareness of Internet Society's work, make people interested in Internet Society's work, attract them to the touch points, and increase their engagement there before we then would target them for conversion to individual membership.

Now concretely, where do we start? So, we recommend to keep the focus of individual membership programs to activities that provide a smooth member join experience that links up with the prospect's journey before they sign up as members, so before they start the signing up process. We are also recommending activities that are tailored to onboarding experience to help newly signed up members immediately connect with the organization and their area of interest, but also to ensure alignments. We see that a lot of our current members, actually, there's I wouldn't say misalignment, but there is a bit of finding out where they fit and how they align, how their desires of actually making an impact really align with Internet Society's mission and goals.

We would then look at a personalized experience on the online member engagement platform, which is currently called Connect. We would foster the communities within the community with a steady stream of content, high-quality engagement, and opportunities for them to contribute - again, this is volunteer opportunities or ways to engage in the work that is already planned by the Internet Society staff - a committed effort to animate and to support the community, and a constant analysis of member activity and preferences to drive continuous improvements of the features and the benefits that we outlined.

What we will need for this program to meet its objectives and to be successful is clear ownership of individual membership experience, and so we strongly recommend that this be fully mandated to the Community Engagement team to drive, the Community Engagement to champion the needs of individual members within the Internet Society, to coordinate with the various Internet Society teams to deliver engagement and content to the members. It's imperative that the whole organization is behind it and that everybody supports this initiative. We will need the commitment from all dependent teams of the Internet Society to provide resources, material, engagement opportunities for

members. It's really an all-hands-on-deck initiative. There will, of course, be the need for tools and systems with high levels of automation to reduce manual interventions and task load. I'll get into a little bit more detail a little bit later. This would also include data analysis, and then staffing, of course, to support the individual members - membership community.

Now I mentioned the dependencies on all of Internet Society for this to be successful. This slide gives you a sense of what that means. I will not go through the detail here. You have this information in the documents I shared, the PowerPoints and the Word documents. This is just to give you a sense of the types of dependencies that we will face to deliver a great membership experience.

Let me quickly touch as well on the resources that will be needed. So, we are looking at to run the membership program successfully, we would need two full-time employees. Now we looked at internally, actually, reallocating some staff to support this. We have moved Stine Philipsen already into the role of individual membership manager, and so she was very instrumental in implementing some of those low-hanging fruit improvements that I mentioned earlier. And then we will have Lia Kiessling who will be reallocated to individual membership, and so we will look at how we can distribute her current tasks across the team or reprioritize some of those things.

In terms of tools and systems, again, this is quite a detailed slide, but, in essence, this identifies what we need to be able to do, and we have been and will continue to work very closely with the Collaborative Systems team to identify and implement these specific tools. Some of those are already in place. Some of them are part of the system upgrade project that Collaborative Systems is working on, and so we will with them prioritize those systems accordingly.

And last but not least, a high-level timeline for the rollout of the program. So, the rest of 2021 will be dedicated to finalizing some of the research that will help us shape the benefits and features, define the system requirements, as I just mentioned, with Collaborative Systems, and, frankly, just evaluating mapping and implementing some of the missing or some of the broken foundational processes related to membership. So, we are doing quite a thorough analysis in terms of compliance, but also in terms of user experience and looking at some of the flows in terms of processes.

So, this is the end of the presentation. There are two slides here with some additional information that we pulled from the survey. I will let you look at that at your own - at your own - in your own time. But thank you for watching the recording, and I'm looking here - I'm looking forward to hearing your feedback and to see you all very soon. Thank you very much.

>> SEBASTIAN BELLAGAMBA: Good morning, good evening, good afternoon. My name is Sebastian Bellagamba. I am the Vice President of External Engagement. And I would like to give you a brief on the new fellowship programs that we are running and about to run at the Internet Society.

As a matter of background, in 2019 we conducted an assessment of our fellowship programs, and that resulted in the proposition of two new fellowship programs that would incorporate the ones that we were already running back then. In 2020, we consulted the community with a proposal for two new fellowships, one that is called now the Early Career Fellowship, it was then called the Youth Fellowship but renamed since then, and then second one, which is called the Mid-Career Fellowship. The Early Career Fellowship has already been launched. It's been running for a month now. So, far, it has been very successful. The Early Career Fellowship is scheduled to start in mid-2022 and the curriculum is being developed as we speak. The community liked the programs as we presented them, and the Board approved both of them for execution.

The Early Career Fellowship. The vision for the Early Career Fellowship is to empower the Internet champions of tomorrow so they can contribute to the development of the Internet while they ensure that the Internet remains open, globally connected, secure, and trustworthy. We have basically three goals with this fellowship. One is capacity building. We want to create the capacity in this Internet champion, for these Internet champions, to empower - as a second goal - a cadre of talented Internet professionals that will present the mission and vision of the Internet Society, and to ensure that the next generation of Internet champions know and embrace the principals of openness and collaboration, the Internet way of working.

In this graphic, you can see an idea of the four modules, that we have divided the Early Career Fellowship in a timeline. You can see that the onboarding started in week one for the fellowship started on June 28th, and there is basically four modules that are being done. The fellows are now at the end of

the first module which is the Internet Ecosystem which is conducted by Dr. Laura DeNardis. There is a second module coming after that which is led by the Oxford Internet Institute, and it's a module on the Internet way of thinking. Project management and advocacy consists of skills that we want to tell them and for them to learn in the third module, and the Internet way of doing, something that we are conducting in conjunction with the DiploFoundation, is going to be the final module of this fellowship. Each of these fellowships consists of a cohort of 15 fellows, so we are planning to run two cohorts a year. For now, it's 100% virtual.

In order to deliver this first fellowship, the Early Career Fellowship, we have partnered with important institutions. I mentioned Dr. Laura DeNardis, the American University, the Oxford Internet Institute, Pyramid Learning and 89up, and DiploFoundation. We have secured some sponsors like ICANN, BroadSpeak, Trust Elevate, Verizon. We are still waiting for more to come on board. And we have also been able to secure the support of guest speakers of many other organizations.

You can see the pictures here of our first cohort of fellows which started the Early Career Program. They were selected - there are 15 in each cohort, as I said before, and they were selected out of 164 candidates that presented - submitted an application for this round.

I will give you some information about our fellows now. The majority of our fellows come from Asia and Africa with some from the Americas in general. They have - 53% of them are individual members of the Internet Society, 27% are chapter members, and the other 20% are either organizational members or non-members of the Internet Society as of the moment they started this program. Forty-seven percent of them are female, 53% are male, 87%, which means that 13 out of 15 fellows, are in an age range of 20-29, the other two overtake 30, but less than 39.

You can see in these pictures where are they coming from in terms of the sector they work on, they study. Forty percent of them are from civil society, and the second most important groups are the technical community and the business sector with 20% each. The majority of our fellows, one-third of the fellows, come from social sciences. And the majority, two-thirds of them, have a bachelor's degree, and one-quarter of them roughly have a master's degree.

There are some comments positive that we could gather in these first weeks of the program. You can say that all the fellows are very excited to be part of this program and looking forward to the outcome.

That's it for the Early Career Fellowship. I will give you some information about the incoming one, which is the Mid-Career Fellowship that is still in development and is going to be launched in 2022.

We are developing the program at this moment. In the final two months of 2021, we will develop the content and prepare for the program to be launched, and we will launch the program in the February-April 2022 timeframe with an application call and a selection process, and we plan to start, actually start the program in May or June in 2022.

With that, I would like to thank you for your time, and I will be at your disposal if - in case there are any comments or questions. Thank you very much. And I give you all my best.

>> KRISTI MASON: Hi, everyone. My name is Kristi Mason, Head of Marketing Communications.

>> JAMES WOOD: And I am James Wood, Head of Content Communications.

We are both very pleased to have the opportunity to talk to you about what we are doing collectively to build and strengthen the Internet Society's reputation. We know that some new Board members may not have all of the context for this work, but we've tried to strike a balance in the following slides between an appropriate level of scene setting and a current view of where we are today in our plans. We hope you find this presentation helpful. And, of course, we look forward to answering your questions during the forthcoming meeting.

>> KRISTI MASON: Thank you, James. So, last year felt sort of like this photo here. There was the tidal wave of negativity around the proposed sale of PIR. It was happening amidst a global pandemic and the Black Lives Matter movement. The pandemic and the civil unrest, while both unfortunate, did provide the Internet Society a platform to talk about the Internet which was proven to be a big lifeline, as vital as the vaccine and voices being heard, and it really allowed us to move the conversation from the sellers of dot org to that of the

Internet Society being a trusted and strong voice for a bigger and stronger Internet.

So, while it felt like we were walking a tightrope 1,000 feet in the air, the sentiment to numbers indicated that we were able to really neutralize the dot org conversation, and so we closed out 2020 with 78% neutral media sentiment and around 45% neutral social media sentiment. Sentiment was the measurement indicator that we were using through the sale - the proposed sale to understand how we were doing from a brand reputation perspective.

So, with the proposed sale, conversation neutralized. We really set our - we set our sights to rebuild our reputation with a focus on being more effective in what we say and how we say it and really to a larger audience so that they could once again see the Internet Society as a global community working towards building and promoting and defending a bigger and stronger Internet which is so much more than the guardians of dot org. So, to achieve our vision, we started looking inside first. So, we changed our approach to communications, which naturally, in any new approach, meant changing the structure of our team.

So, what we had done was we created one team obviously the Marketing Communication - the Content and Marketing team, but what we did was create two divisions. We had one division focus on the content and another focus - another division focused on the channels of content distribution. So, thus, we became the Content and Marketing Communications team, or, as you see here, CMC is what we commonly refer to ourselves as. So, while we are these divisions within one team, we work in constant collaboration, we make needed decisions together, and we - the divisions really focus on the two critical parts of the communication coming together like a relationship. These two teams are always together, mutually inclusive. And here you see our CMC unified purpose, and you can then see how it cascades - the content team unified purpose cascades in the content - in the Marketing Communications team purpose cascades.

>> JAMES WOOD: Thank you, Kristi. So, as Kristi explains, we have a major focus on content as part of our current plan, and that's because it's really a determining factor in everything we do, everything that carries activity carries content, and it's there as an enabler for our success. And when we talk about content in this respect, we really mean all of the things that we produce under the Internet Society banner, so everything from

a tweet to a flagship report such as the Impact Report that we do, and everything in between. And through those products, we carry content that becomes the currency of our ideas, and really it's the way that we do all the things that you see in the chart there in terms of building stronger, more strategic relationships, forging a stronger bond with our community, it plays an important role in achieving positive outcomes for the Internet through our project focus, and, of course, we are perceived through the content that we create, too. So, it plays a key role in building the perception of who we are. And because of that, it's the fuel that powers our brand reputation.

So, understanding that and the importance of content to us, 2020, as well as posing various challenges, actually afforded us an opportunity to stop and take a closer look at how well our content was working for us. And the answer to that question was that it could be working for us much harder. Our work last year helped us to identify both the challenges and the opportunities for doing content better at the Internet Society, and that resulted in a plan for content which we are now in the midst of implementing. And really, this implementation plan that is our focus for 2021 can be thought of as quite a significant change effort for the organization because, ultimately, we hope that it will make us much more effective both through the use of our channels which of course is the aspect that Marketing Communications deals with and Kristi leads, as well as the effectiveness of the content itself. That's the ultimate goal.

And really, our plan this year is aimed at doing the things that you see on this slide, aimed at ensuring that our content is in tune and aligned with our strategic objectives. We want to make sure that we're putting our audiences first, and not saying just what we want to say, but also balancing that need with what they want to hear. We want to be more efficient with our internal resources, our use of time, the money that we spend on content and activities, and, of course, the human resources and capital that we have, too. A key one is that we are putting our content model and plan into place to increase the quality of content over quantity. For too long, we have produced a huge volume of content without really focusing it sufficiently on the quality. Our whole plan is designed to ensure that we get the right content out there as opposed to as much content as we can. Then we are in consort with Marketing Communications thinking very hard about the channels that we have and the interplay between content and those channels. So, asking ourselves the important questions like what content should go on which channel for what purpose and not treating those things as separate

pieces of the puzzle. Then lastly, putting clear guidance in place for what our content should look like and how we go about creating it. So, in short, we're really creating a completely new content system that the Internet Society has always needed but never had.

And we are in the middle of building that foundation, and the foundation is, we hope, a long-term foundation and a permanent one for a better content future for the whole organization and the community. And our opportunity is to improve our content landscape from the ground up. So, by that, we mean making improvements in all of the areas that you see listed there. We are putting governance and the governance framework in place that we have not had to direct all of our content choices and processes. We are putting those processes in place to help us produce the content in the right way and to increase our efficiency, all the while making sure that it's the right content in a way that ladders up to our mission and our objectives. We are creating resources to help both our staff and others create good quality content and we are getting a better understanding of what content goes where as part of the choices we are making for our ecosystem and the ecosystem that we need to support our new content model. These fundamentals we are putting in place now to do content well will allow us over time to strengthen and cement our reputation.

And we have made quite significant progress and headway with that in the first half of the year. We now have that governance framework in place. We have a content vision, and everything ladders up to that vision, which is essentially to craft content to inspire, enable, and equip our various supporters, champions, and allies to collaborate and advocate with us for an Internet for everyone. That's the strategic core of our content strategy. It defines how content will help us achieve our mission. And to make sure that our content is aligned with that, we have a set of standards and principles and categories with which our content must align. Those standards really hinge around the fact that we are ensuring that we are asking those key questions about content in the first place. What content should we be producing given the objectives we have? Is this the right content? Does it fulfill a clear purpose? Who is it for? And will the content start new conversations, or does it feed into existing conversations? All of those kinds of questions will help us standardize the content that we're making. And it must align also with categories that we've set as part of our content strategy.

We also have content principles as part of this governance framework that help us not just make sure that our content is aligned, but also the processes that allow us to generate that content. And very briefly, those principles hinge around the notion that our content needs to be mission driven. We need to be good stewards of the time and resources we have available to us. Good content hinges on collaboration, and we always need to add value through our content. It's all about impact over quantity. And, above all, we need to be providing clarity through the content that we create, and that idea of clarity is something, I think, that can directly impact reputation over time.

Moving on from the fundamentals, we've done quite a lot of work already this year on the processes that we are going to use to apply those fundamentals. So, this really comes in the form of a uniform process for content production. And we've mapped it out at high level, and it's this five-step content production process that you see here that really has an emphasis on planning upfront, so answering all those key strategic questions. And at the very beginning, before we generate any content, having a clear idea of why we need to generate it, how it will help, who it's for, and also the lifecycle of that content, so making decisions at the outset about how long that content should be live, whether it needs to be archived at a certain point, whether it needs to be maintained, et cetera, so we're thinking about its entire lifecycle from the beginning. We're in a good place now with our development of all the processes. We've got the high-level framework in place. We're building out some of the detail in each of the phases, and we're going to be moving forward to testing that workflow as a critical component of making sure that it's the right one for us.

Beyond that, we've also reached some quite major milestones in terms of the resources that we've created to help people generate good content. The first of those was what we have called the Content Toolkit which we published in mid-April that really provides the guidance to manage content from idea to product. It's a mechanism to ground ourselves in our content strategy, but also a manual for doing content well, and it contains the fundamentals, it contains detail of our workflow, and it's the one-stop-shop to help people understand how to generate content and the processes that they should be following. Beyond that, we've also developed a style guide which we've published publicly in June because it's not just for our staff audience. Other people who will be helping us generate

content need to reference it, too. This is really the place where our content conventions are set out. If there is any argument about how things should be presented, what spelling we use, what title or what case we use, how we go about grammar, word usage, voice and tone, accessibility, et cetera, there are a multitude of issues, all of them are answered by the style guide. So, it's a really key resource that provides consistency across all of the content that we will produce as the Internet Society.

And then just in terms of next steps, whilst we've hit a couple of milestones, there's still quite a lot of work to do in the remainder of this year. We need to, as I say, make sure that our workflow is appropriate for us, that it is robust enough, and to get it to a point through testing in Q3 and Q4 that we can activate it more broadly across the organization. The goal right now is for our workflow to be sufficiently developed so that we can apply it in Q4 to plan our content for Q1. So, really, it's all about making sure that we're getting our content system to a place that it can be activated and used as we embark on our 2022 work. There are other considerations in here as well about making sure that we have a good sense of our channel strategy and our content model in order to make that work. Plus, the delivery of a staff development and training program to ensure that people know how to use the principles, the standards, the resources, everything that we're developing this year because it's one thing to create those assets, but it's quite another to ensure that people understand them, understand their importance, and know how to use them. So, still quite a bit to do, but we're on a good trajectory.

Kristi, back to you.

>> KRISTI MASON: All right. Thank you very much, James. So, all the Content team is focused on what the Internet Society as an organization is saying. The Marketing Communications, or MarCom team, is focused on connecting what we are saying to the right audience and through the right mix of communication channels. Using our channels to broadcast messages and hope that the rightful receiver catches the message is just not an option in today's digital world. As the stat here on this slide indicates, the average person spends almost half of their day consuming content. So, audiences are just not going to pick through the noise to get what they want. There is an expectation of audiences today that the content that they want will be put into their hands. So, knowing who the audience is and the best way to reach them really increases Internet Society's

effectiveness in achieving our mission. So, as part of this, we are working on optimizing a core set of communication channels and helping teams target audiences so that the right people get the right message through the right channels in a way that it's very consistent with our brand and our tone of voice.

So, this slide here is an overview of our channel optimization strategy this year. The core channels of distribution when we talk about it from a MarCom sense is events, media relations, social media, and within social media at the global - at the global level, we have four core social media channels, and then, of course, our website. So, the event channel optimization strategy this year is really centered on two things. One is evolving our events so that they're a little bit more engaging, and second is to use this channel in a more effective way. So, last year, we conducted an audit. We pulled about 20 months worth of event data to better understand the use of this channel. What the audit that we did revealed was that there was no common understanding within staff about what constitutes an Internet Society event. And then the other interesting finding - while there are many - the other one of note is that there was - we were involved in many events into the triple digits; however, less than 25% of those we could apply any amount of ROI, even loosely. So, what we did in the first half of this year was we outlined what constitutes an Internet Society event and established criteria for those events. And then as part, we created best practice guidelines so that staff who need to host an event or attend or do an event can do so in accordance with baseline Internet Society standards.

So, moving over to media relations, besides keeping the media machine running across the globe on a daily basis, the media relations team is really focused on building awareness amongst newsrooms so that we can talk about trending news topics. Obviously, we're doing this also through Internet Society thought leadership. So, as part, the team is also training a larger what I call depth of bench across Internet staff to be able to talk about topics, news media topics, and to news media on Internet policy and Internet infrastructure. This happens at the global level and also at the regional level so that when media calls, we can answer that call with our expertise.

Moving over to social media, you know, we're really focused on increasing engagement of our messages and also doing some more core message amplification. So, interestingly enough, there are over 45 - over 45 social media accounts that are linked to

Internet Society Global. So, what the team has been doing is really looking at how we can build collaboration workflows amongst all the various channels and do so in a way that we can have some succinct messaging across the channels, also encourage a more approachable tone of voice, and test and share insights about new social media platforms and also new features. It seems like social - depending on the channel, they're coming out with new features almost on a daily basis. And then we're also doing things like providing our chapters, our extended social accounts, if you will, with social toolkits on critical posts, and all of this, again, is in an effort to increase engagement and increase message amplification.

So, then moving over to the website, what I consider - what I would consider to be our storefront, we've really taken a focus on developing a roadmap to highlight frontend updates and SEO improvements, all in an effort to evolve the user experience. So, using some data that we collected through Google Analytics, we found that more than half of the visitors who came to our homepage left. This and other data points coupled with website best practice approach gave us our roadmap for the year. So, you might have seen that recently we refreshed our homepage and our navigation menus. This is part of the roadmap. And you'll see more of these critical refreshes happening throughout the back half of this year.

So, audience targeting, it's a bit of an art and science, and each case is different depending on the audience you're trying to reach. So, here, we're presenting a case study, if you will, and it's on the Economics of Encryption, a report that was released by the Encryption team earlier this year because it's really a great case study to show the effectiveness of audience targeting. So, this paper was written for policymakers, business decisionmakers, journalists, and encryption supporters. So, identifying the right channel to target this audience and identifying the audience beyond those high-level categories was critical to ensuring that all the efforts the team spent researching, writing, and finalizing got this paper in the right hands. And as you can see here in the results section that the targeting, and targeting is always a paid effort, really outpaced organic by impressions, engagements, and clicks, all resulting in a seven-minute average time on page, which is really a significant amount of time on page, on any page.

So, 2021, how's it going? Let's take a look at how we're pulling this all together, all of our efforts on the Contents side and the MarCom side from a qualitative and quantitative

perspective. So, first, it's worth noting that we worked with the Planning and Reporting team to establish metrics for measuring our brand reputation on a continual basis. So, we started by identifying the strategic pillars of the Internet Society brand. When we say strategic pillars, we mean the characteristics of our brand and how we want to be perceived in the world. So, in the past, we would start with all the metrics we could measure in marketing and narrow it down to a select few based on perceived importance. This approach worked, but the challenge was we were never able to benchmark year over year. So, with a pillar-based approach, we were able to apply one to two data metrics representative of each pillar, taking into account the need to establish a set of metrics that we can measure year over year. So, as you see here on this slide, we have our three pillars, trusted, credible, and relevant. And for trusted, we're going to measure media mentions. For credible, we have two measurements, which is inbound media inquiries and also domain authority ranking. And then for relevancy, we're going to look at average social media post engagements. So, we'll take a look on the next couple of slides how we're doing.

So, from a trusted perspective, the number of media mentions. As you can see here, we earned in the first half of this year, a little over 600 media mentions, which is a very sharp decline from last year, and this is primarily due to the proposed sale of PIR and ICANN's decision to block the proposed sale. Now of those 402 media mentions, almost 40% were headlines and features on topics that strategically align with our organizational priorities. So, while the mentions last year were higher, the quality and topics of those were far less relevant to us than what we're seeing this year. And, of course, we always like to call out top tier media mentions as these are pretty coveted. So, as you can see here, we did get a headline feature in the Times of India. You also see that we got a very nice feature on Community Networks and Indigenous Communities on Mashable. Then there's also a feature here on MSN encryption and keeping people safe online.

From a credible perspective, again, you're going to see the effect of the proposed sale of PIR on media metrics. It will be a recurring theme that will continue this year and into next year until we remove this variable from our benchmark. So, really, again, the proposed sale of PIR really explains the decrease from 44 mentions last year - or from 44 inbound inquiries last year to 15 this year. Also, another factor in the sharp decline is the trending news cycle. So, last year at this time, if you remember, there were lockdowns, there was a heavy

reliance on the Internet to keep society employed, educated, healthy, entertained, informed, and most of all connected.

So, moving onto domain ranking authority, some of you may know this, but to explain just a little bit, domain ranking authority shows the strength of the website's back link profile compared to others on 100-point scale. It's really important because it represents the website - how a website is doing in terms of search engines and how the search engine is seeing you. And then the domain ranking authority, anywhere between 40 and 50 is considered average. Not bad. Anything between 50 and 60 is considered good. Anything over 60 is considered excellent. So, as you can see here, last year to this year at this time, we remain steady in our high ranking. And this is really important to us because search is the number one driver of inbound views to our website. Now you can see the chart on the far left shows a number of back links that we currently have on our website and how high those back links rank on our website.

So, from a relevant perspective, again, we're looking at average social media post engagements across our four core global channels. And we really have a focus this year on testing new approaches. And as you can see, the testing new approaches really got us to the 21 increase in our average post engagement over this time last year. So, what we did differently. So, last year we were really focused on posts that explained Internet terminology, and this year we tested things like emojis, as you can see by the image on the left. This one was actually our most engaged post as least as far back as we can go on both Twitter and Instagram. And then the other thing, you know, another thing to call out that we're testing is the new features. And here you see an image from LinkedIn where LinkedIn is offering this feature where you can directly embed PDFs into a post, so the user benefit is that they don't - a user doesn't have to go off of the LinkedIn platform onto a website. And what we're finding here is when we add PDFs or any sort of content directly into the post, keeping them on the LinkedIn platform is our most engaged post on LinkedIn consistently through this half - this first half of the year.

And with that, I'll turn the mic over to James.

>> JAMES WOOD: Thank you, Kristi. So, I just want to create the link again back to content because, of course, content has a really important role to play in creating brand perception and in contributing to our brand pillars of trusted, credible, and relevant. So, our content needs to work well for us to achieve

that brand reputation, and we want to understand if it's doing that, so there are a number of things from a content perspective that we have begun to measure and look at that tell us whether our content is being effective in creating the outcomes we want for our brand.

The first of those is the level of community participation, and this is linked to the measures that exist in the Community Engagement team because there is a target there to achieve in terms of the number of individual members participating in our projects and initiatives, and clearly content is a key driver for that. We also want to get a better sense of audience satisfaction specifically around the content and what people feel about the content. And we've begun to collect some data on this. We are measuring, for example, the positive response rate in our individual member newsletters. And in Q2, we've had a number of people writing in proactively to us, which is essentially what that positive response rate means, whereas, really, we had nothing like that before, so any measure there is a bonus to us and it's showing us that people are appreciative of the content that they're now getting and they're actually going out of their way to say so. And then lastly, the degree on the amount of strategic content that we carry through our channels, most notably website, one of the things that the content strategy and audit work that we did last year, flagged, was that there was a significant portion, up to 80%, of our content across the website and that's thousands of pages that wasn't always strategically connected to our work, so we want to reverse that. We want to make sure that the vast majority of our content on our website is strategic, and that will happen through a combination of creating strategic content as well as archiving and maintaining that content that is no longer strategic to what we're doing.

And then we'll finish just with a couple of examples of some of this work in action and how MarCom and the content are coming together to bring about these changes. You've heard Kristi mention the website refreshes, changes to the navigation on the website, but also changes to the content, and this is making a difference. It's been felt quite far and wide at the moment in that we've really changed our language, we've changed our approach to a lot of the information we have in some key places on the website, and we've made it much more audience friendly. In addition, we are very conscious that we need to create content that tells the bigger story and not just the story of our projects, but how those individual pieces of work ladder up

to the Internet that we're trying to create in terms of making it bigger and making it stronger.

And then lastly, there is an example here about beginning to see a return on investment from the content that - those content changes that we are making. One of those is the individual member newsletter, as I say, that we're beginning to track. We're tracking the response rates from that. But also, ultimately, it's about what people then do with that content, and that return on investment is really in the translation of content to action because, ultimately, it's the action that we want, and there's a nice anecdotal reference here about someone who appreciates receiving that content, and because of that content is now participating in a meeting to help plan Global Encryption Day. The second example is, again, content related in that this person is saying that they're proud to be an Internet Society member and they are highlighting to their own network the things that we have done in 2020 to create positive outcomes for the Internet. I would encourage everyone to have a look at that impact report from 2020 because it's a really great example of the kind of content that we believe can drive our reputation and that we need to do more of.

So, content and communications and marketing communications are committed to continuing to work hand-in-hand to increase our reputation in these ways and use the power of content and the effective, efficient use of channels to do that. Kristi and I would like to thank you very much for listening, and we look forward to talking to you at the forthcoming Board meeting.

>> KRISTI MASON: Yes. Thank you very much. Bye now.

>> KEVIN CRAEMER: Recording. Thank you.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: So, I don't see any response - anyone responding saying that they are interested in serving as chair, so we'll have to break now. Oh, wait, before we do that, I wonder whether Ted would like to say something about - about his candidacy as the chair.

>> TED HARDIE: Thanks to each of you for your service on the Board. I look forward to continuing to work with you. And I simply wanted to let you know that I believe strongly in the mission of the Society and that, as Chair, if you decide to elect me, I will do my best to make sure that the Board is an effective actor in helping the Society move forward on that mission. Thank you.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Thank you, Ted. I see that Mohammad is joining, so when he joins, I will pause for a moment and ask whether he wishes to express a desire to run for the Chair position just to cover all the bases. Muhammad, can you hear us?

>> MIKE GODWIN: Muhammad, you may be muted.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Yes, Andrew. [audio issue]. Can you hear me?

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Sometimes.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Can you hear me?

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Yes. Now I can hear you fine. So, I was just calling the election of the Chair and I wanted to make sure whether you wished to express a desire to serve as Chair in the next year. We have had the expression from Ted.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: No. Thank you, Andrew. I'm not interested now to serve as Chair, so I am happy with Ted.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Great. Thank you. All right. So, now we have to run an election, which means that we pause and all attendees right now who are not voting members, not voting trustees or me, have to leave the meeting, so Kevin will ask everybody to step out of the meeting who is not a voting trustee, and when he has done that, I will open the discussion among you for anything you want to say about Ted. Ted, also, I would ask that you step out during this discussion. Yes, this works a lot better in person.

>> KEVIN CRAEMER: We are waiting for Sarah and Renalia and Ilona to leave the meeting.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you. You can stop the broadcast to the non-panelists.

>> KEVIN CRAEMER: Yes, we are.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: All right. Welcome back, everyone. The Board uses an online voting platform for the elections and Kevin has configured the electronic ballots and sent them to everyone. So, the ballots have been distributed to the trustees. You should see it in BoardEffect. If you do not see it in BoardEffect, try refreshing your page. It's at the very bottom

of the home page. Kevin will display the results when the - when the election is completed, when all the ballots have been received.

>> MAIMOUNA DIOP: Sorry Kevin, I can't see it.

>> KEVIN CRAEMER: If you scroll down to the bottom of your home page, you should see polls and surveys and then vote for Board Chair. Maybe try refreshing your screen, too.

>> GEORGE SADOWSKY: Polls and surveys.

>> KEVIN CRAEMER: Is anyone else having difficulty finding the -

>> GEORGE SADOWSKY: I am having difficulty.

>> KEVIN CRAEMER: Okay.

>> GEORGE SADOWSKY: I'm willing to make my vote public, vote verbally.

>> KEVIN CRAEMER: It should appear at the bottom of your screen under polls and surveys.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: George if you click on the left-hand side, it says home.

>> GEORGE SADOWSKY: Yeah.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Click the home, refresh, and then refresh the screen, and then when you scroll all the way to the bottom, it has a section called polls.

>> GEORGE SADOWSKY: Refresh.

>> MAIMOUNA DIOP: Thank you, it's done.

>> GEORGE SADOWSKY: Yes. Thank you.

>> RICHARD BARNES: That should be the same cycle you go through for the other votes.

>> GEORGE SADOWSKY: Thank you very much.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Hi. Did it - Kevin, do you see my vote?

>> KEVIN CRAEMER: I don't see individual polls. I just see that we have all but one ballot received. All but one.

>> GEORGE SADOWSKY: Okay.

>> KEVIN CRAEMER: Maimouna, did you find it? Okay. I have all 12. Would you like me to display the results?

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Yes, please.

>> KEVIN CRAEMER: Okay. We have 12 votes, 12 out of 12 for Ted Hardie as Chair.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Thank you very much, Ted, for your willingness to serve, and congratulations. The vote is unanimous. So, at this point, I will hand the role presiding on this meeting over to - over to Ted. But before I do that, I wanted to offer you the feedback from the Board in their discussion. The Board is thankful and appreciates your willingness to serve and believes you will do an excellent job but wanted to remind you that all of the rest of the trustees are here to call upon should you need their assistance, so please don't hesitate to do so. Thank you very much.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you. Thank you both for the confidence in taking up this new role and for the willingness to serve.

Our next agenda item is, in fact, our next election. It is the election of the other officers. There are two agenda items underneath that. One is the confirmation of the decision on the Board Secretary role, and the second is the election of the Treasurer. Since the confirmation doesn't require any change to the group here, why don't we do that first?

As folks will recall, we discussed in working Board meetings the fact that since Ilona has taken up the role of Corporate Secretary, that having her also take the role of Board Secretary - we're not appointing a separate Board Secretary - would make sure that the full set of trustees are always able to focus on the work of the Board rather than stopping and taking notes and doing that sort of thing instead. As a result, we proposed not to fill the role of Board Secretary at this time. Is there anybody who wishes to revisit that decision? Okay. Seeing no issues with that, we'll call that decision confirmed and now move to the election of the Treasurer.

As Andrew pointed out, there was a previous message from John Levine asking for expressions of interest. And during that, Laura expressed interest in the role of Treasurer and there were no other expressions of interest at that time. Is there anybody else who wishes to express interest in the role of Treasurer at this time? Seeing none, we'll now go through the same process that you just went through. Laura, we'll ask you to step aside. And Kevin, if anybody else has joined us as an observer in this short period, we'll ask them to step out as well.

>> KEVIN CRAEMER: Okay. I would ask any attendees to leave the meeting room, leave the webinar, also those of you on staff that are in the meeting. Thank you.

>> RICHARD BARNES: Thanks. Just to remind folks, the BoardEffect dance is click on home in the top left, then refresh your browser and scroll all the way to the bottom, and there should be a vote for Treasurer poll there. Perhaps Board Treasurer to align with the bylaws.

>> TED HARDIE: Kevin, whenever the set of votes is complete, feel free to just go ahead and display the results for us.

>> KEVIN CRAEMER: Okay, here are the results. We have 12 out of 12 votes for Laura Thompson as Treasurer.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you very much, Laura, for agreeing to serve in the role, and congratulations. During the discussion, there was every confidence expressed in your ability to do the job and a great deal of appreciation for your willingness to take it on. Thank you.

>> LAURA THOMSON: Thank you, Ted. And thank you, everyone. I want to say thank you to - oh, thank you to -

>> TED HARDIE: Go ahead.

>> LAURA THOMSON: - for having done it - thank you to Richard for having done it the last couple of years because I've had some insight into how much work lies ahead. Thank you.

>> TED HARDIE: I think the last year - well, maybe not the last year, but the year before that was definitely a challenging one indeed.

So, the next item on the agenda is appointing a liaison to the IETF Nominations Committee. This one is slightly different

in that it is a standard resolution rather than a BoardEffect poll. So, first, the expression of interest prior to that was - prior to this meeting was from Brian Haberman. Brian, are you still willing to serve?

>> BRIAN HABERMAN: I am.

>> TED HARDIE: Is there anybody else who wants to throw their hat in the ring at this moment? Okay. The resolution reads: Resolved, that the ISOC Board appoints Brian Haberman as ISOC Board Liaison to the IETF Nominations Committee for the 2021-2022 term. May I ask for someone to move the motion and a second? I saw Robert move and Laura second. I suggest we do this by acclamation. Thank you very much, Brian, for your willingness to serve.

The next item on the agenda is the Annual Appointment of Committee Chairs and Members. The list that you see on the agenda was drawn from the discussions that occurred after the first expressions of interest. There were some changes to the original spreadsheet in order to accommodate some of the restrictions on different aspects of which committees can have overlapping membership. We can do this in two ways. We can either do this committee by committee, or we can approve the whole. As Gonzalo has pointed out a number of times, it is somewhat faster to approve the whole, but we can definitely approve it committee by committee if there are specific changes people would like or if discussion needs to occur on some committees. So, the first question is: Would the Board like to approve this by approving the whole slate? That's the current proposal. Is there any objection to approving it in that way?

>> RICHARD BARNES: I would be fine with that.

>> TED HARDIE: Okay. I hear no objection. We'll take that way forward. So, in essence, the motion I would like to hear is that we move for the appointment of the Committee Chairs and Members as listed in the agenda. Can I ask somebody to move that?

>> TED HARDIE: I saw George first and then Brian, so George moves and Brian second. All in favor, please signify by saying Aye.

>> BOARD: [all saying Aye].

>> TED HARDIE: Any opposed? Any abstain? Great. So, we have this by unanimous consent. Thank you very much.

As a reminder to those who are watching the recording of this or who are observers, there are a couple of committees in here, for example, the Elections Committee and the Nominations Committee, for whom additional members will be appointed later in the year, but the Committee Chairs at this point have been appointed and they will run the process from this point on.

The next item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes of the previous Board meeting. The proposed resolution there is: Resolved, that the minutes of the 158th meeting of the ISOC Board of Trustees held by video conference on 8th of July 2021 are approved. Are there any proposed changes to the minutes? Hearing none, may I ask for somebody to move the motion?

>> TED HARDIE: I saw Brian first and then Richard. In chat, Richard suggests that we use the raising of hands as being slightly more effective than aye or nay. As a result for this one, I would like everybody who is in favor to please raise their hand.

>> GEORGE SADOWSKY: Ted, you'll want a verbal confirmation from Muhammad.

>> TED HARDIE: Yes. I can tell I can't see Muhammad on my screen. Muhammad, are you in favor? Okay, let's move onto the second question. Is there anybody who is opposed, please raise your hand. Is there anybody who chooses to abstain? I see no hands there. Muhammad, do you wish to record a position on this?

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Sorry, Ted. Sorry, Chair. I lost your voice. Could you please?

>> TED HARDIE: This is the motion to approve the minutes of the previous meeting and the positions available.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: What's your question?

>> TED HARDIE: To approve the minutes of the previous meeting and you can vote yes to approve, no to -

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Yes, I vote - I vote yes.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you very much.

The next item of business is to welcome a new chapter. That resolution is: Resolved, that the ISOC Board of Trustees warmly

welcomes the Internet Society Zambia Chapter, and we extend our congratulations to President Levy Syanseke and all the officers of the new chapter. I propose we do this by acclamation.

In that same vein, we have been notified of a couple of chapters, the Barbados Chapter and the U.S. Colorado Chapter, which have entered rejuvenation status, there are, at the moment, several other chapters, including Nepal, South Africa, Gauteng, and Thailand in that status. And certainly, I'm sure the Board joins me in wishing the two chapters entering and those chapters already in rejuvenation status a success with that effort.

Okay. The next item on the agenda is to accept a summary of the agreed Board action items from the 2021 Board of Trustees. So, as folks will recall, especially those who were on the previous Board, the Board will create a summary of action items that they wish the new Board to consider. This is the moment in the agenda when we acknowledge receipt of that. That doesn't bind this Board to act within it, but it is a formal notification that we have received that advice from the previous Board's view. This is the act [indiscernible 02:09:15]. We will basically go forward with this. The summary of agreed Board action items were: Continue developing a high-level strategy for revenue diversification for the future of the Internet Society and the Internet Society Foundation and continue to support the projects approved as part of the Internet Society's 2021 Action Plan. The proposed resolution is: Accept the summary of agreed Board action items from the 2021 Board of Trustees. Resolved, the ISOC Board of Trustees accepts the summary of agreed Board action items as conveyed by the 2020-2021 Board of Trustees. Is there any discussion?

>> GEORGE SADOWSKY: Ted, a question. I've been on several Boards in the past and this has never been discussed. I've never seen a motion like this. It's always been assumed that the new Board will learn from what the old Board has done and then proceed with the program. Is this a legal requirement on us? Is it just something we have done over the years? I'm not sure you can answer this immediately, but it is curious that we're doing it. Thank you.

>> TED HARDIE: I can answer because I was also curious and dug into the history a little bit, and it turns out that this is not a legal requirement per se. It's something that started during the previous CEO's term as there were a couple of occasions when there was a very large turnover of trustees. As

you know, given the way our system works, we are always expecting a fair number of trustees to be up for re-election each time. And in cases where there has also been a loss of a trustee during the course of a year, that number can get quite high if there's a large turnover in who is elected or appointed. And as a result of that, the CEO suggested, and the Board at that time agreed, that it was a good practice to formally hand over this advice so that even if there were a very large turnover in trustees, it was then obvious to the new trustees what the consensus of the previous Board had been, and it has been carried forward since Kathy's time until now. It does seem to me a good practice given the way the Board appointments and elections work here to make sure that there is sort of a formal send and receive here, and that's the history of it.

>> GEORGE SADOWSKY: Thank you.

>> TED HARDIE: Okay. Seeing no other discussion, I will ask for a motion to accept this summary. I saw Maimouna and Richard. So, once again, we'll do this by raising hands. All those in favor, please raise your hands now. Thank you very much. Muhammad, we have seen your hand. Any opposed, please raise your hand now. Any abstain? Thank you very much. The motion carries unanimously.

So, the next item on our agenda is the Recognition of Outgoing Trustees. To express appreciation to the outgoing trustee for service to the Board, there is a formal resolution which states: Resolved, that the Board thanks Walid Al-Saqaf, Gonzalo Camarillo, John Levine, and Heather West for their dedication and outstanding service to the Internet Society as members of the Board of Trustees and extends special appreciation to Gonzalo for his leadership over the past five years as Board Chair and to John for his commitment as Board Secretary over the same period.

I would like to add, personally, I have found working with each of those former trustees an extraordinarily enriching experience and the statement that we thank them for their dedication is not empty in any way, shape, or form. Each of them has put in an enormous amount of time and effort to their service to the Board, especially John as Secretary and Gonzalo as Chair. And I extend my own personal and heartfelt thank you in addition to this resolution. Is there anybody else who would like to speak to this point?

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Me, Luis.

>> TED HARDIE: Luis, please.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Yes, I would like to thank Gonzalo for his guidance on the incoming Board members. It has been really helpful the way to - his way to explain and for us to understand how the Board works and wish the best for John and Gonzalo in the future. And thanks for their service in the Board.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: I would agree with that. And, you know, I think some of the things that Walid put in his note, I think we all feel. I mean, everybody has contributed enormously. And even when there were differences of opinion, everybody was and still is, including the current Board members, enormously of good will and working together and working through what had been some difficult issues, but we all got there. I just want to, again, personally thank Gonzalo and John for all of your efforts, and Gonzalo and his, you know, incredible leadership and inclusion. And Ted, you know, you're the same way. So, looking forward to it. But thanking everybody.

>> TED HARDIE: Is there anybody else who would like to comment on this point? Okay. I think we should approve this by acclamation. So, thanks to everybody.

That brings us to the end of the current section of the agenda and we'll have a short break until 15:05 UTC. That is in approximately 15 minutes. However, we will resume in closed executive session to receive the PIR report. So, unless there is any other business for this section of the agenda, we will take that short break. Any other business?

>> MIKE GODWIN: I just want to confirm we are resuming in closed session, immediately in closed session. Is that correct?

>> TED HARDIE: That is correct. We will resume immediately in closed session in order to receive the PIR report.

>> MIKE GODWIN: Very good. At 15:05.

>> KEVIN CRAEMER: Yes, at five minutes after the hour.

>> JOHN LEVINE: I'm assuming that the guests are not invited.

>> TED HARDIE: For the closed session, no, that will be a closed session because the report - report from PIR.

>> JOHN LEVINE: I understand. See you later.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you, John.

Okay. See everybody in a few minutes.

Thanks, everybody, for joining us for this session of the Annual General Meeting of the ISOC Board of Trustees. This is meeting number 159. The purpose of this section is to hear a series of reports from different community groups, and the first of those is from Mirja Kühlewind. Before we start, is there anybody who needs to declare a conflict of interest in relation to any of these reports? Hearing none, Mirja.

>> MIRJA KÜHLEWIND: Yeah. There should be some slides somewhere. Yeah. There we go.

So, this is the report from the Internet Architecture Board. If you just can go to the next slide. Maybe full screen would be helpful.

There we are. Because there are some new people here, I quickly have the slide just to explain what the Internet Architecture Board is. So, there are three leadership groups in the IETF. One is the Internet Architecture Board, the other one is the IESG and the LLC Board. The IESG is more responsible for let's say operations of the working groups and the RFCs and the meetings. The LLC is more on the administrative and financial side. And the IAB has another set of tasks which is listed on the slide. So, we are responsible for a bunch of process-related things like electing and appointing people to certain positions. Also, having the whole external liaison process is something that we manage. We are the contact point for IANA. We are the contact point for ISOC as well. And there's also this A in the IAB, the architecture part, where we are a body that has like architecture oversight over what the IETF is doing, and that means we try to figure out if there are any kind of gaps missing, if there are any kind of high-level recommendations that might be useful to the community, and we do this by organizing workshops - organizing ourself into programs, also writing a couple of RFCs from time to time.

Okay. On the next slide, you see the current IAB members. So, the IAB has 12 community selected members. And on top of that, we have also the IETF Chair as a member of the IAB. We have the IRTF Chair in the IAB, and we have the RFC Series Editor, or,

actually, at the moment, it's the RFC Project Manager. It's a temporary position here So, that's us. Next slide.

I think you already received the report that we produced with all the details of what we do, that we produce for every IETF meeting, but here is also the link again. I just want to highlight two things. Between the last meeting and this meeting, we created a new position which is called the Liaison Coordinator position, which is currently served by Tommy Pauly and Wes Hardaker, and this is mainly for our internal organization how we want to handle liaison management in the IETF. However, if you ever have any questions about liaison management, what I actually want to point you to is this email address. We have a new email address which is liaison-coordination@iab.org. So, if you have any questions, feel free to send something there. And the other point I want to highlight quickly is that we recently published RFC 9075, which is the report of the workshop that we had last November on network impacts based on the COVID-19 situation. I reported a little bit on this workshop already the last time I was here. I guess that's why I wanted to just provide you this link if you want to read the whole report there. Okay. Let's go to the next slide.

Another thing I would like to quickly mention to you is also related to this architecture oversight part. So, what we did recently is also trying to focus more on the technical and architectural work, and one of the things that we've been doing is that we tried to reserve one of our calls, our usually weekly calls that we have, once per month, one of these calls for technical discussions only. And you can see that we did this for a couple of weeks already, and you can see some of the topics we've been discussing. Our last discussion was on Content Moderation, and we had two people from ISOC coming in, giving us some background information about legal aspects and these kinds of things, so that was very good and very interesting for us. I hope we can do that more often because I think it's very valuable. So, in general, if you are interested in any of these calls, the IAB calls are actually open for observers, so you can find the agenda on the IAB webpage, and also find the minutes of these calls in case this is something interesting for you.

Yeah. On the next slide, I also want to highlight to you our upcoming next workshop that we are organizing. So, we are organizing a workshop on measuring network quality for end-users. The workshop will be in September. The submission deadline is in two days, so Monday. So, if you're interested in this, you can actually submit a position paper to us, it just

has to be a very short paper, explaining your interest in this topic and we would be able to invite you to the workshop, but we can also figure out if you are interested to invite you without a paper if that's more convenient for you. So, anyway, this is coming up just for your information.

And then I have one last slide. I'm not sure if this is interesting for any of you, but we are in the middle of a quite big redesigning effort regarding the RFC editor model. Was there a question? I'm not sure. Let me run through the slide and then we can have questions anyway. So, the IETF are in the middle of redesigning the RFC editor model. So, that is organized by an IAB program, but it's really a community drive process. And the reason why I'm highlighting this here right now is because we made quite good progress recently, so there is now a document describing the basis of this new model. And so, if you're interested in this, then you - this is the right point of time to look at this draft and read what is going on there. So, the major changes from the previous model were there was mainly the RFC Editor and then also the RFC Editor who was like responsible also for strategy and oversight, and then on the other side, there was the RFC Production Center which does all the operational stuff. We now basically have two additional entities. One is the RFC Series Working Group, so this is more organized like a working group to get more input from the community and more transparency, and that group is now responsible for strategic questions. That group is then supposed to also publish RFCs about the operation of the RFC Series, and these documents are then approved by the RFC Series Approval Board, which is also a new entity we are creating, and this Board consists of the stream managers and the RFC Editor. So, basically, what we have here is that the role of the RFC Editor is changing from being the one and only deciding about strategy, more to an advisory role to the working group and to the Board and to the Production Center. And that's already my report.

So, if you have any questions, let me know.

>> TED HARDIE: Thanks very much for the report, Mirja. Are there any questions?

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: It's me, Luis.

>> TED HARDIE: Luis, go ahead.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Thank you, Mirja, for your presentation. I just read somewhere in the report that there was an open meeting

last 29th of July. I now it has been such a short time between now and the 29th of July, but do you have any insights about what are the results of that open meeting?

>> MIRJA KÜHLEWIND: This is a thing that we do for roughly a year right now that we have at every IETF meeting. We also have this IAB open meeting. So, that gives us more time with the community to discuss about technical aspects and we do a little bit of reporting to the community about our programs, our workshops, and also the documents we are working on, the technical documents, not the administrative boring stuff. So, this time we reported back mainly on the EDM program. That's also something that I did report to you a while ago, but you can also find it on the IAB page and also some technical drafts we're working on right now. I don't think I have anything - like there's no like big outcome out of that. It's more like explaining these things to the community and getting input from the community what we do there.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Okay. Thank you.

>> MIRJA KÜHLEWIND: Welcome.

>> TED HARDIE: Any other questions for Mirja?

>> JON PETERSON: Hi, Mirja. I just wanted to ask, I saw on one of the other slides something I've seen on slides for years about the IAB acting in some kind of advisory capacity to the Internet Society. Like how do you see that relationship these days? It's been a while since I was on IAB. Can you just kind of fill us in on that?

>> MIRJA KÜHLEWIND: Yeah. Actually, this is also something that we did discuss recently. Andrew came to us and did us a little bit of an update of the plans and strategy from ISOC, so we are a little bit more up to date there. I really think we should try to, you know, make the best out of that in the sense that we try to keep both sides up to date about what we're doing and then utilizing the capabilities we have there. One of the things we did recently is, for example, invited some people from ISOC about this content moderation that was very valuable for us, and I also discussed with Karen that we should like figure out those things more often on both sides and just like have a good communication and utilize the expertise we have on both sides. So, I hope that we can work - not work closely together but having a better overview about what the other organization

is doing so we can have a discussion when it's needed or when it's useful.

>> JON PETERSON: Thank you.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you. Any more comments or questions?

>> MIRJA KÜHLEWIND: Andrew?

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Yeah. This is really for the benefit of the trustees, but you mentioned Karen in passing there, and all the trustees may not know who you're referring to. So, Karen O'Donoghue is part of our staff, and she is the liaison from the staff to the IAB. Formally, remember that the IAB is actually an advisory committee to the Board, to all of you. So, the formal relationship is very much like the chapter advisory council and the OMAC, but we have a staff function that provides that link. We get regular feedback from her. I don't know if it would be useful to the Board to have a regular check-in with her. But if that's something you would like, I'm happy to do it.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you, Andrew. Let's take that into maybe one of the working Board sessions as a question. Any other comments for Mirja? Okay. Thank you, again, Mirja, for the report today and for sending it in early so that trustees could read it in advance. I see Jason has joined us as well, and I believe he is next.

>> MIRJA KÜHLEWIND: Yeah. Thank you. I will be off again. Enjoy the rest of the meeting.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you. Hi, Jason. How are you doing today?

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: I'm doing great. How are you?

>> TED HARDIE: Good. We have a couple of new trustees who have joined us since you were last here, and that's Brian and - Brian Haberman and Jon Peterson who I think you know. Luis, do you want to give a quick introduction to Jason?

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Hi, Jason. My name is Luis Martinez. I was selected by chapters. I'm a professor at the Iberoamericana University in Mexico City. Nice to meet you.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Nice to meet you.

>> TED HARDIE: Muhammad.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Hi. This is Muhammad Shabbir. I am from Pakistan. And I work at the National Defense University, Islamabad. And I represent chapters on the board. Thank you.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you, Muhammad. Jason, do you want to give a quick introduction and then your report?

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Sure. Of course. Yeah. Nice to meet the new folks. My name is Jason Livingood. I am Chair of the IETF's LLC Board, so sort of the administrative and legal oversight organization for the IETF. And I previously served on the Internet Society board, so I'm very familiar with the work that you're all doing. And I'm based on the - in the United States on the East Coast. Kevin, do you want me to do the slides? Oh, there we go. Awesome. Thank you.

So, what I'm going to do is really just give a summary of the report that we just presented at the past IETF meeting which was another online meeting. It just concluded yesterday, in fact. Kevin, if you can do the next slide.

Our main sponsor was Juniper, so we thanked them in the plenary and appreciate their financial support. They are one of our key global supporters. Next one.

And I won't go through all these. These are kind of proforma. Next one. Next one. Next one. Next one. Next one.

So, our next meeting is tentatively scheduled for Madrid in November of this year. We have a meeting with the IESG, the Internet Engineering Steering Group, next week to make a decision on whether or not to proceed with an in-person meeting or a hybrid meeting or to have an online meeting again. And while a final decision hasn't been made, I think we can all - I think we all assume based on the Delta variant right now that it's unlikely that we'll be able to meet in person in Madrid. And so, if you go to the next slide. One more.

So, looking ahead, you know, the IETF, for those that aren't familiar with it, has met three times a year in person all around the world and it rotates between North America or the Americas, Europe, and Asia. So, this one was supposed to be in San Francisco, but it was held online, of course, which is what we've done since the pandemic began. The Madrid meeting looks unlikely to be possible to hold in person, but, like I said, we'll decide soon. And what we typically do is we rebook those

venues for the future because there was a lot of work typically done to research those locations and to secure contracts and so on. And then the March one of next year will be potentially in Bangkok, and then Philadelphia next July. And I think at this point, this is sort of the biggest challenge facing the organization is determining, of course, when is it possible to begin in-person meetings and what does that first in-person meeting look like. It's very likely some sort of a hybrid meeting where you have a substantial number of people participating online while you have some people in person. And so, in particular, our volunteer teams, like our Tools and NOC teams, are spending a lot of time beginning to think about what that looks like from a technology standpoint and how to manage that so that everyone - everyone's participation is more or less on equal footing. So, we'll see. You know, this is the biggest uncertainty. We're, of course, not alone in facing this. We'll see what happens and our fingers are crossed for, you know, good developments in the future. Next slide.

We actually had some very good attendance numbers, 1,200 people for this meeting, which was above budget. It was great to see. Next slide.

And we've got actually two new hires on the staff, Lee Berkeley who is our new Director of Development, so the person hired to be in charge of fundraising, and Kesara who is a software development engineer. We have a huge amount of technical debt that's on our different platforms, and so Kesara is one of the folks that's taking that on, along with Robert Sparks and other folks. Next slide. Next one.

And these are our Board members. Next slide.

So, we publish all of our meetings in advance. The one thing that's notable here, which I'll mention again on the next slide, but I'll just go into detail here, is typically we have a monthly Board meeting, but in August we actually have an additional meeting which is our second IASA2 webinar. And so, for folks that aren't familiar with what that is, it's the - it's basically the administrative model or architecture, if you will, for how the IETF is run and organized and overseen. The version that created the LLC Board a few years ago was called IASA2 because it was the second iteration of that model. And when that organization was established in our sort of formative documents, we committed to doing a three-year retrospective to basically go back and review were we able to achieve all the objectives that were set forth when the organization was

envisioned, are there any open issues, et cetera. So, that consultation is ongoing with the community. And we established a variety of ways that we can take feedback from email to GitHub to webinars, office hours, et cetera. So, that's one of those things. Next slide.

So, since our last meeting in March, our last IETF meeting, these are the main things that have been taking place. We completed our second financial review and audit, got a clean bill of health for fiscal 2020. That's great. As I mentioned, we're in the three-year retrospective right now. We updated our SWOT/PEST assessment which Peter Van Roste and I helped facilitate, so strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats, political, economic, social, technical, so basically looking at the context within which the organization fits and potential risks and how to mitigate those things. And then a very minor thing, just finishing an email policy for staff accounts now that we have some new staffers coming on board. Next slide.

So, in terms of budget, we are doing fairly well. The revenue difference here, the reason for that is simply down to when we recognized the revenue from ISOC, in fact, so sort of the timing when that came and when our budget was set. That's not something I would really pay attention to. In terms of where we stand and where we're projecting to be towards end of the year in terms of net income, it will be pretty close to a wash. In our budget, we envisioned that we would have probably two in-person meetings. It doesn't seem likely to be the case. So, a lot of our costs and revenues end up going down, but we've figured out an equilibrium, a way to sort mash those on a meeting-by-meeting basis, which is good, and that's partly because we have a registration fee for those online meetings. Next slide.

And we've got lots of ways for people to contact us. The next one I think is the last. Yep, that's it.

So, that's it for the slides. Happy to take any questions that you may have.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you, Jason. Are there any questions for him? Brian.

>> BRIAN HABERMAN: The three-year retrospective, you mentioned having a bunch of different ways for people to communicate back the feedback. What's been the feedback rate like?

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Feedback rate is very, very, very low at the moment, so we are planning to send some reminders via email in the next couple of weeks just to try to drum up a little bit more feedback. I think part of that is certainly, you know, it's vacation time for many people. At the same time, you know, we want to try to elicit a little bit more feedback. And we posed in particular - I can't remember the exact number of discussion items. It might have been like three or four or five discussion items where we really wanted specific feedback from the community, and those are the ones in particular. We'll be pushing hard again.

>> BRIAN HABERMAN: Cool. Thanks.

>> PAUL EBERSMAN: So, Jason, George. Yeah. Go ahead, George.

>> GEORGE SADOWSKY: Okay, thanks. Jason, just to verify, your fiscal year is January through December.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: That's right. Yeah.

>> GEORGE SADOWSKY: And I noticed in your statement, the last slide, that you have \$20 million in reserve. Is that essentially your reserves portfolio and your investments?

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Yeah, it's reserves and endowment and things like that. But yeah, we want to make sure we've maintained, and I think it was in the formation documents I think it was like three years of reserves to be able to continue operation if there was a major interruption. We don't foresee anything in the near or medium term.

>> GEORGE SADOWSKY: That's prudent. Thank you very much.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Yeah. Sure. Yeah.

>> PAUL EBERSMAN: So, Jason, live meetings, you have a pretty good idea of how to balance the cost, and obviously when you go pure online, it's easier to equilibrium. When we get back to hybrids, most hotels have minimums and minimum attendances and the rest of those. Do you have some kind of like plan or slush for how to finesse that depending on unexpected attendance, either good or bad?

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Yeah. So, the one thing - so, Jay, who is our executive director, Jay Daley, he's been working with AMS,

the Secretariat, on this, and I guess the good thing is the hospitality industry is very flexible right now, so that's a positive, but it has been apparent in some of the conversations that they're very willing to let us reduce the meeting footprint size as needed and that will help so that we don't have, you know, huge amounts of excess space, so there seems like there's a great deal of flexibility. In particular, it seems easy to be able to take an agreement if we wanted to and move that off into the future and come up with a smaller one. But I think the big, big question will be for the next one, like maybe the first hybrid meeting, is it going to be, let's say, one location with let's say half of the people and the other half sort of distributed online, would there be a notion of like regional centers around the world that people might go to. I don't think anybody has a really great answer to that. The community is doing a lot of thinking about that. We'll see what happens. I think the other thing that we've got to figure out is what does the fee structure potentially look like because when we have had in-person meetings, entirely in-person, it was free for the participants, but when we've gone entirely online, there has been a fee, and so we're going to begin some sort of a fee consultation with the community to figure out when you have a [indiscernible] and you still have some costs to defray and it's not all met by the in-person attendance, what does that look like? And when we last did that sort of consultation for online meetings, it was like right before it happened because of how fast COVID came out. So, we're hoping to have a lot more time and involve more community comment, but we'll see. There's a lot of open questions.

>> PAUL EBERSMAN: Yeah. Just to comment on that is that, yeah, most people are still figuring out corporate travel budgets and kind of conference budgets in advance, too, so, yeah, the sooner that we can make some kind of stab at what we're going to do, I suspect that's probably good to share.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Yeah, that's a good point. And, you know, it's the other sort of complicating factor here because, as an example, we were speaking with some of the folks from our sponsor for the Madrid meeting and they said even if you held the meeting here, like we're not allowed to travel, and we don't have a travel budget, so it will be certainly complicated.

>> TED HARDIE: A quick follow-up to that, I know that in the first couple of times, there were fee waivers offered for people who couldn't afford the remote, those were sponsored. Do you continue to find sponsors for that?

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Yeah. It's continued to work as it has in the past and we get a good number, and it doesn't seem like the worries of being overrun with fee waiver requests has occurred, so people are being really reasonable about it. So, we've been pleased. It's worked really well.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you. Are there any other questions for Jason? Luis.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Yes. Have you considered the possibility that you go back, or we go back to online or face-to-face sessions, and then because of the advancement of the pandemic around the world, the next place cannot be held in person, would it change a lot the plans to go back and forth from online to presential?

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: That's a good question. I don't think so. I think we are, at this point, so used to all the uncertainty here and able to sort of quickly pivot to make changes in the meeting plans that I think we'll be okay. And we know how to do online, and we know how to do in-person and we'll learn soon how to do a hybrid meeting. So, I think once those three things are, you know, might be a rotation, you know, depending upon what part of the world and where the virus is, so we'll see, but I think we'll be okay with that.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Excellent.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Yeah.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you, Jason, for the report and for the conversation after. We look forward to continuing working with you. Thanks again.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Thanks very much. Take care.

>> TED HARDIE: Glenn, welcome. You are up next. Just to give a quick introduction, I think you know Jon Peterson and Brian Haberman from the IETF, but Muhammad, would you like to introduce yourself to Glenn?

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Yes. Muhammad Shabbir from Pakistan.

>> GLENN DEEN: Hello, Muhammad.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Hello.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: My name is Luis Martinez. I am a professor at Iberoamericana University in Mexico City. Nice to meet you.

>> GLENN DEEN: Hello, Luis. Nice to meet you.

>> TED HARDIE: And Glenn, if you could go ahead with your introduction and report?

>> GLENN DEEN: Sure. So, I'm Glenn Deen. I work for Comcast NBCUniversal in my day job. In my off time, I'm the Chair of the IETF Trust. If I can get my slides put up. Kevin, you got those slides?

So, you know, it's interesting, as Ted says, I recognize a few of the faces. I also recognize a few of the faces have either been IETF trustees or are current IETF trustees such as John. So, some of this will be material some of you have heard before. Some of this is material some of you helped put together at some point in your relationship with the IETF Trust. But next slide, please.

So, currently, there are five trustees. When the IETF spun off and created the IETF LLC, like Jason just talked about, one of the things we had to change was that, in the past, the old committee, the IAOC, which oversaw the administrative portions of the IETF, one of the things that got you if you were on the IAOC was that you became eligible to become an IETF trustee. And when we spun off the LLC and created that whole thing and blew up the IAOC and ended it, we had to create a new process for selecting trustees, and we had to figure out what does a trustee need to be? So far, that involved changing, you know, the definition of membership authorize - ability for IETF trustees, so they no longer had to be IAOC members since the IAOC no longer existed. But also, part of it involved who selects trustees and where do they come from? How it's done today is we get three selected by the IETF Nomcom, we have one selected by the IETF's IESG, and we have one selected by yourselves, and so that brings us to five people. I'm the Chair. Kathleen Moriarty is the Treasurer. Joel Halpern and John Levine and Stephan are - round out the other five trustees altogether. Together, what our mission is is to manage IP for the IETF and the broader community on the Internet. Next slide, please.

So, as I said, we manage IP. What does that mean? Well, it really means that if there are copyrights that need to be managed or protected, that's a thing we will do, and we do that

for the IETF. If there are copyrights for other materials or copyright related discussions that need to take place, we also do that. For instance, the protocol parameter registers that are - registries that are up on IANA are something that the IETF Trust provides sort of IP oversight over for the materials that come into that primarily from the IETF, but they can come into it from other places. But we look at that as like, you know, how is that being managed. Is it being managed with the intent of the community? Part of the intent of the community for IP around here is not to lock it up and make it inaccessible, but, in fact, to make it accessible, make it easy for the broad Internet to make use of, but also, at the same time, protect because if we just let some of these things - said we don't care, they're free, do whatever you want, we could get into situations where somebody might take something that we've created as a community, extend it, and then lock it away from us as a community to prevent us from even using it. So, we defend the IP while keeping the sort of general principle let's make this easy to use and accessible, and so we navigate the legal structures of IP, and that's copyrights, trademarks, but not patents, around the world, and we protect it on behalf of the community. We also do this, as I say, for IANA. We also do it for ICANN. If the ICANN IT department, for instance, wants to make changes to the domains for ICANN, one of the things that the Trust does is we actually provide a checkpoint where they have to go and say we want to make the following change, the trustees themselves actually are in the role of approving those changes. And so, we provide sort of a checkpoint to make sure that, you know, unwanted changes aren't getting made. Does that make sense? We also do some software stuff, IETF Tools, the IETF YANG catalog, and recently we've entered into an agreement with the IETF LLC, when they got spun up and created, they started creating IP as a legal entity. The question came up, well, who owns and manages the IP? Well, the LLC does a lot of things. They manage big budgets. They work on the meetings. They work on fundraising for the IETF. We said, well, the Trust does that for everybody else. Why don't we do that for the IETF LLC? And so, we just recently entered into an agreement where the LLC transferred the IP that had been created, things like badges for Quick and other things, transferred it over to the Trust for our management, and then we sublicensed it back to them and said, there, this is yours, we'll protect it, but you go off and use it however you like, and you can even sublicense it to other people. And if you have problems, you need somebody to send nasty letters, you know, if somebody is doing something bad, come back to us, we're there for you to do that for you and help you protect your IP. Next slide, please.

So, this will come up in a couple slides why I'm explaining our Trust structure. We are currently a Virginia Commonwealth Trust. We're independent of the IETF. We're independent of ISOC. That is for historic reasons. When we were originally spun up, there was a desire by members of the community who owned a lot of this IP themselves to figure out where is a nice, neutral place to house and protect this IP, and so they spun up the IETF Trust. If you spun it up today, you might not have called it the IETF Trust. You might simply have called it like, you know, the big Internet IP protector for the Internet community. I don't know. Something else. Because sometimes just calling it the IETF Trust gets a little confusing and it makes people think you just do IETF stuff. We don't just do IETF stuff. We do more. And you can see there we have a website trustee.ietf.org. As I covered, there are five trustees. Trustees themselves are not lawyers typically. They don't have to be lawyers. If you are a lawyer, you can still be a trustee. We don't hold that against you. But the role of the trustees is instead of just handing this over to a law firm or a legal group, if you did that, you might end up with capture from one particular legal viewpoint, they may not represent the community, so by having five trustees that sort of guide this and listen to the community, engage with the community, and then represent the community's interests with dialogue with the community when we want to make changes, we provide that sort of community balance, just like yourselves provide that balance for ISOC, and the LLC Board provides that for the IETF LLC and the IETF community. We're small. We have a small budget. It's around \$100,000. Most of that we actually spend on support, lawyers, and things like registrations. We have services that will monitor domains to see if they change. But we're very small. We try to have a diversity of funding. We get a lot of our funding from the IETF. In the past, it was from ISOC. But we also get contributions. In the past, from Google, NBC, Tencent have contributed. And we continue to look for places where it makes sense for us to do outreach and seek small contributions. We do not want to build a big war chest. That's not us. We just want enough really to cover our operating costs and have a little bit of reserve in the bank in case something goes bump in the night. Next slide, please.

So, what have we been doing? Well, I mentioned the IETF LLC IPR transfer, so we took over some stuff from them and then licensed it back. We've been working on the IANA parameters registry. It turns out that while the stuff there is intended to be easily accessible without additional controls. In fact, much of it isn't subject to copyright because of the way copyright

laws shake out. It's confusing. And we've had questions come in from adopters and users of that stuff wanting clarification. So, we did a consultation with the IETF and said, you know, we want to officially declare this stuff and be much more open and here's how we're going to go about doing it. The IETF looked at it and said sounds great. We continue to work with ICANN to get the right balance. We're working with ICANN and IANA, the legal staff over there, to make sure the way we do this expresses the intent correctly and doesn't start infringing upon anybody else's stuff like IEEE's that are also in the IANA registry. So, it's a little bit complicated. We're getting there. It's a slow process. Sometimes it can get extra slow when you deal with lawyers, but that's life. That's what we do. We also protect, in addition, copyrights, logos, trademarks, so like the IETF logo. We're a fashion consulting place. We get to approve IETF t-shirts, and the primary purpose there is that we don't want people taking the IETF artwork and the logo and creating something brand new that is a hybrid that might be a derivative of work that they might own part of, and so we take a look at the shirts to make sure that the shirts themselves are conforming to the usage rules around those logos and those marks. Next slide, please. We're almost done.

So, what's going on in 2021? Well, one of the big things we're talking about is do we need to restructure the Trust from the current registration in Virginia to something else. It wouldn't necessarily be an LLC. I put that on here sort of as a to let people understand where we're thinking the direction would be. The idea here is that when this was created, it made sense to a lot of people that it become a Trust the way it was registered. As time has gone on, that sort of has not become the best practice in the legal community. And one of the things that's showing up is things like when we as trustees, you know, we're personally on the - on the list for people that could potentially be sued for these marks and for these registrations and for bad actions, so we carry insurance on ourselves. Well, we have trouble now increasing that amount of insurance because we're a trust and the insurance companies look at us and go that doesn't seem right, that just doesn't make sense that you guys would be that structure, we're not going to write you any additional insurance. We'll give you insurance, but we're not going to increase the amount. And so, one of the things we're right up against is, well, how do we do that? Well, maybe one of the things we need to look at is restructuring ourselves legally, still do all the same functions, nothing else would change in that regard, but just how we register the legal entity, so that when we interact with these other parties, we

look like they expect us to look like and we follow sort of legal best practice as of today for how we're registered and structured. And I emphasize that because sometimes people get a little freaked out when we say that. We're not trying to change the Trust. We're not trying to add anybody new. We're not trying to expand our scope. It would just be a sort of almost a clerical level legal registration change of how we're structured as a legal entity. Next slide, please.

This is how you can reach us. You can mail us, the trustees. You can go to the website. We have stuff there to contact us. Or you can talk to John Levine who is also a trustee, and he's one of you, or you can email me. We're very friendly people.

And with that, any questions?

>> TED HARDIE: Thanks very much, Glenn. Any questions or comments for Glenn?

>> GLENN DEEN: At least one. Somebody has to say something.

>> JOHN LEVINE: Hi, Glenn. Just for clarification, if we reorganize, we'd reorganize as a non-profit corporation. It turns out there's no such thing as a non-profit LLC. But as you said, it's just paperwork and the actual operation of the actual trustees and the people we talk to and the things we do would all be the same. It would end up saving a fair amount of money because our insurance agent tells us that it's practically impossible to get the kind of insurance we need for a Trust and it's much easier for a corporation.

>> GLENN DEEN: And a lot - of course, we're not going to - we don't go off and do this Friday night one time in a back alley. We're going to do a consultation with the community and say this is what we're planning to do, here's why we're doing it, let's get your input, let's talk about what makes sense, and then we would act.

>> TED HARDIE: Luis.

>> MIKE GODWIN: So, let me just - let me just ask very quickly - I'm sorry, Ted. I didn't mean to interrupt. Luis, if you need to talk, go ahead.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Okay. Mine was just a quick question. There is this worry about the registration of the marks or the

trademarks around the world, but there is some protection from WIPO, right?

>> GLENN DEEN: Well, of course, we follow - we become subject to WIPO and also the Berne Convention for Copyrights, so all those things we do follow and we are protected by, but you have to execute within the framework of those legal structures. So, for instance, trademarks, one thing you have to do is you have to register it. The next thing you have to do is, of course, protect it. Protection is where we actually observe if we discover somebody say, for instance, using the IETF logo on a product. Let's say somebody decided to make a router and they said, oh, this is an officially IETF branded router product. Well, that's an example where we go and have a conversation and say you can't do that. That's not allowed. And please stop doing that. And so, and we'll see. If we had to go to court, we would, of course, do that if we needed to. Usually, these things resolve themselves with letters and lawyers yelling at each other a little bit.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: There has been a lot of cases in the past or just one-off?

>> GLENN DEEN: Well, I've only been around for about five years, and fortunately during that five-year time, we have not been sued. We haven't had to pursue anybody aggressively. We do get requests like, for instance, I would like to use these materials in the following way. We do get those requests periodically throughout the year. The trustees will take a look at them, and we will evaluate them. If they make sense and they're within the community's intent and they don't weaken our protections, we will say, sure, go ahead. A really good example of that is if, you know, according to the current rules that the IETF puts out and the Trust manages for use of an RFC, for instance, if you use the entire RFC without modification, without cutting it up and without taking snippets out, just show the RFC as it is, you don't need to talk to us. You can just go ahead and do that. We've already pre-approved that. If on the other hand you wanted to take a few lines out of the RFC and put it in your book and then do something else and take a few other lines and then maybe add some of your own special sauce around that RFC and how it said to do things and said, well, this is still really the RFC, no, you can't do that. We don't allow you to take little snippets and piecemeal them apart into new structures because there are a lot of bad things that come from that, not the least of which is confusion over the specification itself. If you have people that could like sort of do a hybrid

specification with ours and then theirs mixed in together and people couldn't tell them apart, then that would weaken overall the RFC itself, then which one is the right RFC. It would confuse people. And so, that's why we protect these things.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Excellent. Thank you.

>> TED HARDIE: Mike.

>> MIKE GODWIN: Yeah. So, I just wanted to say I'm glad that John asked the question about LLC or did the clarification on LLCs versus non-profit corporation because when I was general counsel of the Wikimedia Foundation, which was 501(c)(3) non-profit, we had a similar set of problems with our marks. We had trademarks. Although the intellectual property of Wikipedia and the other Wikimedia projects was freely licensed, we had to protect the mark so that people knew when they saw the mark that the content associated with it was free. I think you have a similar situation with regard to the RFCs where you have to invoke your trademarks to make sure that there's not misidentification of something as an RFC that is not an RFC. And that's a hard balance to strike, but we were able to do it. So, I'm sorry that this has maybe turned into more of a comment than a question because, actually, between John and Luis, I have heard my questions answered. But I do respect what you're doing. I hope you find some comfort in the fact that I at least recognize, you know, what you're doing with a mix of intellectual property protection and providing resources freely to the larger community.

>> GLENN DEEN: Thanks. You know, this is where I probably should, you know, you bring up the trademark registrations, Mike, and one of the peculiarities of the law is that you can't register trademarks to trusts.

>> MIKE GODWIN: Yeah, I know. That seems to be wrong.

>> GLENN DEEN: And so, right now, the people who actually own all these trademarks are actually John, myself, and the other three trustees. We are personally the owners of these marks. I've joked a few times and said don't piss us off, we'll go off and create our own IETF because we could because we own the trademarks. But we won't do that. Don't worry

>> MIKE GODWIN: I'm glad to hear that, but we'll track you and see if you keep your promise.

>> GLENN DEEN: And that's part of the reason also, if we go to a different legal structure, the hope is that those trademarks get owned by that legal structure.

>> MIKE GODWIN: That's right.

>> GLENN DEEN: And not the individual.

>> MIKE GODWIN: That's the right model for sure.

>> JOHN LEVINE: That is - that - that - that is - that and - the insurance are the two ongoing advantages.

>> MIKE GODWIN: Right.

>> JOHN LEVINE: It will be cheaper in the future.

>> MIKE GODWIN: Right.

>> GLENN DEEN: And, well, there's a third one, John, and that is when we get a new trustee, we have to - currently, we have in the document which is here, sign your life away, and by the way, we should tell you there's a lot of risk involved while you're about to sign, but don't worry, we carry a lot of insurance for you. And so, when we do that new structure, the hope is that that document becomes a lot less risky for the new trustees to sign.

Anyway, so that's it. Any other questions?

>> TED HARDIE: Thanks very much, Glenn, for your report and for the explanation of the work of the Trust. We look forward to working with you. And thanks again.

>> GLENN DEEN: Thanks. Hey, Ted. Can I ask you a question?

>> TED HARDIE: Sure.

>> GLENN DEEN: You seem to be running the meeting. Are you the new Chair of this group?

>> TED HARDIE: Yes.

>> GLENN DEEN: Then let me say congratulations.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you.

>> GLENN DEEN: Bye-bye.

>> TED HARDIE: Okay. That brings us to the end of the community and working group Chair's section for now. We do have one additional one in tomorrow's sessions when the Governance Reform Working Group will report. But this brings us now to the President and CEO reports. Obviously, these were all distributed and the videos were distributed some time ago, so I presume - Andrew, do you want to go straight to questions, or is there a slide you want to have up?

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: No. I don't have - I mean, I assume that everybody has looked at that presentation and doesn't need to run through it again. I've noted that there have been a number of questions as well on the mailing list. I hope that, you know, things were received there, that anything that I've answered has been answered to people's satisfaction, but I'm happy to take any questions people have.

>> TED HARDIE: Great. So, if folks have questions, please use the raise hand tool and we'll start running a queue. Laura.

>> LAURA THOMSON: Hi Andrew. Sorry, I asked the question a bit late, which was it looks like we're doing really well on a lot of our targets in the action plan, and I was curious whether in the past we had revised those targets upward at midyear. You know, if we're doing so well, then let's set them a little higher while we can.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: So, as a general rule, I don't like to move goalposts once the game has started, so I think our plan has been actually that we keep the targets where they are in the current year, but we take this into account for the setting of future targets. I will note that historically the Internet Society didn't always have a superb history of tracking these things terribly well, so the practice of sort of setting explicit targets and so on is one that the staff didn't really have historically, and so we had to learn a little bit about setting these things correctly and so on. So, you know, I think next year's will be probably a little more accurate, but I will point out that, for instance, we've also gotten better on making budgets that we actually stick to. On the whole, I think that this exercise is a good one and that's part of the reason that I don't like to move the numbers around while the year is going on.

>> LAURA THOMSON: That seems completely reasonable. Thank you.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you. Richard.

>> RICHARD BARNES: Thanks. So, Andrew, as Laura pointed out, a lot of stuff is going really well. The stuff that's not already achieved seems to be well in progress. I kind of wanted to ask the reverse question. Where do you think the biggest kind of risk points are for us in the remainder of the year?

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Well, I mean, one thing, of course, is that the financial numbers, particularly with respect to org members, are not all that we would hope, and that's an area where, you know, we're still struggling a little bit. One of the things that I have tried to point out to the staff more than once because, you know, people are sometimes a little unhappy about this. The thing about particularly large corporations that, you know, are some of the ones that we've lost is they don't turn real quickly, right, so the problem is that it took a while for some of them to leave and then they realized, oh, actually, you know, we're not getting what we need out of the Internet Society, so it will take us time to win those people back, and so that's one of the risks, that there's more of this softness that we haven't really fully understood, so I think that that's a big risk.

There remains, obviously, just operational risk from the realities of COVID. I mean, we don't know what else could happen. It feels like 2020 is still going on in some ways and it's a gift that keeps on giving. So, I think that, you know, that remains a very serious risk. And more generally, there is this enormous risk, I think, going on for the very nature, the very meaning of the Internet Society, and that is that the public discourse has turned against the Internet to a large extent. I think that what we see is, you know, certainly when I first got connected to the Internet, I mean, if you asked anybody at the time, you know, do you want an Internet connection, everybody would have been enthusiastically, yes, that's a great idea, I love the Internet, it's fantastic. Just on Thursday I guess it was, the Canadian government brought out this plan for what they're going to do about online - online harms, and their plan is basically, well, we're going to create a tsar that's going to like decide what good speech on the Internet is like. I mean, this is, you know, we no longer have to worry about totalitarian governments who don't like the Internet because, you know, democratic governments that have

been long in support of it have now kind of turned against it, and I think that that's a sort of existential risk for the Internet Society. I think that's the thing that really keeps me up at night.

>> TED HARDIE: Paul.

>> PAUL EBERSMAN: Yeah. So, I was going through the renewals, and having gone through this with other non-profits also of the how do you get people to renew, one of the things was that there were a fair number of these fail to renewals where we simply no longer had - or your renewal people had no longer anyone to talk to at those organizations. Do we do any form of vaguely LinkedIn like sharing of I know somebody at or does anybody on the Board because I know that with investment and VCs is one of the values they bring in is who they know, and so we used to get in the habit of asking the Board do you have a contact with this customer that can help us get an in? Are we doing anything like that?

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: We do. Yes. But there is a deeper problem hiding underneath this, which is a lot of our - a lot of our organizational - sorry, we stopped using organizational, we're going to use organization - a lot of our organization members have - we have different kinds of organization members, and some of them really are members as organizations, but a chunk of them are really, you know, kind of individual members who happen to be employed by somebody, and when the person goes, the interest of the organization wanes as well. And what we need to do, and this is, I think, what the team is working very hard on, is to provide more general value for organization members so that the organization sees an organization reason to be involved with the Internet Society. I think we're getting better at it. I don't think we've got all the way there yet. But I believe that we're headed in the right direction because the team has started thinking in those terms and we've had some changes in the staff that have really been addressing some of that.

>> PAUL EBERSMAN: Value propositions that translate to dollars, which is really what gets them up the chain at corporations is the challenge. Good to hear that you're working on that. Thanks.

>> TED HARDIE: I have a question about MANRS. In the discussion, it sounded like you were looking at how it was going to be spun out in the future or what its future organizational home was going to be, one of the two options was that it might

be a supporting organization a la IETF LLC and one might be that it's a fully independent organization. Maybe you could walk us through what the advantages and disadvantages were from the perspective of MANRS and what we as the Board might end up having to decide about that, if anything.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Well, you'll definitely have to decide something in the event that it is within the - within our own organization. One of the questions really boils down to a question of like how much organization are they going to want. And because of the - because of the way that - because of the way the participants in MANRS are working with one another, it might be that they actually need to - they actually need essentially a lobbying organization, an industrial association of some kind. And if that's the case, then probably they need to be a standalone organization. We've got to spin them out fully and they're not part of the Internet Society. The problem is that a lot of the participants like the link to the Internet Society and would like to stay somehow inside the Internet Society, and so they've looked at the IETF model as one that seems valuable. So, I think the community is still discussing this. I think that's the real critical thing. Not everybody - I don't think that there's a total consensus on this, and there may be some stratification among the participants. That is, you know, smaller operations are more keen to be sort of within the Internet Society and very large operators are much more likely to want to join an industry association of some kind because they have, you know, they have different sort of mental models for the organizations who are part of it. So, I don't - I mean, I don't - I don't know what - how this is going to sort itself out. It really is something that we're trying to facilitate within the community, so I can't really - I can't really say which way it's likely to - likely to fall.

>> TED HARDIE: There's no deadline you've given them to work this out?

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Well, I mean, the idea is that this is supposed to start taking effect next year, so they've kind of got to get it together. My understanding is that the conversation is drawing to a close and that they're going to probably be making a recommendation sometime in September or thereabouts.

>> TED HARDIE: Brian, I saw your hand and then it went down. Did you have a question?

>> BRIAN HABERMAN: That's because you asked the exact question I was going to ask Ted.

>> TED HARDIE: Okay. Are there other questions for Andrew at this time? Jon?

>> JON PETERSON: My first time using the raise hand tool on this. So, since nobody else wants to dive in on this one, I guess, I want to go back to your existential threat, Andrew, because I agree with you deeply, actually. I guess my question is what's the plan? Like if that's the biggest threat, like, you know, where is there any traction to get on that?

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Well, it's a good question. The reason for the Internet Way of Networking project over the last two years has really been to try to build the policy framework that we can - we can use to try to - try to draw the - draw the discussion in a different direction. Now we've got to use it. Now we've got to start doing these things. That was the reason for the emphasis in that project on this impact assessment toolkit because the observation was that, you know, for environmental changes, for instance, things that people are going to change when they build a road or a dam or whatever, you have to do this assessment. In a lot of countries, it's a legally mandated one. It's pretty clear to us at least that many of the things that people are doing are attempts to, you know, they really involve this is the handle I got, so I'm going to start - I'm going to start messing with, you know, the definition of what an online service is, for instance, and that kind of thing has these consequences, and so what we hope is that by using this tool, we can say to people, look, you haven't done this analysis, and what you're going to, you know, you're going to pollute the lake, you're going to - you're going to destroy this environment. That's the tool that we've got right now. But I say this - I think that the staff are getting tired of hearing me say it all the time - like, you know, our - the people who are opposed to the Internet, who don't want it, who want to tear it down and so on, are like national governments who can literally print money and some of the largest and best capitalized corporations in the history of humanity. We've got less than \$50 million and a handful of volunteers. That's what our army is, right? And so, we're in a perilous situation and we need to make the organization as strong as possible and to speak with one voice. That's why you keep hearing these attempts to like get us focused on just our stuff, because without that focus, we're never, you know, we're just going to be scattered all over the place. I think, you know, I believe that we've

improved quite a bit in this respect over the past couple of years, but now we've really, really got to join that fight, you know, all the time, every time it crops up. I think it's very difficult to do given the number of countries there are in the world who are trying to adopt legislation that is really quite harmful to the basic infrastructure of the Internet.

>> JON PETERSON: A quick follow-up, okay, Ted?

>> TED HARDIE: Yes, please do.

>> JON PETERSON: I mean, I learned something I was pretty ignorant of, you know, on our onboarding about the limitations on lobbying that are imposed on us because of our IRS status. Do those obligations, I mean, what can we do internationally? Is there anything that's like different internationally for lobbying, or is that like totally illegal? I actually don't know the law about this at all.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: So, it's - it - the lobbying definition is global. So, at any time we talk to any government about specific legislation, we have to pay attention to that. We've got this tracking device that we have and I get sign-offs and all the rest of it. We made the election we did the year we did it because, prior to that, we hadn't been taking that election. We made the election we did precisely because we could see, oh, wow, like we're going to have to start talking to legislators and we're going to have to do it all the time. So, we've got this limitation. We are working very, very hard to make sure that we are - we stay entirely within the bounds of our legal obligations and so on. It is - it's a cramp. It's a cramp on us because we have this additional problem that, you know, I mean, it's one thing, obviously, you know, there are definitely governments in the world who have long been hostile to the Internet and that was never a surprise and it would be nice to try to do something about that, but the reality is we can't. But I am, you know, beside myself with worry about the fact that, you know, like Canada, the United States, France, Britain, I mean, these are countries that historically led the development of this infrastructure and now it looks to me like, unthinkingly probably, they are going to tear it down because of reasons that I think are valid public policy reasons. But it's really a threat to this infrastructure, and that's really - that's really what's worrying about it.

>> TED HARDIE: Luis.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Sorry, I had the mic closed. When you speak about all these threats and the need to access it in a more monolithic way and with a sense of direction, it's - I agree very much with that. But I get worried about the community consultation when you see that the priority for the individual members is to expand rather than protect or defend. Yes. So, I don't know. I think there is not a simple answer, but I think we should develop some strategy to enforce these counteract, defend strategies amongst the individuals and to reinforce what the organization members were setting as a priority, which is - I don't remember well - was protect. Right?

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: So, I do think it's important to recognize that, you know, the materials for the Internet Way of Networking are not - it's not a sort of simple thing that you can grab hold of very easily. It's really a sort of conceptual one and we've got a lot of work to do in order to make this clear to people and get people to understand, you know, what the advantage is. The other thing about it, of course, and this is another issue that we face, we are the Internet Society, so basically every one of our members thinks that the Internet is great and can't understand why anybody would like not want it and so on. And so, we don't have the - we don't have the population within ourselves that sort of naturally says, oh, yes, this is - this is under - under real threat, unless you're facing these things all the time. And so, I think that there's a whole lot of people who have joined who are really looking at us to sort of try to - try to expand access and make sure that people have access to the Internet and make sure that they have access to the tools and training that we provide and so on. But for the Internet, I mean, if we're an advocacy organization for the Internet, our problem is that we need everybody to understand the value of this thing. I think that's something that we've still got to do some more work on on those materials, but I think we've got a solid foundation. I think that that's the good news about it. I believe that that project went a long way to make it very, very clear and to provide the necessary materials for people to be able to do the advocacy that we hope they will.

>> TED HARDIE: So, I have three people in queue right now, myself, Robert, and then Muhammad. I'll make my own quick. The two things are, one, my experience with governments is that it is far, far more effective dealing with them not just telling them they shouldn't do X, if you can say do Y instead because they want to do something, and if you just say don't do X, the resistance to that message is just extraordinarily high, not

nearly as high if you can say do Y, it's the right way instead. The second point is the Internet Way of Networking as a set of documents and as a set of approaches, I think, is compelling, as you say, as a foundation and advocating for that foundation is good, but it's not yet a call to action. I think you saw from my exchange with Joyce on her presentations, I strongly believe that if we are going to get the Society as a whole as opposed to the staff to act on this, you need a compelling call to action, and formulating that I would suggest is top of - top of the list of things for what you and your seniors staff need to be doing both to bring members in in general and, in particular, to focus them on this issue because that call to action can move us beyond the lobbying activities to which we are permitted to the kinds of activities which the other parts of the Society as organizations, as individuals, as chapters can and will do because they are independent actors, their limits are not the same. So, I strongly encourage you to consider how to create a call to action. Robert, you're next.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Thank you. So, Andrew, I completely agree with your urgency. You know that, I mean, we've worked together on these issues. I also would agree, Ted, that we're many years beyond just saying, no, we have to find alternatives, but part of that, I think, is something that we're already beginning to do. Andrew, you alluded to it. That, frankly, through the gathering of the data about the Internet, but I think we can go beyond that in terms of how people are using it, how they're benefitting, but also understanding why there are people who are not online or are not benefitting as much, I think, does become part of the compelling arguments in crafting the alternatives. There are many times that governments are jumping in with solutions, but they have not clearly articulated the problem that they're trying to solve for. That's always the first question I think we need to be asking. What's the problem you're solving for, and then are there ways that we as the Internet Society building a community can help solve - help them solve those problems because oftentimes the solutions that we're seeing that we understand are counterproductive actually are not related to the problems they're trying to solve.

Finally, in terms of governments, I think it's a little oversimplified, but it works. Right? It's a two-by-two. There are governments that are well-intentioned and those that are not. There are governments that are well informed and then there are those that are not. Many times, what we see are well-intentioned governments that are not well-informed proposing or taking actions that have adverse consequences even contrary to

what they're trying to achieve. So, part of what we're doing and what we can do as the Internet Society, and we'll be doing more of it, is through the - is helping governments become better informed to understand. We're seeing - and there's unfortunately a persistence, and I would argue a growing number, of governments that are ill-intentioned, and some of those are extremely well-informed, and those are the most difficult to combat. And then you have those that are ill-informed and ill-intentioned and that's just more difficult to deal with. And each of you mentally go through that two-by-two and think about the kinds of responses that we're seeing from different governments for different purposes.

Just one example without naming the country. There was a country that began to impose taxes on the Internet and on Internet usage. One of the arguments - by the way, a number of us predicted, well, that's going to reduce - people are going to drop off the Internet, right, thinking that that was a bad thing. One of the responses from one of the government officials was that's the point, right, because they don't - some governments don't want people online, so that would be what I would think of or put into the quadrant of ill-intentioned, well-informed. I think - so, Andrew, to your point and to the agenda is, I think, we have to be more strategic in thinking about how to respond, but also, you know, look, the vast, vast majority of governments and the billions of people who want to be online, they see the benefits of the Internet, and I think we can really help, you know, improve the information, the capacity, but also the compelling arguments on why it's important to be connected.

>> TED HARDIE: Muhammad, you may still be on mute.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Am I audible?

>> TED HARDIE: Yes.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Okay. Thank you, Andrew. This really was an enlightening presentation that we viewed a couple of days back. It's just an interesting discussion as well. One thing that I just wanted to highlight here, and perhaps if not immediately, in the near term, or in the longer term plans, you can think of is that Internet connectivity and the tagline of ISOC, Internet is for everyone, when we interpret this line, it should mean that meaningful connectivity, a person who, and I have seen people who just want videos on Facebook or YouTube, is also connected to the Internet, and also a person who connects

to the Internet goes online, does some business, sends some money abroad, or within the country, it's also connectivity, but you may agree with me that this is a next level of the connectivity. While we can discuss the benefits of both and both users, their priorities, we would also agree that everyone has the right to connect meaningfully to the Internet. I have seen people, particularly people with disabilities, confusing services - or not using the services of certain banks and financial institutions just because the service was not accessible. When I say accessible, I mean that there are certain hitches where it would require some other assistance, some outside assistance for them to use their service. So, this, I mean to say that when you prepare your next set of communications, you can include that it's not just the connectivity. This is the way that Internet Society is defending the Internet because if everyone is using Internet meaningfully it becomes more important for them to defend and also the stakes are included for everyone. Thank you.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you, Muhammad. Andrew, that's a lot to chew on. Do you want to chew on it a little bit, or answer now?

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Well, so, I mean, we are part of the - I am Commissioner in the Broadband Forum in the UN and that forum is very strong on this line of meaningful connectivity. From the Internet Society's point of view, what is meaningful connectivity is dependent on you. I don't think that the Internet Society has a view about what people ought to do with their connections. The nice thing about the Internet is that it's this general-purpose technology which means that you can do what you want with it, and that fact that you can do what you want with it is part of the - part of the advantage that we see. So, I think that that part - that piece of our emphasis in the Internet Way of Networking project about how this is a general-purpose technology that can be used for all kinds of different things is a core part of what the Internet Society is after in trying to promote the Internet. But I completely agree with you that the more people rely on the Internet, the more important it becomes to them. I think that what's interesting is that this current drift in public policy is chipping away at that general purpose and instead making it really a transport mechanism for a few very large corporations and that is a really dangerous drift and that's why I get so concerned about it.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you. We do have Rinalia's report up next as part of this general discussion, so I suggest we move to that now, and then if there's time at the end, we can return to more

general discussion. I'm sure an existential question for the Society and for the Internet as a whole will occupy us for more than the allotted time, so why don't we move to the practical matters of the budget and membership that Rinalia shared with us. Rinalia.

>> RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Ted. I hope that I've provided a clear enough overview of our planning process for the organization that essentially helps us develop the annual action plan as well as budget. So, I'm happy to address any questions that you may have about that.

>> TED HARDIE: So, first, I'd like to thank you for addressing the questions that I had for you in advance. That was very helpful. There was one tiny follow-up I wanted to do. You listed some of the members who are already involved in the encryption project and I wondered if you had a target number of members you wanted involved in that or a percentage of members you expected to be involved in that and how that process was going to go, just a little tiny bit of additional data if you have it.

>> RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: So, we don't have targets for organizational members. What I've been doing in terms of the success measures related to the project leaders and what they're supposed to deliver is to encourage them and the project teams to integrate the ISOC community as much as possible across the board so the org members, the chapter members, as well as the individual members. It is a work in progress, but I would like to share with you a little bit of data on where we stand at the end of last year in terms of participation in projects. It's in the chat right now.

So, you would recall in my response to your email that I had said, okay, the survey response this year is low, but last year was worse. So, while last year was worse, by the end of the year, we actually got pretty good involvement across our community, for example, 59% of org members got involved in projects, and the bulk of them are, of course, in MANRS, but still there are others who are involved across the other projects. Also, 49% of chapters in good standing also got involved in projects, 1,871 individual members ended up did something related to projects primarily because we've had the training called the fundamentals that informed our community members about what the projects are about, what are the issues that they are trying to tackle, and this is part of the training where 77% of chapters participated in it and then more than 500

people who participated in the training actually implemented something post-training that supported the projects themselves. So, that's not bad.

I also wanted to show you where we are at mid-year along the same lines. Here we are. Even though we have the survey response, this is not bad for mid-year. In terms of org members, we are at 40%, chapters at 37%. I expect these numbers to be higher by the end of the year. And then the indirect support or involvement is that chapters doing activities on their own just after learning what the projects are about and then they are doing it in the areas that the projects are activating, and also we have more than 3,000 individual members that are engaged. So, that's the additional data point that I want to give. The short answer to your question is I don't have a target, but we will know by the end of the year in terms of how high they can go.

>> TED HARDIE: I really appreciate the additional data. Thank you. Luis.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: That's me, right, Ted? Thank you. Hi, Rinalia. Thank you very much for your presentation. I sent you some points and questions through the email. The only thing that worries me is about the statistical certainty of the results because the sample is so small that we can doubt about the results. But making the calculations, then there is not that big error because we are talking about plus/minus 4%. Yes, theoretical. But do we have any plan to improve this response rate? I know that only about 65% of the individual members get the communications because of the mail-out option. But do we have any plan to improve the response rate to get more accurate responses, or we should think about other ways, such as focus groups or maybe something more controllable?

>> RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: So, last year when we did our survey, we didn't just do the survey, we also had dedicated calls just to get more feedback qualitatively by discussing it with community members. This year, we didn't do it because we have a follow-up process as part of the action plan process that I have presented, which is different parts of the organization go back to the community to get them more involved based on areas that they are interested in. But I also wanted to get a bigger context on survey responses for ISOC. Last year, we had several consultations, and I noted a pattern. When our community members are interested enough in the topic, they will respond. For example, there was a consultation on learning needs last year, and the response rate was almost 3,000 respondents across our

community. Second example. The consultation on the new fellowship program, we had slightly over 1,000 respondents. A third example is the consultation on strategic goals, which is the definition of what is open, globally connected, secure, and trustworthy Internet, which can be a little bit controversial because there is a diversity of opinions in our community, but the response rate was also slightly over 1,000. So, when it comes to the action plan priorities and what it focuses on itself, two years now we've done the consultation, and the response rate is low. So, my sort of just hunch about it is that they are not too interested in it at that level, but some of them who are interested will engage directly in the projects and activities themselves, and they find other ways to do what they are interested in. Certainly, we can take measures to improve by adding the focus groups itself and building in the confidence points in the survey results, if you prefer it that way. But my sense is it will not be a huge improvement. I could be wrong.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Thank you.

>> RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Welcome.

>> TED HARDIE: Pepper.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: So, Rinalia, this is very helpful. To your last point, it is difficult to increase the numbers. But what I wanted to ask was - and I don't know of a way to do it - but my intuition is that if we benchmarked it against other similar organizations, right, that are doing sort of actually a lot of good work, that the relative number of respondents would not be all that different. So, I'm not sure that this is something that is necessary - we always can try to do better, and we need to do better, but I wouldn't beat up on ourselves necessarily. I was wondering whether there is a way to benchmark against other similar organizations, maybe in other areas, and that may be something that you want to do or the staff wants to do because I suspect it's not going to be very much different in other sectors or other parallel types of organizations.

>> RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Pepper. I will look into that and see. If Board members have ideas on what those organizations might be, I would greatly appreciate it.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you. Are there any other comments on this point? Any other questions or comments for Rinalia's report? I will have one final question. You said everybody is looking forward to the replacement of Member Nova. I join you. I

am also looking forward to the replacement of Member Nova. Do we have a theory on when this happy day will occur?

>> RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: It is part of the plan for this year. It is under Sandy's area of responsibility. I am sure she will - I am sure she will get it done.

>> SANDY SPECTOR: Thank you, Rinalia. It's in the process now. We're working on it.

>> TED HARDIE: And happily, we'll be moving onto Sandy's report next so she can fill us in on that along with everything else. Thank you very much, Rinalia. We appreciate it.

>> RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Most welcome. Thank you.

>> TED HARDIE: We are running a little bit ahead, but I think probably best to just go ahead and power through unless anybody feels a strong need to take a quick break now. Okay. Let's go onto Sandy's report then. Sandy.

>> KEVIN CRAEMER: This is a closed session, Ted, so we should probably move to the other Zoom room.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you very much for reminding me. So, thank you to our observers and to those who have been watching. Because this report is financial in nature, it will be an executive session. Thanks.

**Transcription provided by:
Caption First, Inc.
P.O. Box 3066
Monument, Colorado 80132
877-825-5234
www.captionfirst.com**