

**Internet Society
Board of Trustees Meeting 166 - Day 1
18 June 2022
Transcript**

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: All right, so, we have - we'll go back to the thing that I already handed off which is thank you, Ted, and you have been elected and please, you know, take over.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you all for your confidence and good morning again. The next order of business is the election of the other officers, the two officers being the treasurer and the board secretary.

As I'll remind the folks on the board, the board secretary has essentially no duties except service on the Executive Committee.

We've received one candidate for each. The candidate for treasurer being Laura Thomson. Are there any other folks who wish to speak to - speak up at this point to offer to serve as treasurer?

Seeing none either online or in the room, Laura, would you like to speak for a few minutes?

>> LAURA THOMSON: I don't know if I have a few minutes in me but I will speak. I would be - it would be my pleasure to serve as treasurer again for another year. It's been my honor to work with Sae in her first year as CFO and I hope I can continue to serve the board in a useful fashion.

>> TED HARDIE: Thanks very much. Could I ask the candidate and non-voting members of the board to step out for a moment?

Thank you very much. We are back in session. The feedback of the board to you, Laura, is that we very much appreciate the service you have given to the board as treasurer over the past year and we're very happy to see you stand again. And I have the permission of the board to make this appointment by acclamation. So, please signify by clapping.

The next order of business is to elect the board secretary. We currently have one candidate for the position, Robert Pepper. Is there anybody else who would like to throw their hat in the ring at this time?

Seeing none, may I ask that we pause the recording and ask the candidate and the non-voting members to leave the room again.

Thank you very much. We're back in session. We - the board thanks Robert Pepper for his willingness to serve in this role and I have the permission of the board to make this appointment by acclamation. Please signify that by clapping.

Okay. The next order of business which I can reassure everybody who has been getting up and down as if it was a game of jack-in-the-box, that they don't have to do again for this, is to populate the various committees and other liaisons that the board is required to do.

That starts with the appointment of a liaison to the IETF Nominations Committee. I believe the person who previously agreed to serve in this was Brian Haberman. Brian, are you still willing to serve?

>> BRIAN HABERMAN: I am.

>> TED HARDIE: Is there anybody else who would like to put their hat in the ring at the moment?

Okay, seeing none, the resolution reads:

Resolved that the ISOC Board appoints Brian Haberman as ISOC Board Liaison to the IETF Nominations Committee for the 2022-2023 term.

May I ask someone to move the motion? Barry and Laura. So, Barry moves and Laura seconds. I think we can once again make this by acclamation. So, please signify by clapping.

The next item of business is the appointment of the committee chairs and members. So, this is being presented at the moment as an aggregate motion where each of the committee chairs and the -

Oh, okay, thank you. It's been pointed out that I have missed the appoint a trustee of the IETF Trust action item. So, Victor has agreed to serve in this role. Is there anybody else who would like to volunteer at this time?

Seeing none, the resolution would read:

Resolved, that the ISOC Board appoints Victor Kuarsingh as a trustee of the IETF Trust for a term of two years.

May I ask someone to move the motion? Barry moves and Robert seconds.

I think once again, we can make this by acclamation. Thank you very much, Victor, for your willingness. Thank you for catching that. I apologize.

The next item of business is the appointment of committee chairs and members. So, this is being presented as sort of an omnibus motion where all of the committee chairs and committee members are listed. May I ask everybody to take a moment and look through and see if there are any suggestions which need to be adopted or any changes people wish to make to the list of committee memberships or chairs which they hold or which they believe need adjustment of any kind.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: You have this note that some committees need to be more populated, right?

>> TED HARDIE: So, those are the members of the committees which don't come from the Board of Trustees. So, both the elections and nominations committee traditionally have members from the community. So, those are populated after this meeting once the committee and the chair of the committee have discussed the needs of the community for who to draw on.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Okay.

>> TED HARDIE: Are there any questions or proposed amendments to the list of chairs and committee members as presented?

Seeing none, I'd like to do this by - by affirmative vote. First, is there anybody who objects to the list as presented? Any abstentions? Then please signify by raising your hand either in the tool or physically to signify a positive vote.

Okay. Thank you very much.

Muhammad, welcome. In your absence at the beginning of the meeting, Laura was reappointed Treasurer, Pepper was appointed Secretary, and I was reappointed Chair.

Okay. The next -

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: My congratulations to you all, so, and my apologies that I got - I started a little bit late.

>> TED HARDIE: No problem.

The next item of business is to approve the minutes of the previous board meeting. So, can you please put the minutes up, Kevin?

Are there any opposed to the amendments to the minutes as presented?

Okay. May I ask somebody to move their acceptance? Thank you, Luis. Sagarika, thank you for second.

Any abstentions? Anyone opposed?

All in favor, please raise your hand either in the tool or online. I really - I think I meant in person or online. Otherwise, I think I just said online two different ways.

Okay. Thank you very much for that.

The next item of business is to welcome two new chapters, the proposed resolution here being resolved that the ISOC Board of Trustees warmly welcomes the Interplanetary Chapter of the Internet Society and the Internet Society Qatar Chapter. We have also been notified that the US Colorado Chapter, US Philadelphia Chapter, and the Nepal Chapter have recently been de-charted after unsuccessful rejuvenation attempts, and I am sure we extend our best wishes to the members in those territories for their ability to reorganize at some later date.

In the meantime, may I ask someone to move the resolution to welcome the new chapters?

>> GEORGE SADOWSKY: I move.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you very much, George. And I saw Brian as a second.

I think we should probably do this by acclamation. Please signify your assent by clapping.

>> BARRY LEIBA: What is the Interplanetary Chapter?

>> TED HARDIE: So, are you aware of the previous Interplanetary SIG? Okay. So, it dates back almost twenty years. It was founded by Vint Cerf and a number of his colleagues from JPL and other parts of the technical community which are interested in extending Internet technology to serve space flight and other long distance applications. They've supported test systems for the DTN bundle protocols and applications over the years.

When the recent reorganization of activities took place, they were not one of the special interest groups which resulted from that reorganization and they decided to reform themselves as a chapter with a fairly curious geographic bound. Traditionally, chapter - chapter geographies are a good bit smaller than interplanetary, but in these special circumstances, it worked out well. And so, they have organized themselves as a chapter.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: They were originally also a chapter, prior to the creation of SIGs.

>> BARRY LEIBA: I was not aware of that. Interesting.

>> BARRY LEIBA: It gives a new meaning to diversity.

>> TED HARDIE: As far as I'm aware, all of them identify as human, however, so we cannot yet claim that there are any members of the Society who do not so identify, so.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: As far as I remember - as far as I remember, when you apply for a new chapter, they ask you about the languages. So, have they claimed a different language, official language, Klingon or something like that?

>> TED HARDIE: No, the official language for the chapter is English.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Okay.

>> LAURA THOMSON: If you look at the chart, you'll see they actually do have members in all of the - all of the continents that have people on them permanently, so it's very diverse.

>> TED HARDIE: Okay. The next item - the next item of business is to accept a summary of agreed board action items from the 2021-2022 Board of Trustees. I will remind the incoming board that this does not mean that you necessarily agree them. This is a handoff. That means that we have received them. So, it

is obviously up to the ongoing board of 2022-2023 to decide to what extent it wishes to take on these action items, but this is a mechanism by which we maintain the continuity of the board by passing the summary from one active board to the following active board.

So, you're welcome to discuss this at this time but I remind you that assent to this does not mean that you accept the action items as a - as necessarily the direction of the Society but rather that you accept that you have received them from the previous board.

So, the - the current set listed are continue to support the projects and activities approved as part of the Internet Society's 2022 Action Plan;

Consider implementation of policies and procedures to increase board diversity and improve structures of consultation among the lines of those suggested in the recent Open Forums on Governance Reform;

Support the evolution of the relationship of the Internet Society and the Internet Society Foundation as a supporting organization.

Do folks have any questions or discussion?

Seeing none, the resolution here reads:

Accept the summary of agreed board action items from the 2021-2022 Board of Trustees. Resolved, the ISOC Board of Trustees accepts the summary of agreed board action items as conveyed by the 2021-2022 Board of Trustees.

Barry - did you have a question or were you moving? Moving. Anybody second? Victor.

Let's go ahead and do this by affirmative vote. Is there anybody opposed? Are there any abstentions? Please signify your assent by raising your hand either in person or in the tool.

Okay. That passes. Thank you very much.

Okay. The final item before the first break, and we have made startlingly good time, let me just say, is the recognition of outgoing trustees. And the purpose here is to express our

appreciation to the outgoing trustees for their service to the board.

The resolution reads, resolved that the Board thanks Richard Barnes and Paul Ebersman at the conclusion of their terms for their dedication and outstanding service to the Internet Society as members of the Board of Trustees. The Board also thanks Mike Godwin and Maimouna Diop who both resigned earlier in the year.

Is there any discussion? Pepper? Oh.

Seeing no discussion, may I ask someone to move? Robert has moved - Pepper has moved. And Jon has seconded. I think we should do this by acclamation. So, please signify your assent by clapping.

We are running well ahead of time but given that I think we should probably take - go ahead and take a quick break and return at the top of the hour, that would be in twenty-three minutes. Time for two coffees.

For those of us in Den Haag, a perfect time. For those of you in other places, please take a moment and we'll see you soon.

>> GEORGE SADOWSKY: Twenty-three minutes.

>> TED HARDIE: Yeah, actually, why don't we pause that because we're still waiting on Pepper.

Thanks, everybody. We're back in session and our next item is Andrew who will be talking to us with the status update, action plan processes, et cetera.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: But it's not me because I believe Rinalia is taking this. Sally starts?

>> TED HARDIE: All right. So, Sally then Rinalia. I have both of you as following Andrew so it's just a quicker handoff than I was expecting but we're very happy to have you. Please go ahead.

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: All right, handed off. Okay. Good morning/afternoon, I guess morning, for everyone. This is our Action Plan 2022 status update. The data that you'll see here is current as of the close of Q1, so obviously an enormous amount of work has still been ongoing, and so we continue to work on

all of these plans, but this is an update of where things stood as of Q1.

And with special thanks to Rinalia and her team, we've worked very hard to set success measures for each of our projects and initiatives and track our progress towards those and every year we get better at doing that and we're really pleased to see in Q1 how much progress we had made so far.

So, with that, we'll go to the next slide.

We've divided our projects into two kind of groups. The first set of projects relates to growing the Internet around the world and the second set of projects is around making the Internet stronger. We'll focus first on growing the Internet.

This first project is deploying and growing community networks. This is our work to build connectivity around the world and local communities and to empower those communities to connect themselves. The success measure - first success measure in 2022 was the number of existing CNS, community networks, that we helped to improve, with expanded coverage or added services.

Our target is seven. This is in progress. Work has begun on five of the seven deployments and the remaining two were started in Q2. So, we are on track for this one.

>> TED HARDIE: Can I ask you a quick question on that?

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: Sure.

>> TED HARDIE: Obviously, there's been a lot of supply chain issues around networking gear in the industry as a whole. Is that hitting these projects as well?

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: Not that has been reported to me so far, but I think it's something that the team is - is paying close attention to, because it is a barrier and there's a lot of different barriers to getting equipment into countries, supply chain among them, but tariffs and other things as well.

>> CHARLES MOK: Thank you. Sally, can you give us a little bit of information about what these projects are, where they are, and you know, because yeah, I have no idea.

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: Yeah, sure. Not a problem. So, for our existing community networks, we have work underway with

community networks in Armenia, St. Vincent, Guyana, in the Inuvik region of Canada, and Bolivia among others.

For new community networks, which is the second item there, which is with fifteen or more users connected, our target was three. The work is underway now with community networks in Nepal, Baluchistan, Pakistan, and Malawi. Does that give you a little bit of a sense for that? Is there more that you -

>> CHARLES MOK: How are these projects or locations selected or are they volunteered or - just an idea?

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: Yeah, I think there's a number of different ways that we do that. Sometimes it's with local chapters that have - that have identified that there's the community in their area that is ready to do this. Others with partners on the ground in the regions. So, it is a community-based process rather than ISOC sort of declaring that this is a place. It is really intended to be working with the community to identify where there are gaps in connectivity, places that are underserved, and where the community is ready to take on this kind of a project.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Thank you. The actually, before joining the board, I was leading a Beyond the Net project in Latin America for creating a map of community networks just in Mexico. The database is existing but there's still not a graphical interface. And the idea is to later make this tool available for every region in the world to complete the whole chapter, the whole view of the community networks.

Because there's a number of very - let's not say strange - but challenging places around the world like the Arctic Circle or Patagonia, Georgia which is one of the topics examples, but there are very small networks, just like the fifteen users in regions that are really completely isolated, if not by the Internet, and that is maybe in Manaus in Amazonas or in the southern border of Mexico or in Canada. It's amazing, Canada has some isolated - very isolated places.

So, that is something that I think we should see soon the result of that.

And also the - regarding the community networks, I know we tend to measure our success in terms of how many networks started running or fulfilled the objectives of the project, but maybe we should start thinking about technology, yes, because

many of these networks may fall into use all technology. And others maybe top of the notch technology. Maybe thinking of IPv6 and 6 gigahertz band for their links, yes. While others are using the remains of other networks.

Yesterday also, we were talking about fiber optics. So, maybe it's interesting to see which sort of technology these community networks are using, because it's also a measure of evolution of the networks, yes. Thanks.

>> VICTOR KUARSINGH: So, one question target and we don't have to deal with it today. So, I noticed that we, you know, number of CNS that we built, is that the - so, is the strategic target the number of installations? Is it the number of users that will be captured? Is it the captive nature of the network? Like, that's the one thing that goes through my mind is what is the strategic goal and then over year over year, if I think about like what are - like, what are we trying to get to? Are there thresholds and milestones that we're trying to reach? Or is that out of focus from these specific plans?

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: One of the challenges with this topic is that there's a tendency to say, well, you know, really what you need to do is connect more people, and these are like - this is, you know, filling the Pacific Ocean one eyedropper at a time, so this is never going to work.

And I think that's the wrong measure for this. The goal really is to create evidence of complementary systems because the Internet Society is far too small to really make a dent in the problem of, you know, communities that should be connected and aren't or should have connectivity and don't.

And in a lot of cases, the answer there, for instance, is not a community network. The answer is hey, telco, put some cable in the ground, you, you know, monopoly. And they just don't because you know, they don't think it's worth it.

And that's actually a completely different regulatory problem and this is not really what that's about. This is to solve the problem of cases where nobody is ever going to hook this up unless people do it themselves. And so, you've got to give them the tools to do it.

And so, yeah. We've been - we've been focusing on counting the number of networks and we have, you know, a sort of threshold of like, you know, below which like you know, fifteen

or more users, because below that, we're thinking well, like, that's a LAN. But we're trying to, you know, we're trying to get to a level where people are getting meaningful connectivity and able to do things but also are able to drive it themselves and thereby demonstrate that there is this viable mechanism by which, you know, even people who are otherwise ignored by largescale deployments have a means to get to the Internet. And that's what this is about.

We're trying to, you know, foster a community of people who can support one another in doing this.

>> VICTOR KUARSINGH: Okay. That actually makes a lot of sense. So, then as part of this, do we ever do like a retrospective kind of like what was engagement looking like before and then what does it look like after? Maybe I should have done more reading? It sounds like it's a yes to that.

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: Yeah. I think one of the things the teams are really working on is - I mean, there's a role for the Internet Society, certainly. But there is also - one of the things that we can do through training, through things like case studies, through investing in kind of the business model for a community network, is enable communities to pick this up so to speak themselves so that it's not just the Internet Society doing this but that communities have the resources, that we make those resources available.

So, there's - I think if we go - so, the unique accessing resources and content. It's not just content for the sake of it. It's about case studies, like what worked here. How long did this take? What kind of community was involved in getting it together? And then following up on that months and quarters later.

So, so that's a little bit of what's behind the content piece.

If we go to the next slide, you'll see a real focus on training here. So, in Q1, we trained 190 people. We're launching two new courses. And again, this is the idea that people can develop the skills to - to empower themselves to build this kind of connectivity. Otherwise, it is, it's just one little network at a time.

And then fundraising around community networks. Andrew mentioned this yesterday. We're very happy to get the grant from

the NRC to do community network training and capacity building with indigenous communities in Canada. And the team, through - at the WTDC, the World Telecom Development Conference last week, just finishing up, was part of the pledge for connectivity as a mechanism to try to bring more organizations into this kind of work and support the work that we're doing. So, they were laying the foundation there with that pledge.

Yep?

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: The - maybe, Andrew, the - one of the things that we need to take as a summary of what is the impact of community networks is social benefit. It's very hard to measure but if we set, let's say, quasi-quantitative form, that may be very useful to measure the things that Victor was addressing, how these things are changing in time.

And also, I would like to know how P2C is going to change this panorama because I understand that the goal of ITU is to train about 100,000 people, yes, and develop more, about 10,000 CNs. So, that surely has to impact the things we do, right?

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: Absolutely. So, the pledge that we made was to support one hundred, what we call, complementary connectivity solutions and train 10,000 people to build and maintain this infrastructure by 2025. In doing that, what we're hoping is to create a platform by which partners can come into this work with us. And we've already received some early indications of support for that.

So, to say this is where we're trying to go at a large scale, please come with us, either through financial support or other ways of partnering to get to that result.

>> SAGARIKA WICKRAMASEKERA: Do we have any sustainability plans for these community networks? With my experience, I actually have installed this, we have been training people, capacity building and so on, then later on there will be a drop off.

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: Yes, that's absolutely a concern. And one of the pieces of work that the team is working on this year and actually it started last year, was looking at what are the sustainability models, different kinds of models that communities can use successfully. We know there's no one size fits all, and so we try to be really careful about that. But again, going back to the case studies, this is what's worked,

this is what hasn't worked, these are the kinds of plans that need to be in place over the long run. Because you're right, it's not enough to just drop the technology in there. You know, six months later, people have wandered off and done something else. There needs to be a sustained commitment and a model that they can work within to be successful at that.

>> TED HARDIE: Rinalia, did you have something to add?

>> RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: So, two things. We have a five-year strategy and within this, the Action Plan is the primary instrument for us to implement that strategy. So, the things that you see on an annual basis, what we do is actually to achieve what we said in our strategy to build, promote, and defend the Internet. The first one was to extend the Internet to communities that need it the most and that's where you're seeing CNs and IXPs, et cetera.

So, impact is very important. In relation to what Luis was talking about, we produce an Impact Report every year based on the implementation of the previous year, but in order to determine the impact and social benefit, we need time. We can't just - we need time to see the impact and to assess it and then be able to capture it with the human centered stories that come with it, because that is what captures peoples' attention and heart and that will also motivate them to also consider donating to the cause.

Yeah, so, that's what I wanted to say.

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: All right, we'll go onto the next slide. So, again, part of this building the Internet to the communities that need it most, the work that we do on fostering sustainable peering infrastructure, our work on Internet exchange points has been longstanding, I think as many of you know.

We work in two areas, to establish new Internet exchange points and also to support existing Internet exchange points. And in both cases, we are on track.

Charles, perhaps to anticipate your question, I mean, you'll see up here the work in Georgia and the Canary Islands really carries over from 2021. None of these things happen just quickly. It takes months and months of preparation and community work in order for an IXP to be deployed and be successful.

And you'll see here as well, work being done on existing IXPs, Mexico, Rwanda, Angola, and Paraguay.

What the team does is they send out requests with proposals to the regional IXP associations to determine existing IXPs that may need additional support. What's the nature of that support? And that begins a dialogue on what are their needs, what's the equipment that might be needed, what's the additional support that the Internet Society could reasonably provide in these cases.

Next slide.

We also - it's not enough, we're not just dropping IXPs in around the world. There's an actual vision for interconnection and traffic exchange across the globe. And we know that we have partners all around the world that help make this happen. So, working with IXP development organizations to support Internet exchange points around the world. We have partnerships with APIX, APNIC, the APNIC Foundation, Euro-IX, et cetera so that we can work together to really build a community that supports these IXPs as they develop and grow.

We're also working very closely with regional Internet exchange point associations to support a general vision of enabling 50% of Internet traffic to be locally accessible by 2025. These are conversations that are ongoing. And again, if we can do this as a community, we can have a much bigger impact, and that's - that's the thinking here.

Next slide.

Part of the work, this is a separate project but certainly highly related to our work on Internet exchange points, is our ongoing support for technical communities. We know that technical communities, whether they be network operator groups or NRENS or other technical organizations in the local community, are the places that keep communities online. That's where collaboration happens. That's where training happens.

And so, we continue to support the technical communities around the world through training. The network operations and local area networks courses are very popular and well attended and we continue to try to bring people into those courses as needed.

And then supporting new technical communities. In Q1, we focused on identifying where those might be, where the needs might be the greatest. And over the remainder of the year, we'll be looking to build and support additional local communities as the needs are expressed.

Next slide.

Measuring the Internet. This is the work we do to try to present to the world a perspective on the health of the Internet, so to speak. We have a tool called Pulse which is where we try to track data and using a number of partner data sources to present a picture to the world about the Internet.

We started in the area of shutdowns, as you'll recall, and last year launched the Internet Resiliency Index in Africa, and that's something that this year we're hoping to expand globally.

Interestingly, I mean, as I think that you all know, world events over in Q1 created quite a bit of interest in the kind of data and presentation that the Internet Society offers. And so, you see that represented here in the numbers.

We actually had a general goal going into 2021 to improve the visibility of this tool, to spend a lot more time and effort on taking it to the next level and really making it a place that people could find accurate information about the Internet. As it turns out, the first quarter of the year gave us - presented a need, obviously, in the world for this kind of information. And you see that there's a lot of effort on, you know, fifteen blog posts published right around the time of the Ukraine/Russia situation, and also there was issues in Yemen and in India. So, there's unfortunately a lot of activity in the Internet that is showcased on that tool.

So, you're seeing a lot more increase in engagement which is something that we're really proud of and hoping to build on this year.

>> VICTOR KUARSINGH: Quick question. And you kind of answered at the end there by saying that there were events that kind of helped. When targets are created, how sensitive - like, the forecasting models we use to say what does success look like, I just notice there's a lot of variability between the achievements. And that's probably okay. But like, is that forecasting model based on some kind of objective way of

figuring out what we can go up by this percentage or we can get this number of things?

And I understand this is really hard and I'm not - I'm trying not to be, you know, overly - I don't know - I forget the word I'm supposed to use there. But the point - you get where I'm going at. Like, how do we figure out was the target good? Was it just our ability to get an achievement? Was it the wrong target? Do we change the way we forecast what the target should be? I'm just trying to understand strategically how we look at that.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: So, not to put too fine a point on it, the Internet Society has not always been super good at this, and over the last few years, I think things have become quite a bit more disciplined about this. So, when I was first being interviewed by the board, there was this question that was put to me about you know, how would you measure this? And it became obvious to me that this was something that was a weakness and we really needed to - we needed to work hard on it.

Developing that skill within an organization of the scope of the Internet Society takes time. And I think what you see are the fact that we're at this point is a suggestion that we've now got the basis on which - on which that accuracy can get better over time.

Last year, you'll have to go back to the recording because I don't have the presentation here handy, but last year we had some things where we reported, you know, exceeding goals by like 150% in some cases. It's like, okay, well, great. You made an estimate. You really exceeded it. That means that the next time, your estimate needs to get tighter.

And so, you know, I think we've been seeing that but I'm not going to pretend that that work is done.

What we've been trying to do, however, in addition, is to get the - get the targets to be sharper. So, the early targets were like fairly broad because you want to - you want to learn to hit something first. But as we get - as we get better at that, you know, we want the targets to be more finely grained and then that greater granularity gives us a theory of why these things are.

When we're producing this, and this is all part of the internal discussion - you know, I don't really imagine that the board wants to be involved in this level of discussion - but

when we're - when we're doing it, we have a lot of - a lot of internal discussion about okay, how does this thing advance the story of the five-year targets, right? So, you know, how does this show that we - and we'll be talking about that tomorrow, I think it is, about how we develop that and so on.

So, I think maybe there will be more information forthcoming on that particular topic of how that develops that will be more satisfying to you.

>> VICTOR KUARSINGH: Yeah, and just for clarity, I was less concerned about - I wasn't trying to say this - trying to get the sausage made for the algorithm. It's more like what kind of algorithm should we have and what should it look like. So, I was just looking at it from a strategic perspective.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: We'll definitely have that conversation. I think it's tomorrow.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Sorry, before you go ahead. Regarding the results from Pulse, do we have some traffic measures how people are going into make use of that information? Or we are just broadcasting information and we have no feedback from that?

Because I have read some, not reports but the maybe blog posts, when they - where they make use of the Pulse information as a reference. So, I may understand that as being very useful, especially when the Ukraine and Russia conflict started, people went over there and got some information about the status of the Internet around there. But I am not sure and I do not remember if there is continuing monitoring operation of how Pulse is used.

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: Yeah, that's something that the team - I was actually looking in the notes for the remainder of the year. They want to dig into those numbers. They did a little bit of that last year. You'll see, I think if we go to the next slide, you'll see a little bit of the media mentions. So, you see where Pulse is being referenced. And they would like to see those numbers, I think, be much higher. They would like more aggressive use of that - of the tool going forward. They would like to see people referencing it. That's ultimately the goal. So, yes. Digging into that, understanding the audience for this, doing that kind of audience research so that we're producing something that is in fact useful is where we're trying to go with this.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: When we say media mentions, that is global?

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: Yes.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Very, very, very small.

>> RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Our media mention target for the year is 1,000. And we met it by the end of Q1 because of the splinternet campaign situation in Europe, essentially. And this contributes to it but there are other things that - yeah.

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: On data partnerships, this was a big focus for the group in 2021. They secured over twenty data partners. This year, the focus is on really refining the platform, utilizing that data, and they did sign - we signed an MOU with the University of West Indies on Internet resilience in order, again, to take the African Internet resiliency work and work on it on a global scale.

So, that - the team feels good that we are on track for this one.

Next slide.

And can I do a time check, because I know we - okay. And how much - just keep going. Okay. I'll just keep going until someone tells me to stop.

Understanding low earth orbit satellites. This work here was really to, in 2022, to develop a position of the Internet Society on this, understand the relevance for our work to grow the Internet. This is an emerging topic in Internet access. So, this is a relatively small project. As I think many of you know, they released the draft. It's in the PDP now, in our policy development process. So, the community is taking a look at the - at the first draft of - of the position and our view on it and we'll be incorporating that feedback over the coming months and with a goal, and we're on target, to communicate the position to the Internet Society community.

>> VICTOR KUARSINGH: A question there quickly. This was one of the discussions we had on the email list recently. What are the expectations of the board when like - so, you know, obviously, the draft was there. It was very interesting. It was a good read. We had a good, lively discussion. What are the expectations like? What would you - like, what is the

expectation for us? Do we just give ideas? "This is great." Is there - I wasn't quite sure what the outcome was that we were looking for there.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: So, the board historically has wanted to be consulted on PDPs, but the policy development process that we have that was adopted before I started ultimately makes the decision about whether this - whether this policy has met the community threshold and so on, makes that a staff decision.

So, the board is welcomed to provide feedback just like other, you know, parts of the community are. And the board traditionally takes an active interest in these things. Not every trustee of course, but like different trustees are more or less interested in a given topic. Different parts of the community have different interests in this. And so, you know, we get answers from various people.

We certainly appreciate the feedback and the staff have allocated the time, but if what you're asking is like, you know, do you have to do an in-depth review for every - like, are you sort of the equivalent of an AD for Internet Society PDPs? No. That's not expected.

>> TED HARDIE: And I'll point out that it's sometimes hard to keep your hat straight and many of us have technical interests or you know, policy interests around some of what's going on here and we may provide feedback on that basis.

If it comes to the point where you really feel the board has to get involved because this is heading in a strategically wrong direction, and I haven't seen that myself in the - in the past two years, then that would be a conversation that you'd need to raise on the board.

But most of this is just a way of giving staff feedback on the progress of these and it doesn't require board action. And as a result of it not requiring board action, you can think of it as, as Andrew put it, us behaving like a part of the community, a specific part of the community that happens to have a kind of a ten thousand foot view of what's going on. Make sense?

>> VICTOR KUARSINGH: Yeah, that makes sense. I was just asking because, you know, in that particular sense, I felt like I was getting into the weeds and like, wait a minute, is this the right place for me to spend my time on board activities?

It's fun or it's interesting but it may not be where if I have X number of hours to spend on board activities, I'm trying to figure out where should I be spending my time.

>> TED HARDIE: Okay. And I think part of the question there is, is that really your board time or is that hey, this is fun and I, as a member of ISOC, am interested in providing feedback. There's a line there.

>> VICTOR KUARSINGH: Yeah, maybe it's not really - but anyway, if I'm going to spend time on cycles, because I think everyone here is pretty busy, I want to make sure, what brings the most value? Where should I be paying my most attention? That's why I asked.

>> TED HARDIE: I think you'll find your way toward it after a time. And as was said already, you don't have to review each of them. So, if there are ones you do want to dive into, that doesn't imply we're expecting the same for every single one.

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: Okay, next slide. So, this set of projects is the work that we do to strengthen the Internet around the globe. This is led by Joe Hall. Okay. All right. So, the first project is promoting the Internet way of networking. You'll know, and Rinalia might go over this with the strategic objectives, but one of the objectives we have is that the Internet model is the preferred model around the world and this project was setup to sort of develop a tool to help understand whether policies are - the policies that are being proposed are considered - are aligned with the Internet model and what does that mean. And so, there's a lot of work done in this project.

This project wraps up in Q2. So, it will complete its work in the next couple of weeks. It does not mean that our commitment to this work stops, rather that it is - our goal is that this becomes infused throughout the Internet Society and becomes part of our general advocacy strategy going forward.

In order to wrap up its work, one of the key pieces that the team needed to do was train internal analysts, so staffs, staff members who could do the Internet impact assessments on different policies. That target was fifteen. As of Q1, that hadn't completed, but I can tell you that there's been a lot of work in Q2 to - to bring that along, so we're confident that that is going to be done.

Number of new training courses. Again, this, the idea is that we want to empower not just staff but the community itself to be able to use this tool and to do that, the training will enable that and those will be ready to be launched in the coming weeks.

A number of Internet impact briefs, those continue to be developed. Unfortunately, there are lots of interesting policy proposals always emerging around the world that create and pose threats to the Internet model. And we have found that this Internet impact assessment or Internet impact brief is a very good tool to develop our own analysis for what the impact of these policies would be on the Internet, and then to use that as a basis of advocacy in the markets where that policy is being developed.

So, as of the end of Q1, there were six. I know that there have been several more that have been added. And you know, we really do aim to work with these - work on these with the community impacted, so whether that's a chapter or a local partner or whatever the case may be, you know, our goal over the long-term is that this is not just Internet Society content but that this is a tool that is actually useful for policy makers.

And then in the long run, we intend to have an advocacy playbook that sits alongside these impact briefs. So, it's not just issuing a report and then hoping everybody just absorbs it, but that there is a methodology for how you use that impact brief to do appropriate advocacy.

And obviously, that's different in different markets and you know, there's sensitivities in different places that are present and not in others. But how can we use that to - to get people really thinking about when you're developing a policy related to the Internet, what is the impact on the Internet? And get people thinking in that mindset.

Next slide.

Okay. Sorry - there we go.

The next project in our strong portfolio is related to MANRS. This is our routing security work that's been ongoing for a number of years. One of the - the big success measures, and I think the board has discussed this before, is the transition for the MANRS community to a 501(c)(6) or the equivalent. I'm not going to spend too much time on that here but to tell you that management is expected to get a legal summary from the team very

soon and then we would expect to be coming to the board to discuss this with you probably after the end of this month is what - is what our plan is. I think, Ilona, does that sound - that sounds correct?

>> TED HARDIE: Victor, do you have a question?

>> VICTOR KUARSINGH: Yes, so, sounds like there will be a discussion at some point around this. Okay. Okay. I have two hats, the board hat and an operator hat. So, very interesting.

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: Okay. Charles?

>> CHARLES MOK: Yes, I'm actually also very interested in how to, you know, all the ways from your presentation about the CNS or the way through to, you know, this slide, how to impact, you know, think about what the strategy would be to increase the policy impact of the, you know, all this great work that's being done.

You know, media - the media may be part of it, you know. You get people thinking about ISOC when they think about these issues. Also, how to work with others in the community that are more in the area of pushing policies in different countries and continents and so on, how to work more closely with them using ISOC as a more technical oriented entity with credibility that they could rely on. You know, they can go ahead and talk about more of the policy or even political stuff, but you know, for ISOC, we can give them the technical credibility and so on.

You know, I would be - I would think that that is something that we should try to put some effort into developing some stronger partnership with, you know, people or organizations in that community to work together. And really, in terms of the target, you know, start to think about how to - how to relate it to changing or improving policies.

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: So, this is sort of music to my ears. This is my background on policy. I completely agree with you and what we find is yes, ISOC brings that technical reputation. We understand how the Internet works. We are not political. We are not taking any company's position. And so, people can rely on that as a solid input to the policy process.

Having the local partners on the ground. Sometimes that's the chapter. You can rely on us to help with the technical background that we might be able to provide and they have the

context to take that locally and that is really impactful. And we've seen that I think in Belgium. We see it in Brazil. I mean, there's many markets where this has worked extremely well.

And you'll really see that in the encryption project because part of the recognition there is that this is a big threat. There is a threat around the world to end-to-end encryption. The Internet Society by itself cannot prevent that from happening. What we can do through a coalition is work with partners who are well placed, as you said, sometimes to do the advocacy directly, sometimes to rely on us, sometimes to come together.

So, I mean, what you're saying is absolutely correct. It's not enough to just issue a report. You have to be able to do something with it and walk it all the way out to impact.

>> TED HARDIE: Muhammad?

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Yes. Thank you for this wonderful presentation. So, I actually have two points. First, a quick question. When you mentioned that there was impact assessment, there were media mentions count. Does this count include positive versus negative mentions or it's just a count that this number needs to be achieved? And if there is some sort of negative media attention that Internet Society actually gets, what is the usual policy of the Internet Society? How do we counter that kind of publicity?

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: So, the question, I think, that Muhammad had, I'm going to ask Rinalia here. Is the media mentions, you said about a thousand, is it - do we track whether it's positive or negative media attention? And what do we do as a response?

>> RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Yeah, so we do look at the sentiment, on whether it is positive or negative. And usually, our communications team will look at the negative aspects of it and develop a response by pushing out more positive oriented messaging and positioning either staff or influential community members to make the - or contribute the messaging. Does that answer your question, Muhammad?

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Yes. A follow-up would be that the thousand number count that you mentioned, does this include - and you mentioned that we have achieved this by the end of first quarter - does this all of thousand include the positive number count or were there some kind of negative attention as well?

>> RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: I think it includes all of them because any attention is good attention because it gives us an opportunity to go out there and respond to the negative ones and ride on the positive ones and create more.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Okay. Second, it's just a comment and it does not need any response at this time. But with regards to Internet disruptions in many of the areas as Internet Society Impact Assessment Toolkit, it mentions and it counts, it would be prudent to see the impact that it has on communities and in those areas.

If I give one example, it would be the people with disabilities in certain areas. For instance, if there was an Internet disruption in XYZ or some area, people with disabilities would sometimes have the only communication channel that would be the Internet. For instance, for people with physical disabilities, for vision disabilities, and for even people with speech impairment, Internet sometimes is the only communication tool that they use to communicate with their family, friends, as well as in the community.

So, when this tool is taken from the people, it disrupts their lives, sometimes even more than people without disabilities.

So, my feedback would be that if impact assessment includes stories rather from these areas, this may carry more impact and this may include more value to the tool. Thank you.

>> RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Muhammad. That's valuable.

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: Okay. So, let's move on from MANRS then. Next slide.

And next slide.

Okay. I mentioned this already but this is the work that we do on extending encryption. And you know, Charles, I think to your point, ISOC can't do it alone. The Encryption Coalition is something I think we're particularly proud of in growing the number of organizations that are both committed, willing to put resources, time, and local expertise into - into the cause of defending encryption around the world.

We had a target of 400 new coalition members. The Q1 actuals are 275, so we're well on our way to achieving that. The added 19 in Q1.

I think it's important. The note here, 56% of these organizations are in the global south, and really focusing in Q2 on looking at specific segments that are particularly at risk when encryption is threatened or undermined. And so, working with those kinds of communities, LGBTQ or domestic violence survivors, women, et cetera to really try to focus the message about the real-life impacts of threats to encryption.

And the coalition is a way of doing that, of extending our reach.

Next - oh, yeah.

>> BARRY LEIBA: And what are they doing? Is it outreach? What is the action?

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: So, those - the coalition actually has a lot of dialogue together where they track the threats and then mobilize together for action. So, if the threat is particularly local, a local community can then depend on this global coalition to help them develop, whether it's talking points or a strategy or bring partners together or organize an event. I mean, there's - it means that you're not alone as a small community organizer in a country that you actually have a global community around you. So, there's a lot of organizing that's done together, comparing notes. Reusing - I mean, some talking points never fail and are applicable across multiple markets. And so, that's what they do together is to try to pool their resources, essentially.

Next slide.

>> BRIAN HABERMAN: So, Sally -

>> TED HARDIE: We have a - yeah.

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: Oh yeah.

>> BRIAN HABERMAN: Quick question. Is there something that the board can do in helping you with that recruitment process?

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: I think that if the board wants to help, we will always welcome it. I would be happy to facilitate

conversations with any board members that want to speak to the team working on this. Growing that coalition, refining the message really is critical. I think that was something that we said at the early outset of this, that the message on the other side can be very impactful sometimes and pull at the heartstrings, so to speak, and really getting the message, getting a global community together that's - that's committed to this. Anybody who wants to help is - we are welcome - we welcome that.

>> BRIAN HABERMAN: Great. Thanks, Sally.

>> CHARLES MOK: Well, I'm on the mailing list so I see all of the messages all the time. Some good work going on there about, you know, certain, for example, like you mentioned, some local law or issues and then you give them the feeling that there's a whole global community behind them and if they want to get together a statement, you've got people from all around the world supporting them and so on.

Now, my question is, how much are we trying to also engage our own chapters to do this, because some of the chapters may not have so much of a focus on these policy reports, but they might have a very good understanding about what's really going on locally or maybe the other way around. If they are not just contributing to some of the messages, they will be very helpful in getting the messages out to the local communities as well.

So, I mean, when you talk about all of these engagement numbers and so on, I don't know whether it's right or wrong, but I get the feeling that it might be more about other organizations that are outside of ISOC. But are we also talking about our own chapters as well at the same time?

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: Absolutely. We - there's been - and I'll pull the numbers after lunch but if you go back to Global Encryption Day last year, a large number of the events that were held around Global Encryption Day were really driven by our chapters.

If you look at the work more recently in the UK Online Harms Act, the UK chapter has been at the forefront of that. I think that's true in Germany and true in Belgium and around the world.

And where, as you say, where they may not have the skillsets or the interest yet and they're learning about this, then that's where the training comes in. And we've done a lot of work with

Joyce's team to offer training and talking points, whatever we can do. Because fundamentally, you're right. The people on the ground are the ones who are going to have the most impact with their local policy makers. So, I would say chapters are at the top of the list and the more that we can get them engaged, I think the more powerful our message is going to be.

>> RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: As of today, as I see the statistics, there are 41 chapters involved in the encryption project out of 124. Forty-one.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: So, that would be - chapters, right?

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: Okay. Next slide. We're almost done with mine.

Let's see. So, these are the number of advocacy activities. Again, Charles, to your point, organized by the coalition and/or the ISOC community. This is a whole range of things, you know, speaking at events, signing letters, reaching out, and they count. They literally count the instances of advocacy.

So - and we have to for some of the reasons that Ilona explained yesterday, because this is policy making, right, policy making is happening here, so, around the world, so we have to track this quite carefully. And you'll see some of the just in Q1, the work that the group had done already.

And then this last one is going to be - is hard. The number is small. The number is two. The number of global government entities that make statements in support of end-to-end encryption. That's not easy to get governments to say that in their out loud voice.

I - I have in my notes some good news on the horizon for Q2 and we think that we at least have one that's able to say that. But this is - we hope for this to culminate around Global Encryption Day. So, that's something that we're working on now. So, we feel good about that.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Sorry, Sally.

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: Yes, yes, please.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Do you have a date for the Global Encryption Day?

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: I have to look that up. I'll Google.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Well, just late - it's after Community Day, right? April?

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: No, it's October.

We will get that to you, how's that? It'll be in October.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: October. Yes, after Community Day, right? That happens in September. Okay, yes. It's a short week. A [inaudible] week.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: I don't believe it's been announced yet but the date that you saw in April was an open letter - it was an open letter that was signed. So, I'm sure it's later this year but I don't actually think the group has settled on the date.

Well, it's because it came from the same channel on Twitter. But the - the - part of the - I'm not sure that we want to announce in an open meeting right now exactly what the date is because I'm pretty sure that there is a plan for how that's going to be announced and I'm pretty sure it's not in an open meeting by accident.

So, I mean, I think we can get you the date when we have it but I'm not sure we're going to come back in this session and say this is what the date is.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Yeah, just, I think it's a great opportunity to bring other audiences, other communities into the ISOC at large community, especially children, young people who get a lot of concerns about encryption. Although it is not the main technical focus but it's a very important social issue that everybody is aware about encryption. Thanks.

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: Thank you. All right, last slide. NDSS. This is the annual Research Conference that the Internet Society supports. Yay. It took place again this year as a hybrid event and was highly successful again this year. I will say the data as of this report, that the conference was in April, so the data is still coming in for this. So, we'll have better data to report for you for the next report.

But the fundraising targets were exceeded for this year and as a hybrid event, it was extremely well attended and met our expectations. Again, waiting for the data to come in.

>> BARRY LEIBA: I'll just add that I've been going to this for the last eight years or so and it's a really great symposium.

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: Okay. I will hand it off to Rinalia.

>> RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Do members need a break? No? Okay, we'll keep going. Let's go to the next slide, please.

Oh, Sally, you missed one. Digi-Sov, yes.

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: That's terrible. I'm so sorry. Digital Sovereignty is a project that just began in Q2. This is another smaller project on an arguably very big topic of digital sovereignty. This is an issue that is all over the world and nobody can quite agree on what they think it means, but people are using it in lots of different ways, many of which not particularly helpful.

So, the plan this year is similar to LEOs. Do the research on how the term is being utilized and develop an Internet Society position or perspective on it and work that through the policy development process for the community.

It's not just to do this in isolation with staff. There's a lot of conversations. They've had some excellent discussions with org members, some chapter events, and a lot of conversation going on because this is a term that's out there and probably even more present in our world now than even when we had planned this project.

So, this work has just started which is why we don't have any data to report here because it began in Q2, but the expectation is that you'll see this out in the PDP in the Q3 timeframe.

Okay, now am I really done? Okay.

>> RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Okay, so, I am going to cover what we call initiatives in the action plan. Empowering people to take action is the theme. How I would define initiatives is basically the things that we do to grow Internet champions around the world, more of them essentially, and to empower and enable them so that they are more effective in what they do

either by themselves, with each other, or in collaboration with staff in terms of the efforts that we initiate through the organization.

So, let's go to the next slide.

So, this initiative is about training that we provide for chapters every year. When we launched the five-year strategy, one of the concerns raised by our community is that many of the projects are extremely technical. And so, what we did to support our community is to basically launch a training program, what we call fundamentals, because it's essentially fundamental information about the projects, why it exists, what problem does it address, and what we can do as a community and as ISOC to address them.

And so, we've been doing the training for a couple of years. And so, the target for this year is to provide the training to five hundred chapter members. The training is yet to take place in Q2 and Q3. And in terms of the percent of fundamentals training participants that implement an activity locally as a result of the training, the target is 20%.

And for your information, last year, 2021, 73% of our chapters basically participated in projects, which means that many of them have benefitted from the training itself and 44% of organization members.

Let's move to the next slide.

This is about special interest groups, and I have notes on this because it's special. So, special interest groups are essentially vehicles for our community members, either they are individual members not part of chapters or chapter members, to come together on topics that they are passionate about, connect, learn, exchange, and collaborate.

And we changed our approach to SIGs primarily for two reasons. One was that many of them were having difficulty in establishing themselves as legal entities, which means that if they cannot do so, they have trouble receiving funding. And also, they were having difficulty engaging a global community to come together on the topics that they wanted to work on.

So, we changed the approach and a proposal was developed by a volunteer group comprising community members working in collaboration with staff. And last year, it was presented to the

board and it was approved. And so, New SIGs, as we call it, was launched this year.

And it involved basically asking our community members on what are the topics that you're interested in and it was aggregated, it was presented back to the community, and they were asked to pick the top five. And the top five became the five SIGs essentially.

And the topics are Internet for education, online safety, Internet of things, affordable Internet access, and cybersecurity.

In addition to the five SIGs, there are three standing groups as they call it, because they have no time limitations. The others are rotated out every two years based on voting of topics. And the standing groups are the ones on accessibility, youth, and gender.

So, these are the SIGs, and our targets for the SIGs this year is the number of SIGs that have implemented more than 70% of work plan deliverables by end of year, five, and it's in progress, and also a net promoter score for the SIGs themselves and the target is fifty.

Now, in terms of, is fifty good or bad? In terms of net promoter, the scale is between -100 to 100. Zero is considered to be good. Above zero is considered to be good. Above twenty is considered to be very good. So, fifty is generally excellent to get. Okay? Next, please.

Mobilizing individual members. You may know that we have more than 89,000 individual members around the world. Half of them are chapter members essentially. And our target is percentage of total membership that have an engagement score, 10%. And this success measure will establish a baseline in 2022. However, it is dependent on us having our new association management system online within the year. And I think that we may not be able to achieve this target based on progress on AMS replacement.

In terms of global newsletter open rate, the not for profit open rate average is between 20 to 25. Our target is to achieve 26. At the moment, at the end of Q1, we have achieved 31%.

In terms of tailored newsletter open rate, the target is 28%. We have achieved 60% with the newsletters focused on digital sovereignty and one other which I can't remember.

Moving on, empowering Internet advocates. This is about our fellowship program and also the alumni program which we are developing this year. We have five fellowship programs. They are Early Career Fellowships program, mid-career fellowships, IGF Youth Ambassadors, MANRS fellows, which is tied to the projects, and the IETF Policy Fellowship Program.

So, our target for total number of fellowship program participants for this year is 90. Q1 actuals is 15. Out of the normal five that we do, we decided not to pursue the IETF Policy Fellows this year, primarily because we've been doing them in remote mode in the past two years and we have not been successful in getting good participation. And we think that when we can get to full face to face opportunity for doing this program, then we can bring it back online.

>> TED HARDIE: Can I ask you a quick question about that?

>> RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Sure.

>> TED HARDIE: How much of the difficulty with the restarting it as in person do you think is the structures of the places you need to send them, like IGF or the IETF? And how much is the kind of origin country restrictions, et cetera? Clearly, there's a whole bunch of the world where leaving and coming back still has fairly onerous quarantine restrictions, so the number of people you pull from many of those countries is relatively small because the cost of attending something external would be, you know, fifteen to twenty days of isolation.

>> RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Yeah.

>> TED HARDIE: How are you tracking that part of it and in the hope that we can restore this next year, is there a particular measure you're looking for, for what kind of epidemiological situation we would require? I mean, sorry to put it in fairly clinical terms, but is there something we can currently track there or is it going to be seat of the pants?

>> RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: I'm looking at Andrew's face. Did you want to respond to that?

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Well, sure. So, there are kind of three problems here. Two of them you already touched on and the third one is lead time. So, the - the policy fellows at the IETF, for instance, you know, you've got to line those people up way, way

in advance because you know, you're asking somebody to come for a week and to give that up and frequently at a level in the government where that's difficult for them to do.

And so, we've really got to get them lined up way in advance. And the situation with the IETF meetings themselves is kind of tentative from meeting to meeting. So, until we get past any of that, it's like essentially impossible to plan to restart this.

The big - the big thing we did discover with this program was that, you know, we tried to do it in virtual mode and the reality is, none of those people can be in virtual mode and pay attention to this because what ends up happening is they've got their day job. And the only way to get them out of that and get them paying attention to this is literally to pick them up and move them. And without doing that, you just can't.

So, until - until we get to the place where some of the exact problems that you're talking about get to a predictable level, not so much a, like, a particular level, but really become predictable as to, you know, when a meeting - whether a meeting is going to run, whether it is going to be face to face, and so on. I don't - like, I'm very skeptical if that's going to restart next year. I just don't - I don't think that it's very likely because I don't believe that governments of the world are doing good epidemiological work on this. Instead, we've just decided to you know, not know. And I think that that's going to create continued uncertainty in how the meeting is run and so on.

>> TED HARDIE: Okay. And I think I agree with your analysis. If we need a year's lead time, then we would have to say, do we know now with certainty that the summer meeting of a particular organization will be in person or not. And we'd be running the odds at this point and asking people at this career level to run the odds with us is probably not effective. So, thanks for the clarification. Luis?

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Yeah, just a quick question. I think there is not yet a set date for the IGF.

>> BARRY LEIBA: Yes, there is.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: There is now? Oh.

>> BARRY LEIBA: It's in Addis Ababa, last week in November.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Okay. Really? Addis Ababa? Addis Ababa, IGF. Okay.

>> RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Okay. I'm going to continue. We also want to achieve a baseline for the alumni participation rate. The alumni program is a new one. A proposal is being developed. It looks pretty good the last time I looked at it. And when it's ready, if the board is interested, I can share it with the board, because I think it's - it's an important program. It draws on the pool of people that have gone through our training programs. So, they are essentially our Internet champions and we need to nurture them more so that when they go out into the world, they have the support and resources to be effective because that helps our cause.

Next slide, please.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Sorry, the - are we still keeping the stories of all the fellowships, all the guys that are going to different places, collected into let's say - the website I think they were placing some histories about these fellowships.

>> RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: We have data from 2017 onwards. Before that, I don't think we can vouch for it. But yes, we have. Okay.

Okay, let's go to the next slide. This is about MOUs with partner organizations. And we are constantly trying to expand our pool of partners because they bring more resources to what we can do on the ground, especially on projects.

So, the target for this year is to get twenty-five new partners. We already have 77 existing MOU partners and we just want to add new ones. And Q1 actuals is we've gotten five of the target.

Next slide, please.

This is about fundraising. So, we have a target for grants fundraising. The target for this year is \$600,000. \$230,000 of that is earmarked for empowerment activities. That means training and e-learning as well as the fellowship and alumni program.

And for Q1 actuals, the funding achieved for this is slightly above \$15,000. For sponsorship fundraising, the revenue amount secure target is \$390,000 and again, a certain portion of that

is earmarked for empowerment activities. And Q1 actuals is \$165,650.

And in terms of number of sources of funding, we're always trying to expand this, which is why we track it. The target for this year is sixteen and the Q1 actuals is seven.

And I think that as of now, the revenue figure for grants and sponsorships have exceeded this quite significantly. I think for revenue, it's slightly over a million, but I'd like Sae to step in and just tell us what the figures actually are.

>> SAE PARK: The target or the figures that the fundraising team had raised or committed is over 1 million, but when I do the presentation on the financial reports, you're not going to see the quite the big figure just because a lot of these grants are coming in as restricted grants and it becomes unrestricted as we work on these projects or the grants.

So, yes, in terms of from the fundraising perspective, they have exceeded the target already.

>> RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Sae. Moving on to the next slide. This is about our training and e-learning program. For this year, we are going to - we are in the process of rolling out fourteen courses, and these courses basically are in three categories. They are either oriented towards advocacy training, policy training, or technical training. An example of technical training is network operations, for example. An example of advocacy skills training are those related to the Internet way of networking and learning how to develop those impact briefs, Internet assessment impact briefs.

And essentially, these are the targets. We are trying to achieve 10,000 people to enroll in our courses this year. For Q1, actuals is 2,000. The last time I talked to the team, I think we may be up to 6,000 to 8,000 already as of now. So, we are confident that we may be able to reach this target.

Percent satisfaction expressed towards our courses, the target is 92% level of satisfaction. Q1 actuals is 96%, so that's quite good. The baseline for completion rate established, the target is to achieve in establishing the baseline, and so we have that, 16.5% established last year. I actually should put up what the target was for last year to know that. I apologize for that.

But one thing I want to say for e-learning programs is the completion rate tends to be low from our perspective, and that's because our courses are open and we invite the world to basically come and get exposure and training on, you know, what are the essentials of the Internet? What are the policy skills that you need, technical skills, et cetera?

So, a lot of people come and they look around and they may not actually complete a course. And so, that's why you see this figure of 16.5%.

Another baseline we want to establish through this program is percent of people who have completed a course that say that they intend to apply the knowledge and skills gained on our courses to grow and/or strengthen the Internet, actually contribute to our cause. So, that baseline has been achieved and Q1 actual is at 90%.

Let's go to the next slide.

>> TED HARDIE: Actually, could I ask you to drill down just a moment for the - for the baseline for completion rate. I understand what you're saying, that because it's open and people can kind of come in and look around, that we may have people who never intended to complete, right. So, the way the structure of the course is, there may be a serious difference between those who intended to complete and have a problem and those who didn't.

And I'm wondering if there is any way to tease that apart in the future, because it seems likely that we're losing signal on maybe ways in which the training could be improved for those who did intend to complete and didn't, because that signal is kind of being swamped by the signal of people who were just looking around. And obviously this is something where over time you may be looking to ratchet up this from 16.5 to other things, but kind of - what's the arc here? What's the intent here? Are we trying to get breadth, get everybody exposed? Because that's a very different aim from getting a lot of people complete.

>> RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: We want to get people trained so that they are more knowledgeable about the Internet in general. And the team is actually currently working out a way of - what's the verb - sussing out those who are serious and those who are not. And when that becomes concrete, it will be implemented in the system itself.

>> TED HARDIE: Okay, thank you. And one of the things I can tell you from having worked in developer relations in companies is - is just breaking things down a bit so that things count as complete to folks very early on, because that really does help people get the sense of like, oh, I could actually get through this and maybe it's worth it.

And I see Muhammad has his hand up.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Yes, Ted. In addition to what you have just highlighted about the people getting enrolled in the programs and them completing it, one example could be the barriers related to accessibility because if people are unable to access the content, they would not be able to complete the course.

So, this, I believe, is a very good suggestion that the - the staff and the people, the team working on the course modules would have.

>> RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Yes, thank you, Muhammad. And also, I want to emphasize that our courses are available online and offline and accessible to people with disabilities. Also, we - our learning management system will offer course content via mobile apps which is very important for people in developing countries in particular. And all content will be mobile, accessible on mobile browsers, which also make it more accessible.

Okay. Let's move on. Strengthening our community connections and participation. Success measure is development of an implementation plan for the new systems or tools that we select in 2021. This is about our AMS replacement which is very important for our community. So, for this success measure, the target is to achieve it. We are at 75% completion by the end of Q1 but I think that we have an implementation plan now and the team is trying to get that done for the year.

So, the other success measures and targets, it's to achieve implementation of the new systems and tools as applicable according to the plan and decommission of legacy systems and tools as applicable according to implementation plans not yet started because it's dependent on the new plan being rolled out, essentially. Yeah.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: So, there is something that I want to state here and we've previously been a little coy about this in

open sessions, but since we're in an open session now, I can state this.

We have informed MemberNova that we are not going to continue that contract and that is ending. We're replacing it with Fonteva. That is a decision that's been made. The contracts are in place and this is rolling ahead.

So, you know, there was uncertainty about this in the past in various open sessions. Previously we hadn't disclosed this. But this is now, you know, information that you don't have to - we don't have to pretend that it's not happening. It wasn't clear in the contractual situation in prior meetings.

I'm pleased about this. We've had a lot of community participation in selection and development and so on. We've done, I believe, a better job than we did the last time we undertook this. So, I think that there is a positive development happening here. But it will take time and you know, I know everybody wants this to happen right away and I want everybody to understand that we're going to do a long, slow, careful job about this because, you know, we want to make sure that we have uninterrupted handover.

So, you know, please be patient because some of the folks who are doing this get the message, you know, like now, now, now, and it just takes so - it takes a certain amount of time to do any kind of operational cutover. So, I appreciate the patience.

>> RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Okay, let's go to the next slide. This is the last initiative, essentially, and it's a new program called the amicus program. The objective is to offer expertise, subject matter and technical expertise to courts. And that is to help shape legal precedent on influential cases that affect the Internet, essentially. If we are successfully, then those will be read and adopted and followed in other jurisdictions as well, and that's where we think that it could be very influential.

So, the success measure is the number of important precedential opportunities for amicus briefs identified by Internet Society Amicus Council. The target is six. Q1 actuals has already exceeded that with eight. Number of amicus briefs filed at appropriate courts of law, the target is at least two. Zero in Q1 and several have been considered but discarded because they are not the right ones. A number of other amicae that solicit our sign-on to their briefs to reach out to coordinate briefs. The target is four. It's in progress. Q1

actuals is two. And Ilona can provide more color if you would like on this program and that is the end of my presentation.

>> VICTOR KUARSINGH: Does this skirt the lines of lobbying at all or is this - like how - I guess it does or doesn't? Like, how close does this type of activity get to that world of is this lobbying or is it just basically engaging?

>> ILONA LEVINE: Yeah, that's a great question. So, because we're not influencing legislation and this is judicial forum and court of law, it is not lobbying. Amicus in the US courts, and that's why we started with the US courts, are very widespread and very easy to contribute. So, I was very excited that the board approved this initiative last year, so we've been working really hard on setting up the right filters so we can find the right cases because we can almost daily respond to issues that the courts get wrong sometimes, but because almost everything connects to Internet, right, attaches on the Internet, we are being very careful to make sure that the cases that we lend our expertise in or to are the cases that are advancing our mission.

So, that's why you see that we've been very careful in assessing opportunities that come our way and we just haven't so far found the right case to contribute. But we filed an amicus brief last year, before the official amicus program was launched.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Well, there is one more thing I want to say about that because you were asking about, quote, "skirting the lines of lobbying." And I want to be very clear, we are not skirting the lines of lobbying ever. If we're doing any lobbying, we are - we've got a registry of it. We keep it, we keep track of it. But we are definitely lobbying. And you saw some other things, like for instance in the discussion about - about encryption, there are direct interactions with governments directly trying to influence what they do in their legislation. And we are lobbying in those cases and we are keeping track of the time and money that we are spending on that because we are very serious about it.

It is an extremely difficult problem for us because you know, given our status, we need to be extraordinarily careful about that, and yet given our mission, that's an example of something where suddenly governments have become quite aggressive about producing legislation that directly affects the core of the Internet and we can't pursue our mission without engaging with that - with that - with that legislation.

It's a - we are - part of the reason we made the election we did, for instance, was in order to get clarity around that because it became very clear a couple of years ago that governments were legislating in ways that were extraordinarily harmful to the Internet and contrary to our mission. And so, we need to be - we need to be prepared to undertake that.

But we've got tight limits on what we can do and we're extremely conscious of that and we're keeping tight track of it.

>> ILONA LEVINE: And I would just add, and courts sometimes interpret the law and they may interpret it wrong, and so we have no limitations on lending our expertise to courts and making sure that the courts interpret the law or at least understand the consequences of how they interpret the law that may have on the Internet. So, we have no limits on that and we're excited to mature this program.

I think Luis had a question.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Yes. Rinalia, as compared to the previous quarter, if we want to summarize the engagement in a thermometer, how do you feel? It's steady? Are we raising engagement or it's going down? We know that through pandemic, we have passed through a number of different situations and most of them are unexpected. But the spirits were high and more or less it kept like that. But now that we're going back into these face to face activities and we have raised other expectations, how do you feel? Is community increasing engagement or we're still in this plateau?

>> RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: I generally see plateau except when we have special things happening like the splinternet campaign. And suddenly, that mobilized the entire community to come together and participate and lead in their own local contexts and countries.

So, I have - because I think that the challenge of splinternet will continue for the rest of the year and because we are going to deepen our focus on responses via the Internet way of networking by empowering others to respond to it, so I think that we can keep up the steady beat, but to see an increase, a dramatic increase, I don't think so.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: And the other thing that - because of many discussions happening in the world, we may need more information

about the demographics within the chapters. Do we think - do you think, both Sally and Rinalia, that we have the available resources to describe the membership in terms of demographic studies?

>> RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: So, we can - we are currently looking at them in terms of their regional spread. We do that - we've been doing that for a while. But what we want to do through the engagement score establishment is to determine which cluster is most active across a certain range of activity. That's actually quite valuable for us to know who is really interested in a particular topic and when the right opportunity comes around, to match them to that opportunity. We need the system to be in place to do that. So, it's very much dependent on the AMS.

>> TED HARDIE: So, let me ask a follow-up question. Luis, were you actually thinking about demography, for example, for us to know what the gender balance is of the membership? So -

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: No, we don't.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: We need an individual disaggregation level if we want to have some sort of accuracy in what we're stating.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: So, there are three different things to say here. The first one is, we can't actually require collection of that data. So, understand that any data we have is voluntary and it's garbage data as a result, right? Like, it's very, very bad data. We - when we collect - when we collect gender balance data, a lot of people refuse to tell us. And it means that we're extremely blind about that thing and I - like, I don't believe that like, any number is better than no number. It's just false. This is a place where we could be badly misled by that data and I want us to be very clear about that because there isn't any way - there isn't any way we can require it.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Yeah, I'm sure of that, but the - any data that you have and you're aware about uncertainty, then it's valuable data if you know the uncertainty limits for those.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: If we could know the uncertainty limits, we would be able to backwards calculate that thing because it's a two value system, right? But - well, maybe it's a four value system. But in any case, it's not very many values.

The - the basic problem that we have here, however, is that it's - the bias in the non-disclosure data is an unknown bias and it's very, very hard to analyze that. And we do not have the capability to get to the underlying data. We can't afford to do the kind of analysis that would be necessary in order to make that reliable.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: But - sorry, Laura. But we have location, geography, we have age, approximately, no?

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: We're not allowed to ask those things. It's against the law in some jurisdictions to ask.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Yeah, but the - well, on gender, well, we're blind.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: I think we have some indications but I don't want us to believe - I don't want us to be misled into the idea that we're going to get anything like the kind of certainty that would be necessary in order to answer some of the questions that I think you're referring to, because, you know, I know people really want that pony but like, I do too, but I'm sorry, ponies are not on offer.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: What I would at least would like is to compare as the figures published by the IETF, yes. And those figures are published on the attendance to the last sessions of IETF. They have made a, let's say, accurate statistical estimate of the IETF population.

>> BARRY LEIBA: The IETF has an optional question in your registration of what your gender identification is. And we - not everybody fills it out. You don't know if people are telling you the truth. I mean, you just can't attest to the completeness or accuracy of that information. It's just a guess.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Yeah, but the - sorry.

>> LAURA THOMSON: That's all right. It's a relevant question which is what percentage of the data we have is prefer not to disclose, right? Because I think it's pretty high. A number would be useful.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: That's part of the reason that I am so anxious about this. And it's - and this is true in our community. It's more true in some chapters than others, which, like, you know, so there are regional variations in this which

is also like really deeply problematic because you don't know what bias that's introducing.

We have this problem also just in the staff. I mean, we have a very serious problem on the staff because our HR system requires, because a lot of governments require this, our HR system requires that to be a binary value. That was why I said before.

And so, we've got an optional question for staff to offer us an additional identification and many of the staff refuse to do that and I can't - I can't require it.

So, even within the staff system, I've got like really bad data about this and it's - this is something that troubles me deeply when we - some of the discussion that happened during the governance discussion, where people seem to think that this was a kind of trivial thing to answer and it's just really hard. It's much worse - I agree with Rinalia - it's much worse in our current system which also has very bad facilities for tracking a lot of this stuff.

And then there is one more thing that I want to say, and that is in the case of the chapter membership, we also don't have that kind of information because many of the chapters do not share the data with us, because remember, chapters are independent organizations. And we have to respect that.

So, there are, like, it's not just that we've got poor data in various ways. It's that we've got poor data in multiple dimensions and that's a bad place to be making statistical inferences.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Inferences. Well, what surprises me is the IETF published an analysis of their population with the statistical analysis of the results, claiming some level of uncertainty. Now, I agree with you. We have unreachable data, yes, but maybe if we go and ask the chapters to describe the demography of their membership, maybe we can get some more accurate data.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: What I would say is once we have the tools in place, like once, for instance, we have replaced the AMS, I am totally prepared to take that data as the baseline and say okay, what's the trend on this data. And not make, you know, not draw conclusions about, you know, real rates about the world, but to say, okay, this is where we started. What is the

trend in this data in the places where we are able to collect it? That is a reasonable thing to do and as long as you don't - as long as you don't think that that's giving you a picture of the world, you're fine. But what I don't want to do is ever make the promise to people that we're going to have, like, a good picture of what our voluntary Society, you know, what its demographics are. We can't force people to give us that data and we have plenty of positive evidence that there's a significant number of people who don't want to and we don't know why.

And it's tempting to draw inferences about what those reasons are but I - that to me is a very, very dodgy thing, no matter how much you desire the numbers.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: The statistics allow us also to do sampling, right, yes. So, if we - I don't know, we're talking about a universe of 87,000. So, well, let's say 90,000. Yes, so maybe going into some statistical acceptable levels, maybe we're going into a sample of 1,500 which can be achievable even with data disclosure forms, yes.

Because the other issue representativeness which will be related to geographical location, that is easy because we have disaggregated the number of members per chapter per region and at the end, per world, yes, because now we have to deal with other worlds but still unpopulated.

But - so then the - I think maybe we should think on the statistics solution to this. But yes, we are somehow in the blind.

>> TED HARDIE: So, this sounds like a conversation that we might want to revisit once we get the new AMS in. But Rinalia has another presentation for the 2023 action plan process, and being mindful of time, I think we should go ahead to that.

>> RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Okay. This is a presentation about the 2023 action plan process. I hope you've received it because the text is very tiny and it's possible that you really cannot read it.

So, first, an overview, and I'll recap what I had said earlier. We have a five-year strategy. We refer to it as the path to 2025 because by the year 2025, we would like to see an indication that the Internet is bigger because of what we have implemented and that it is also stronger based on the things that we've been able to do through projects primarily and

through the enabling things that we do through empowering people to help us with our cause.

So, the strategy is centered on build, promote, and defend the Internet. And our primary instrument for implementing that strategy is the annual action plan. And how we resource the action plan is through the budget, the annual budget, and also the skills of our staff, all right. Those three things are quite important for us.

And we developed both the five-year strategy and the planning process in the year 2019 and we started using them for the year 2020. So, you would have seen the first action plan for the year 2020 and this is the process for next year's action plan. We always begin the year before.

A few things to note about the planning process. First is that this process evolves every year because my requirement for it is that it continuously improves and it incorporates lessons learned. So, if there are things that we need to improve on, you will see some adjustments, but generally the flow heads towards the same direction. It ends essentially with the board approval or rejection.

This process is open to all staff. It involves the entire organization because the action plan and the budget for the action plan itself is binding on the organization. So, it's extremely important for all staff and it is open to all of them to participate.

The second thing to note is that community input is gathered every year on priorities for the year that we're interested in for the action plan itself. In the past few years, we've done annual surveys, the response rate is not great, but we take it anyway and we try to supplement it by gathering input when we have regional calls or when we have face to face opportunities or any opportunity to connect with our community.

And the final thing is that the Board of Trustees has some several touchpoints in this process. The first is that when the leadership and management team decided on the priorities for next year's action plan, you get informed about it. You have an opportunity to react and that comes back to assess feedback.

The other point when you get key information is when we've shortlisted the projects and initiatives for next year based on the proposals that are developed by staff, after having the

input from the community, is that you get a chance to take a look at that short list and also a chance to give us feedback.

And then finally, when we've put everything together with all the details and the resourcing information, it comes to you for approval and also rejection if you don't like it.

So, that's essentially the process as a whole. If you see the different colors, it basically denotes the different groups of people that are involved in that process itself. So, at the very top, it's - sorry, I have to look at my screen because it is tiny.

It's the management steering group which basically makes the day to day decisions, decisions that span six months to eighteen months, essentially.

The following layer is the future group. It's a subset of the leadership team that is tasked to look after the sustainability and relevance of ISOC. So, it is looking at the future of ISOC itself and it looks at proposals with that lens.

The third group is basically the senior experts. These are our technical experts. They are the most senior in the organization. We tasked them to look at trends about the Internet, how is the Internet evolving, what are the emerging technological trends, and what should we prioritize based on the frame of the five-year strategy itself.

And the next one is basically all staff. They can propose any project based on the priority that we say we want to achieve our five-year strategy. Following that is the southeast quarter leaders. These are the team leaders that report to me. Essentially, they provide the support and enabling services that enable projects and other things to be successful for ISOC.

And then we have staff submitting - the community that provide input. The finance group under Sae who basically makes sure that we develop the budget that gets tabled to you at the end of the year, and then of course, the board, in light gray at the bottom.

If you want me to go through the flow itself in detail, I can do that, but that is the overview and I hope that you've had a chance to look at it and I'm happy to address any questions that you may have.

>> TED HARDIE: George?

>> GEORGE SADOWSKY: Where are we now in this process?

>> RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: We are at - past 14 June where the management steering group has decided on the 2023 priorities and these priorities are coming to you next week formally via email.

>> GEORGE SADOWSKY: Thank you.

>> RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Okay.

>> TED HARDIE: Any other questions or comments?

So, I have to say that continuing to manage for continuous improvement in the face of the volatility over the past three years has been quite challenging and we certainly appreciate your efforts. I mean, the number of unexpected mass events from the pandemic to a new mass refugee event, et cetera, has been very high. And finding ways to incorporate those understandings as they have gone through both on the foundation side and inside ISOC has been really impressive but something where I start to think about what the systemic version of that is. How do we recognize those and make sure that the flexibility you have is appropriate to the volatility that you're dealing with.

I don't really have a suggestion on how to do that concretely at the moment. You could kind of do it in a kind of baseline way with something like an index, but I think it's something that we need to think about as it looks like we're going to continue to have a fair amount of volatility in - in the parts of the world that we need to affect with our mission.

And so, definitely as you think about this process and continue to improve it, it would be useful if you think about how the volatility you have to deal with is impacting both your timelines and your need for flexibility so that the board can support you in responding quickly and appropriately when we do see the kinds of events that require responses that we don't get a year's lead time on. Thank you.

>> RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you. That's very helpful. And tomorrow when Andrew presents the mid-term status of the five-year strategy, that will be an opportunity for the board to engage on the substance of it and also to talk a little bit more about what are the patterns that you may be seeing around the

world that may require some adjustments. And then if that's clear, then I can accommodate that in process.

But thank you for that input.

I think that we need one more year's cycle to, on the process side, to see whether or not we can stabilize it just from the organization side, because we have a change that's coming up. But beyond that, I'm looking forward to the discussion tomorrow.

Thank you, Ted.

>> TED HARDIE: Luis?

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Yes, and I agree with you, Ted. The - it's a success, being able to be stable on the current situation, and keeping this plateau level, yes. You cannot grow in uncertainty and we have been able to keep steady, yes. But it's also this volatility, as you described, the chance to imagine a future, a different future for many of the programs we have. Maybe the fellowships have to be rethought also as events are changing. But also, it's the chance to say, well, let's restart and imagine a different sort of fellowship that satisfies either the needs of society and the needs of participants, yes.

But for that, you - for that exercise, you need a view of the whole. How do we imagine a community and the engagement and staff and all the - all the people you described in this process? How do we imagine them in the short and mid-term future? Thank you.

>> RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Ted, I think what would be ideal, we had this discussion possibly a year ago and I had said that once we have the results of the mid-term strategy, that's an opportunity for the board to give us feedback on any course correction or adjustment that we need to have. So, I think it begins tomorrow. But thank you for that feedback, Luis.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you, and we can certainly make substantive suggestions for course correction based on what we're seeing in the world right now, but I think what we're also seeing is the rate of change is - is much higher than we might have predicted, right. And that's hard to give a course correction around but it might be something where we can give flexibility to staff to make sure that they can course correct quickly enough to react.

And so, we can certainly respond quickly if asked a specific question. Do we need to quickly setup a program for the pandemic which the foundation did amazingly quickly. Is there something where a refugee response needs to happen quickly? But there's also something where the flexibility that we can say, look, we recognize the volatility in general and therefore we're going to expect a deviation from the action plan relevant to the volatility. And you know, you can't throw it out if the volatility doesn't justify that.

But if we do have a new mass scale event that does justify it, we want to be able to give the flexibility do the right thing for the mission without kind of hewing to the action plan that was made before the circumstances changed.

But exactly how to structure that is not something I can really lay out today, but it is something that as you think about process and particularly how you want to think about it after this mid-term report, it might be useful to bring to the board, because you know, we see market volatility, we see geographic volatility in terms of the current situation in Ukraine, and we see a lot of other things that are not looking like the next year or two are going to be smooth sailing.

>> RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: We appreciate the flexibility orientation and giving us freedom to respond to relevance and need. Thank you, Ted.

>> TED HARDIE: Well, thank you to both of you for the presentations today. I think we're ready to take a break now. It's eight minutes before the hour and we have our lunch break from now until the top of the following hour, which would be one o'clock here in Den Haag. So, we'll -

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: And that is opening in closed session.

>> TED HARDIE: Yeah. For those of you who are observing, that will open in - that session will be a closed session to receive financial reports. So, after that, we'll come back to the open session.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: We'll be reopening at ten to - 13:50 local time.

>> TED HARDIE: 13:50 local time for the open to observer sessions to begin again.

Thank you and see the board in about an hour and see the observers at 13:50.

Open session now. The next thing on the agenda is the board meeting dates and locations for the 2022 retreat and 2023 meetings. There is a proposed resolution here. The resolution is to approve those dates.

It says resolved that the board approves the following dates for the 2022 board retreat and 2023 meetings and, provided that it is safe and practical to meet and travel, in the following locations.

To clarify, that means we are firm on the dates and the locations will depend on conditions as we get closer to the time of those proposed meetings.

For the 2022 retreat, the proposed time is the 21st through the 23rd of September in Europe with the specific place to be determined.

For the 2023 Q1 meeting, it will be the 1st and 2nd of April, which will be co-located with the IETF. The location for that IETF has not yet been announced.

For the 2023 Annual General Meeting it will be the 16th through the 18th of June in Washington, DC, co-located with the ICANN meeting.

And for the 2023 Q4 meeting, it will be the 11th and 12th (November) in Prague, once again co-located with the IETF.

May I ask somebody to move the motion? Barry and Luis.

Are there - we'll do this by affirmative vote. Are there any objections? Are there any abstentions?

All those in favor, please signify by raising your hand either in the online tool or in person.

Okay. Thank you very much. The motion has passed and these are set as our upcoming dates. Thank you very much.

The next item of business will be to receive a report from the IETF LLC Chair. Has the chair joined us at this point?

>> KEVIN CRAEMER: He has not, Ted. I do not have Jason with us, yet.

>> TED HARDIE: Okay. We'll - please go ahead, Kevin.

>> KEVIN CRAEMER: It was just to say we're a bit ahead of schedule.

>> TED HARDIE: True. We will then pause the recording for just a moment while we wait for him to become available and then resume when he is.

Your report.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Okay, great. Thanks. Appreciate it. Let me figure out how to present something here. Oops. Hold on. There we go.

Okay. I cannot start screen sharing while someone else is screen sharing.

>> KEVIN CRAEMER: Oh, let me stop. Try again, Jason.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: All right. All right, how's that? You seeing - you seeing a presentation?

>> TED HARDIE: We are. It's not yet in presentation mode, so if you could put it into presentation mode, that would be handy.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Yeah, let's see. I almost never do this with - with preview. Where the heck is presentation mode?

>> KEVIN CRAEMER: It might be view. View, full screen.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Yeah, hold on.

>> VICTOR KUARSINGH: You had it a second ago, Jason. Right there at the bottom, there's slideshow and then -

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Got it, got it, yeah. All right. Sorry about that. There's so many - so many things over my screen here.

All right. Thanks, everybody. My name is Jason Livingood. I am the LLC Board Chair. And these are the folks that serve on the board right now. Whoops. I don't know why we're going through. Let me back up.

These are the folks that currently serve on the board and - sorry, I'm just moving some windows around. And have been on the board, other than Lars who is new, as the IETF Chair, the rest of us have been on since the beginning of the board.

All right. And - I don't know why it's being a pain here. All right.

All right, so, next up, these are the staff members. So, this is a mix of, you know, fulltime equivalent folks and staffers. So, Jay Daley, Greg Wood have been both around for a little while. Lee-Berkeley Shaw, recent hire to focus on development which is really fundraising. And Kesara and Nick, focused on all of our technical, you know, depth and sort of development needs that we've got that the community can't -

So, just as background because I know that you have some new folks that are joining the ISOC Board. The - oh for goodness, this back and forth here.

The IASA is basically the Internet Administrative Support Activity. And it was put into place originally in 2005. And so, it went for quite a while and the community felt, probably starting around 2016, that we just needed - it was a needed revision. And that was something that was undertaken. The contract with the Internet Society was in 2018. The RFCs that are surrounding it followed either in 2018 or 2019.

And one of the key objectives was for the IETF to achieve significant independence from the Internet Society and you know, per the RFC 8712 here, operate at arm's length. Whereas before, there was a great intermingling of staff and folks were sort of, you know, wearing both hats so to speak and it ended up being not just confusing but you know, a problem for both the organizations in terms of productivity and focus and so on.

In 2021, we were required under the initial terms of the agreement and under the IETF RFCs as well to perform basically a retrospective, a look back to see what were the key objectives that were laid out and were those objectives met, and then of course, you know, should we make any course corrections.

And sixty-one of those, sixty-three were achieved or on track to be achieved and two were yellow. One pertained to the IETF's technical environment which is part of why we've hired a couple of contractors to help us in that regard. And then the second

was developing a sustainable funding model, you know, which is in part about differentiating beyond just the Internet Society's contributions. And so, that justified the other hire that we've made.

And of course, if you've not read it, definitely take a look at the operating agreement that we have in place for the new members. It's very short and easy to understand.

So, the one thing that I think we wanted to cover here today, especially as new folks join, is that you know, with new staff joining not just at the LLC but also at the Internet Society, we want to make sure - and of course, new board members, we want to make sure that we have a mutual understanding about the existing agreements and the relationship.

And I think we've had some concerns lately. We've worked on some potential changes to antitrust policies to match, you know, the current risk environment. And we've taken, you know, a lot of - a lot of advice from counsel, not just our regular counsel but from other counsels. And you know, there seem to have been a high degree of questions there than there would have been in the past.

Similarly, our OFAC Compliance Policy, we've seen instances of communications directly from ISOC to some of our staff and contractors which was unusual and surprised us. We didn't have a heads up to some of those things.

And then, you know, I've been asked about clarifying things like shared services for HR benefits that we assumed would go on for some time and so on.

And then just some other governance related issues pertaining to the board.

And so, you know, I sort of raise those issues to say, you know, things have been going pretty well lately but maybe as a result of recent changes with some of the staff, you know, we've noticed some, you know, things that would cause us to question that arm's length agreement, and that may just be a fact of folks getting up to speed, getting the history of some of the relationships here.

And then just for folks' reference, this is also in the ISOC-IETF agreement. We've got a bunch of obligations to ISOC and I would encourage you to read them and then, you know, if ISOC

believes they were deficient on any of those, there's a bunch of steps that are laid out and also important to read and understand.

The key is that, you know, if there are substantive disagreements, let's use, you know, OFAC compliance or antitrust policy or something like this, you know, there's sort of a method to go through a cure and review process, and try to work through those issues.

So, that's it. I would love to have any discussion. You know, I tried to be very high level in this part.

>> TED HARDIE: Thanks very much for bringing the matters to the attention of the board. It probably would be good if you put your issues slide back up for just a moment.

Thanks. So, I just wanted to first of all, you know, say obviously the operating agreement that was put in place is still in place. Our understanding of the current situation is that you know, the IETF LLC is still expected to behave with an independent board and its board is responsible for the administration of the IETF. And just like the IETF LLC is arm's length from the standards process, we are arm's length from the IETF LLC.

The one thing I will say is there are certain things that you being a disregarded entity of ISOC necessarily require us to coordinate on. And a great example of this is fundraising. And we were talking about this some time ago. You have your own fundraiser, Lee-Berkeley. I've chatted with her in her role. And the fundraising you do has an impact on ISOC. Obviously, funds you bring in counts toward ISOC's 990 and they impact how ISOC presents its - its fundraising situation to the IRS and to the other authorities.

So, we do need some methods for working with folks like Lee-Berkeley to make sure that if there are donations coming in, that they're structured in ways that benefit both the IETF LLC and ISOC's maintaining its 501(c)(3) status appropriately.

So, there's definitely moments there where we do not need in any way, shape, or form to direct the activities, but where coordination is valuable. And understanding how you would like us to do that coordination is certainly something that we can discuss.

But for certain topics like that one, the public support test, is something where we are - we are functionally one organization from the point of view of IRS understanding of our relationship, and we have to be a little bit more coordinated than fully at arm's length for topics like that. And I just want to make sure that you understand that it's no intention on our part to direct the affairs of the IETF LLC and the administration of the IETF, but there are those topics where we have to be aware that the external legal constructs or IRS constructs treat us as the same body, and for those, we do need coordination.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Yeah, absolutely agree. I think this, you know, goes into other areas where, you know, to use an example, you know, we're working with our accountants who have a contract with us. And they get a contact from an ISOC person who asks them for reports directly or directs them in some aspects of their work. And ISOC doesn't have an agreement with them and you know, we have a confidentiality agreement as well with the contractor.

And so, you know, it's stuff like that where we want to make sure it's very clear that like, you know, if we have a contractor and you've got questions about, say, a financial report or whatever, you can send those to us. We'll work with our contractor employee to get them and so on.

But it's just sort of one example but yes, totally agree, a high degree of coordination is absolutely appropriate and you know, we're committed to ensure that ISOC passes the public support test and has whatever documents they need for IRS or other compliance.

>> TED HARDIE: We really appreciate it and obviously many of these are detailed elements of it, making sure we agree on the specifics of what accounting standards we're going to use for audits. For example, this is coordination we also need to do with PIR. And that kind of thing, if you would, you know, want us to make sure that questions like that always pass through Jay, for example, that's certainly something that I believe Andrew would have no problem agreeing to. Is that correct?

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Well, so, the particular example here appears to have just been a miscommunication where you know, there was an attempt to try to expedite some stuff that I guess the accounting contractor hadn't been informed that there were some questions coming and so, you know, I have regular chats

with Jay and he raised it with me and I raised it and as far as I know, we solved that.

>> TED HARDIE: So, I think from our point of view, obviously the board doesn't get involved in the - in the accounting standards beyond the Finance Committees making sure that the audits are well received. And the same is true for many of the other committees.

We see the point of coordination from staff to staff being Andrew and Jay.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Yeah, that's appropriate. Yeah.

>> TED HARDIE: Okay. So - Luis did you -

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Yes, I would just like to stress the importance of consistency. As we saw it in the Audit Committee Report, yes, we need to work in consistency in every part of ISOC. So, we follow the same standards and follow the - we get the same good results.

>> TED HARDIE: Are there other discussions folks would like to have with Jason? Or Jason, are there other points you want to raise to the board?

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: No, I think that's all.

>> TED HARDIE: Okay. Well, let me thank you again for the presentation, and if there continue to be any of these coordination issues, the board believes that Andrew is the right touchpoint for those and please work with Andrew or have Jay work with Andrew on those. And if that has any issues, please do raise it again. That's for the - I believe that covers the issues you presented here, is that correct?

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Yeah, I think so.

>> TED HARDIE: Okay.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Yeah, thank you. And just one last note. You know, the IETF has a meeting coming up in maybe six weeks or so, the end of July. It's our second hybrid meeting. This one will be in Philadelphia and so far both in person participation and online participation is trending very nicely. So, we're expecting another good hybrid meeting.

>> TED HARDIE: That's great to hear. Do you know by any chance when you expect to announce the location of the Q1 meeting of next year? I'm noting that it's not announced now but just wondering if there's a timing you're expecting to announce it.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: We had hoped to have it be some time ago. If I'm remembering correctly, it's an Asian location which has proven very difficult to negotiate with. And for a period of time during sort of COVID lockdown, they weren't really doing much in the way of communications with folks that were trying to book from outside countries because of uncertainty about what the national regulations may be for entry.

We are down to some very, very small issues around catering and some other sorts of things in relation to rooms and so on. But we're very close and we think that the attendees will be very pleased with the location.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you very much for that update. I mention it because in the - the session just before you joined, we were approving the locations of the upcoming meetings of the board and in addition to this year, meeting after the IETF in London, it is now our plan to meet in conjunction with the IETF for Q1 as well.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Okay. Got it.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you again for your time today.

>> JASON LIVINGOOD: Thanks. Thank you. Take care. Bye bye.

>> TED HARDIE: Bye.

Okay, the next item of business is to receive a visit and have some discussion with a local chapter leader who I believe is unfortunately stuck in traffic. So, we will pause for a moment again while we try and sort out whether we need to address the schedule or just wait a few moments. So, you can pause the recording.

Welcome back, everybody. We're here at this point to receive our guest, Ruben Brave, from the local Netherlands chapter, and to listen to his report or his discussion.

>> RUBEN BRAVE: Thank you, Ted, for introducing me. Thank you all actually for your attention and the opportunity for me

to speak here on behalf of the Dutch Internet Chapter. And of course, I would like to congratulate on behalf of the Dutch Internet Chapter, the new trustees board members.

Can I just - okay. I thought I needed to press it. Thank you.

Yes, I am also to share here with you that I have been at the Internet Chapter since 2019 and I was a general - general board member and I really like what we do at the Dutch Chapter. It's a very active chapter. Fields of interest are disinformation, misinformation, but also advising ministries through cyber diplomacy how they can enhance their policy with regards to Internet governance. So, personally, I collaborate a lot with ministries of economic affairs, foreign affairs, and interior affairs.

My background is I am a, what they call a serial tech entrepreneur. It sounds a bit dangerous these days but it basically means that I've setup a lot of mostly tech companies, some of them for private organizations, also for large corporates such as the national ISP in the Netherlands. I was allowed to be instrumental in setting up the first draft for the 50,000 members. And I have also been involved at the board level at several Dutch organizations in regards to sports or leisure.

Currently, I am involved in what they call diversity and inclusion in the Netherlands. So, I collaborate with the Ministry of Economic Affairs to make the Dutch startup ecosystem more diverse and inclusive.

What I said before, we are a very active chapter. We have a lot of fun, actually, at the chapter. We like our subscription to the mission of the Internet Society, which is to provide a safe and trustworthy Internet for the benefit of, yeah, everybody on this planet, actually.

And yeah, this brings me to the two matters that I have put on the agenda actually, because we also believe in the Dutch Chapter that it's important to practice what you preach. So, we've been involved as a chapter, as an organizational activity for organizational development in helping individual members to follow-up on procedures that seem clear at the Internet Society.

So, one of them is actually setting out a chapter, a new chapter. It's a quite straightforward process, actually. And the other thing concerns the setup of a so-called special interest group. So, we have been - yeah, we followed up actually all of

the procedures concerning the setup of a special interest group, but we still, to date, do not have any clarification why this original procedure was not followed up.

We have gotten, of course, information from the officers that we were in contact with and yeah, they had an explanation that they were reviewing - the Internet Society is reviewing the chapter, the special interest formation process, and they had clear reasons to do so.

But we have been - what I said before, we are a very active chapter. We are volunteers. A lot of them are people who work as volunteers. But I would like to make room also for the interpretation that volunteering is also valuable work. There's a lot of people who aren't involved at board level at the chapter who are Internet professionals. They work at high hourly rates and they really like spending their time and donating actually their time to the chapter of the Internet Society Netherlands.

We are of course aware that the Internet Chapter in the Netherlands is a separate identity of - is an independent entity of - yeah, is not connected to the Internet Society. So, we are aware of that. But it also means that when we look at the contract that we have as a chapter with the Internet Society, we do have some question marks when it concerns the support that, I believe, it's under Article 3 or 4, support that is, yeah, said to be provided by the Internet Society Netherlands concerning organizational development.

So, there are two capacities, actually. Of course, individual members, for which the chapter and special interest group process are designed for, actually. We can read that as the process is formulated. But it's also another capacity that as a chapter, you have a relationship with the Internet Society, a formal relationship, and that is formulated also in support provisions from the Internet Society.

Both these - from both these capacities, we see some issues with regards to the follow-up of Code of Conduct. Also, for individual Internet Society members, assuming that officers who are involved in these processes are also Internet Society members. But also, there's a code of conduct for board members and officers for Internet Society and these entail things like fair and - fair and honest treatment. Well, you know that probably better than I do.

But we feel that these codes of conduct have not been followed up.

And yeah, concerning the specifics, yeah, of course you can ask any questions, of course, if there are any questions, but I would like to raise these questions because if the Internet Society's mission is to provide a safe and trustworthy Internet, the question for me is then of course, how is it possible if in the collaboration with the Internet Society itself, these principles are probably at least from our perspective, these incidents, not being followed.

>> TED HARDIE: So, let me back up a little bit to the first item because I think you were first talking about the set of mechanisms by which chapters and SIGs were approved, and ask a clarifying question.

Clearly, you already are a chapter. Was there a movement inside the Netherlands Chapter to setup a new chapter as well or was it a -

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: The new chapter was the proposal for a Surinam chapter.

>> TED HARDIE: Okay. And so that was then brought to the regular process and where is it in the process now?

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: So, from our point of view, it turned out that there was more than one group that was working on - on setting up a chapter there and they were not communicating with one another or they didn't know about one another or something. And we attempted to bridge this but there were some miscommunications during that time. And in particular, there were some - some correspondences that were forwarded that turned out to create tension among the group.

And much of this nearly as we can tell has to do with, you know, sort of wider geopolitical contexts and historical contexts that I don't think we can do anything about.

But it was our understanding that the two groups that were working on this agreed on the final application, which included people from both of the groups that had been originally working on this.

Now, once the - once the joint - once that final application was shared, according to the standard process that we have which

is when a new chapter comes in, it is shared with the rest of the chapters for comment and so on, that was the moment at which we heard that it appeared that there was not actual agreement and that clearly there was a problem there.

And so, we had to go back and reconfirm that all of the - all of the people who were listed were in fact supporters and this ultimately ended up being, you know, causing some people to say, no, no, I never supported them, and so on.

Finally, there weren't other concerns raised from the chapter community and the chapter was chartered on the 1st of March 2022.

>> TED HARDIE: So, just to confirm my understanding there, the people who raised the issues on the chapter list were from - chapter leaders from other chapters? They were members of the different sets of proponents?

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Well, the different sets of proponents included chapter leaders from other chapters that were not the proposed chapter.

>> TED HARDIE: I see. And so, from your perspective, this process included a number of potential issues, one of which was that people weren't being contacted to confirm that they were willing to serve as proponents and so some of them did not believe that they were being listed as proponents appropriately.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: I think that's the case. I mean, I think there were, from our point of view, there were - there was some intrapersonal conflict among the various people who were involved in this that created some tension. There were - there was some language that was infelicitous, shall we say, on a few occasions, that I think we wanted to, you know, smooth over.

I think we did learn about some - some of the - some of the internal staff handling of some of these things that, you know, we could sand smooth some of the processes there. And I think that there have been some reviews of some of the internal processes in order to make confirmatory links at the appropriate time, and you know, some care in drafting announcements and communications. And I think some, you know, I think we didn't - we didn't handle all of the balls perfectly within the staff and I think we did some review of that. But I also think that, you know, there is always some difficulty in community processes when there are some internal conflicts - you know, there is competition across the community. And some of that was exposed

in this. There were differences in the community and it's always challenging to, you know, to do work in public the way we do at the Internet Society when you've got, you know, some potentially deep disagreements about how things are going to work.

And I think that some of the history here, though it is not as happy as we would like, was really exposing, you know, some divisions within the community. And that isn't something that we can magically fix.

>> TED HARDIE: Okay. Ruben, you mentioned as well a SIG process. Do you want to tell us what the SIG was and what the issue was?

>> RUBEN BRAVE: Yeah, so the SIG was a SIG focused on - oh, I'm still on - is focused on dis and misinformation and also using the Internet protocol that was at least facilitated by Internet Society, the annotation protocol, so just like an additional layer on the web where you're able to annotate on words, sentences, or paragraphs. And this annotation layer, this - part of this Internet infrastructure, we also use to guide editors-in-chief of mainstream media to provide them quality indicators of the information on their - on their news media.

For this, we used a method of crowd sourcing, of curated crowd sourcing to find people who are domain experts in a certain field or through tests, have proven to have some level of critical thinking so that we know that these annotations have a certain quality level.

But of course, to scale this up, we saw the opportunity to collaborate with some individual members to enable a special interest group to be formed. And yeah, in hindsight, maybe the same processes have been there also active. So, it was not clear to us why our application was stalled. There was - we were given notice that the Internet Society was working on a new formation process, so that we knew. Only when we - we were not involved in the creation of this new special interest formation process. And when we saw the final outcome actually of the special interest group formation process, the new one, we saw that it would not fit the formation of the disinformation chapter of the disinformation SIG that we envisioned. Basically, it meant the death of the SIG.

We did have a sort of plan B, of course, to have a working group in the chapter. But that creates all kinds of legal aspects concerning accountability for the present board members

because a working group is not a separate entity. You cannot create a separate entity out of the working group. So, that would be very complex for us, actually.

But it's a working group now and a lot of renowned knowledge institutes are involved. There are like six hundred annotators of, I believe one third is curated. So, again, it's a mystery to us why - because we already had created this application, why it was not created as was possible of course then.

>> TED HARDIE: So, let me just make sure I understand the timeline. So, it sounds like the SIG was informally organized and operating and presented a document for recognition right around the time the process was changing. Is that -

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: That's right. So - so, we got the application for the new SIG in November 2019 and that was the time when we already paused acceptance or creation of new SIGs while we were working on the new process. And there were exchanges back and forth from December to March 2020 about why this was paused, because we were doing the new thing.

We did try some other things because we knew that new SIGs were all paused during this period. And it was taking a long time to build the new SIG approach because we had a community working group that was sorting out what the new rules were going to be for how SIGs were going to be operated and so on, and that took, as you all know, it's taken quite a long time.

I mean, we're only just really getting it into place now.

So, I mean, I do think it's unfortunate that, you know, that these two processes collided. I can't say I'm delighted at the length of time that it took us to get the SIG issues sorted out.

The reason, just to remind everybody, the reason we were trying to do that was because the prior arrangement for SIGs was also really deeply unstable because it required - like, SIGs, you can sort of think of SIGs as being kind of parallel to chapters under the previous arrangement. And the difficulty was that whereas chapters generally speaking have a geographic scope and therefore an obvious jurisdiction under which they exist, the SIGs were supposed to be global, and in the absence of a global government, it became difficult to understand where a SIG would be located. This tended to mean that SIGs did not have bank accounts all of the time or if they did, they frequently had them under the aegis of some other chapter.

And this tended to be a very, very awkward solution. Many SIGs were unhappy with it and that's why we kicked off the new thing.

So, I am sorry that these - that these two processes collided with one another and I know that it was an unsatisfying experience for you, but that is the reason why it went that way.

>> TED HARDIE: So, just to clarify one other thing, the other part of this was of course a limitation on the number, right?

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Yes, because the way that the SIGs - well, the limitation in number and the community selection mechanism. But, you know, because the community ultimately selects which ones are going to be supported.

The reason for the limitation in number is a practical one. We only have so many staff and because these all have to be functionally, you know, delivered as part of the Internet Society's activities, you can think of SIGs as having roughly the same functional relationship to the Internet Society that the IETF used to. That it's really an organized activity of the Internet Society and the Internet Society does all of the, you know, contracting and financing and so on. And that's a very different model from the way SIGs used to work and it's certainly true that changing this course kind of midstream made it especially awkward for anybody who was trying to create a SIG at the time.

And I - you know, I can't do anything but apologize for that because it was a collision.

>> TED HARDIE: And it sounds like in particular, once the process was complete, you looked at it and said, now this doesn't match what we want to do because this isn't an organized activity of ISOC through staff, it's an organized activity of a particular chapter, right.

>> RUBEN BRAVE: Yeah, exactly, yeah.

>> TED HARDIE: It sounds like almost creating a second chapter with this mission but still geographically limited to the Netherlands would be another way of approaching your problem. Is that something you and your leadership have considered?

>> RUBEN BRAVE: Yes, we have considered that, of course, and we are still considering it. Again, also, the special interest activities were part of the organizational development of the Dutch chapter, so we were looking forward to collaborating with the special interest group. But also, you know, we're now talking about it in two minutes or something like that, but I would like to emphasize that this process maybe took more than a year or something like that and we were kept on a string all this time.

We have partners also as Internet Society that are serious partners. What I said before, they were serious knowledge institutes, serious journalists also, helping us to create this special interest group. So, again, you know, we see these two capacities as individual members who want to create initiatives, either it be a special interest group or a special - a chapter or a special interest group, and the activities - bless you - and the activities we have as a chapter that strengthen our position in the Netherlands to provide activities in line with the Internet Society's mission and the Internet Society's business plan.

Having said that also, we looked at the business plan of Internet Society and the last version we could find was 2016 or something like that.

We see that there is -

>> TED HARDIE: Are you looking at the action plans for -

>> RUBEN BRAVE: No, business plan, because the contract of the chapter refers to a business plan, not to an action plan. The action plan is of course an extension of policy of the Internet Society, but the distinction between policy and business plan has clearly been made in this chapter agreement.

So, for us, it's very unclear also when we looked into the bylaws of the Internet Society. We couldn't find a specification of a special interest group. The chapters we did, but not from special interest groups. So, we were puzzled how, you know, we - what I said before, we invest our time and profession and our network in setting up activities in line with our contract actually with the Internet Society, but then when it comes to the part of - well maybe it's not only about deliverance but also about transparency, actually - then we are kept in the dark.

If it was like, you know, Ruben, we would love to support your chapter but at the current time, we don't have the capacity for, you know, then we know what to - how to handle also, our national interests also.

So, the lack of transparency is something that we see - that we have worries about. Let's put it like that. And that we would like to address this and of course, this is a just a verbal introduction to the matters, but we would like to follow-up in a written version where you have a structured timeline also of the events. But this is the summary of the two things that we would like to address and what I said before, yeah, we support of course the Internet Society and its mission wholeheartedly and professionally also, but we do think that it's important as an organization that stands for a trustworthy Internet, that, yeah, practice what you preach should be a very important principle.

>> TED HARDIE: Luis?

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Yes, thanks, Ruben, for coming today. And the - I try to understand. When you say about contract, is it the MOU?

>> RUBEN BRAVE: I don't know what it is in English. In Dutch we have what is called a charter agreement, I believe. So, it's -

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: It's the charter of the chapter, right?

>> RUBEN BRAVE: Yeah, yeah.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Okay, which comes with an MOU with ISOC. Just because at the very beginning of your conversation, you speak about the chapter as very distancing related to the rest of ISOC and all the chapters are very important for ISOC. That takes me to the - this issue you were discussing about the Surinam chapter and the SIG. But you said also something very important, which is you're working in diversity and inclusion, yes. That's very important to share with other chapters because we know Netherlands is a country that has a lot of experience in that area, also in peace, in work toward peace. So, that may be shared with other chapters.

So, that brings me to one of two things I want to ask. The first one, because we can speak a lot about the bad things, but

there are a lot of good things to be told. So, what would be the great story of the Netherlands chapter? Yes, that's one thing.

And the other thing is I'm very worried when you said that there was some breach of the code of conduct. So, if you want to be a little bit more specific to see if we can suggest something to prevent that happening because it's not nice that anyone at ISOC is breaching the code of conduct.

>> RUBEN BRAVE: Yeah, I can imagine that. So, the first point was why I spoke so remotely about the chapter. Actually, when I look at the charter agreement, I see point 6, there is a specific article that says chapter independence. So, the chapters have operated as an independent identity with the sole authority over the chapter's activities, governance, membership, funding, and other matters. So, this is the reason I did it.

But of course, we feel involved with everything that is happening in the Internet Society because we're also humans and we talk to people in the community.

But what this - what I also meant, that, you know, these two things, both the SIG and the chapter formation are as we look at it, at the process, are designed to facilitate individual members, but it doesn't exclude the possibility that individual members can collaborate with a chapter as part of the organizational development of the chapter.

So, yeah, what would be the greatest achievement of the chapter. Oh, that's - I think, you know, there's a minimum requirement for chapters to be like - to have like one mission related activity, but already I think we are at ten or something like that.

But I think that one of the things that we did was quite invisible actually, was influence the Director-General of the Netherlands to at least reconsider not shutting down the content coming from - from, yeah, from entities that they don't like. So, that was something that played - that was relevant during the Ukraine/Russia conflict or war, however you define it. But we were able to have a seat at the table there and yeah, we find it very important to provide insights of, you know, the Internet way of working to also policy makers, yeah.

>> TED HARDIE: And Muhammad, you have a question?

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Thanks, Ted.

>> TED HARDIE: Muhammad, do you want to type your intervention if you're having trouble?

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: This is Muhammad Shabbir, for the record. So -

>> TED HARDIE: I'm sorry, Muhammad. Whatever codec you're using is not - not handling the packet loss. It is really impossible to hear you. So, if you could type it. Oh, we've lost him.

Are there other questions for Ruben or discussion?

Charles?

>> CHARLES MOK: So, Ruben, what can we do now? What do you want to - how do you want to take it forward or any other options to resolve? I mean, you've heard what Andrew has said. What do you think you want to do or what can be done for those chapter and the SIG?

>> RUBEN BRAVE: One of the issues we had was - hm.

One of the issues we had related also to the communication with the officers. So, the communication just was at a certain point, nonexistent anymore even though we tried to make contact. And we made contact, I mean, but we didn't get any answers. So, for us, it's important that someone maybe from the board or someone - another organ within the Internet Society can get the parties back at the table, so, because we want to continue the activities as foreseen because they are relevant for our chapter, and to see if there can be a practical solution that fits the possibilities of the Internet Society itself and also suits the interests of the Internet Society Netherlands, because I don't believe because, you know, it was a quite straightforward process, I don't believe that it should be a real issue. I don't believe that when it concerns chapters, there is exclusivity for instance. And to just really look at a practical solution to resolve this matter.

So, actually get a third person at the table to solve this.

>> TED HARDIE: So, it sounds like you, as in prep for that, you're planning on creating a document to send to the board.

>> RUBEN BRAVE: Yes.

>> TED HARDIE: So, do you have an anticipation of when you might want to send that?

>> RUBEN BRAVE: Well, the holiday is starting so I have to be - but yeah, I think that in the beginning of August, of mid-August/September, we could provide a - yeah, a document that shows all the time and all the - yeah.

>> TED HARDIE: Okay. You're certainly welcome to send it to the board chair email for my attention and I'll route it from there.

>> RUBEN BRAVE: Yeah. Thank you.

>> TED HARDIE: Any other questions or discussion for Ruben?

>> CHARLES MOK: Did Muhammad type in his?

>> TED HARDIE: I haven't seen anything. Kevin, is there anything in the chat from Muhammad on the Zoom chat?

>> KEVIN CRAEMER: No, there's no - no question typed in from Muhammad.

>> TED HARDIE: Muhammad, we can see you again. Do you want to try one last time?

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Yes, Ted. Am I audible now?

>> CHARLES MOK: Yes.

>> TED HARDIE: Yes, please go ahead.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: So, I just wanted to thank the Netherlands Chapter and their administration for joining us today. And on the SIG part, I just - is and was a frustration situation for yourselves, following the bylaws, because these are [inaudible].

As regards to a SIG working group, I happen to be a part [inaudible].

>> TED HARDIE: I apologize, Muhammad. We've lost you again. And it sounds like even when we do have you, you're quite seriously garbled. So, if you could send your intervention by chat, that would be a bit better.

So, Ruben, we'll forward to you his intervention once we get it, but let me thank you again for taking the time to come and talk to us today and to raise these issues. We appreciate both the dedication of your chapter to the mission and to improving the functioning of the Internet Society.

>> RUBEN BRAVE: Thank you for having me here for the meeting.

>> TED HARDIE: The next item on the agenda is receiving a report from the ChAC. And I believe, Frédéric, you're on with us now.

>> FRÉDÉRIC TAES: Yes, exactly. Thank you all very much for the invitation. Do you hear me correctly?

>> TED HARDIE: Yes, we can.

>> FRÉDÉRIC TAES: Okay, excellent. Thank you. So, normally it should be Pierre-Jean Darres here to present this report but he has had issues and we have just prepared a small report to you on the work and topics of the Chapters Advisory Council Steering Committee.

Go to the next slide, please.

Yeah, so we have worked on four main parts. We do focus and then list all of the topics we are also busy with. The first one is the ITU/United Nations discussions. We want to build a framework to engage chapters through the Chapters Advisory Council. That's the first project. I will detail all of these afterwards.

The second one is interpretation within working committees, it is a request we have received from Eduardo Diaz. And we have translated in how to engage the broader community.

Next item is the digital sovereignty. To have chapters to liaise with local and regional governments. And finally, a chapter survey. We are focused on the work chapters are willing to do rather than how to do. And that was done in the past.

We can go to the first topic on the next slide. I think I can even move forward myself. Oh, yeah. Exactly.

So, a framework to engage chapters through the Chapters Advisory Council. So, first, we have very good collaboration, notably through Elizabeth Oluoch and the whole ISOC staff team. The Chapters Advisory Council Steering Committee, OMAC, and some chapter leaders who participate to review the WTSA recently a few months ago.

Very good work has been produced by ISOC staff and all associated people, including two reports. I mentioned here the issue matrix, one of April and one for a later date. The issues matrix is really complete and really excellent work, but heavy and complex work. So, for example, for the first one, there are seventy-seven issues reported and going in many directions and topics, like radio controlled devices or encryption or IP addressing and many other Internet related issues. And this is also quite complex for chapters to onboard when you have such big work, how to involve in the ITU or United Nations discussions and how to approach local governments.

So, we have built an action plan together. That's also a work in progress. The first thing is to increase the national government's understanding of Internet Society priorities. That's really the first point under the first objective we want to reach together with the chapters.

The second one is to increase government's support of the open globally connected Internet, to have really an active participation.

And the latest one is information sharing with OMAC and chapters and ISOC staff, of course.

So, that's the action plan in short.

With the question how to involve more governments and chapters and how to know them, it's the next slide, we just have summarized the proposal. If we can go to the next chapter. Thank you.

The idea is to have chapters who didn't onboard yet, start an onboarding process with a few topics. The topics are not final. It's a proposal. It's an idea to focus on some key topics that will be easier for chapters to onboard and not seventy-seven topics at the same time.

The first one is splinternet, especially with the - how do you say it - with the international situation with Ukraine and

Russia. So, they are really requests to isolate some parts of the Internet and to splinternet. That's a first approach.

The second one is digital sovereignty. That could be approached very differently depending on the countries. In my own country, for example, it's through data retention. The government is asking to capture all metadata like IP addresses, geo organizations, the identity of the people, and provide that to government on request only for [inaudible] case.

So, digital sovereignty is supported coming into many countries now where each country wants to decide about the Internet in this area and not matching with the Internet way of working, of course.

Encryption is another example of a topic on how to protect, and we are talking here about end-to-end encryption over the Internet. And this is a proposal really to approach chapters and to come with those three topics, that chapters could approach local governments and institutions to start and engage in discussions.

Of course, in some areas, we have the domain issue, it's more the access to Internet because the Internet coverage is poor and connections are quite bad. That would be another approach for those countries. That's the idea of the onboarding.

And for chapters already engaged, we have a lot of things. I just mentioned a few with the Internet way of working, the issue of metrics, we can use the full Internet tools, et cetera. And that's really the approach here in chapters onboarding. Three, local governments, an alternative for countries with poor Internet coverage, and from there, the five [inaudible] KPIs. It's a proposal.

Like, for example, in each country, the situation, what are the challenges, and what could be present threats to the Internet model from the legislation or the upcoming legislation in some countries.

And then to - with this dashboard, to see what is the participation of the chapter and to really have more chapters involved in this process and when chapters are involved and when we have a vision, also what's the status. Does the government have a good understanding and are they supportive, yes or not.

That's the idea and we still need to refine with staff, the model. Do we need to setup working committees on these topics and support and others?

That's the proposal. I propose on this topic, if you have questions, raise your questions now before moving to the next part.

>> TED HARDIE: Are there any questions from the board? Luis?

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Yes. Thank you, for your report on these issues. So -

>> TED HARDIE: He's got several things he's going to go through. This is just the first of the projects he wanted to hit on.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Yeah, I just want to know if the - from the chapters, how they are participating in this process. If there is a lot of participation or is it just - how about the - the percentage of participation.

>> FRÉDÉRIC TAES: Yeah, the percentage is rather low, so that's why we - we come now with the onboarding approach to help more chapters to onboard. For example, digital sovereignty. The status last Tuesday was eight chapters and SIGs having providing input. It is not much.

And of course, even to participate with the WTSA meetings, it was even lower. It was more people already engaged through the actions we took in government that at the same time were part of Internet Society. But it's too low so that's why if we have a dashboard and KPIs, as in the proposal, then we can really see with full objectivity, how many chapters, which chapters, and engage in an action plan.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you. Please go on.

>> FRÉDÉRIC TAES: That's all your questions? Are there other questions?

Yeah, next topic, interpretation within working committees, how to engage a broader community. The way we had translated in the Chapters Advisory Council Steering Committee - I will not read the full text here. It's just for information. The original request that we had received and it was more from Latin America where it was observed that a few people are contributing to the

Internet Society compared to the mass of people available. And the request, how to improve that.

Moving to the next slide, if we can go to the next slide, we have what's the status and the work done. We have - our approach is always to start from the what. What's the objective? Because live translation is more a way of doing things, but to do what? If we do live translation in everything, like now for example, in this meeting in six languages, okay, what's the added value?

So, we have more restarted the broader discussion with Eduardo Diaz on first understanding what are working committees. And the definition is any committee created by the Internet Society globally and asking participation to volunteers. As an example, we have the special interest groups that we can be also on a topic. Digital sovereignty can be one. In the past, it was a working group, working committee report about the batch for example for the different chapters. Those are examples.

The objective is to engage a broader community and not only English-speaking people or people able to speak fluently in English. And the status is note in preparation, to be translated, of course, and sent to chapters for feedback. And in the next slide, I highlight the content of this note.

So, first, the objective, to engage - engage non-English speaking communities. Which communities? Here we have seen, dependent on the chapters, different approach, everything needs to be translated and it should be part of our DNA. Or only priority ones when really it serves more the community. Like for example, if we have the special interest groups for gender equity, that could be with live translation/interpretation for this special interest group.

The options, how to do it. The best is live interpretation during the working committees when possible as we are doing with the community weeks, for example, or other topics like Internet fundamentals and trainings. That's, of course, best. But at minimum, and the quality of software of technology is improving, is to have live transcription and live translation with tools that could be available. It could be a good idea maybe to invest in this future technology.

What we must do, in any case, is the translation of supporting documents. If there are working committees with slide translation but the invitation was in English, it seems the supporting document needs translated.

There were also some questions from chapters that benefit that. For example, Spanish countries, Spanish-speaking countries, how can they have access to tools or funding to translate.

During this reflection and analysis, we have also put attention on terminology. Sometimes if people put MANRS for example on the things, it is too complex for people. Even encryption translated in other languages.

In French, [inaudible]. It's really complex sometimes terminology and we can also work on easier terminology to address more people from the global community.

In which languages? We take as a basis the top international languages in the world here and really also part of the survey to get feedback from chapters.

So, this survey will be sent in the short future and afterwards with a final note with the approval and support of as many chapters as possible.

>> TED HARDIE: So, I'm going to interrupt you just for a moment because -

>> FRÉDÉRIC TAES: Yeah, this is finished.

>> TED HARDIE: It's because at the beginning of meetings, we normally declare conflicts of interest. I wasn't aware that you were going to have live interpretation as a topic. I apologize I didn't see your slides in time. And I do need to declare a conflict of interest for this because I have an interest in one of the companies that does this automated tools for machine translation. So, I will recuse from discussion of this topic and ask Laura, would you mind running the queue?

>> FRÉDÉRIC TAES: Okay. I think it's fair to mention this conflict of interest.

Are we moving to the next topic or feedback?

>> LAURA THOMSON: One question from Victor.

>> VICTOR KUARSINGH: Just one question. If you go back a slide. So, maybe I missed this nuance. So, this is to - one of the objectives here is to engage non-English speaking

communities, languages below include English. So, is it - is the target the communities that are first language not English but still use English as the language by which to communicate? Or is it to communicate in those foreign languages? I'm just trying to rationalize the objective.

>> FRÉDÉRIC TAES: From what I have learned from Latin America, so, they have Portuguese and Spanish widely spread but English - people cannot speak in English, could not intervene in a meeting in English. And if it's only English mandatory who participate to live meetings, then you miss a big part of the community. That's what's the message.

>> VICTOR KUARSINGH: Okay, so if I understand it, the objective is to be able to communicate in those foreign languages as a way to access those communities, get their input, et cetera?

>> FRÉDÉRIC TAES: Yeah, exactly.

>> LAURA THOMSON: Any other questions? Please go on.

>> VICTOR KUARSINGH: Actually, I had one other question, but this might be a broader topic that we take off. So, in the previous slide to this, there was the SIGs. There was a SIG question. And just from a prior conversation, I'm not sure if it's a capacity item. When - I guess there's a total number of SIGs that could be supported by ISOC in total, right. And so, there has to be - there has to be some selection as to what areas do that.

And so, when there is both community chapters that are trying to bring up SIGs versus things that the committee at large make sure that they want, where does preference go and how does that, like, that selection process, is there like a qualitative thing that goes in there? Because you might have community members that want to work on something that may not match what the kind of the global position is but they actually have people wanting to work on it, versus hey, we want to work on this as a global Society but now you have to go find people who want to go actually work on it. Like, is that - I mean, this may not be for this part of the discussion but that's just one question that came to my mind based on the previous conversation and now working into this one, so.

>> SAGARIKA WICKRAMASEKERA: Do you have Internet localization projects or do you have any strategy on that to engage the non-English speaking people to your projects?

>> FRÉDÉRIC TAES: Sorry, I didn't really catch your question but basically, if there was a meeting, it is to have live translation to enable live interpretation to enable people not clearly understanding English and not able to participate in English to be involved and to participate. And in which languages but in alternative international languages, as Spanish, French, or others.

>> SAGARIKA WICKRAMASEKERA: Did you develop a specific strategy for that or in that sense involving non-speaking people?

>> FRÉDÉRIC TAES: That's really first to have the input from the community, from the different chapters on what are their priorities. I know that some, in my opinion, also an opinion of the Steering Committee, they want to have that in our DNA. So, to have everything translated as the European Parliament or Commission are doing in twenty-two languages. But that costs really a lot of money. So, I think we should define priorities and that's part also of the survey that will be sent to chapters, what are the priorities. And for the priorities, not high, medium, or low. It's more a ranking that we will ask. Please, could you put one, two, et cetera. So, really the proposal in these areas, we see really an opportunity.

For example, I will just take a personal example, gender equity or it can be [inaudible] community to have translation and live interpretation in other languages. And that will be the input that we receive from chapters.

>> LAURA THOMSON: In the interest of time, you may wish to move on.

>> FRÉDÉRIC TAES: Does that answer your question? We can also connect offline if you want. Really, it's a pleasant topic and welcome to -

>> SAGARIKA WICKRAMASEKERA: Yeah, we better communicate offline, I guess.

>> FRÉDÉRIC TAES: Yeah. Really, that would be excellent.

Digital sovereignty. It's one of the two next topics, I will say only a few things because it just started with the next big priority. Again, the steering committee will take the lead on this. And the objective is to enable chapters to liaise with local and regional governments. And it's there that we make also the link between digital sovereignty and the ITU or United Nations discussions on the Internet way of working that would be one of the three topics.

A chapter survey, yeah. It's a survey we will send shortly that was in the hands of Pierre-Jean Darres. You can go to the next slide where we give the status.

It's really to get the priorities of the chapters, to know if they have other key topics that they would like to have addressed by the Internet Society and that is not part of the action plan, to know the interest in organizing some workshops, webinars, working committees with the Internet Society and with domains, languages that should be supported, so linked to the previous topic, and what would help chapters to be more involved with the Internet Society global community. That's really the, in a nutshell, the content of the survey. We have an advanced draft to be translated and sent and that's in the hands of Pierre-Jean Darres and we see internally even the conditions, how to manage that in the upcoming months.

We do not intend to send that in July or August because people will be on holiday and we expect discussions on these answers, but we would like to have the input before or jointly with the Internet Community Week that would be in September.

You can go to the next slide. And even next slide. Here are the topics we are working on for your information. So, the Community Week early in September, full ChAC Council calls and communications, and then also selection of chapter volunteers for the Board of Trustees Election and Nomination Committee and the same for the Chapters Advisory Steering Committee for next year.

That was the - all the topics and the status we wanted to share with you today.

>> LAURA THOMSON: Thank you very much. Questions? Luis?

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: I will share your microphone.

I have a - I have this concern. The chapters, let's say they complain but it's not an actual complaint, it's just some kind of worry that they need to communicate with the other parts in the organization, especially the Board of Trustees. So, then the - we find in the middle, the ChAC, right, and then the - the ChAC was designed for other things, right, to help to organize the chapters to, let's say standardize the way they do business in accordance to the charter, the common practices, sharing best practices. But I just want to know if the ChAC is able to have or act as this communication channel or the ChAC should think in other ways that the chapters may communicate to the other parts in the organization, yes. So, that is the question, if the ChAC, do you think, is ready to act as a communication channel, or should be thinking how to enabling this communication, that the chapters say they are in need. Thank you.

>> FRÉDÉRIC TAES: Yeah, good question. I think there is a really strong and good communication from ISOC staff made to the different chapters. The purpose here is more the coordination between chapters. So, if we want to pass a message about, for example, live interpretation, it's not only communication from ISOC staff to chapter or from chapter to ISOC staff. We need to coordinate it, to collect the input and the feedback and to provide it back. So, that's the first question.

And in the other sense, also some chapters are willing to be more involved but they don't know how to do. The example here we have taken with three - with encryption, digital sovereignty, and splinternet. And there we can come with noted interest and specific actions to enable chapters to better participate to the global Internet Society community actions.

That's really the way we have understood our mission. Now, if you see differently or - I understand, but we really want to act on this, on the request of the chapters and based on the what's and not how they want to do it. More the what, what are the objectives, how can we support between chapters, and also liaise with ISOC staff and others.

Does that answer your question? I don't hear anything.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Yes, yes, yes. Yes, you - you answered the question but I have in the head this level of participation and I'm trying to match it to something that we heard from the chapters. I don't know where. They were saying - they were asking that they use the ChAC to bring their proposals to the board and they said well, actually, the ChAC is not very useful

because they only meet sometimes in the year and they do it for very limited time. So, I'm not asking for a how to do it, as you say, but the - what we should be thinking or how to organize that communication problem in ways to be solved in a productive way for the ChAC members and for the chapters, right.

But we don't have the solution now. It's just an invitation to think from the ChAC how to organize the chapters and say well, how do you want to communicate? Let's work on these tools to be communicated as you were doing with the chapters' participation in ITU activities, which I found very interesting, the way they got information from ISOC and the way they provided feedback to be taken into the WTSA or WTDC, right. Thank you.

>> LAURA THOMSON: All right. Does anyone else have a question?

>> VICTOR KUARSINGH: I don't have a question but I just want to confirm. So, if I understood your original question, you want to know, is the ChAC there to primarily provide a method by which communication occurs? Or are they a vehicle by which that communication occurs? Did I understand your original question?

And then from your comment later on, it seems like you have a preference that they should be working on the method by which communication works, and that's the key thing you seem to be most focused on. Is that - did I understand that correctly?

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Yeah, we cannot come - not even Charles now can come and say well, this is the way the chapters are going to communicate with the rest of the organization, because this is not the way ISOC works. So, the chapters were saying or were told that ChAC was a vehicle, yes. But we heard from Charles, they are not ready to do that.

So, I think the proper place to develop this method of communication should be the ChAC while working with the chapters as they show us that some of the initiatives have been successful. That is the example of ITU as work around the policy. So, maybe they can work on that but it is something to keep in mind. [inaudible].

>> FRÉDÉRIC TAES: It's true we have only volunteers on their free time and maybe we need more support to be more effective, more productive. That's a good point.

>> LAURA THOMSON: Charles, do you have a question?

>> CHARLES MOK: Yes - hi, thank you. I was looking at the - your description about some of the work you were doing with the UN/ITU advocacy or discussion within the chapters and also digital sovereignty and so on. Just wondering, because this morning we also heard about some of the topics being mentioned in the action plan, are we talking about the same things or how are you coordinating between the work of the ChAC and with the staff action plan or not?

>> FRÉDÉRIC TAES: It's also part of the survey, is to know really from the chapters if they really clearly understand the action plan of ISOC and how they are engaged in this action plan. It is also part of the discussion of the survey, to see if we have two different works or if we are really together. And if we are not enough together, what can we improve and then how.

>> CHARLES MOK: I think that's very good but it was actually, you know, considering that I was looking at the group's name, it's the Advisory Committee, but to me, it seems like this is a little bit more than just advisory. You are actually doing work that is helping with the action plan of ISOC. So, I mean, it's good that this is happening, but at the same time, I don't know whether it's in the same, you know, along the same line as what Luis is asking.

How much should we - should we or should we not expect the Advisory Committee to - to focus more on advising how we can build a strong relationship with the chapters? I mean, certainly working on some of these topics might be conducive to the same goals, but yeah.

>> FRÉDÉRIC TAES: For example, I can answer your question, how to advise to have better collaboration with chapters, is keeping simple and stupid. If we see the ITU, the discussion, it's too complex for chapters. And if they want to onboard, they cannot because they are discovering the document of many pages with many topics and it's too complex and it's too much for me and they do nothing. And then we have a poor involvement of chapters.

And our advice here is to - to come with a simple onboarding process and select three key topics for chapters so they can really onboard easier and then gradually improve the work with the chapters. That's our advice here.

Put an onboarding process to help chapters to onboard easily on topics and not start with documents of hundreds of pages with many different and complex things and people don't know, okay, what I need to do as chapters to approach my local government based on the issues matrix for example. They don't have any idea.

>> CHARLES MOK: Sorry. One last comment. Because I was just thinking about, for example, when Ruben was here and talking about some of the issues that he seemed to have with chapter communication with the headquarters and so on. You know, I - and then one of my questions would be, if I were him, would I come to the Advisory Committee first? Or seek help? For most chapters, apparently, they don't do that. Should - should he not as a chapter to do that?

>> LAURA THOMSON: If you don't mind, I think we've thought about this for a long time and we are somewhat behind schedule, so I am going to thank Charles (Frédéric) for coming to talk to us today and hand the mic back to Ted for the next session.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you very much for your time today. We appreciate the report and we look forward to continue to working with the ChAC as you work through the issues that were discussed today and the projects you have listed. Thanks again.

>> FRÉDÉRIC TAES: Thank you.

>> TED HARDIE: So, I'm going to ask Kevin. Kevin, has Muhammad rejoined us?

>> KEVIN CRAEMER: No, I do not see Muhammad. Oh, here he is. He is there. Muhammad, can you hear us?

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Yes. Kevin, I can hear you. Can you hear me? And am I understandable?

>> KEVIN CRAEMER: Yes, you are now.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Actually, I had a power outage and I am hoping that at the top of the hour, it will correct itself, and I will have my Wi-Fi Internet back. Currently, I am connected on my mobile data. So, if I am fine, we can go ahead with the agenda. Otherwise, we can take a short break and start at the top of the hour.

>> TED HARDIE: Let's take a short break. Let's start five minutes after the hour just to give you a little bit of time in case the - there is a mismatch there. That means we would be back in eleven minutes.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Yeah, thank you, Ted.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you and we will see you again in just a few minutes.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: How are you, by the way?

>> GEORGE SADOWSKY: Okay.

>> TED HARDIE: Muhammad, we're ready for you to start. As we are now on the topic of the ISOC Accessibility Framework which was sent to us from the standing group.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Yes, thank you, Ted. Actually, I have actually this to say and more to hear from my fellow colleagues that - in the beginning to accessibility, digital accessibility, or [inaudible] accessibility for people with disabilities.

[inaudible]

Responsibility after the Charter on Accessibility and Disability was de-chartered due to the new SIG strategy. And in 2022, once again, it was de-charted in '21 and '22, reformed as Accessibility Special Interest Group.

My purpose coming to the board with a proposal in regards to ISOC policy for persons with disabilities is that there have been a lot of work. But this work has mainly remained to some actions and some of the frameworks into ISOC system with regards to employment, some specific tools.

Mainly it has been that there were issues and when it was pointed out that this is the issue, staff or some other community members, they come together to resolve the issue.

The purpose of this policy should be that if that is - there should be a policy that should be guiding the Internet Society about the different issues as they come in front of the Internet Society instead of when the issues arise - [inaudible]

Developing more accessible [inaudible] guidelines.

So, we need [inaudible].

Others which are doing some work on persons with disabilities. So, this works needs to be bringing together under a single umbrella which would, at this point, be the Accessibility Standing Group. But this work could also be driven by the action plan, the - and the larger strategy of the Internet Society.

The ultimate objective here is to make the Internet accessible for people with disabilities. If some chapter wants to start or some SIG wants to start, for instance, to make Internet equally accessible and affordable because when we talk about the availability of the Internet, it's not just the - the cost that is - that people incur on devices. It's also the cost incurred for people with disabilities in certain cases that they use or incur to access through those devices, to the Internet. For instance, the availability of screen readers or availability of accessible devices in certain areas.

This work cannot just fall in the domain of the Internet Society. That's why I say we need to define our limits. And we also need to define the extent to which Internet Society will go. But there has to be some extent because when we say the Internet is for everyone, people with disabilities form a very considerable part of everyone, around 15% of the global population. And if we do not consider while promoting our policies, while implementing our strategies, while formulating our plans, we are effectively ignoring this 15% of the world population which, as a global Society, I would say we cannot do.

So, I will stop there and if there are any discussions, we can move forward on that.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you. I appreciate your taking the time to go through that and I appreciate the ISOC Accessibility Framework which was previously shared with the board to remind folks on the board there are really two high-level goals of the ISOC Accessibility Framework, building a culture of accessibility and ensuring minimal barriers to participation and engagement with ISOC processes and practices.

And I think as we start the discussion, it's important for us to consider first what barriers to participation and engagement with the mission there may be. So, there is definitely - how do we make sure that people with disability can join us in the mission of ISOC. And then there's a second part, how can the

mission of ISOC serve those with specific disabilities. And so, as we start the discussion, maybe we want to take those as two different topics that relate to how ISOC and people with disabilities relate to the mission.

So, why don't we take the first topic then of the minimal barriers to participation and engagement which is really how do we make sure that people with specific disabilities are able to work with us on the mission. Any thoughts from the board?

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: I would take this, Ted, and to my understanding, both topics - these are two topics, but to my understanding, they come together on a single framework which I am proposing here is that the Internet Society needs to have a DNA on accessibility.

So, currently what is happening, what is happening is that there comes a person with a disability or someone telling the Internet Society that this is the problem in your system. And the Internet Society is [inaudible].

What is removed in the system as well as inculcate a culture of accessibility within the organization, that the organization should have certain minimal standards set for itself, laying down the principles that this is what should be ensured in the planning of and execution of Internet Society activities.

Now, I do understand that not every activity that Internet Society runs should have the accessibility provisions for persons with disabilities because it's not just the - the purpose of the Internet Society is not just to serve as an organization of people with disabilities, it has a larger perspective as well. But certainly, there should be someone or an expert in the Society who should be examining our plans and activities and the execution that are we - are we or are we not fulfilling and achieving [inaudible].

>> TED HARDIE: So, Muhammad, we lost audio for you. And let me just do a quick reply. I note that you're saying that you believe that this should be part of the DNA of the Internet Society, but what I want to point out is that what we're measuring is actually quite different for the two different questions.

So, for the first question of how - how minimal are the barriers to participation and engagement with ISOC, we would measure that by looking at the - the mechanisms by which ISOC

interacts with its members to make sure that they meet specific accessibility goals and that they can be measured against particular targets for accessibility. And we would measure them basically by saying anybody with a screen reader can get through this and there's no - there's no hindrance or there's a particular level of accessibility guideline which we're meeting, and we can set that and make a target to meet that, and that's how we would measure that question's impact. Have we met or not met our goals there would be measured that way.

For something which is an external program designed to help people with disabilities, it would be measured completely differently. And even if we were still talking about screen readers, we might say, there is a fundamental economic barrier to the use of the Internet because screen readers are expensive. And therefore, we want to work with somebody maybe to propose something to the Foundation as a grant for the development of a software screen reader or a low cost screen reader or one that works with lower cost components, and we would measure the success of that program completely differently because it wouldn't be based on our own communication but on the number of lives outside of our membership that were impacted.

So, I think we really do need to be clear. We may want to do both. I don't deny that. But what I want us to be clear on is how do we set this up not just as a set of desires to serve the community well, but a set of goals that we can measure ourselves against, because if we don't do that, it'll be very difficult to know whether we're making progress on either of those two questions.

Charles?

>> CHARLES MOK: Yes, thank you, Ted. I think your explanation at least helped me understand a lot more about what the board is considering when we face this issue of how we can improve accessibility as a whole.

My idea of hearing what Muhammad has been saying is that I think he is focusing a little bit more on the first question, of making sure that services and the resources that ISOC provides to the public and chapters and so on is keeping up to a significant or high enough standard of accessibility that is acceptable or should be expected from an organization like ISOC.

And if that is not yet the case or - okay, actually, your question about finding a way to measure is very important

because one of the problems might be that we don't have a good measurement as to where we are or we haven't seen that particular measurement or result. And that's why I think we're discussing this.

So, coming up with that measurement, it's that - and if we haven't come up with that measurement, is it because of resources? Is it because of not exactly knowing where we - how to measure or whatever?

So, I think - I think that is what we're trying to - what we need to understand first.

>> TED HARDIE: So, Laura, then I believe we're not starting from ground zero here and we probably want to ask Andrew to give us a sense of where the current activities are. Let's do Laura, Andrew, and then Luis. And then Victor, were you in queue? Okay.

>> LAURA THOMSON: I was going to say that I think one of these is partially dependent on the other, which is that I feel that ensuring minimal barriers has to come first, and part of the reason for that is we need to make it easy for people with disabilities to be involved in ISOC because you know, there is a saying in the disability world, nothing about us without us. And if it's hard for people to participate, then it's going to be harder to build out the other programs.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you. Andrew?

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Well, so, it - I've heard what Muhammad is saying, that the Internet Society is reactive in terms of somebody reporting a problem and then doing something about that, and I recognize that that is probably historically true. But I'm not actually - I don't think that I can agree that that is in fact what the Internet Society staff function is doing now.

So, we've been using, you know, conformance against various web accessibility guidelines in purchasing decisions over the last year or so. The problem of course is that none of that stuff has shipped yet, like, it hasn't landed, right. But I mean, we're not going to invest more money for instance in doing anything about MemberNova because we're replacing that platform. And so, the efforts - you don't see them yet.

Similarly, there's a fairly significant chunk of the style guide that is about this topic and requires audio description

when you've got a video, it requires alternative formats, it requires - it requires that always all videos have to have closed captioning, images have to have alt tags. There are a whole bunch of rules about PDFs. There's a whole bunch of rules about plain language and structure and so forth.

So, and all of these - all of these are here in an effort to try to - try to make sure that we are providing the necessary support.

The - the tools portion of the style guide refers especially to the standing group tool kit and you know, refers people off to that in order to do validation of this. And this has become a standard practice in our communications materials and so forth.

So, I - I certainly accept the criticism that historically the Internet Society staff seem to always be only reactive to this. It is nevertheless the case that we've adopted a number of policies over the past twelve to twenty-four months that have been an attempt to address this.

And so, if there is a desire for some framework here, beyond that, I don't know what it is. And it's - it's not clear to me what that is, so I would like some clear direction from the board on it.

>> TED HARDIE: So, Luis is next.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Thanks. As far as I remember, and I need Muhammad to confirm, he was speaking for some time about UN framework regarding disabilities, yes. As a policy for the whole organization, not just focusing on the digital means, on the digital assets, because obviously that has a very - there are a number of frameworks that may guide the design of the website and the tools to be used and the requirements.

But in the beginning, as far as I remember, this discussion started as a whole organization policy, and that needed a more complex framework because - and as you say, Andrew, the - we need some light regarding what is applicable in terms of the - to be an inclusive professional society, yes. But I need some light by Muhammad. Thank you.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Yes. Thanks to Luis and Andrew and Laura as well. [inaudible].

Discussions with the leadership of the standing group. The work has started to go in the direction that it should go. But prior to that, there have been a lot of good work and the toolkit that Andrew mentions is the best example of the prior work that was done under the umbrella of the [inaudible].

If you want to build a new website, you would have to set a standard that to which level of the WCAG, Web Content Accessibility Guidelines 2.1, which are the latest standards of accessibility with regards to the website and digital content. You would make your content and design accessible. Single A would be the least accessible and triple A would be the utmost accessibility.

Most of the [inaudible].

Easier for us and for any other person to check whether the ISOC websites and digital content were accessible to a level of AA standards or not, if there were any other fixes to make, they could be made. But if you [inaudible].

>> TED HARDIE: Muhammad, we have once again kind of reached the point where your audio has started stretching and breaking. So, I'm going to ask you to mute yourself for a moment, break the audio connection, and then try again, because sometimes that will restart the connection to Zoom.

So, if you could pause your audio for fifteen, twenty seconds and then restart, let's see if that gets us a new context or not.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Yes. Am I audible now?

>> TED HARDIE: That's a little bit better. Thank you.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: So, I will just quickly sum up. So, I agree with what Luis says, that I [inaudible].

To get there. So, this is what I want. Perhaps I am - I am not being clear on that and I think it's somewhat clearer for people if you were able to hear me.

>> TED HARDIE: So, you came back to clarity at the very end when you were asking whether we could hear you. But it was in fact a bit difficult. So, let me try and bring the board back into the discussion a little bit and ask folks on the board, if we want to take Laura's point of view that the first thing we

need to do here is to make sure that the work of the Society is accessible enough so that we meet that rough test of nothing about us without us.

And although we will continue to offer programming that's accessible, any specific programming directed at this problem will continue on its path but not get additional emphasis while we consider the first question. Is that a fair result of this initial discussion?

Obviously, there is no resolution here today. It's just a discussion.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Ted, am I audible?

>> TED HARDIE: You are again.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Okay, so, Laura's point - I'm sorry I forgot what was said. To some extent, we are already doing that. For instance, the Standing Group on Accessibility is consisting of people with disabilities.

What we need to do is, and that is for the Standing Group on Accessibility people and leadership to think about, it should not be the concern of the ISOC Board and leadership. Of course, we can provide them with the resources but they need to bring more people with disabilities on board.

I know there are a number of people with disabilities [inaudible].

So, the standing group needs to enhance its membership on Laura's point. So, we have started there but we need to improve on that.

Am I still being heard here, Ted?

>> TED HARDIE: Once again, we could hear some of it but not all of it. I think -

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: My apologies for that.

>> TED HARDIE: No, it's just where we happen to be. So, I want to go back to the point that I think I heard you make which was we have started down this path and there's been a good bit of work that Andrew shared with the board on improving both the accessibility standards and in the purchasing standards, making

sure that the things that we're bringing on board, say, to replace MemberNova, have appropriate accessibility goals and frameworks.

He also noted in the chat that signed a contract with a consultancy on inclusion work and one that has nonprofit global experience. Obviously, we'll have to see whether that particular consultancy brings enough experience to the table to improve matters, but I think the bigger point is to continue to work with the membership that we already have to making sure that the accessibility and inclusion of what we're developing is meeting their needs and extending beyond them as much as we can.

I do want to be sensitive to this question of how do we measure because it's very easy to put out a statement that says you support X and then do nothing. And this is not - it's kind of almost worse than useless because you're setting up an expectation and not meeting it.

So, I think what we may want to do is to make sure, as we go through the action plans and other things, that we understand the extent to which the programs that are being developed, for example, the trainings, et cetera, would be accessible, and that we focus on how the measurements are being done, because I think, you know, we need to make sure that when we make a commitment to the community, that we make a commitment that we can then demonstrate to the community how well or how poorly we were able to deliver. Does that make sense?

Okay.

We are beginning to run a little bit past time but I don't want to close this too abruptly. Luis, it looked like you had an additional point?

No? Victor?

>> VICTOR KUARSINGH: So, if I understood that, the focus now will be efforts we already started. It's focused on the output of ISOC, training materials, things for the community, it being accessible and to the community at large. That's the initial focus area. Is that a fair enough understanding? As opposed to the actual ISOC employee base which might be a different goal, maybe it's aligned, maybe it's not. So, I just want to make sure I understood where that first -

>> TED HARDIE: Right, and the point of that is then we can grow the non-employee - the volunteer base of the Society to include more people with different challenges and therefore have their experience to guide us both in how we continue to improve ISOC and how we then might create additional programs to serve people with disabilities as specific programs. Clearly, they are part of other programs because of intersectionality but that would be the kind of order of operations as I believe might make sense.

>> VICTOR KUARSINGH: Yeah, and I think that makes sense in that going back to Muhammad's point, is that would build the most controllable part is the one we do first. You learn from that. You understand what works, what doesn't work, and we use that as experience for the body to then figure out what are the next set of goals and you work outward from there and that kind of goes towards the building the DNA, right. Is that - maybe I put it together -

>> SAGARIKA WICKRAMASEKERA: In my point of view, that's what Muhammad is asking because in Sri Lanka, we do the pilot program on accessible Internet, accessible webpages. So, most of the people that requested are accessible like with the accessibility tools on the webpages. So, we have been training thirty government web developers to create the accessible websites.

So, we were planning to, like, spread that all over the world, like what we did was a pilot program, so we want to make it available for the other regions of the world as well.

So that's what Muhammad is asking. So, with my experience all over the world, PwDs, the first request is accessible websites. So, if we can have a strategy to address that issue, then we will be able to move on with what they requested.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you. And Luis?

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Just a final thought. We cannot think of inclusion in any sense if we don't think about the whole organization. Imagine, we cannot have an accessible website for the information ISOC shares and having non-accessible services inside the offices in the US or in Switzerland, yes. You need to be consistent and have a whole thinking, which is very complex in this sort of organization because we're talking in a global organization, nonprofit, with not clear frameworks, the - and essentially we're - this is our chance to take the leadership in how people think of the digital future of people, yes, because

as ITU in particular, they say, well, people with disabilities are growing up, yes, and nobody is incorporating policies in their operations according to that part of the future.

So, that may be our chance to take some leadership and make a positive change in similar organizations. Thank you.

>> SAGARIKA WICKRAMASEKERA: So, in my point of view, what we thought was as an initial group, so in the policy making process, we should include these people with disabilities. So, otherwise, normal people, they won't feel what are the difficulties they are facing, especially in the Internet arena. So, that's what we have to do. We have to make initiatives on that. Then only we can move forward with what they clearly request.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you. And channeling Muhammad's comment from the chat, measurements should be done by following standards. I think we all agree that that's the case.

Let me thank the Accessibility Standing Group and Muhammad for bringing the topic to the board. As you know, there was no resolution required, but I feel that we've come to a better understanding and I appreciate the efforts that went into it.

Our next topic is in closed executive session. So, I will ask the visitors to the - to either the Zoom session or locally to - to go ahead and leave us to the executive session.

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