

**Internet Society
Board of Trustees Meeting 161 - Day 2
14 November 2021
Transcript**

>> TED HARDIE: Thanks, everybody, for joining us for day two of the November 2021 ISOC Board of Trustees Meeting. The first agenda item for today is the presentation of the 2022 Action Plan. Andrew?

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Thank you. I think, Kevin, there are some slides.

The - the purpose of the Action Plan in any given year is really to tell us what the Internet Society and in particular, what the staff function the Internet Society is going to tackle in the upcoming year. So, that's what we're going to present to you today. Next slide, please.

Oh, and for the recording, of course, I'm Andrew Sullivan. I'm the President and CEO of the Internet Society but the rest of you already knew that.

Now, the interesting thing about this coming year, well, it's actually just a couple of weeks from now but the Internet Society is about to turn thirty. And when the Internet Society was formed, of course, the Internet was a very different place. It had a lot of different functions. The web was only a couple of years old and it didn't have graphics yet. So, that gives us, you know, some sort of situation in time.

Some other things that are worth thinking about at that time. The NSF Net Acceptable Use Policy hadn't actually ended yet and so there were all kinds of restrictions on what you could do with the Internet and you know, it was a very different place.

But the future of the Internet was looking bright. Everybody was very enthusiastic about the Internet. People thought, hey, this was a - this was a good thing, if they even knew what the Internet was.

There was this - this hope about what the Internet was going to do and that is not the situation that we're facing with the Internet today. People do not feel anymore that the Internet is an untrammelled good. They don't feel anymore that the Internet

is something that brings us all of the benefits that the Internet actually does because we live with it all the time.

So, what we see are the negatives. We see the problems.

So, the next thirty years are going to be a really serious issue for the Internet. And the Internet doesn't have a voice on its own. That's us. We have to build and promote and defend the Internet. We have to - we have to do this so that this tool can continue to benefit people.

We have - we have a tremendous tool here at our disposal, something that is - it is a remarkable achievement in many ways, that people would invent a tool that gives the control over how that tool can be used to the people who are implementing it as opposed to any other authority. It's designed that way and all of the rest of the things that we've built around it in order to try to control it and so on are really add-ons to a system that is fundamentally a system of individual and collective action, of something that gives us the ability to work together in order to achieve something that we want, which is to connect with one another. And that is what the Internet Society is about. And so, that's what this action plan is intended to give us, but we have to be concrete about what actions we're going to take in that - in that. So, that's what this action plan intends to do. Next slide, please.

We have to do things now because if we don't respond to the challenges that people are putting up to the Internet and to the values that made it this marvelous tool, we're going to lose it.

The alternative to, you know, the alternatives that people are proposing, these like little national nets and all the rest of it, are not another way of having an Internet. We might call it the Internet when we're done, but if we build a system like that, it's not the Internet anymore.

>> GEORGE SADOWSKY: It's not the Internet we know.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: It's something entirely other. It's a network but it's not an Internet and it doesn't have these functional capabilities of giving the opportunities that the Internet does. And so, that is why we're going to continue to focus on those features of the Internet and try to continue to promote and to build and to defend the Internet that we know and that we are advocates for.

Next, please.

So, we care about it and it's the core of what the Internet Society is for. So, this roadmap for the coming year is the way that we're going to try to make sure that the Internet is for everyone, everywhere. And we want to do that so that the next thirty years, we're still around to say the Internet is for everyone.

Next, please, Kevin.

Now, this diagram will be familiar to you who have seen presentations about prior action plans and that's because of course, we set out a plan for ourselves for 2025. So, we continue to structure things around - around these fundamental pieces that we need to make the Internet stronger, that we need to grow it so that more people have access to it. Still almost half the world's population doesn't have access and that's a terrible thing.

And we have to empower people. We have to be not just about the Internet but you know, the Internet Society, so we need to make sure that the Society part is also continued - continues to be built.

Next, please.

So, we're going to start with growing the Internet because if people don't have access to the Internet, of course then it isn't very interesting to them, all the rest of the strengthening it and all the rest of it is not that interesting too. Next, please.

The first thing, we're going to continue the program of community networks. And I think it's a really important thing to understand that the reason community networks continue to be at the core of this is because of the - of the - it's right there in the name, right? It's not just networks. We're not just building more network; we're building more community too because that way you continue to get - you continue to get the benefits of people who are - who are invested in making sure that this network continues to work for them. That's how the Internet really works, right? The networks get together and interoperate and so that's what this is.

Our plan is three new community networks and to improve seven additional - seven more next year. But we're continuing to work

to try to build case studies and so on and that's because people don't understand why this works. So, we have to give them the tools in order to advocate for this approach and we're going to make sure that at least a thousand people have these relevant case studies and so on so that they can advocate for this style of networking.

And we're going to continue our - our focus on training, on building the capacity that people have in order to deploy these kinds of systems. Next, please.

Peering infrastructure remains a focus. Peering infrastructure is very, very good in some parts of the world and remarkably bad in others. And so, what we're going to do is we're going to focus on the places where peering infrastructure is not so good, we're going to try to develop three new ones. We think that we've got three that are pretty good probabilities of success. We're also going to try to help ten existing IXPs mature and advance.

There is this problem with IXPs, right? You get them off the ground and then they - then they really need to be sustainable and you need to make sure that that sustainability is a long-term sort of thing because of course, when people start unplugging from them, they quickly go south.

So, that's a - that's an important part of what we're going to do and the goal here ultimately is to try to keep Internet traffic locally accessible. As - as latencies go up and so on, you know, the experience of the Internet gets quite a bit worse and so the idea is to try to keep local traffic local and that's - that's the aim of all of this. Next, please.

Another important part of this, and this will be familiar from the - this year's action plan, but we're actually breaking the effort in two. So, the work on sustainable technical communities is identified as a separate effort here. And so, we're trying to provide the technical expertise, the training and best practices and so on. So, we're going to try to establish five new communities and make sure that at least 1,800 people participate in our courses related to the network operations and so on. We think this is achievable. This is quite a bit higher than last year but of course, as you saw in our report yesterday, we've actually already exceeded our targets from last year, so we've increased the targets.

Next, please.

Measuring the Internet continues to be a focus and this is important because the - the discussions around how the Internet works and so on are frequently poorly informed by data. They are frequently full of you know, hand wavy statements about how things work and so we want to make sure that people actually understand this.

We're really, really trying to make sure that the Pulse platform continues to be - to be useful for people. Remember, this is a sort of clearinghouse of various other datasets. We're not developing datasets ourselves yet. And so, we're going to try to develop new partnerships with four data and research providers and we're going to try to make sure that - that this becomes a mainstream tool. So, we're looking for media mentions, you know, largescale media mentions to make sure that this platform continues to build its public presence.

But we want to make sure also that it's used by the Internet community and so we really want to drive that up as well and that's the reason for the page views and social media engagement number here.

Next, please.

Now, this is a new area of focus that we're going to - we're going to start this year having to deal with low earth orbit satellites. There's a lot of new - noise about low earth orbit satellites. There's a lot of these taking off. It's an interesting area - I was about to say an interesting space but it was unintentional. Now I've made it intentional, I guess.

It's an interesting area of focus because it appears that this could - this could be a really useful development for the Internet.

On the other hand, it's not like this is the first time people have suggested this and previous attempts have not really worked out that well because of course, space is expensive and difficult.

Never the less, we really want to - to develop a serious position about this because the Internet Society does not currently have a position at all and so we're going to do this in the community and we're going to run through our policy development process and then the Internet Society will have an opinion, an official opinion, about whether low earth orbit

satellites are really a useful plan for how we're going to extend the Internet or whether they're actually a drag on other kinds of deployments such as fiber and so on.

Next, please.

We also have to work to strengthen the Internet because, as I said at the - at the outset, the Internet is under assault. People mistrust it now in a way that they did not once. And so, we need to make sure that the Internet is strong so that people can embrace it and make sure that they - they want to continue to use it. Next, please.

We have been working now for a couple of years on this program that we call the Internet Way of Networking. What this really is though, of course, is an explanation of a style of how you build networks. The way that the Internet is built is different from other kinds of networks and I think a lot of the public discussion about it doesn't understand that.

We've now got solid materials that people have started to embrace. They understand, I think, at least some people understand how this analytic tool can be useful. Now what we want to do is take that mainstream and make it the foundation of our future policy discussions.

So, what you will see is that the Internet Way of Networking will gradually become just a set of tools that we use rather than a project. So, this year will be the last year for this defined project and it will just become a theme that carries through our work, but we've got some work to do on that still.

So, we still need to have two new modules, one about the key enablers for the Internet, and another to train people on how to conduct the impact assessments. These impact assessments, I think they're a very, very useful tool, just as environmental assessments are, for instance, when you build roads and dams. When you make policy about the Internet, you should do an assessment of what the effects are going to be and so that's what that's for, but we've got to teach people how to do it.

We're going to continue to create a repository of the analyses that people do so that this becomes a living tool that people can continue to use.

We're also going to have some in-depth training to the staff who are going to work on these issues to make sure that they've

got this at their fingertips. And we're going to develop this advocacy playbook so that we can get people the tools that they need in order to advocate for the Internet style of networking, this way that is so powerful.

Next, please.

We're going to continue our focus on encryption. Encryption remains an extremely difficult area. It's a critical function for the Internet and yet there are a lot of people who really want to take it down. So, we're going to continue our focus on advocacy.

We want two government entities, agencies or agency officials or something like that, to use Internet Society language on this. The goal is to start making these approaches common among public officials, because if we're effective with that, then gradually we can change that conversation towards our - towards our thinking on this issue.

We're going to continue with the Global Encryption Coalition. We want to have the community participate in that. We've got lots of chapters already who are involved but we want to - we want to engage more.

We want at least 750 advocacy activities. This is a high number but it's totally achievable.

We also want the growth of the Global Encryption Coalition and so we're hoping that we're going to reach four hundred members by the end of '22. Next, please.

We are continuing with the global routing project based around MANRS. We're going to continue the increase in ROA measurements. That remains an area that we want to focus.

We're going to continue the increase in MANRS participation, so we're going to get - we're going to get, you know, increases of the validation. This remains a very challenging area, as you saw yesterday, and so this is why, you know, 5% increase doesn't sound very big but actually we really, really need to measure this because if we can't measure validation, then in fact we can't measure whether - whether the system is working the way we want it to.

We want to reduce the number of participants that become nonconforming. So, some - some MANRS participants come in. I'll

come to you in a second, Richard. Some participants come in and then they fall out of conformance and so we want to - we want to reduce that.

But finally, we're continuing to press ahead with the community design and community led effort. It is likely that MANRS is going to become a new, independent legal entity. We are investigating precisely how that is and that, we expect, will be well in hand by the end of 2022.

Richard, I saw your hand.

>> RICHARD BARNES: Yeah. Just a brief comment. Previously on - I think it's something I said yesterday - I think I agree that these are the right metrics to be tracking in terms of organizational progress tracking, but it would also be useful if we could get a view kind of, of ROA penetration and validation penetration in kind of fractions of the total Internet as a way to kind of drive this. I think that would be kind of a useful view to have kind of as an internal project thing. Yeah.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: I think if we can - I think if we can be successful at measuring validation in the MANRS community, we can probably develop that tool. But like, we got to aim here first, right? So, that's really why this is - why this is so important to us.

Next, please.

In this year, we treated NDSS as a - as, you know, one of our many initiatives and it became clear to us that each year's NDSS is a distinct thing. This coming year, we're going to run this as a hybrid program, at least we currently plan to run it as a hybrid program because people are starting to travel, but it's going to be very challenging to run an academic conference in a hybrid mode. And yet at the same time, it's very clear that the all online mode has some disadvantages in terms of the hallway track and so on, and so we are going to do that.

We want to continue the success of NDSS. It's been successful so far. We want to maintain it in the top five research symposia. But we're also hoping that we're going to attract some new researchers. This is always a problem in research communities that you've got established people and then new people have a hard time penetrating. So, we're hoping to expand funding of this so that we can attract more new researchers and so on.

And we're going to continue this effort to make sure that it is relevant in the research community and the standards community. So, we're going to aim for two collaborations there.

Next, please.

This term "digital sovereignty" is kicked around a lot these days and one of the biggest problems with it is we don't know what it means. People keep using it and what they're using it for is to - is to hide sometimes things that they're trying to do, and sometimes they're trying to express something.

And what we've got to do is understand what that - what that term means or the various kinds of meanings about it and which of these things the Internet Society thinks is - is a reasonable stance for governments to take and which of these things are in fact contrary to the Internet Way of Networking.

And so, we're going to - we're going to do that. We're going to develop a policy position. We'll do this within the community. So, again, through the policy development process, in order to understand what digital sovereignty means and what the consequences are when people use those various meanings for the Internet and its fundamental design.

Next, please.

So, those are the projects that we are going to undertake, the staff led projects this year. But the rest of this is about - is about how we're going to empower people, how we're going to empower our community and the wider community of Internet users to be able to take action in favor of the Internet.

Next, please.

So, we continue to work to make sure our chapters have the - have the capacity that they need in order to do the work in favor of the Internet. So, we're going to continue to train and we're going to train five hundred chapter members on these fundamental topics, so using the - using the tools that we've developed for that already, and we're expecting that 20% of the participants will apply that knowledge and implement another activity, so some kind of training or awareness raising or advocacy in their local community.

So, what we want to see is not just, okay, well now we've inspired people to take this knowledge, but also that we see them going on and doing something with it, so we're confident that the knowledge we're spreading is in fact picking up and you know, building the community, the wider community in favor of the Internet. Next, please.

This year, we, as I mentioned yesterday, we developed this new SIGs strategy, the special interest groups. So, 2022, now we've got to actually deliver. So, we've got to turn this on. We've got - we've got the five basic ones. Now we're going to focus to supporting them, develop the workplans, support them in achieving the goals, and then we want to understand, we're going to do some measurement, of what our members think of this approach because it's possible that this will work. It's also possible that people think actually, this doesn't work. This wasn't what they wanted out of - out of this evolution.

So, you know, we're going to build on that and that way, in two years when the time is up, we will be able to look back and say, oh, okay, this is working or this is not and just as the foundation says, test, learn, and adapt, we will do the same thing here. Next, please.

We want to continue to mobilize our individual members. This focus has been building and I think that we're having some positive success with it. So, we continue to have this - this membership newsletter and we have an open rate in the - in the mid-20%. This is very, very good for newsletters for the nonprofit sector and so we're going to - we want to maintain that because we want to make sure that this continues to be relevant information for them.

We also want to build a new - a new service and that new service is really a sort of curated kind of thing. You know, there are other nonprofits who do this sort of thing where you pick topics of interest to you and you only get that tailored sort of news and you don't actually get all of the rest of the things. So, you can choose whether you want the traditional one which is just this sort of general topic or whether you want things that are focused for your - for your - for your interests.

So, we're going to build that and we want an open rate of that of 28%. This is very, very high but we're hoping that - we're hoping that by building something that is tailored, we

will - we will achieve this very, very high open rate. I think that would be a real victory. Next, please.

We'll continue our investment in the learning activities at the Internet Society. This was a high priority investment when we started it. It is starting to show the results. I think what we saw yesterday, for instance, is that we've got very, very high satisfaction among people who take those courses and we've had a lot of demand for many of those courses.

So, we plan to continue that effort. We're going to aim for 10,000 people in courses next year and we want to achieve the 92% satisfaction rating. So, we're raising our stakes a little bit by, you know, going after a larger audience. So, we anticipate that the satisfaction rate will be a little bit lower than what we're seeing today because when you get a bigger population, you know, you will inevitably attract some people who got something that they didn't want.

Next, please.

We're going to continue with the fellowships. So, the - these fellowships have been successful so far but they're really in early days and so we're going to continue with the early career fellowship. We're going to continue with the youth ambassador program for the IGF. And we're going to continue with the IETF policy programs.

The policy programs will probably undergo a revision if the virtualized IETFs continue because they're - they're proving challenging as they are but we want to make sure that we continue that support.

We also intend to launch the mid-year - mid-career fellowship. So, the mid-career fellowship is the - is the second part of the fellowship program that I introduced to you now a year ago, a little over a year ago. We're going to - we're going to, you know, complete that work so this will make a total of eighty-five fellows.

The other part of this is building the alumni network. So, we haven't - we haven't done that yet because of course the first cohort is only coming through, but over time, the idea is that we have a network of alumni who have been through these fellowships and who then support one another and continue to support one another through their careers so that, you know, we build a community around this that actually builds a whole group

of people who are talking to one another and who are advocates for the Internet and the Internet Way of Networking.

Next, please.

We're going to continue to work on our platforms. So, you know, this year we've done a lot of foundation work on that but we haven't - it's all been behind the scenes. Nobody has seen anything. We really, really want to make sure that we launch something that is solid, that the community, you know, believes in.

The big focus for next year is really the implementation of this. Get the tools out the door. Get them useful to people. And make any revisions that are necessary immediately after the launch.

Next, please.

We have to continue working on the resources for the Internet. We have to make sure that we have diversity in our funding, that we have a strong public support test, and we also want to make sure that we - we have more resources to do more work. If we had more money, we could do more things. The Internet Society benefits, of course, from its very generous funding from - from the Public Interest Registry, but our resources are tiny compared to, you know, the opponents of the Internet. We need to - we need to really step our game up.

So, we're going to aim for sponsorship at about \$390,000 and grants with targets of \$600,000. These are not super high but that's partly because what we're really trying to do is go after numbers, the broad base.

I'm much less concerned about the dollar value right now than I am concerned about the diversity of it, and so that is where we're focusing is to make sure that we get a broader base of this funding because once we've got a broad base, I think the - I think the funds will actually go up fairly quickly. The big problem that we've got at the moment is it's too narrow and we need to make sure that we broaden that. So, that's the goal of the sixteen new sources of funding here and twenty-five additional partners.

Next, please.

We're asking to and we will be asking for a designated fund for this, to - to do some work on amicus briefs. So, especially in the United States, and that's the reason the US is the target for the first year of this, a lot of policy is made through court decisions. This is less true in some other countries but in the United States, an awful lot of stuff comes through the courts and it comes through the courts with information from various people and we get requests, will you come and help us with this - with this brief, and we don't have a way to plug into that. Ilona and the rest of our lawyers are busy and we don't really have a way to - to just pick this up and say, oh yeah, that would be great.

So, what we're going to do is we're going to set aside some time and money to do this and to be ready to do it.

So, we're going to identify up to six cases that are going to set precedent for US policymaking, and then we will file briefs at appropriate US courts of law.

I recognize that this is a US only program and I am, you know, especially given where I am talking to you from, I am acutely sensitive to that, but the reality is that other legal systems work in a very different way. This is a common way to do it in the United States. If we are successful with this in the United States, we anticipate that in the future, we will broaden the focus outside the US, but in the first year, it will be only in the US.

The goal of this is also not just to be successful in building legal precedent in the United States but also to build collaboration with other - with other organizations.

We have seen in the past that sometimes our links to other organizations that are aligned with us, you know, are sometimes strong and sometimes weak, and so this is another way for us to build that, just as for instance we've had a lot of good success with a number of other coalitions where we have worked. This is another way to build that.

So, we're going to try to work with four other organizations in order to do these amicus briefs.

Next, please.

We need to do more for the Internet. The Internet Society has to be the advocate, be the advocate for the Internet because the

Internet doesn't have a voice for itself. And it is getting beaten up right now and that's terrible because it's such a marvelous tool. It is really a thing that is good for humanity. We need to make sure that it continues to be good for humanity because the Internet is for everyone.

I submit our Action Plan for the board's consideration. Thank you very much.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you, Andrew. I'm sure that there are both questions and comments. I did have one early question before we get at them and I wanted to go back to your program on digital sovereignty. Some years ago, the Internet Society had a series of efforts trying to straighten out the use of the word "net neutrality" which had rapidly moved from being a fairly specific term to being a very broad set of policy statements, some of which were completely opposed to the other policy statements which claimed net neutrality.

As I've surveyed myself, this question of what digital sovereignty means, some strong echoes have come to me in that and I suggest that as you approach this topic, you not simply think about what your position is going to be on digital sovereignty but what language needs to replace that because I strongly believe that what we're seeing here is that same sort of fracturing of discussion around a set of topics where people use the same words and don't mean the same thing at all.

And I think this is a great opportunity to take that and work both with the chapter communities that you're working with and with the Internet advocacy you're developing in the career fellowships to kind of create a cohort of people who know how to use this new language and can bring it back out.

I know this is kind of the first year of this and this particular one, but I think there really is a history here in the Internet Society community of tackling similar problems and I hope you can tap into that history as you tackle this one, which I agree, is certainly one that needs attention.

It looks like we have Luis and Pepper in queue.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Thanks, Ted.

>> TED HARDIE: Luis, you're up.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Yeah. I'm coming. Yeah, so then the - thank you, Andrew, for this extensive action plan that gives us a clear path the Internet Society is taking next year. My only concern is as you know, we have worked a lot towards diversity, equality, and inclusion, even representativeness. So, I would like to know, in this action plan, where is the - this DEI taken into account? Are we doing a specific action to improve diversity and equality throughout the organization and the impact we have on the chapters? Thank you.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: So, there are kind of multiple answers to your question. If what you're talking about has to do with the relationship between the chapters and the board and some of the discussion that has been happening with the chapters involves that, right, involves how the chapters and the board align with one another, I think it would be completely inappropriate for the staff to propose a way forward there. That is really something that I think the board has to tackle.

And so, I think that, you know, we have to be - we're aware of that.

There is some effort within the staff organization around DEI. We have a - we have a consultation. Internally, we've been working on a statement of work and an RFP that will go out to the market to see whether we can engage a consultant to help us in those efforts.

As you will probably be aware, we had an effort last year that was not completely successful and so we've been taking - we've been taking things very carefully in order to make sure that this time we - we undertake that work in a way that is entirely sensitive, you know, to the global issues facing the Internet Society staff.

This is extremely difficult right now because many organizations that can help with that sort of staffing effort or that sort of staff analysis are extremely busy and it's hard to - it's hard to get them to respond to things.

At the same time, you know, the staff organization has been under some stresses this year as you know. We lost our CFO and SVP for Business Operations who was one of the key players in - in developing this - this RFP.

And so, it has not gone as quickly as I would like. I would have preferred, in fact, that when I was speaking to you today,

we already had put out the RFP. That was the plan but we are running a little bit behind.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Yeah, thank you. And from your point of view as the CEO of the - of ISOC, is there any - any action you see from your chair, working towards this issue on diversity, equality, and inclusion throughout all the organization? Because it's - it's a task which is not only part of the CEO or the staff. It's an action that should be taken into account in every part of the organization, the individual members, the organizational members. So, just a quick view of your view as the CEO on this issue?

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Well, I think that there is a - you know, we have several different parts of our community and each one of those parts of the community has different facets related to this set of issues.

So, there are issues related to, for instance, the perspective of different parts of the organization. Sometimes there are parts of the community that complain that the Internet Society is, you know, too American, that it's got too much of a US influence. At the same time, there are realities about our - about our legal status that mean that, you know, certain US focus points are just going to have to be there. We - you know, we don't have an option of saying no, the IRS is wrong about this and actually there are better ways to do it.

Unfortunately, you know, I mean, I might feel that the IRS is wrong about lots of stuff but I'm not really in a position to say, you know, so we're not going to follow that.

Other things are places that I think we actually have quite a lot of focus and we have - we have a very diverse - a very diverse community. But not all of that diversity is reflected in all of our discussions about this. And this is a problem that I think the community has to tackle, that the reality is, for instance, on several of our mailing lists, whether we like it or not, very frequently it is the same voices, and unfortunately, those voices are overwhelmingly male and are overwhelmingly of one generation and are overwhelmingly of a certain sort of profile and experience and so on. And some of them are complaining about the lack of diversity and it often strikes me, perhaps the best way to do something about that is to stop talking and listen to somebody.

I think that that's a really, really important feature in our - in our public discussion that we're not always successful at doing anything about.

Unfortunately, the staff organization can't actually intervene with that point. We're not really in a position to say to the mailing list, you know, you're out of line here, because every time we do, what that - what we get is oh, you're trying to censor our discussion, and we're not. We're trying to make room for other voices.

But those voices are not going to speak up on their own. They're going to leave that discussion unless we make room for them. So, I do wish that some of those - some of those mailing list discussions, you know, would be a little more willing to - to listen to other perspectives and to come in.

So, I hope that you know, that we're successful with that, and that is the reason that, for instance, this coming week, we have a community week which is aimed at ensuring that the diversity of our community is served in all of the various ways that it can be.

I mean, you know, we're unfortunately not able, you know, to get together and so on, and there's a resource constraint there anyway. What we have learned actually from - from this imposed travel stop is that the, you know, we could include more people if everybody doesn't have to get on an airplane. And so, that's a thing that we have learned from this and we've actually improved our - our support for the community in that way.

So, what you will see for instance in the activities in the coming week is that this is spread around the globe. The globe is twenty-four hours around and so we have to - we have to do things at all - at all different times and so on, and that imposes some difficulty for the staff organization but it's an important thing in order to make sure that the diversity of our - of our community can be all included. So, that's what we're - you know, that's the piece that we can do.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Thank you. And as a member of the board, I appreciate all this work we are doing and this call to action for all of the community to - to work on the diversity issue. So, see you next week on Community Week. Thank you.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you, Luis. Pepper?

>> ROBERT PEPPER: So, first, thank you, Andrew. It's an incredibly ambitious plan. It's built up - you've built it up over time and I think the ambition is great. And we're going to all have to work really hard to execute on it.

But I also think that the metrics and the goals on the metrics are extremely important. So, I think it's - it's actually a very, very good plan and completely supportive.

I also really appreciated your opening remarks because the Internet as we know it, as it developed the last thirty years, there are big questions whether there's even going to be a next thirty years. And I think the - you're highlighting this and then also highlighting, you know, this word "sovereignty" is extremely important because, Ted, I agree with you that, you know, going back to net neutrality, different people used it in different ways and it was not always consistent. A little bit of that was, you know, because people were coming from different perspectives and a little was because of, you know, sort of cynical application and use of the phrase "net neutrality".

The digital sovereignty I think is - is - is different in that it's being used in very cynical ways. It's being used and was initially used by governments that flat out reject the multistakeholder approach. They look at this as a - as a way for governments to take control of the Internet. It goes directly to what Andrew talked about. There will be networks. They may be national networks but it's not going to be the Internet.

And so, there's an interrelationship across the various actions and activities within the plan and digital sovereignty, for example, goes back to the Internet Way of Networking. I mean, it essentially underlines everything because the extent to which this trend or arguments in favor of digital - what, you know, the phrase digital sovereignty, fundamentally is at odds with the Internet as we know it, as it's grown up over thirty years. And Andrew's point from the very beginning that you know, the Internet was something that was you know, users controlled it, right? It was not something that was centralized. The - so, this is, I think, actually one of the most important efforts and in the thread, you know, data localization is part of this but it's not the only thing. And then there are inadvertent, well-intentioned activities by governments that play into this.

But fragmenting a global, interconnected, open Internet I see as one of the biggest threats and the question is whether we're going to have another, you know, whether there will be a next

thirty years. So, I really think that the plan as you laid out, Andrew, is terrific. And the digital sovereignty is in some ways an organizing principle around which we need to think about the other things in terms of growing and defending the Internet. Thanks.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you. George?

>> GEORGE SADOWSKY: Thanks very much. In the last hour, I have noted about a dozen points that I would love to dig deeply into. I wish that the entire membership of ISOC would listen to this conversation because I think it's central to some of the dissonances that exist within the community, as Andrew was referring to earlier. And unfortunately, that doesn't seem to be the case.

Andrew, thanks a lot for this. This is - it's - it was a great presentation. It was articulately delivered. It - it has - it is valid. It has a consistent approach and I support it completely.

I wish we had more time face to face to be able to dig into these dozen points and others that I'm sure have raised in - been raised in your mind. I hope we get to that point at some - in the near future. Thank you.

>> RICHARD BARNES: Thanks. I just had a brief comment here as kind of plus one. I'm super excited about this plan and I wanted to call out in particular, an attribute that might not - I don't think was super clear in your talk, Andrew, which is that there are some areas of this where we don't know what the right answer is. Like, the LEOs stuff, the digital sovereignty stuff, like, this is getting our bearings in a new area that's super important to the Internet and we don't know exactly what the right answer is. And so, I just wanted to emphasize that that's an important thing to do and we need to have that whole pipeline of things where we don't know what the right answer is, we don't know what the right directions are. Things where we do, we need to execute, and things where we're winding things up and winding things down.

So, congratulations to the team on kind of capturing that whole pipeline. Thanks.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you. Shabbir?

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Yes. Thank you, Andrew, for the very well articulated presentation and the paper that you sent earlier for the prior reading. I read actually all of that and I really enjoyed it.

Two points, one is, you mentioned the new SIG strategies, the five that have been selected by the community and the three that may be the permanent ones. So, I hope to see a support plan, that you mentioned in your presentation, very soon.

If you have anything and if you can talk about something about that, that would be really good.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Well, I mean, the short answer of course is that we're - we're just launching this. And so, we're - we're feeling our way forward because what we knew was that people were unhappy with the way that special interest groups were supported in the past. It wasn't working for all of them. Different ones had very different experiences. There wasn't a lot of exchange between the SIGs and the rest of the community.

And what we wanted to do was, you know, sort of try to support that.

At the same time, you know, we have only so many staff and we have to - we have to figure out how we're going to be able to support this.

So, we're feeling our way forward. There is - there has been a little bit of staff adjustment in the last couple of months in an effort to try to make sure that this - that this is successful and the staff who are working on this are building up their understanding of what the - what the different groups are going to need and so on, and they will be sharing that, you know, as time goes on.

But I - I don't want to - you know, I don't want to oversell this, right? We don't have like a - we don't have a simple answer at the beginning and we don't have a predetermined answer because the reality is that in communities, you don't always have the knowledge in advance of exactly what people are going to do. So, that's what we're working on and why this is - why this is on the list of, you know, priorities for next year, to make sure that that is solid.

So, I don't have something, you know, sort of ready for you now because we haven't done the work yet.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Yeah, so, I would be interested in reading when if something is ready.

The second point is that George - that was mentioned by George that very well elaborated action 2022 plan and which the participants will have seen.

And I - when George was talking about this, I was reminded of the response that we received when George sent this invitation to the observer sessions on some of the lists. So, that - and some of the response from some of the community members is really one aspect of the elaborated discussions that have been going on on the discussion and what some of the members think but I will not talk anymore on that.

Second point that I wanted to highlight here was the - the accessibility part. I heard yesterday as well and today that next year, there will be different software updates, some tools updates, and different foundation software that you have been using to communicate with the users and community. You will be replacing or updating those.

My concern there would be that if prior to replacing those softwares and applications and any program that you launch, there should be a consultation or an expert advice to the ISOC with regards to people with accessibility - people with disabilities because when you launch something and we discover that, oh, this is not working, this creates a bad impression, I would say, of such a global organization.

Of course, there would be some of the issues, I do accept that and I acknowledge that, but we should try to minimize those issues as - as less as possible so that we at least can claim that the Internet Society supports that the Internet is for everyone.

And first of all, the Internet Society itself is for everyone and its message is delivered in accessible formats and it tries to make its message accessible for everyone.

So, the things that you can start with and I can - I have a number of clients noted. I will not take more of your time but in trainings, you can have accessible advice. Also in the programs that you would be delivering through e-platforms that can have the accessibility features as well as some of the topics included in them.

And last but not the least, if you plan to change any of the tools, you should have those vetted from the accessibility point of view first before launching and applying them for the community. Thank you.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: So, just on that latter point, we do in fact have a - have requirements in all of our - in all of our purchasing for - for the certifications necessary in order to give us assurances that the software offers the accessibility features that are necessary.

I mean, quite correctly, what you're saying is that we need to make sure that those features are there. And so, we do actually include that in our procurement.

One problem that we have, of course, is that we're not in a position to test every combination of this. So, during user acceptance testing, we can't actually test every platform with every locale with all of the different kinds of accessibility mechanisms that people have. We - we simply don't have the resources to do the testing necessary to match that because there are so many different versions of this and the way it interacts with different locales is - is such that we really end up against a problem there, which is why we try to make sure that we loop in the accessibility SIG every time, you know, we do one of these things.

And we've had very good collaboration there but it's imperfect and I - I want to acknowledge that it's going to remain imperfect because the accessibility landscape with a lot of the software is so bad right now. It remains very, very challenging and I recognize that - that we do not always succeed in our aim.

But I want you to rest assured that in fact, we have this built into our procurement policies in an effort to try to make sure that we can actually give you and other people with accessibility issues, a - an experience that is appropriate.

Because I agree with you. It's not just the Internet is for everyone; the Internet Society also needs to be for everyone and that means people of all different kinds of abilities.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you very much. I do want us, before we go into the closed session, to return a moment to your basic message because I think it's very important.

The action plan is the expression of the mission of the Society, particularly the staff mission over the next year. And as a call to action, I think it demonstrates a clear understanding of the challenges which are facing the Internet and an ambitious set of goals to try to work towards concrete outcomes that will drive change in useful ways, both for the Society itself and for the Internet as a whole.

That call to action, I think, is something to - to echo something George said, is one that I think we need to share with the Society as a whole. And I encourage you, Andrew, to take a five-minute version of this, the call-to-action part of it, and make it available both in accessible forms as Muhammad was saying, and in translated forms for the bulk of our Society, and put that out there as kind of a key outcome of both this meeting and the action plan itself because I think there are many aspects of this where individuals can drive.

The point you made earlier about things are being put onto the Internet as if it were the cause of problems rather than simply a medium of exchange is a call to action to help people highlight that point, to help them highlight the good things that are happening, using that same medium to tell their stories and to listen to each other's stories in ways that reinforce the things that the Internet can be.

Yes, there is misinformation. Yes, there are poisonous statements which are transmitted over it. But those are a tiny fraction of the enormous traffic of people living their daily lives using a capability that was not there thirty years ago.

And I think we have to take the action as you laid out, of telling that story of how much the daily life that we have built depends on those core capabilities and how much would be destroyed by allowing folks to take the bad things which happen and to regulate, legislate, or act in ways as if they were the only things that happen.

So, I really appreciate this as a call to action. I really encourage you to build that call into a short message which we can share widely, both within the Society and outside of it.

Thanks again.

George, it looks like you had a final statement?

>> GEORGE SADOWSKY: Yeah. You said something that resonated with me. It's interesting that people use Internet governance as a phrase, where they're not talking about governance of the Internet, they're talking about governance of processes that migrate to the Internet that were here long before the Internet. And that is one of the - it's a misleading phrase in that it tends to say well, it's the Internet that needs to be governed, it's not peoples' behavior on the Internet. Thanks.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you very much. We do have now a section of our agenda which is in closed body, so we will have to change to the other Zoom which should be put forward in just a moment, and we'll, for those of you who are watching this either synchronous or asynchronous, we will be back soon. Thanks, again.

>> KEVIN CRAEMER: Ted, did you want to move immediately to the closed session or wait until the hour on the agenda? It's fifteen minutes past.

>> TED HARDIE: Okay. We'll meet there at fifteen minutes past then. People can take a few minutes to refresh their beverages.

>> KEVIN CRAEMER: Okay.

>> TED HARDIE: See you then.

>> GEORGE SADOWSKY: Okay.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you, everybody. During the closed executive session, the board received the presentation of the 2022 budget and the report of the Finance Committee on the proposed 2022 budget. The Finance Committee, having recommended the budget to the board, what we now have in front of us is a series of budgetary resolutions which would then put that into effect.

The first of these is the proposed resolution, resolved that the Internet Society Board approves the 2022 Action Plan and budget as presented.

May I ask for someone to move and second?

I see Richard and John.

In order to take the vote for this, may I ask people to use the raise your hand tool in - in the video conferencing system.

I believe that's unanimous. Thank you very much.

The next resolution relates to one of the board designated funds and it is approve funding for the Internet Society Amicus Program, resolved that the board approves the expenditure of \$336,000 to fund the Internet Society Amicus Program using the remaining from reserves.

May I ask -

I saw George and Luis.

Please signify ascent by using the raise hand tool.

I believe that's unanimous. Thank you very much.

The next budget resolution relates to the Compliance Program and reads, resolved that the board approves the expenditure of \$85,000 to fund the Compliance Program using the remaining from the reserves. May I ask for someone to move and second?

I saw Brian and Laura.

Please signify ascent by raising your hand in the tool.

Thank you very much. I believe once again, that's unanimous.

The next one of these is to approve funding for the Emerging Opportunity Fund. Resolved that the board approves the expenditure of \$250,000 to fund the Emerging Opportunities Fund using the remaining from the reserves.

May I ask for - Muhammad moves and it looks like Pepper seconds.

May I ask folks to signify ascent by raising their hand in the tool.

That's unanimous. Thank you very much.

Richard, your hand is up. Do you have a question or did - just getting ready for the next one?

The next of the proposed resolutions is actually not a budget resolution but is to appoint a member of the IETF LLC Board. As the trustees know - Andrew, you have your hand up.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Yes. If I may, just before we turn to the - to the remaining business, I would like to thank the board for its vote of confidence on this but also I want to express my extreme gratitude to the many, many staff who contributed to this. This was a large activity across the staff and I want to - want to express my deep appreciation because of course, I get to stand up here and propose all of this but I didn't do most of the work. So, it's really important that I recognize that. Thank you.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you and I want to repeat in the open session what Muhammad said in the session just now, obviously this was a very challenging moment to develop both the action plan and the budget, both because of the pandemic and because of the - the situation on the death of an important member of the executive team during the past year, and we, as a board, recognize the challenges that those represented and appreciate the efforts that you took both singularly and as a group to achieve that. Thank you very much.

But turning now to the other business in front of the board, the next resolution is to appoint a member of the IETF LLC Board. As the trustees are aware, the proposal is to reappoint Sean Turner for another term. So, the resolution will read, resolved that Sean Turner is appointed to the board of the IETF LLC for a three-year term, effective in March 2022.

May I ask for someone to move the resolution? Laura and John.

Please signify ascent by raising your hand in the tool.

Thank you. That's unanimous. And I wish to extend the thanks of the board to Sean for his service in his first term. Obviously, a challenging thing to get the IETF LLC going and we appreciate his efforts on behalf of both ISOC and the IETF LLC.

The next piece of business before the board is the appointment of members of the ISOC Nominations Committee and Elections Committee. There are two related resolutions here which I propose we take together.

Mike, did you have a comment?

>> MIKE GODWIN: Certainly. I'm sorry. I did not have a comment. I just - I had not lowered my hand from the previous vote.

>> TED HARDIE: Oh, okay.

So, the two resolutions are together. First, appoint members of the 2021-2022 Nominations Committee, resolved that Melchior Aelmans, Sylvia Cadena, Houda Chakiri, Rosa Delgado, Carlos Martinez, and Jon Peterson are appointed to the 2021-2022 ISOC Nominations Committee chaired by George Sadowsky.

And the second resolution is to appoint the members of the 2021-2022 Elections Committee. Resolved that Luis Martinez, Lars Steffen, and Komlan Togbedji are appointed to the 2021-2022 ISOC Elections Committee chaired by Maimouna Diop. The president serves as a non-voting, ex-officio member of the committee.

These two being taken together, may I ask for the - Robert and Brian.

Please signify ascent by raising your hand in the tool.

That appears to be unanimous. Thank you very much.

The next of these is to approve the elections timetable. Thank you very much for getting that on. And the resolution will read, resolved that the 2021-2022 ISOC elections timetable is approved as presented.

May I ask someone to move the resolution, please?

Luis and Brian.

Please signify ascent by raising your hand in the tool.

That's unanimous. Thanks very much.

Our agenda currently has us on a short break to review the - to review the reports by the ISOC community and working group chairs. Kevin, may I ask if by any chance the people presenting the reports are already with us?

>> KEVIN CRAEMER: We do have Hans Peter here so perhaps you want to take the Governance Reform Working Group Co-Chair's Report prior to the Chapter Advisory Council Report. In the meantime, I can see if PJ Darres can join us early.

>> TED HARDIE: Okay. I think it probably would be valuable to go ahead with that rather than to take that additional break. Is that amenable to the board? Okay. It seems like it is.

So, why don't we go ahead when Hans Peter is available with the Governance Reform Working Group Co-Chair's Report, and after that we'll either take a break or receive the Chapter Advisor - Chapter Advisory Council Steering Committee Chair's Report depending on whether Pierre-Jean is able to join us.

>> KEVIN CRAEMER: Hans Peter is joining us now.

>> TED HARDIE: Hans Peter, good to see you. So, thank you for presenting this report and for sending it in early. Is there a particular set of things you want to highlight in the report for us now?

>> HANS PETER DITTLER: Yeah. First, hello, and nice to see you all now. The report is very short and hasn't really much to report and I think that's the main thing to highlight.

There was no real progress made during the last months and the most progress by uploading some new files was done in the last few days. And one thing which was also mentioned by Mike in the written report already is that we've not found a broad community to grow and discuss. It is still only, he called it in the written report, a small subset of people and small in this case means that really only I would say three to five people are interested in this topic and I think that's something we have to change if we want to really reach out and have usable results.

So, we have to find a way to make this group more known to the people and people get more involved. Otherwise, we won't see real, substantial results. That's my take from it.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you. And in the written report, there was also a recommendation that we consider going ahead with the legal analysis of some of the proposals that have been made because the legal analysis might then spur additional activity. Do either of the chairs want to talk to that?

>> MIKE GODWIN: I'll address it a little bit. I think that, just to unpack the history of it a little bit for, especially for newer board members, I think the original, when I was originally recruited to work on - to work in this working group as a co-chair or as a vice chair at that time, I think the goal

that Gonzalo had in mind was that as - as someone who was law trained, I might be in a better position to steer the discussions in ways that were consistent and compliant with the legal realities that we have to work with as a - as a US incorporated NGO.

And for various reasons, I think that was you know, that was not - I was probably not the right person to do that, although I'm certainly law trained but I - but because I'm also associated with the - with the proposed PIR transaction, you know, I did not necessarily have credibility in terms of saying what I thought could or couldn't be done.

The people who were initially interested in governance reform believed or had adopted the idea that the reason an earlier board had supported the PIR transaction was that we were - that there was something wrong with governance and that governance thing needed to be corrected.

But as the PIR transaction, you know, was not - was not effectuated, the impulse to - for larger groups of stakeholders to engage in governance reform discussions tended to fall away.

So - so, the proposal, I'm sort of saying this in a longer way than what I had written, but I think we can either decide that the working group as it stands, as it's constituted, is not fit for purpose. I disfavor doing that because I think the - the subtext of that will be read as saying that the board was never interested in considering governance reform proposals.

I think a better way to proceed is just to sidestep the issue of lack of consensus. There really is no - and Hans Peter and I agree on this, by the way, that there's no - there's no emergent consensus among the participants. Is to - is to go ahead and take the proposals, the only fully developed reform proposals that we have and have our internal legal analysis take place regarding those proposals. That way, whatever the outcome of that analysis of feasibility is, that could actually inform future proposals from the working group.

And in addition, you know, I think it's a useful exercise for us to try and steer the working group back into something that is a little bit more fit for purpose.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you. Luis had something - your hand was up earlier. Did you have a question?

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Yes. I appreciate Hans Peter and Mike's remarks on the governance reform. I agree totally with Hans Peter. The issue now or a critical issue is to bring more people into the discussion. If not, it is becoming repetitive and let's say a very limited discussion. And we want to get more about these issues because if not, it tends to have a discourse that is not really contributing rather than criticizing everything that is happening in ISOC.

So, I feel that the focus on the governance issues are lost. So, if - I think we need to develop a mechanism to bring more people into the discussion and to get a better view on what do we understand as we - governance within ISOC. Thanks.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you. In queue now are George and Muhammad. George?

>> GEORGE SADOWSKY: Yeah. Thanks, Ted. This is a situation that we just shouldn't allow to continue. It's - it has the potential for great embarrassment, although one might dispute who should be embarrassed as a result of this. But there seems to be no leadership, no willingness to take on the task of guiding the group outside the group and that is really discouraging.

Richard is, I think, being passive for a reason that he wants to see other people contribute and they don't.

Have we - have we had any out of band discussions with any of the people within that group? Have we asked them some variant of the following question, what can we do to - to help galvanize activity on your part so we can either do something meaningful or drop it?

Sometimes I wouldn't want to go quite - I don't think I'd want to go on the record in saying something like that but sometimes some off the record, informal conversations might help break the jam because I don't think the current situation is doing anybody any good. Thank you.

>> TED HARDIE: So, I'll just remind you that this is a recorded session and you just were on the record, so. Intentional or not, there you are.

So, Muhammad, you're next.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Yes, thank you. Thank you, Peter and Mike. I actually have been following the discussion since July this year on the group and it seems that there are a lot of discussions that have been going on and the perception that I get is repeated here as well, that we are going in circles.

What I propose here is that instead of going in circles, we need to move forward, and the proposal in the - in the report actually is, I think, which can bring in more discussions as well.

If we want to have a legal opinion as proposed in the report, I think we should move ahead probably. This may precipitate some of the discussions as well. People who would comment, would comment, but we - the other side of the coin is that some people who might be interested in the group might just be getting away because the discussion is going on in circles. So, we should also try to limit the discussion and we should also fix some lines on when we want to finish the work because as I see it, the working group currently going on, there is something infinite going on and there is no deadline.

So, this - this may not be - I may be critically incorrect but it seems that this is not the way that the group is working. So, I hope this helps.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you. I guess the point of discussion at this point is whether there is any trustee who would object to having the legal analysis done and returned to the Governance Reform Working Group as the next step?

George, did you have a comment there?

>> GEORGE SADOWSKY: No, no. Well, yeah. I guess I do. If we do proceed with this, and I think that's probably a good idea, then let's make sure we keep a line of communication open, telling the group we're doing this and keeping them up to date because I have a feeling that the lack of communication increases the amount of distrust between the groups.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you. Laura?

>> LAURA THOMSON: How much is that legal advice going to cost? Is that internal or is that something where we're having to - is it a loan, basically, is my question.

>> TED HARDIE: Ilona?

>> ILONA LEVINE: Yes. I haven't seen the proposals but I think there are two - two things that I need to consider once I see the proposals. One is, it probably will be an outside legal review. And two, I need to make sure that in that assessment and results back, we're not providing attorney-client privilege communication and advice. So, it's - I need to take a look at the proposals first to see how we can respond back without incurring a lot in outside attorney fees and also make sure that we're not providing attorney-client advice.

>> LAURA THOMSON: That sounds good. Yeah. I only - my objection is - I'm sort of - I don't know if I have an objection because I don't know how much it's going to cost. I might, basically.

>> GEORGE SADOWSKY: If we do go to an outside legal firm, let's be very careful to remember the precedent that ICANN set where the reconstruction, the restructuring of ICANN process allowed the group, the outside groups to direct the lawyers and we ended up with a legal bill between two law firms of over \$30 million.

>> TOM HARDIE: I do not believe this board intends to spend \$30 million on this analysis. Andrew?

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: So, just to pile on a little bit with what Ilona has said because I want to be clear about this, I actually would be a little stronger than what Ilona said. I think this has to go to an outside firm because Ilona is the lawyer for one of the parties in this. And so, it also can't go to our usual outside firm which means that we've got to go and find another firm. And the proposals that we have are not actually concrete enough to be - to be things that you could do an analysis of like, how would you implement this or is this - you know, I mean some of them are like, are of the granularity of individual members should have more say.

Well, I mean, you can get an opinion. You can probably get ten opinions from any law firm that you would like on - on that - on that topic, but whether you're going to get something that can be actionable is less clear to me.

So, I think the answer to Laura's question is, this bill is going to be big. I don't think it will maybe be as large as what ICANN spent on it because - because ICANN was spending on two competing firms for the same work. I'm not sure that that was

the best strategy in keeping bills down but that's what happened. So, we're not going to do that.

But I don't want you to think that if we do this analysis with an outside firm, it's going to come back like in an afternoon. This is not a four-hour bill - four billable hours kind of response.

>> TED HARDIE: So, we have Luis, myself, Richard, and Mike in queue, and I want to ask kind of a functional question. This seems like a topic where there needs to be a good bit of kind of back-and-forth discussion. May I propose that we actually table the discussion to our next working meeting, have it there, perhaps get Ilona to take a quick squint at these and confirm Andrew's perception or provide her own perception of how much legal work it would take, presuming an outside counsel? I think that would give us a little bit more data for the discussion and might give us a little bit more time.

Are folks okay with that proposal?

Okay. George, are you not okay with that proposal?

>> GEORGE SADOWSKY: I'm fine with it. I was looking for the thumbs up on the - in the -

>> TED HARDIE: Okay. So, I think then we'll defer this to the next informal discussion with the understanding that Ilona will take a short look at this just to - to estimate the amount of legal work that would be required and we'd go from there. It may very well be that this can open a line of dialog which allows us to say, we'd like to take this but in the current form, it would cost, you know, this amount of money because they are kind of not yet honed down to specific proposals. If you give specific proposals, then this would be the next step. And we could start a conversation that way.

Okay. I think that brings us now to the question to Kevin of whether our colleagues from the chapter side are with us yet or not?

>> KEVIN CRAEMER: Yes. PJ Darres is joining us right now.

>> TED HARDIE: Okay, so let me ask Hans Peter, were there any last words you wanted to say or?

>> HANS PETER DITTLER: No. Thank you.

>> TED HARDIE: Well, we really thank you for your efforts with this and for bringing us the report and we'll keep in contact obviously as we continue the discussion of how to make this a fruitful effort. Thanks again.

Okay. The next item on our agenda is to receive a report and Pierre-Jean, you are going to present it, is that correct?

>> PIERRE-JEAN DARRES: Yes. Hi, Ted. Hello, everyone. Thank you for - for having me with you today. Okay. Can you hear me clear?

>> TED HARDIE: Yes, very well.

>> PIERRE-JEAN DARRES: So, I'll - I'll start right away with a quick update on the Chapters Advisory Council and the Steering Committee current work.

So, if - if you can, Kevin, move to the next slide. Thank you.

A few slides just as a background support but the first topics, you already know that. I already talked about that during the last presentation I have made. So, it's just about let's say wrap up on the ChAC and the steering committee and the ongoing work we are actually doing.

So, the first two or three slides are just for - for your own consultation if you want, but I won't go over it again and bother you with all the details as you probably already know them right now. So, Kevin, if you want to skip to the slide, ongoing work, directly. You can move to basically the slide should be five or six.

Yep. That's fine. Thank you.

So, currently the ChAC, we're still functioning the same way, meaning we are taking topics from the Chapters Advisory Council representatives, so coming back from the chapters, and we're still working on a few topics we have ongoing for the past few weeks and month now.

One that is now closed is the rules and procedures for the Chapters Advisory Council Steering Committee which was amended during the summer. Last time I said we had improved it. Now it's online and it's fully available for everyone to - to read it and

to have an insight of what has changed actually. So, it's fully transparent and it's a way to facilitate the work for us. And within - within the rules and procedures and the ChAC charter amendment that happened last year, we had introduced a few points that might be useful for the upcoming steering committee elections. So, I'll talk about that in the end.

Recent - recent work, multiple chapters per country. There was a request from the ISOC staff to, let's say, formally have something basically do we accept formally or having a framework on how to accept several chapters per country. The general idea is that yes, it's - it's useful as long as there is no competition within chapters. So, we have the recent case for new chapters in India and in Canada too where we had a new chapter, Manitoba.

So, this - this topic will be an ongoing collaboration with basically more ISOC staff than the Board of Trustees and then once the chapters are chartered and it goes to the higher level, then it will be on you, the Board of Trustees, to go with it.

Another big topic that was a concern for chapters was the opt-in/opt-out and this was a longstanding topic. Chapters were - so, basically, background, chapters were not that, let's say, happy, with the way it worked and the fact that they were not really able to communicate directly with chapters through the AMS systems, through the Member Nova systems. And this is a topic that goes back to last year actually. We started to work on that one last year. And it has come with a new data privacy policy and a data sharing agreement that I think you already are aware of. It was part of some of your discussions during the summer and lately.

So, chapters seem to be more happy with that and able to, in the future, communicate directly with the members and the opt-in members.

So, this actually should be closed once implemented. It is not fully yet for all chapters so we will still keep tracking this one. Actually, the new steering committee will be tracking this one in 2022.

The next point we are starting to work on, we had researched that but still on communications. Some discussions lately and not lately, of course, but have been quite messy on mailing lists for chapters and do not really provide the results that would be expected in terms of engagement or involvement for some

topics. So, we are trying to think about a way that would make it more efficient and actually better for all chapters still to be aware of the communications but perhaps reduce the size of some mailing lists that have perhaps too many people in it and not many participating or just a few of them participating.

So, it's - it's kind of starting work on what could be done and we probably will get back to the - to the staff and to the Board of Trustees with a few recommendations in the first quarter of next year or in the first half of next year.

Then - then another topic of interest for chapters is the funding. We had some troubles for some chapters in that they were not able to receive funding from ISOC because of legal constraints whatsoever. So, we are trying to find ways that are applied within other organizations and trying to find models that could help us to have them receive this funding. And once we have a bit more - a bit more info on that, we will probably - actually, we will surely go through the ISOC Foundation and try to discuss with them how this could apply to the funding they are providing for chapters.

And to end up, I'll just close with a new topic we're starting. Actually, I put it in the agenda last week or the week before to formally have something. It was about the Chapter Advisory Council mobilization. As we already talked several times in the past, the fact that it doesn't have any let's say power makes people think it's useless or they are lacking a bit of movement. So, we are - we are going to work on how to mobilize people and how to get their work on the topics that concern them and their members and find a way to have something a bit more dynamic than we currently have which is currently to be honest, kind of a problem.

And I'll - I'll close quickly, my points, with the Chapters Advisory Council Steering Committee 2022 elections that are underway. So, we will have a few - perhaps a few members returning next year. A few will end their mandate this year. They have been there for a long time and I would like to take this opportunity to thank them also.

If you do not know their name, that's a good way for me to give them. Special thanks to Satish Babu who is there for a long time and who has been really helpful, especially this year for me as a chair, was the Secretary of the Steering Committee and he's been really helpful and he's been there for the Chapters for a long time. So, I think he deserves a good thanks.

And I'll end also with an opportunity to thanks, Kevin, of course, who has been really patient with me with the sometimes late replies from my side.

And Christine, who deserves a lot, a lot, a lot of thanks from the chapters and perhaps it's not mentioned enough publicly, but she is really helpful for chapters.

So, that's - that concludes my point and I'll be happy to take your questions and answer them.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you very much. Luis?

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Thanks. Thanks, Ted, and thanks, Pierre-Jean. There are a couple of things in the report that I should - or I would like to express here. One is the lack of quantitative data, yes. I think you should work to get more quantitative data that allows everybody to compare how the ChAC is working.

We know you are doing the work but the - we don't know how efficient is the work and the only way to get this feeling is with quantitative data. So, I should tell you to develop some dataset that allows these comparisons. That is one thing.

The other thing is related to communication, yes. As we know, ChAC is a formal communication channel between the chapters, the members, and the board, and the rest of the organization, and I don't feel that it's doing - it's happening in such an efficient way, yes. Many people I have heard, they have no idea what ChAC is - happens in the individual membership. Yes. Even chapters, they discuss, well, what is the role of the ChAC. And that leads us just to a communication problem.

So, I would encourage you to develop some communication strategies with the chapters and the members in a way that they know what is the function and what is - what are the possibilities of the ChAC, yes. Because if not, we're getting a lot of mixed communication in other informal channels that essential just leaves the ChAC on the side of these discussions. So, that will be my recommendation. Thank you.

>> PIERRE-JEAN DARRES: Thank you. Thank you, Luis. Yes, I agree with you on the communication part and the tools and that's the point I mentioned almost in my - in the few points I just presented. It's the communication one where we should work on something. I don't have the solution on myself only so of

course, it's for all people to work. And for the communication, what the ChAC does will be - so, the - there will be the Community Week as I'm sure you're aware of and we'll have - we'll be having a Chapters Advisory Council Lounge.

So, over the three days, it's kind of get to meet the ChAC Steering Committee and representatives. So, we will be there to start with the communications through videos and how it works and why we are here. So, it's a starting point, of course. But this - I hope this will lead to more - more efficient communication as it was mentioned earlier, for the coming year.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you very much. I was going to ask you to drill down a little bit about what your mobilization strategy work is. I know you said in the report that it is just beginning, but if you could outline for us in a little bit more detail, what your intent is there, that would be useful.

>> PIERRE-JEAN DARRES: The intent is basically, frankly, some people of Chapters Advisory representatives, some are there just for the title. Let's say it like that, let's be frank. We never see them during the calls. We never see them when they're here for ten years but we do not really know if they are still there or not.

So, that's also a problem to work on on our side for the chapters and to make sure the - the representatives are really present and are working for their chapters because it's a good opportunity for them so they have to seize that opportunity.

I'm - I'm just pointing out, of course, a few exceptions, because we also have representatives that are quite active and are doing the job, but we also need to have some kind of renewal for representatives from my own perspective because it cannot stay the same for like five, six, seven, or ten years. It has to move and we should have new ones coming in with new ideas and we have some chapters that have pretty young representatives that are quite active and I hope will help with that.

So, that's a part of it, renewal of inactive representatives first.

Then not necessarily only working within the Steering Committee which has been the - the way to work in the past, but probably opening a bit more, the work to outside representatives to have more unfilled, let's say, working groups. And I hope that's a starting point, as I mentioned, but I hope this would

foster a more dynamic collaboration between the representatives and between the chapters and that we will also - I often heard the word we want a bottom-up approach. That's fine. But for a bottom-up approach, it has to come from the bottom.

So, it has for chapters to give topics, give ideas, express their problems so we can try to solve them. And I'm not saying we did, if I could say so.

I know by saying that, some chapters will think I'm not their friend but I am, so it's just like, I encourage them to give their ideas and to express their opinions formally and not just replying to a few emails and mailing lists two or three months afterwards because it doesn't help their own cause.

>> TED HARDIE: Thanks for that additional color. Are there other questions for Pierre-Jean?

Okay. Thank you very much for your report today. We appreciate it and we look forward to continuing to work with you.

>> PIERRE-JEAN DARRES: Thank you for having me there. I actually, as I mentioned, we're in an election period for the Steering Committee so I hope I'll be there again with you next year but I cannot say I will be chair or not. So, the chapter leaders will decide.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you again. This actually concludes the number of reports we're going to receive in person. As the trustees know, there were a number of reports shared with us and I would like to thank Mirja Kuehlewind, Lars Eggert and Jason Livingood for sending respectively, the reports of the IAB, the IETF, and the IETF LLC.

I would also like to bring up one aspect of the report from the OMAC. Kevin, could you bring up their report and specifically the last page with advice?

So, there are a number of things in - in this report for the purposes of the trustees to read, but in particular, I wanted to make sure that we covered this as part of today's meeting to highlight to the trustees that we did receive this from the OMAC and to take note of it so that when we next discuss with OMAC folks, the activities of the Society, that we are aware that we've received it and have responded.

Andrew?

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: I will note just on the last one of these items, in fact, we have started a series of briefs. We just had one quite recently with the OMAC that was I think pretty successful. So, I think that we're going to continue with that because it yielded a lot of enthusiasm and some very useful feedback to the staff.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you, Andrew. I think we can take this then to mean rather than to start, maybe to continue.

I think that brings us to the end of our agenda so I'll ask at this point whether there's any other business.

Once again then, I will say thank you to all of you for being part of today's meeting. Thanks in particular to the staff who prepared all the materials and to the constituent bodies like the - the chapters, the IETF, the IETF LLC, et cetera.

And I want to return at last to the call for action. We began today with Andrew giving us a stirring presentation on the needs that the Internet faces over the next year and in the near future and the actions that the Internet Society will be taking to address those needs.

I think we have a strong action plan and a good budget and I - I believe that the Internet Society is answering the call of the needs that the Internet has, to be a voice for the Internet way, and I want to say thank you to Andrew and the staff for answering that call. Thank you very much.

With that, I believe we stand adjourned. Everyone, enjoy the rest of your day, evening, or morning.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Yeah, and night for me.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you. And night.

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