

BoT Meeting 168-Day 2

Speakers: Ted Hardie, Andrew Sullivan, Barry Leiba, Brian Haberman, Luis Martinez, Robert Pepper, Jon Peterson, George Sadowsky, Muhammad Shabbir, Laura Thomson, Sagarika Wickramasekera, Charles Mok, Sarah Armstrong, Ilona Levine, Rinalia Abdul Rahim, and Sally Wentworth

**Services provided by:
Caption First, Inc.
P.O. Box 3066
Monument, CO 80132
800 825 5234
www.captionfirst.com**

>> TED HARDIE: Welcome, everybody. We are resuming the Internet Society Board of Trustees meeting that was paused yesterday in order to hold the Internet Society Foundation board meeting. I'll start today with an additional question of whether or not anyone has any conflicts of interest for today's meeting.

Great, seeing none I think we're ready to go on with the agenda as presented, which begins with Andrew and the President and CEO's report.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: I thought there was a slide for this. No, excellent. I'm sorry? So there are a couple of things to talk about today that are, you know that are pending. Excuse me I have a - there it is, okay. The first is the situation with the reallocation, and the second has to do with our progress on the - on the remainder of the action plan for the year. So the action plan is well in hand things are, you know, things are approaching their conclusion in all of the projects. The last of the projects that needs to finish out for the year at any time now, we will see the report from the sovereignty - from the Digital Sovereignty team that is in good shape. As you know, we finished up with the with the work on the internet way of networking earlier this year, and the other projects are well in hand, everything is pretty close to budget. I think we've got a couple of things that are a little underspent, but I believe that we're going to be, you know, very close to the projections for the year. That was the thing that I thought I had a slide for. So I apologize that I didn't - I must've misplaced it.

The overall efforts for the year have been a big improvement over previous budgetary work. So you will remember that this is a long-standing theme at the Internet Society that we have these budgets and then like near the end of the year there's this panic where we have to figure out like, you know, how to spend the remainder of the money. And that was a long-standing problem and I think we've cracked it. This is good in the sense that it means that we don't have, you know, little surprised pockets that we have to sort out at the end of the year. It's less good in the sense that we don't have, you know like ever-increasing piles of money that we have, you know built up for future events like reallocations. But I think on the whole an organization that can do accurate budgeting is better than one that can't, and whether you can't because you're underspending or can't because you are way overspending, is sort of a secondary consideration. So that's the first sort of bit of good news. I feel pretty good about that. I know it was one of the main targets for me for the year, was to get stuff within about five percent of the budget. And I think we might land it this year. So, like yay team.

I really, I, you know, maybe I'm being a little flip about it, but actually I think this is excellent that the organization has managed to figure out how to do this. And I appreciate all of the work that has gone into it. The reason for this, by the way, in case anybody cares, is a sort of a bunch of back-end efforts that have taken several years to do. So the staff organization has really embraced a bunch of tools that allow people to be much more predictive about this. Finance has done a lot of good work with the rest of the organization on understanding what their budgets are, and like, you know what they're spending rates are, and understanding the difference between cash and accrual. We are deploying even as we speak a new tool having to do with purchasing and so forth. And all of that is an effort to get the organization as a whole to have a picture of what the financial picture - of what the financial situation is.

The reason this was a problem is a cultural one of the Internet's - historically at the Internet Society, which was "Oh, that's a financial problem so finance will cope with it." And this is a fairly consistent pattern that we've had in several areas. We had the same thing with fundraising right, "Oh, that's a fundraiser problem, the fundraising people take care of it." "Oh, I need to communicate this, here communications pipeline. Please take this out and do this." And by that point, of course, the communications people look at this

and say, "Okay, I've got this huge list of stuff, but like nobody will understand this, but it's too late to fix it." So we have changed that culture, I believe we changed it at the Internet Society and this is one example of how that's working. So that's a really positive development.

The reason I think that that's so positive is because of the situation going into the reallocation. So we're in an open session and we haven't talked a great deal in open sessions about this reallocation, so I'll just give a few notes about that. But everybody on the board will already know this. I'm sorry that this will be boring for you. The fundamental plan here is to expand the work of the supporting organization. So, the Internet Society is a supported organization, it's a public charity. And it has more than one supporting organization, Public Interest Registry is one such place supporting organization. It is created as a - you know its mission is to support the Internet Society in particular ways and do some education around the DNS and so on. And that's what Public Interest Registry does. When we created the foundation, it was a separate supporting organization. And we talked about this yesterday, that supporting organization had certain functions that it originally had to do, which you know, it was primarily originally, we were working on philanthropy, and the reason we were working on that that way, was to get the organization up and running. But we had a bunch of other things that we wanted it to take over.

And so now we are ready to do that, because Sarah and her team have done such a great job. We can now expand the remit of support that the supporting organization offers, and we're taking some other functions away from the Internet Society and delivering them in the supporting organization inside the Internet Society Foundation. The critical thing to understand here is that this is not really a change of anyone's job. It's not actually adjusting a job that anybody does, if somebody's moving from the Internet Society into the Internet Society Foundation, they will be doing the same job with the same team. We're not laying anybody off for this, we're not actually changing the job that anybody does. We're changing which corporate organization they are working within. And this is a normal thing for the structure of supporting organizations, that's the point of having supporting organizations is to do things on behalf - in support of the mission of the supported organization. That's why they exist in tax law in the United States, that's the entire purpose of them.

So the plan is for that to take effect at the beginning of the year. As part of that, we are also changing the three management jobs. So we're changing my job, because you have told me several times that you want me doing more of the public defense of the internet, and I understand that. But in order to do that, there are some things that have to be taken away from the things that I do. And so fortunately for me, we have Sally and Rinalia who are able to take over some of those functions that I have been doing. And so Rinalia will be doing this for the Internet Society Foundation, and Sally will be doing this for the Internet Society. They will be the managing directors as of the beginning of the year and they will lead the, you know, operations of these two organizations. And then I will presumably be able to, you know, take the public positions that are an important part of what we've talked about.

So that's the way that that's happening. So we have this fairly elaborate project plan that allows us to bring this home at the beginning of the year. We have been taking weekly meetings with the leadership, there is a transition group that is leading this. It includes all of the executive management, it includes, you know, various parts of the organization including HR who are, you know, who are keeping track of these things. And we're getting excellent support from Yvette, who is doing the project management of this. You know, we have a smart sheet that we go through every week and make sure that everything is on track. There is a thing that had been held up that board has completed, the compensation committee said, "Oh yes, we check off on that." So that's one more thing that you know tomorrow - no Tuesday, we will be able to check off and say hey this is done.

So you know this is the sort of ordinary, operational functioning of this. This is well in hand and there have been some deadlines that have moved but nothing, I think - I'll confirm with me, but nothing that I think has slipped in any kind of deadly way. We have an outside consultant; her name is Sharon Ashmead who is also helping us on this. She is an HR professional who is good at sort of organizational coordination. And so, she has been working with us to try to help make sure that those pieces all land and to provide a sort of outside view. You know, one of the problems when you're making a change in an organization is that everybody knows each other. And so it's easy to make assumptions and one of the things that we have found with Sharon is she asks questions like, "Well why are you doing it that way?" Then everybody says, "Well, just because," and then it's the opportunity to ask whether that was in fact,

the very best way for us to make that change. So that has been, I think broadly speaking successful.

I don't anticipate that they're going to be any - that there's going to be a long tail after that. We will prepare a report for you just as we did after the last reorganization, we will prepare a report for the board about the success of this. That will be sometime, you know, after this takes effect because we want to see whether it actually, you know, yields the results of we want. So, probably in the first quarter of next year, sometime we'll prepare an initial report about that. And then obviously an evaluation at the end of 2023. I think those are all of the really - I think those are all of the really hot things that are that are on the plate. So I can open it for questions if there are any or if there are other areas that I haven't touched on that you hear need to hear about.

>> TED HARDIE: So I have a question on how the long-running project on membership management is going. Is that to you or is that to somebody else here?

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: That can be to me. So I guess there are two questions I have there. Or I guess a clarifying question before I answer you, is this the long-running project on like the association management software? The replacement of MemberNova? Or is this the thing about individual membership?

>> TED HARDIE: I meant the first, but the second is interesting as well.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Okay, good always good to open the pit for myself. So, the good news about the about the AMS replacement is that it's chugging forward, and this is landing just sort of at the perfect time. The back end of the software that we selected is Salesforce. And, of course, we have a new fundraiser who is coming, and he was talking about the, you know, the CMS that was necessary for that. And we said, well we're, you know, starting up the Salesforce thing and he said, "Good, because I was about to ask you when you will have Salesforce for me." So, that is, you know, that's proceeding ahead. We believe that everything is going to land on time in the first quarter of the year. Most of the challenges have to do with integrations, which is the same challenge we've had all along with the software that we had. There is a little bit of difficulty with single sign-on effort that hangs over from the way that it was implemented in MemberNova. And that has

presented a kind of rock in the road that we were having a fixed but I think it's in good shape.

The one thing I will say is that there is a tendency with software systems for people to treat them as a magic bullet. And so, we're now in the part of the curve where people are saying, "Oh, well when Fonteva arrives, that will be fixed." And so, I want I want to set the expectation that sometime after Fonteva arrives, there will be a whole bunch of things that people were expecting that it would do, you know, puppies and rainbows and so on, that don't materialize because there are business processes that are still probably inadequate. And so, we have some additional work to do to make sure that that those business processes are all handed off correctly. I think we've identified all of them, but I will not - I'm sufficiently experienced in you know, systems transition to know better than to believe that like everything has been adequately caught. Testing, I think is going to start just in a few weeks. So, I don't think there will be any big surprises, but I'm sure they'll be some little surprises.

On the individual membership efforts, we've got very, very high response rates on, you know, opening the newsletters and so on. So we've got really good engagement. I think that, you know, what we're seeing is a next step that we probably got to do, which is to figure out how to turn that engagement into enthusiasm for contribution, and actually to, you know make room for those contributions. There remains a challenge, and this is true generally speaking with the organization, there remains a challenge in turning the enthusiasm of members and chapters and organization members of the Internet Society into action where we're really collaborating. I think that's the sort of the next step, I know that's Sally has been looking at - looking through that lens as we're thinking about this reallocation because Joyce is moving to the Foundation for other reasons because of Constance's departure. This is an opportunity to look at that more generally. And so, there's a project going on to look at, okay well, since we've got this transition happening why don't we have a look at all of the projects and see what the next - you know what the next several years are going to bring. So, that is - and individual membership is one component of undertaking that. So that's ongoing and that ends - okay, yeah. I guess we don't know about the date-date, but sometime in the first quarter.

>> TED HARDIE: Luis?

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Well, you read my mind. The first question was about the AMS. Recalling your experience in systems transition and systems design and systems operation, don't you think it's been too long - the transition from useless MemberNova into promised Salesforce?

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: No, I think - well I mean, in one sense, yes. And that's because like, if I could - if I had, you know - I'm fresh out of time machines, but if I could I would go back and like prevent the decision to be with MemberNova in first place. But you know, we made that transition, like in the first quarter of my first real year here, right? So that decision was made in 2018. We were implementing it in March of 2019, and immediately discovered a bunch of assumptions in that work that were very serious errors, I think in the original conception of it. So, there were reasons that that system was selected that involved an organizational theory about vendors that I think was a mistake. And that assumption really was, we'll be their biggest customer and therefore they'll be responsive to us. And what I learned that that was the assumption I panicked, because you know like you should never put yourself in that position and we have borne the brunt that decision.

So we will certainly not be Salesforces' largest customer, even Fonteva's largest customer. I mean they're doing a bunch of things in here. So I think we're well positioned, but what we have been doing is this making sure that each component, and each assumption about the systems has been correct. Some of this has meant that we're taking a lot of time with community members and so, when you ask isn't this taking too long, my response to you is well like, if I give the community 10 minutes, they will cry about that instead and then we will have a debate about how long we're consulting with the community. So that has taken a lot of the time because every time somebody says, "Well couldn't we cut this consultation?" I say no. And the reason I say no is because the last time we did cut that consultation, and then people were surprised by the implementation. So I want to make sure that when we're doing this, we give chapters, we give you know, power users of this within the community the opportunity to, you know, to evaluate things. All of the feedback has been really good from that, but the reality is it takes a lot of time to do stuff in community.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Because I have sense of Peter and the Wolf, yes? Here's coming - here's coming the new system. Well, still not here, but it will come. And so, I feel there is a

danger in ISOC Community, the way it has to be - things have to keep going. So chapters have found the way to do things to not having the appropriate system and stop complaining now and now they are doing in another way. So my sense of fear is that if we take so much time, by the time the system is ready nobody's willing to use it because they already have a simpler solution.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Well, I mean, I'm not sure what you want me to do about it. The reality is that, you know, it takes a certain amount of time to make this kind of transition appropriately, particularly if we want to consult with all of the chapters to make sure that, you know the track and so on, to make sure the people are ready to embrace this system and to find out whether they feel consulted. And so, it's like we have to take that time and if we don't take that time, which is really the only way to trim this time line, then we will have a different problem, which is well, you didn't consult us in this. So there's kind of no winning in that case. And therefore, the only thing I can do is say yes well this is the timeline that we can provide. The dates haven't slipped with the exception of one time when somebody did trim some community consultation, and gave a date based on that and then we found out that the consultation had been trimmed. And so I pushed it back out, and that's why it's Q1. But like I have had no feedback to the to the effect that this is not going to land in the first quarter and you know, be up and running, and then full deployment in the rest of the year. It just does take that long. This is particularly bad in this case, though I will tell you because the - now I'm going to bore people.

But the underlying architecture of MemberNova was a NoSQL architecture. So there isn't actually a straightforward data migration plan. And yeah - I yeah - that was my reaction when I heard that too. It was trendy at the time and the problem is our problem is like almost a picture-perfect case for relational data. And so, like the model for how to do this is bananas, and it's not that different from saying, "Okay, well we've got a bunch of unrelated text files and now we have impose a schema on them." And so that is kind of what's happening now. And that work has to go on and it has to be done slowly and carefully because we do have, you know, we have data in here that is subject to compliance regulations, subject to GDPR, subject to the California Act, subject to all of these things. And we need to make sure that all of that is handled appropriately, and given the tools that we have available to us some of that is unfortunately like manual checking and so forth.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Yeah, in the first migration from AMS to MemberNova, there was a lot of information lost.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: No, no so this is one of the problems that crept up with - that project was not - was clearly not led by somebody who done a large-scale data systems migration before. And so there were two errors, and one of them was in my opinion, this NoSQL thing, but the other one was a decision to do a data maintenance task at the same time as doing a system's migration task. So, the so-called data loss was no data loss at all. It was instead a culling of data for which we did not have appropriate compliance information. So we had a whole bunch of people who had not agreed that we can continue to contact them under the GDPR, and we needed to implement that and we needed to catch up. And so, in order to do that we needed to take them out of the database. And the solution that people hit on was, "Oh, we're doing this data migration anyway so we'll drop the data while we do it," and you should never do that. Like, that is the worst idea ever because it's impossible then to compare the before and after states because you're changing the data and changing the schema of the data at the same time. So it was an error, it was a very complicated error. We didn't actually lose any data, and we confirmed that at the times in several different ways. There was no data loss, but it looked like it to everybody because the like culling of the data happened at the same time that we did the system's cut over. Which is precisely what you never do that.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Yeah, I know if you are - it's amazing that in the Internet Society chapters, there were no back ups.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: But there were back ups.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: No, no, no, no local back ups between in the chapters. Nobody have a print out of the members. So you said, well, where's my list of members? Well, it seems in the immigration just wait. No, I need the list now. Well take you - do you have a backup? No, we never make backups. So that adds to the chaos, but at the end we're going to move into the new system. I can tell you the first consultation was maybe two and a half years ago?

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Well, the first consultation -

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Because we haven't had a consultation.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Yeah, but it happened basically months after the MemberNova implementation because it was so much dissatisfaction. So the first question we - like the first branch in there was, okay can we make this thing better? And that took several rounds to make the decision, could we make this better? And the, I mean, I won't share in a public meeting my own feeling of the time but you can imagine - but we need it anyway to take the time to decide could we make it better. In the end we concluded that actually we made a mistake in our choice in the first place. And that isn't to denigrate, you know, the system in question, it's just that it wasn't a good match for our needs. And I think that that needs assessment that has been one of the reasons that this has taken longer because I insisted that we have to do a really careful needs assessment this time because when you've botched one already you can't afford to do it - you know, you can't afford to make a mistake the second time.

And so it needs to be really complete. And so, yes, that needs assessment is taking a long time. Every one of these consultations goes like six weeks because when you're talking to people you have to take lots of time and, you know six weeks after six weeks after six weeks adds up. So I, you know, I appreciate that there is a lot of feeling about, you know how important this is. It's important to me too, but it's important to me to do a, like good, slow, careful job rather than to do it urgently. If I have to choose between those things, I want to do it right.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Yesh, I agree. Q2, Q1?

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Well, we'll have the systems live in Q1 but whether the complete migration is finished before Q2, I would be dubious.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Okay.

>> TED HARDIE: Do you want a resolution from the board to the chapters that they should make backups? Because that seems like possibly a useful piece of advice we can give? Well, they're not normally in our remit.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: There should be a quick reference migration recommendation for this.

>> SARAH ARMSTRONG: Good luck.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: We've got lots of opinions from the chapter.

>> SARAH ARMSTRONG: Because there are lots of complaints from different chapters that they'll lose there lead.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: So the data loss in particular, like this was a this was a constant theme that people kept talking about the data loss. They kept saying well we lost all of these chapters. What happened was four months leading up to - this all happened before I started, but for many, many months with several iterations. Every single email address that we had was contacted multiple times to request consent that we retain that contact information. And we never got a response from the ones that were dropped. And the reason we never got a response was because those were people who indicated that we weren't allowed to contact them, or rather as a legal matter if we didn't get a response from them, that was a signal that we weren't allowed to contact them at all. Right, that's the way our understanding of our obligations under the GDPR worked. And so - and there were a number of complaints like, you know, "Well, I don't live in the GDPR so how - or I don't live in Europe so how come I'm subject to that?" The GDPR's rules are if somebody is a European, they are covered, even if they're not in Europe. And so - and of course we don't know whether somebody is a European if they are unwilling to talk to us. So there's no way for us to identify you know what - who is behind that email address if they simply do not respond to us for a year.

Now, I would like to suggest to people that the idea that we had these members whom we contacted multiple times over many, many months and they did not respond even one time, is an indication that there isn't somebody at the other end of that email address, right? Like a lot of these were Gmail addresses and Hotmail addresses and so on, and like people just drop those things. And if somebody deletes their Gmail account, for instance, or Hotmail account or whatever, like if I were the operator of this - I don't know this for sure - but if I were the operator of those systems, I would just send those emails into nothing-land, right? I would absorb them and drop them. I can't imagine that somebody who's operating email at the scale of Gmail wants to be generating bounce messages. So, my suspicion is that those things just go into the ether. Somebody here may know about this, but like, I don't want to really know.

So, our theory was that people who were completely unresponsive were not in fact members of the Internet Society

for real. Like we were counting them because like they were, you know, they were an account that we had. But somebody who is completely disengaged to the point where it's like, can we send you another email ever again for all of history? If the - if what you get is no response at all to that, our theory is that this is somebody who is sufficiently disengage from the Internet Society that they're not really a member at all. And that was the, you know that was the approach that we took in trying to figure this out. Once that happened, ipso facto, right? Once somebody's not a member of the Internet Society, they can't be a member of a chapter either. That's one of the agreements we have with the chapters, that every chapter member is automatically - has to be a member of the Internet Society. And if they will not be a member of the Internet Society, they cannot be a member of a chapter. Oh, well, I'm wrong about it at least at Gmail. They do generate bounces, good for them. It's nice to see that -

>> TED HARDIE: Actual data.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Yeah, it's nice to see that old fashioned - but I mean we processed actually the ones of the bounced we - what I understood at the time - now I'm excavating from my memory, but I remember we got this report. When we got actual bounces, we definitely treated those as dead. Like we definitely removed them as like, that's an indication. This is the only address we have for this person. It's the only email address we have for this person and we got to bounce, we deleted them. But again, the problem was we didn't actually produce the separate step of now we're going to delete all of the data from the original source system, and do all of that work, and then we're going to migrate the system. Instead, what happened was we treated the - because the old system was itself, maybe not designed in rigorous data science ways, the decision was taken - and again, I was involved in this - but they made the decision not to delete the data from that, but rather to do it while they were doing the data migration. And really, I mean like of all of the best practices I've ever heard of, this is probably at the top of the list in systems migration. You never do data change and systems change at the same time because of this validation problem. It's very, very hard to do the validation of those things. You can do it, but it's much harder than to do the one step at a time.

Yeah, I mean like the tooling that was developed in order to do this validation, I was impressed that they managed to do it and I convinced myself, I went through it and convince myself that it was valid. Fortunately, the data set was small enough -

like this is still you know, not really a million records and so it's not like it's an impossible thing to check. But I don't want to pretend it was good, that was a bad way to do it. But here we are in this situation. What is true is that we have - we have explained this several times, and we've explained why this is true and so forth. But we were unable to give people the confidence in that. And of course, the reason we were all unable to give them confidence in that, is because you know the post hoc sense that people have is a natural thing to do. That you see these two things in constant conjunction, you naturally attribute cause to that. And that's a thing that people just automatically do.

And so, I think that that was a problem with that migration. That because we did the data migration and the data changes at the same time, people attributed loss of data to the data migration. We will not be doing any data changes during this migration, and so we are not going to have that problem. But I recognize that there are people who continue to believe that we lost a bunch of data at the time. Dave Burstein, every chance he gets says, "You know, you lost all of these members because the number went down," we didn't lose those members in my opinion. Those were members that have been lost over time. They were people that we could not contact, we couldn't reach them, counting people that you cannot talk to is foolish. You are denying yourself knowledge about like your own membership and so on. We should have been treating the fact that those people were non-responsive as loss all the way along, and we should have been making sure that we were engaged with people all the way along. And measuring things like the open rate on messages that we send out so that we can tell whether anybody is interested in the messages that we were sending. We weren't doing any of those practices, we are doing them now and that will be one of the things that we can, you know, we can use in order to validate our continued engagement with the membership after this migration

>> SAGARIKA WICKRAMASEKERA: Maybe did we make a like available the chapter leaders that such situations are their responsibility to, like make their members aware that this is the situation? Because most of the people that are not really willing to reply back? So they just say that we are members on the Internet Society forever, so they don't worry, right?

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Well, I think I mean we generated a lot of messages during this GDPR implementation to make sure that people understood that they needed to undergo - you know, I mean

like the messages went out and said, you know, they had like big flashy lights at the top saying your account is going to be deleted. They were crystal clear, and we did talk to chapters about this on several occasions. It appears that there were some chapters who said, "Oh, that's a GDPR thing, it doesn't apply to me because I'm not in Europe." And I cannot speak to how carefully those messages were put across, that all happen in 2017 before I was employed here. So I really can't - I really can't speak to like how well that was understood, but in any case we are not doing any data changes this time. So it should not be a thing that that causes any sort of effect in this particular case. It's not - this is not a case where we are, you know doing data migration and therefore, people have to be worried about this. And, you know, we have backups, we will continue to run the systems in parallel and so on. Just as we did the last time, we did have the systems running in parallel last time after the migration, which is part of what allowed us to do this verification, to make sure that the two things were there. What people wanted us to do was to restore the data that was dropped. And we couldn't do that because we dropped the data for GDPR compliance reasons, it had nothing to do with the systems migration.

>> TED HARDIE: So I think it's very important at this point to kind of go back to the fact that most of this happened in 2017 and 2018, and we're learning from it, right? And so, what we've learned in this new upcoming migration is one, we need a great deal more time for the consultation with the community on what their expectations are. And two, that we're doing this one step at a time, and if there's any other data changes which are needed, those will not occur with this transition. I do want to caution people though that we're probably going to have to maintain both systems for a significant period of time, because the underlying problem that Andrew pointed to that switching from a NoSQL database, which operates startlingly differently from most data stores to a standard SQL relational database, means that we might actually have to keep the other one running for a while to be able to excavate data that was not properly identified in the initial transition. And I think that the time this is taking is much more due to that than to any other aspect. I'm pleased to hear that we're expecting it in Q1 of next year, it has been slower than I think any of us would have liked. But I think ultimately, the aim is on the right path. Sagarika?

>> SAGARIKA WICKRAMASEKERA: Did we define the transition period to like data transition, data migration?

>> TED HARDIE: I'm sorry, I'm not sure I understand the question? Can you clarify?

>> SAGARIKA WICKRAMASEKERA: Did we decide the time period for the transition? For the two systems?

>> TED HARDIE: You mean the parallel operations?

>> SAGARIKA WICKRAMASEKERA: Parallel operations?

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Well, I mean we have a contract with MemberNova and that will expire, and they're not cheap. So, you know, by the end of next year, I anticipate that that system of go away because we can't - I mean I can't just kite that forever, right? The other thing is given our experience, a little less than a year ago with MemberNova, I'm not sure I want that system live on the internet forever. So, you know, so we will be shutting it down, we'll take appropriate backups and so on, and then we will shut it down after some months of parallel operation. I think the plan is a few months, but the other thing - look, I did database systems for many years before I ended up in this job. And there is a point after which you just can't do, you know backwards looking because your new state has changed. And so, at some point you've got a divergence problem where you can't keep going back. And you know so what you must do is do good validation that the front end.

The fortunate thing is like, what if the nice things about NoSQL systems is that they're not that clever in the way that the data is stored, so there's like a limit to how many different things you have to worry about. It's not like a relational migration where you have to make sure all of the relations are correct, because they don't have any relations, the relations are all in the code. So, as long as you've got the data in at least one state, you can make the data that you need for relations that maybe you missed.

>> TED HARDIE: Ilona, did you have a comment?

>> ILONA LEVINE: I'll just add that we have a very detailed project plan with collaborative systems and a number of people from collaborative systems are involved in this along with legal because obviously it's data and data handling is extremely important to us. So we stay in touch on making sure that the data is handled properly. But I just want to assure the board

that there is a very detailed project plan in place, and they're working day and night on that.

>> TED HARDIE: Luis?

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Yes, I have a very different question. Just to add on the systems migration. We have as an organization we have been present in a number of international events, and in the previous meetings we learned about the participation of staff in these meetings. Do we have, at this stage, a summary of how - because there were three major conferences this year where staff participated. Do we have some report of how this ended or we were just present at the conference?

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: You're thinking of the ITU?

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Yes, ITU-WTSA, the Plenipot? And the WTDC? And IGF, by the way.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Well, so IGF is still in the future. I can talk about IGF quickly if you want. That one's a little bit - I don't have to be quite so careful. So IGF, because it hasn't happened yet, I can't tell you anything about the conclusions. We will be participating in IGF only virtually. We made this decision a couple of months ago, the reason we made this decision had to do with the conflict situation in Ethiopia. So we had to make a decision about whether we felt comfortable sending staff into a country that was an active, hot civil war where people were shooting at each other even though they were shooting at each other actually in the city where people were going. I think the executive level of the organization was unanimous in saying, no, we should not send people in the hot civil wars. And so we did you know, we looked into okay, well is this for instance an insurable thing, and the answer was like absolutely not. We looked into the question, you know, like so we still even today, we still have one staff member that we have not managed to evacuate from Ethiopia. She will be leaving soon. We did speak to staff from there, they all felt very uncomfortable with their situation and so those were things that, you know, we had to take into account.

I did speak to relevance staff at the IGF Secretariat to say like really? And the answer was, you know, everything is stable in Addis. So you know, I can only go with the information I had. It is true that one of the groups has signed now what appears to be so far a stable ceasefire, and seems to have agreed to certain terms. And for all we know everything will be

peaceful in Ethiopia where the IGF happens. But we had to make a decision early on, right, in order to buy plane tickets and do logistics and so on. And we made the conclusion that sending staff, you know, was a dangerous thing and we wouldn't ask them to do it and therefore we decided to participate only remotely. I will be participating remotely, other people will be participating remotely, you know I'm getting up at 3:00 in the morning in order to go on one panel.

But you know, I think it's important. I don't mind saying on the public record, I think it's really unfortunate that the IGF in general, like the global IGF, did not take the opportunity of the pandemic to figure out a different way of working. Because it does seem to me that the tradition of getting everybody on a plane and going to one place - I mean there is a climate conference going on right now, and I'm not sure that this is a sustainable answer for how we're going to do global internet governance. Our experience is that the local and regional IGFs have been tremendously effective, and are really, you know good and effective ways of working and we continue to be supportive of that. But one of the things about that is that you know, travel is not such a big part of them. And so, while I recognize the value of getting everybody together, here we are all together and I think it's valuable. I also have to recognize that you know, the global IGF is probably going to have to evolve its ways of operating. And I'm not too convinced that they have completely embraced that yet. So, I wish they would but you know, it's not my meeting and they will operate it the way they want. So that's the way that the situation with the with the global IGF.

On the topic of the of the ITU discussions, it's important to remember, and this is true of all of the organization - all of the meetings that happen, it is important to remember that we are sector number. So we don't have a vote, we can't actually, you know, we can't actually make changes to the way things go. Bless you. But we were there and the staff were very effective, and we invested quite a lot in this. In a year where our travel budget was really very constrained, we had staff on the ground for like all of the meetings and for the entire time, it was a very significant portion of our travel budget this year. But you know okay well great, you're going to a meeting, big deal. The critical thing to understand about our role in all of the ITU meetings is that, you know, we're there as kind of a supportive, we could meet with a lot of people and try to get them to see our view about the internet way and how that is advantageous.

We can try to influence people to adopt an approach to these problems that is congruent with our understanding of the way that the internet develops, we can try to encourage people to, for instance, maintain the IETF and other such bodies in the multi-stakeholder footnote that acknowledges that, you know, this is where those things are maintained. And these resolutions come up all the time, but we cannot vote on them and we often can't even be in the room when some of these things are being discussed. Now, one thing that is frustrating for somebody like me about operations at meetings like the ITU, is that status quo is often progress. That is, when somebody is attempting to erode the role of the IETF in making internet standards, the fact that it doesn't get eroded and nothing changed in the document is quite possibly the product of hours, and hours, and hours of work. And it's hard to see that, and I recognize that it is hard to see. I also have to tell you that, like, here in an open session, or maybe like in a public presentation, I'm not super prepared to say, you know, these are the things that we did in order to convince people one way or the other, or even to tell you that we did or did not do anything about this.

And that's partly because I'm not too convinced that that is helpful in our negotiations, in our discussions with people. But I will note that for instance, various proposals to remove the IETF and other such bodies from various footnotes to, you know, say, well this, you know, this really should be operated by us. None of those things were successful, none of that stuff happened. The proposals for greater state intervention in the way that the internet operates, or the proposals to like start treaty negotiations and so on, most of that stuff is like a dead letter. And we had a lot of very active people on the ground and we have very, very good relationships with a lot of governments. Some of those governments are governments that are keen that we not make a big deal about it. So, I believe that we were quite successful, I believe we were effective at this, and I think the results speak for themselves. It's always difficult to show that, you know, your interventions are the ones that made this political consequence, that's always a very difficult thing. But I am extremely confident that our staff were tremendously effective in maintaining warm relations with a number of actors there.

>> TED HARDIE: Pepper?

>> ROBERT PEPPER: So, without - for the reasons that Andrew said, without getting into any details, I can tell you that the ISOC people on the ground both from Kigali and in Bucharest were

very effective and made a huge difference. So thank you for making sure that they could be there.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Actually the - well my comment was to get your view but the first analysis I get on the Plenipot - well, on the proceedings of each of these conferences, I find very positive that the way the Internet Society and IEFT are mentioned, is positive for our view. We need to increase the way - the perception of ISOC in order to raise funds, yes? So, as long as people perceive that we are doing a good job in any arena, not only the international arena - the arena, then I feel we will bring more funds into our PST mission.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: So that is the theory. One thing that I will note is we ran a number of round tables with the organization members, with respect to this matrix, which we always prepare. And we prepared it again this year for these meetings, we ran a number of roundtables. The feedback - like I got personal mail from some people that was like, you know, keep doing that, like don't think that's not useful. So we've definitely had a lot of very positive feedback about that level of engagement. It is not the sort of thing that you make a lot of big public noise about, it's instead the kind of thing where you need to - you actually really do need to rely on word of mouth there. But don't think for a second that we have not looked at that and said to ourselves, like what are the other organizations that actually ought to be part of this membership? And draw them in? And I know of at least one case where Robert, who leads this with the organization members, told me that that was the clincher for him. He managed to get somebody to, you know join because they wanted access to that resource.

>> TED HARDIE: And I'll draw your attention to the OMAC report, which mentions both the pre and post Plenipotentiary roundtables, as particularly valuable. So I think your point is well taken. We are now at five minutes before the hour, we have about ten more minutes before we need to change topics. Are there any other questions for Andrew? Victor? Sorry, Muhammad? Victor shook his head.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Just a quick comment. I do understand when, and you'll see that with policy and policy making at the government level, it's difficult to say something that this was done by you, of course, these are the governments. But as you said yourself that the result speaks for themselves, and we cannot stop doing and participating in these kinds of meetings. Because if we do so we would lose a number of other

opportunities that are there in these kinds of meetings, just a comment. My question is related to the sovereignty project that you mentioned in the beginning. Where is it, what can you tell us about that project? And where you see it going from here?

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: So the point of the Digital Sovereignty project was originally if you look at our action plan from last year, we were going to adopt a position on what digital sovereignty means and so on. The team did a lot of work, a lot of research and so on, on this. And the report went through our policy development process so just like the LEO's project also did this, we had two of those this year where we had the consultations with the community. And our policy development process involves formal consultations with parts of our community and then a report that is, you know, a final report and that is approved by the management of the Internet Society. So that report is in my inbox, we approved it in fact this week via email. The conclusion of the report is that we don't take a position on this, so it's an unusual policy that we have adopted which is like we don't have a policy here.

The reason we drew that conclusion, to steal the thunder a little bit of the - I mean this is an open session we don't have so many people online that I feel really embarrassed about it. The reason we have that position is that we concluded that this term is a term of - like art is giving it too much credit - but like it's a term that is being used in a way - like the sort of constructive ambiguity in an effort to like introduce stuff in all kinds of ways. And so, what we concluded that what was useful was to lay out all of the meanings of this, and the ways that it gets deployed, and the rhetorical device by which digital sovereignty can get deployed in various ways. And that allows us then to you know enter those arguments effectively and then try to shape that discourse either more or less effectively in favor of the internet way. So this is linked with, you know the project - the internet way of networking project that happened before with the analysis and the impact assessments. Now we have this Digital Sovereignty Project which has given us some more information about this to understand like how this term is being used and what the rhetorical effects of it are. And the consequence of that - that project will finish, and the consequence of these two things, you know will come together in a project for next year that we will be introducing to you when we talk about the action plan in whatever it is - well, a few minutes.

So the basic idea here - and you know, if you cast your mind back to when we introduced this project way of operating, the idea was that a project was contained, we got it stood up, we did the project work, and we concluded. And from that we said, okay, here's the next place that we are, what do we build on next? And so this is an example of having done that. We had the internet way of networking project, we got the results that we wanted from that, we have this digital sovereignty project, we got a result from that. Even though it was a small and short project. What we knew we needed was a clear statement about this, having developed that clear statement now what do we do with that thing? We go on and start another project in order to do some work with that.

Sally and Olaf and David - Olaf didn't come but David Frautschy came. And I had a meeting the other day with the Tony Blair Institute because they're very interested in some of the work that we're doing about this. So you know, we've developed some potential collaboration there on the basis of this stuff. They were super interested in this report. So you know, the goal of these projects is to be sort of self-contained and to complete. I feel very strongly that like every project has to have a beginning, a middle, and an end, and the end is the most important part of that. You need to know what finished is like so that you then know what your next platform is so that you can launch from there, and that's what we've been doing.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Yes, thank you very much, Andrew, for this detailed briefing. Of course, that report that you mentioned is lying in your inbox would be very interesting to read and it will be an interesting reading. I remember last year when we were discussing the Digital Sovereignty project, I was really enthusiastic that this is one of those things that is our core impact internet in the years to come. So the report that has been the outcome of one year of research and work, of course I would be interested in that. Thank you.

>> TED HARDIE: Barry?

>> BARRY LEIBA: This is Barry Leiba. I just wanted to highlight something that Andrew said, and I'm sure I don't need to tell you, Andrew, this but just to the public comment. I'm involved in other organizations that have over the years made bold statements and things like that. And in recent times they found it more effective to start with setting the framework for discussion as the Digital Sovereignty Report does, and then they become the sited entity for this. This is "Go look at what this

group wrote, that's good stuff." And then the bold statements that come later fit into that and are listening to more than they would have been in the first place where people would have just started disagreeing with them.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Yeah. So that was in fact - I mean what we'd intended, right, at the end of this - of this Digital Sovereignty Project was to have a clear idea of like what things did the Internet Society like and not like about this term and like how are we going to use it? And what we - I mean if you look at the - and the result is coming, we're going to post it anytime. So you will definitely be getting a copy of this December 1st, excellent that we have a date. So it's coming soon. The critical thing to understand is that what we concluded is that there are cases where people are using the same term to mean like opposite things. And that fact means it's not actually useful for us to have a way to use this term because people will co-opt your meaning, right? And so, what we're trying to do is get clear on these things and then give people the tool when somebody stands up, say, you know, a large government in Asia, stands up and says our digital sovereignty is important here. And what that actually means is we are going to exclude everybody from the ability to use this tool. That is the opposite of like you know, my personal digital sovereignty of like keeping my private information private.

Those are like not only, are they inconsistent meanings of this term, they are like ways of turning one term into the other term. And that's the kind of thing that we've been worried about. That isn't a particularly good example for this report, but it's a way of thinking about how these terms can be used. So that's actually the purpose of all of this.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you. I'll point out that I've had people ask me whether MANNRS was an online safety program and I'm like, yes, but probably not the same kind of online safety as you're seeing out of like the Online Safety Bill because it's about something else. So we have to be cautious about just about people who are deploying these with rhetorical devices to deliberately obfuscate, but the fact that in a lot of cases, they're just a breadth of meaning here that can make it a bit difficult for somebody not deeply steeped in the programs to understand what's happened. And with that, we, I believe turn to Sally in the presentation of the 2023 action plan.

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: Good morning, everyone. My name is Sally Wentworth, I'm the Senior Vice-President of the Internet

Society. And I'm here today to present the action plan for 2023. Next slide.

I think as the conversation over the last hour, and even yesterday, reflects for us is that the internet is at, of course a very challenging moment. We heard from Sarah the ways in which and the breadth of desire for access to the internet. The ability to use the internet and all of this creativity that is being unleashed. And yet, we know that 2.7 billion people still don't have access to the internet. We know that decisions are being made around the world that make it harder for people to access the internet. We know that decisions, even well-intentioned decisions as we heard yesterday from the UK chapter, are threatening the fundamental model of the internet. And so, this is an important moment for the internet. And the Internet Society has a role to play, a crucial role to play we believe, in defending the internet. Continuing to build it and to empower a community of advocates around the world who can carry this message into their local communities.

So, this action plan is a reflection of what we, at the Internet Society, will do in 2023 to fulfill our mission and to achieve impact in the world. Next slide. I think this is a slide that will be familiar to many of you but this is a little bit of how we organize our work at the Internet Society, we have projects related to growing the internet, again with nearly half the world's population not connected we still have work to do. We have projects related to making the internet stronger, this is the work we do to defend the internet and the model, and the vision that we believe in.

And then, finally, but not least important, perhaps even the most important is empowering people around the world to advocate and defend the internet, and giving them the tools and what we can do with the Internet Society to strengthen their ability to build, promote, and defend the internet in their local communities. Next slide. So the first group of projects that I will speak about for our action plan relate to growing the internet. I think just building off of the conversation that we had yesterday in the presentation of the foundation's action plan, I think one thing I would just point out, and it's particularly relevant to the grow projects, is this shift that we're making so that the grant-giving work that we do or used to do with the Internet Society, is moving to the Foundation. That's an important shift for us and we're actually - we're working very hard right now with Sarah's team to make that possible. But we really do believe that this is a way for us to

scale the kind of work that we do, the grant giving work that we do, to provide a more consistent experience for our grantees and then to benefit from the kind of data and information that a grant management system can provide us in order to guide our investments in the future. So we're really excited about that. But that is a significant change in how we interact with our communities and you'll see that in some of the future projects.

Another important theme for the grow work is a focus on sustainability. The idea that we don't want to just drop investments in and then wander off, we want to look at and ensure that the investments we make, whether its technical support, financial support, capacity building; that these are investments that are sustainable by the communities over the long run. So that's a big focus for us in the coming year. Next slide. This first project is on connecting the unconnected. You'll be familiar with this as our work on community networks. We firmly believe that we at the Internet Society have the ability to empower communities to connect themselves to the internet. So we'll continue our work in this area, again with a strong focus on sustainability and look to build or improve 30 community networks or other access solutions in the year ahead. This is a very ambitious goal, and to do this we will raise a million dollars in order to help fund this work.

Again, on this theme of sustainability, what we want to do is provide the resources, and we have many of them already on our website, but a real concerted effort to enable people to kind of do it yourself. How do you build a community network? What are the tools you need? What's the environment that needs to be created? So that you don't necessarily have to know an Internet Society staff member in order to do this yourself, right? That's part of that scaling idea that we're focused on, and so we'll be spending a lot of time on creating those resources this year. Next slide please.

Fostering sustainable peering infrastructure, and this is our ongoing work on creating a vibrant peering ecosystem around the world. We know that in many countries the internet experience is still unreliable, it's expensive, it's slow, and the work that we can do on deploying internet exchange points and helping them to grow and thrive, is one way that we can contribute to a stronger internet. This year, we will focus on working with partners to increase local traffic and select emerging economies by 20% and also provide support to 6 internet exchange points. And then this is an important point, ensure that they conform to routing security best practices. What we're

really trying to do is ensure that as this infrastructure is deployed that we're building that mindset of security in from the outset, and this is a nice connection between this project and the work that you'll hear about on MANNRS in a few more slides.

And then finally regional organizations, the regional internet exchange point associations are really critical partners to us to help provide training, outreach, tools, and other things that those communities need in order to reach the internet exchange points in their regions. And so, we will continue to collaborate with those organizations. I also want to pause here and say that this project and two other projects are possible and in the budget this year, in part because of two very generous grants that we've received; multi-year grants. And so a lot of the work that we'll be doing this year is about building the pipeline so that we can deliver on those grants in subsequent years. Next slide please.

Enabling sustainable technical communities, I believe and in all my years of internet training from many of you actually. The internet is, you know, it's bottom up, right? It's built by people. And when you're deploying internet infrastructure, you need a community of technical experts that can build the infrastructure; they you build it, they can maintain it, they can sustain it, and they can defend it. And so, it is our deep belief that local internet technical communities are critical for the sustainability of the internet around the world. So we are committed, we've been in this space for a long time. We are committed to supporting technical communities. One thing we want to do is a little more data-driven support. So we really want to understand what are the capacity gaps? What do people need? And we will be providing support to six technical communities this year, and again building the pipeline for additional support in the future based on this assessment and data that we get.

Training continues to be a key part of this. We will train a minimum of two thousand people in our courses related to network operations and local area networks. And again, on this theme of sustainability, provide instructional guidance and tools to the communities because it's not easy to keep - to organize this way. It takes a lot of time and commitment and we have some experience in this, and we want to make that available to those communities in a way that they can then replicate it themselves. Next slide.

Measuring the internet, a couple years ago we deployed a new tool called Pulse. The idea being that, wouldn't it be great if the Internet Society was a source of data and information about the health of the internet around the world? And this is something that we've been building for some years now, getting a lot of information about the user experience with this tool, and really want to enhance that over this coming year in particular. One of the pieces of feedback that we got was that country reports would be quite useful, and the ability to kind of click on a country and see the state of infrastructure deployment, shut down data, market consolidation, other sorts of things that's the result of the kind of data that we've been able to collect with partners. And so, we'll be launching that in early 2023 in response to that user feedback. We will also be expanding the internet resiliency index to another region this year, and launching a new economic model to calculate the cost of internet shutdowns. This is work that we've been doing with an in-resident economist and we really think that this is going to strengthen the kind of advocacy that we can do around shutdowns.

Thinking further about shut downs, we found an excellent partner who's going to - who's interested in training journalists on how to report out on shutdowns and use more data-driven reporting about internet shutdowns. And so, we will be aiming to train 30 journalists, particularly in the Middle East and India where shutdowns are quite common unfortunately, so that we can see better reporting about this really difficult problem in their countries. And then, we also want to continue to raise the profile of the Pulse platform, and so, we will be looking for a minimum of thirty media mentions in the year ahead.

And finally, we've observed, as we been in this measurement space, that there's a real need for more academic research in this area, more original research, peer-reviewed research; and so we're going to support a - or we're going to pilot an academic measurement, research residency program this year. And on the basis of that experience, we might see if we can grow that program in subsequent years. Do you want me to pause to take questions or as we move through the different - okay I guess yes.

>> TED HARDIE: Brian then Pepper.

>> BRIAN HABERMAN: So, you mentioned, you know targeting six regions in four different organizations back on slide seven.

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: Slide seven, thanks for reminding me it's seven.

>> BRIAN HABERMAN: It's those internet exchange points. Do you have those identified? Do you know who you want to work with? Or are you going to do some kind of call for participation?

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: Yes. And Michuki is here actually online as well and he can help address that. We do have - we're looking at where we have certain criteria that we use for where - how the traffic patterns look. Also, the emerging economies - or focused on emerging economies I think at the outset. And we do have target countries that we're looking to work in.

>> BRIAN HABERMAN: And then the second one with the residency program, are there particular organizations that you want to work with who have already been doing measurements that could help with that?

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: Yes, yes.

>> BRIAN HABERMAN: Or are we trying to expand the base of academic institutions that actually do the measurements?

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: I think the answer to both, the answer is yes to both. I think there are certainly partners that are very active in this space and we work closely with all of them - or many of them already. But we also think that, and this is actually some of the observation even with working with our economist who is based in Mumbai, there's more work to be done and there's just not enough being written about this around the world. So I think if we can light a spark in the academic community to look more at the data and work more in this area, particularly peer-reviewed research, I think it would be hugely beneficial.

>> BRIAN HABERMAN: Thanks.

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: Yep.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: I'm really glad to see that, you know one of the things here is helping certain journalists understand the issue through this journalist training. This has come up quite recently in other conversations I've had with Civil Society. Many of the journalists who are familiar with the issues in the

past have moved on to other things. And many of the journalists who are currently writing about these issues more broadly, - not just about the shutdowns but more broadly. Even things like net neutrality, have no background and they admit it. And what's happening now is that they are being fed - because they are coming in completely being new, are being fed by - let's just put it as larger organizations that have huge comms machines that are not necessarily friends of an open global internet. And so, I don't mean to take it offline but I actually think that since the Internet Society, you know, is a knowledgeable can be a highly credible source of valued and balanced information about the internet. I think we should think about the journalism training going beyond just the shutdowns.

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: Thanks for that Robert. I think that would certainly be our aspiration. I think we start with this partnership and I think, kind of our happy place for the Pulse platform is that it is the go-to place for journalists, Civil Society and others, who in our chapters; imagine a chapter that wants to go talk to their government and you have a report on hey this is the state of the infrastructure there. You know you're much more credible in that conversation with the government officials.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: It's even beyond just the report and the data. It's even, you know for journalists; what are the questions that you should be asking everybody, right? Even the internet companies, right? And there have to be good responses, and so helping journalists scale up so that they even know what the right questions are to ask, I think is extremely important.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Now that Robert is mentioning the many organizations of the Internet Society think about media training, yes? So, we are educated in a way to deal with media to pass our message, so our message is understood. So essentially it an impedance matching, right? In terms of engineering. But that's very important, we need also to create the culture, yes? Journalist they don't want to be trained or educated; they just want to adopt the cultural terms. I may suggest that we can look at the methods used by the Salzburg Seminar in Austria, yes? Which is a result of the Harvard University in the US and the 1947 Peace Programs in Europe. The way they have been dealing - there's a media academy coming from Boston College and the Salzburg Seminar where they deal with these issues. How journalists must be - not educated - accustomed to the cultural terms related to this special culture. And also, one of the things that I think we should do,

but I'm not sure if you should be answering this or Andrew - I don't know who. But we need to look into the media mentions, yes, who is mentioning us, and in which sense we are mentioned, yes? Because usually you have to build a medium up, yes, to see where are we influencing? And again, this brings us into our fundraising because we need positive talk about us. It's not just about us, it's really an analysis of what is media saying about us. Thanks.

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: All right, this is the work - this section is on our work to strengthen the internet. Next slide. As this audience well knows, the internet is under constant challenge and threat, and this is the work that we plan to do over the coming year to do our part to make the internet more secure for everyone. Next slide.

So we are coming off of a highly successful Global Encryption Day, which I think you all have read about and we want to continue the momentum in our defensive encryption and extending encryption so that everyone can communicate securely online. We are extremely proud to be part of the Global Encryption Coalition which has really come together as a powerful advocacy force in the world and very diverse group of individuals and organizations and chapters and civil society and others who are collaborating around this really important cause. We want to work to help mobilize this community and see that culminate in at least 900 advocacy activities next year. Again, leading into Global Encryption Day of course, towards the end of next year. We don't advocate just to advocate, we want to see change made in the world, and we are working very closely and very hard. It takes a lot of work to pull this off but we want to see government officials actually saying, out loud that they support encryption. And they're plenty of governments willing to say the opposite and so, we want to work very hard to ensure that we at least here it ten times from government officials next year.

And Barry, just taking a page out of what you said, thought leadership is important for us and we want to continue to strengthen our thought leadership when it comes to encryption and advocacy and see that the Internet Society's work mentioned by governments explicitly, and/or by the media at least 30 times next year. And Luis, I think this speaks to your point, the visibility is important when we then want to think about funding and other things. And so, we want to keep that visibility of the Internet Society high on this on this critical issue. Next slide.

Our commitment to the Mutually Agreed Norms for Routing Security, or MANNRS, continues this year. We're extremely happy, actually I was told yesterday that we've exceeded nine hundred participants, approaching 1000. And so, this is a community that is growing, and we're extremely proud of that and happy to play our part in supporting this community. We want to see improvement in routing security conformant of 10% among this community next year. This is also a fabulous community to join the Internet Society, and so we would like to see at least five MANNRS participants, although I think we can we can find more than that among the nine hundred, joining the Internet Society as organization members in the year ahead, so that they can speak to a broader set of issues around securing the internet.

We also want to grow the MANNRS Community by adding at least 10 of our existing organization members to the MANNRS community. And then as I said earlier, bring the internet exchange points into this community so that at the outset of their deployments, they're keeping things like routing security top of mind.

>> BARRY LEIBA: Just, I forget how many organization members do we have?

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: Ah, I have to look that one up.

>> BARRY LEIBA: Not that important, its's -

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: Okay, we will get that number to you, okay? All right, next slide.

>> BARRY LEIBA: I can look it up myself, it's okay.

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: Sorry I don't have that top of mind. I don't know if Joe does? Joe is sitting right there. Nope, okay. We're going to get it for you, Barry. All right, next slide. NDSS, this is a leading security research symposium, NDSS, we're extremely proud to be a key partner for this conference and it will celebrate its 30th anniversary this year. We want to ensure that the NDSS remains a top five premier academic research symposium, and we will do our part to ensure that that happens, in part through ensuring that it is a strong and sustainable event. We have a target of sponsorship of grants of \$75,000 dollars and 10 sponsors for 2023. We think it's also important that the technology that is thought about in the research community as it comes to fruition, is developed in an open

standards environment. And so, we will seek to facilitate at least two collaborations between the research community and the open standards community to help make that possible. Next slide.

This is the project that Andrew alluded to earlier. This is a new project for us, protecting the internet from fragmentation and we're really quite excited about this. This project builds on the foundation of the internet way of networking project where we worked very hard to develop the Internet Assessment Toolkit, and the internet impact briefs as a mechanism to be able to evaluate policy and understand the implications of policy decisions on the internet. Of course, we also have the Digital Sovereignty Report, which will be released December 1st. Which as Andrew said, gives us a real important view of how that term is being used and the ways in which it might either hurt the internet, depending on its use, and the global internet will contribute further to fragmentation.

And then, of course, we all witnessed events of this year, right? Where decisions are being made at a geopolitical level in the height of conflict and very difficult times. People even with very good intentions, making decisions and proposing ideas that were potentially really harmful for the internet. So bringing those things together, we think the Internet Society is poised to step out in a strong way to defend the internet against fragmentation. And that's what this project is about. One of the first things that we will do is create an internet fragmentation threat matrix. We think we're quite good at this whole matrix thing, so we're going to keep it going. Where we can evaluate - try to bring the different ways in which fragmentation may happen.

It's complex, it's not going to be one thing - open door number one and the internet is fragmented, right? There's economic decisions; there's business decisions; there's very technical decision. There is a lot of complexity in this space, and so we think that this kind of threat matrix can be very helpful for the community in understanding the kinds of things that could lead to fragmentation. We think this is something we can do with the community and with partners. The conversation we had the other day with the Tony Blair Institute is just one indication, but we think this will be something that will probably be a rolling matrix because the threats will change over time. And - but it's something that we think is an important tool.

On the basis of that, and with that, we will develop six new internet impact briefs, the policies are coming fast and furious all over the world, and so we'll keep that work going in collaboration with community partners. With all of this, we think that we can engage in at least 100 advocacy activities in 2023 to defend the internet from fragmentation. This is not just ISOC staff; I want to emphasize that point but we think we can help inspire that and join with others to make that possible. We have to step out; we have to be heard, the internet is at a crucial point and we think that the work we've done over the last several years positions us to make a statement in defense of the internet. Again, in terms of thought leadership and the way that we'll know if we're being successful, we'll see government's reference - and the media reference our documents at least eight times and we want to encourage government officials to make statements in support of the internet at least twice. Let's aim for higher than that. All right, next slide.

This here, this is our Amicus Program, this is technically not a project but because it aligns so closely with our work on defending the internet, I thought I'd put the slide in here. But this is an ongoing program that we have. It's something that we started last year, the US legal system is unique in that you can file these Amicus briefs to provide additional information to the courts about cases that they're considering. We have come to believe that there is a need for basic - not so much basic but honest information about the implications of these decisions on the internet. The court system in the US is extremely active in the internet space. Some really big cases coming forward that have really significant implications for the internet in the United States, and also globally. And so, we think that there's a role for the Internet Society to be a voice of the internet in those processes. So we'll be looking to identify at least twelve precedential cases and controversies. We are not going to file on all of them, that's not something that we're prepared to do but we'll aim to pursue up to three filings at appropriate courts of law.

This is also a way to raise our profile with partners that we might not have interacted with before, and it puts the Internet Society into a very important conversation that's happening around the future of the internet and the law. Okay, so that's our Internet Strong portion of the update. Is there - are there any questions or comments on that? George?

>> GEORGE SADOWSKY: I have a comment on the encryption program and I'm not sure how strongly I feel about this, but

first of all, I'm in accord with everything you're doing now, that's just fine. But when I argue the encryption case with people, the usual counter-arguments come up: law enforcement, intellectual property, harm to children etcetera, etcetera. And we know them well. And I'm wondering if there isn't some small benefit in making at least marginal step toward blunting some of those arguments by saying, look through non-technical needs are ways of dealing with these problems that have been used - that are being used and have been used, etcetera. It's not technical, we're not experts in the field, but it might be that we might blunt the strength of the counter-arguments somewhat in this way?

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: So it's - one of the things that has been interesting to me about the discussion sometimes in the community on the encryption project, is that people keep saying that this is too - you know, this is an example of the technical focus of the Internet Society, and it's not an interest enough in the society thing. Look, we're doing no technical work on encryption, right? Like there are, we are not doing any invention of algorithms or anything. No crypto systems are being invented at the Internet Society. This is a complete policy discussion. And it's about, you know, and we do have to blunt those arguments, and I think one of the things we've been doing, but maybe we haven't been aggressive enough about it. So, I'm going to say something that's controversial that in open session but I'm going to say it anyway.

I hear for instance that we need - you know, child protection is super important and so we need to worry about that. And I agree that child protection is really important, but I'll tell you what, I think that the child protection that cryptosystems provide to actual children is at least as important as the theoretical problem of protecting them from, you know, somebody who wants to get child abuse material from across the internet. Because the ability of children to protect themselves by contacting child protection authorities, to protect themselves from people in their own household, has got to be at least as important as any protection from across the internet. And I think that that's, you know, that's an example.

It's a - there are consistent examples of all these cases, every one of these discussions speaks at a level of abstraction that is quite hostile to encryption generally. And the reason for that, of course, is because it's easy to think about this in abstract cases. But when you think about it any concrete cases, you can see every time how encryption is at least as protective

as it is dangerous. And I think that that's one of the things that we have to keep pressing political positions on.

>> CHARLES MOK: I see that you have set the number of targets throughout the presentation, and some of them, you know, rare to be large numbers, like 100 efficacy activities relating to the internet fragmentation issue. And with some of them - some of these numbers are much smaller like three cases for [inaudible 01:34:39] or Amicus and like getting at least two officials to talk about internet way of networking and so on. I just want to have an understanding about how you generally, you know, for all of these to come up with these goals and numbers. You know, probably some of them are based on your resources or your experience or you are starting from zero, and some of them might be you've been doing it a long time and so on. So, but how do you come up with those numbers because obviously we don't want to simply set a goal that is reachable or whatever, right? So can you give us a little bit of - yeah. Thanks.

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: That's a great question. And I think Andrew would probably agree with this, this is something that we have been working on for several years and trying to get better at it. So you might have seen a couple of years ago when we first started doing this, the targets might have been very low and the results were well in excess. And as we were learning about, you know target setting and resourcing really. You know, and that's something that has taken a lot of work to understand what are the resources that are involved to actually get to the point where a government official is able and willing to step forward. And that's not all going to be ISOC resources, but what's all the coordination and collaboration and outreach that's necessary? So you could do all of these advocacy activities, that's actually more within your control. You can look at the resources that are involved and make some sort of projection. It's a little harder to know whether, you know, the winds of the world are going to allow a government official to step forward, or not step forward. And so, it is - sometimes it's an aspirational target. So I think this year, Joe correct me if I'm wrong, but I think the advocacy target for encryption was 750 advocacy instances.

>> JOE: That's correct.

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: And this year it's going to be 900. And I actually poked at that a little bit a couple weeks ago and said, "Okay, what are we - what's that about?" And we said, you know, we think this coalition has momentum right now, and we

think that they're active and we think the threats are going up and so we need 900 instances. That's - you know, that's a goal that pushes us. So, it's and then three filing briefs. These are - Ilona is sitting here and she's on this group. This is highly intensive, resource intensive work that goes into doing that. So resources, understanding our community, understanding the scope of the problem the best we can, you know but we're not making widgets here either. So we're not, you know, producing something off of a production line that we can predict with, you know, that level of precision. But every year we try to get better at being clearer about what we're trying to achieve and measuring it along the way.

So there is in fact, some big group of people in Joe's group measuring all 750 instances of advocacy as best they can. Did that answer your question?

>> CHARLES MOK: Yeah.

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: Okay. Okay, onto empowerment. This is, some of this you would have seen yesterday in Rinalia's presentation. Because of course, with the reallocation there are pieces of this work that will be in the foundation, but they are still part of what the Internet Society will be delivering in 2023. We continue our belief; you know there's only so much the staff can do. We are a community that believes in the internet and we want to mobilize this community to support this vision that we have that the internet is for everyone. And when you are defending the internet, you need a lot of people around you, and so our focus this year is to build and nurture a community of internet champions to support and defend the internet around the world. And to do this, we need resources to expand our impact so that's what this portion is about. Next slide, please.

This initiative here is about empowering internet champions to defend the internet. We are extremely proud of our flagship fellowship programs, the Early Career Fellows and the Mid-Career Fellows, and the work that we've been doing to build these champions and create this community of people who are ready to be out in the world, building and defending the internet. In addition, our online learning program continues this year, of course, and we will continue to strengthen that so that people have the tools that they need to advocate for the internet in their local communities. We will add one new course this year and update five courses in the Learning @ ISOC curriculum, this is about making these courses more accessible and improving the overall experience for our users. We'll collaborate with at

least five partners to deliver the training and maintain something that we are extremely proud of, the 92% satisfaction rating from our learners. And we'll keep listening to the community to understand what their needs are for future training.

Importantly, we don't want people to finish the program and then wander off and do something else, we would like to keep them within the Internet Society community. And so, building the alumni network is extremely important to us. This is a place where we hope these alumni can continue to interact with the Internet Society, continue to learn and continue to share experiences and be part of our overall community. And so, we will be seeking to double the number of people in our alumni network this year. Next slide. We will - our work to recognize internet champions, as we did this week, will continue - congratulations George. And we will continue to support the awards programs to recognize the contributions of the people that come before us and have built and defended the internet over these many years. We want to continue to see the applicant pool increase and we'll look for 10% increase on that. And as always, continue to evaluate and improve our portfolio and consultation with the community.

>> TED HARDIE: So can I?

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: Yes.

>> TED HARDIE: Can I drill down on this for a minute because reading the report, it says we will evaluate our portfolio of recognition programs and identify opportunities for future improvement. And it really reminded me the extent to which I think "champion" may be problematic as a term we are using to highlight this. Because I think a lot of people look at their own contributions and they don't see themselves in that light. They see what they're doing as potentially advocacy or potentially just doing the right thing, and they don't think of themselves in that sort of David versus Goliath role that champion can imply. And I think one of the problems we have here is that we actually, fundamentally need a mass movement, and we're describing this activity in terms of, you know the person at the front of the parade who carries the torch, rather than the thousands behind them who carry the candles. But the light really comes from the thousand with their candles.

And I think when we look and re-examine this, I would really like us to think is there a more inclusive term than

champion? That can both recognize the people who are dedicating their whole lives to this, that's an important thing to honor. But also recognize all of the people who are doing the right thing in hard circumstances, even if they only do it once. I look at these requirements we have for advocates, and we're looking for a 100 of them, we're going to have 100 internet champions out of that minimum, right? At least 100 people are going to have to step outside of their comfort zone to advocate for something that their government or their company, or their peer group, may not approve of. They're going to have to say it's more important to have encryption than this, and that's going to be uncomfortable for them.

So I think this recognition work is very important, I think the ideas you have about maintaining the alumni network are very important because they're building it from being something that's either one and done. But a long-term support network for this sort of advocacy, but I really want us to figure out a way to talk about this, that doesn't give people the impression that they can't be it, because I think everybody in this room could stand up and say that you're an internet champion. I think anybody in our chapters could stand up and say that they're an internet champion, but they probably won't because the word sounds so big in their mouths. We have to find a way to say this is you, and you can make your friends part of this movement too. You can pass that torch; you can take your candle and light someone else's without imagining yourself to be somebody who has dedicated her life or his life to this. And I think that's really important. Rinalia?

>> RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Ted. I think that's an important point. But I want to emphasize that the label "internet champion" came up some years ago for us to describe also our community. So it's not to the person who wins the award alone, but it's an entire community that is championing the internet in the things that they do in their daily lives or in their voluntary work. So it's not exclusive, it is more inclusive, but if you want a better term then we can look for it.

>> TED HARDIE: I would really appreciate that, because I think intentional or not, the way we're putting this right now, may cause people to exclude their own action from this understanding. Barry?

>> BARRY LEIBA: Yeah, I've looked at it as a difference between say internet advocate and internet champion. But I'm also happy to look for a different term.

>> TED HARDIE: Pepper and then Sagarika.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: I actually think, for a variety of reasons, internet champion is actually probably a good label. That not - I mean I'm - I don't think we should necessarily focus on labels as much as your point which is there are people who are going to be the internet champions broadly. Then there are going to be the people who, you know in a particular situation are going to be not just advocates, Barry, but they, you know they're going to step and actually, you know at a particular moment in time and a particular situation are going to actually sort of shine because they are going to take a position, they're going to take a risk.

And I just think we need to be recognizing all the people who are stepping up these days to support, you know our mission and the open internet. And, you know I'm not sure, you know making distinctions among them all. I mean the fact is, you know the internet is under threat, the global internet as we know it. And we need to activate as many "quote" champions as possible at every level. And if we can come up with different labels for different extraordinary behavior or people stepping up into extraordinary situations, I think we want to recognize that as well.

>> TED HARDIE: So that's Sagarika, then George, then Laura.

>> SAGARIKA WICKRAMASEKERA: I think that other than the champion, they are the stars of the internet.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Yeah.

>> TED HARDIE: George?

>> GEORGE SADOWSKY: I resonate to everything Ted said, but I want to stress the importance of the network, the champion network, whatever you want to call it. I think you want to actively feed it and make sure it stays together, because now there's the possibility of, you know, I participate in a dozen lists and bunch of other things and so on. When in the workshops when we develop the network, there wasn't any other choice. And so, people stayed together. But the fact that you could have

groups of people reinforcing each other's interests and desires and goals, that's really important in feeding that network.

>> TED HARDIE: Laura?

>> LAUREN THOMSON: I keep forgetting about mics. So I do think I really appreciate what you said, Ted, absolutely agree with it. It's really hard to think about it because I think as we know a lot of people who do really good work tend to have like a little bit imposter syndrome, like it wasn't really anything, right? Like I'm not a champion of the internet, I just like do this, that, and other. I'm sure, like George would not describe himself as some of the champion of the internet like on his resume or anywhere else, but he certainly is one, right? But, you know, and I hate to result to of any kind of military analogies but that is really what we're talking about here, right? Like you can't have an army that consists only of a handful of generals, you do need, you know, a whole army basically. I don't want to debate the language for hours here, but I do think that is something that we should discuss further at some point or we're open to creative ideas.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you. And I'll just finish by saying, I think part of the reason it resonates this way for me is again, not in our context, but in other context. Champion often means a single winner, right? And so, that's not what we're talking about here. Yeah, and I think people said hero, again there may be an imposter syndrome issue with telling people that they are heroes. But there's an important element to this, that in addition to recognizing the people who have dedicated their lives to it, we have to recognize the people who are taking their first step, and the people who are continuing to do this advocacy work on behalf of the internet as part of the movement. And whatever term we use, I really appreciate the ongoing work that you're doing to maintain those connections, to keep those networks, both within the membership, and within the fellowships, because I feel like those are the way people kind of keep their nerve as they're doing what can be very difficult work. Thank you again.

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: Okay, thank you for that input. We will take that on board and work with that. But I think the intention is as you say, as we are a community of people with a very important mission that needs to be active and need - and we're all doing it in different ways as you say. The last point on this slide that I want to highlight is that we will, of course, hold our third annual community week in 2023. I think we'll do

be doing it earlier this year, so expect it earlier in the year. And the idea here is to bring the community together, this is where our fellows and our online learners and our chapters and our org members and the staff and the community can come together to celebrate the successes that we've had, to look at the challenges facing us together, and to come together in support of the mission. And we will look to increase community week participation this year by 10%. Next slide.

We have to - we can't do this without additional resources, which we have already been talking about over the last couple of days. But we understand at the Internet Society that we need to grow our base of public support for the work that we do. Obviously, there are numerous reasons, legal and otherwise, why that's important. But it's also just really important that we have a community of funders that are standing by us and believe in this mission and want to support the work that we do. We take this seriously, all of us in the leadership team, but also in the staff and, you I know, you heard from Rinalia yesterday about the plans. So I think it's important that I speak up and say that from the Internet Society side, we are fully committed to this. This is not just one team and the foundation whose responsibility this is, but we all stand ready to do the part that we need to do to make the Internet Society sustainable. And we believe in it. So, the goals are ambitious and what we aim to do to meet our fundraising goals is raise one million dollars in sponsorships, five million dollars in grants, \$1.2 million dollars in membership fees, and \$2.8 million dollars in individual donations. This is highly ambitious; nobody can do it alone. We all have to do it together, but we're committed to doing this. Next slide.

We have work to do. We have an ambitious plan for the year ahead, we are proud of this plan. This was the result of a lot of work and a lot of vision. Input from this board, I want to call out the comments and the feedback that you gave us on the importance of defending the internet, really went into the formulation of this plan. We are excited by it and now we are ready to make our vision a reality. The internet is for everyone. Thank you.

>>BARRY LEIBA: Great last slide.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you, are there questions? Then I'll make a comment, its ambitious but it's what we need. And I think the level of ambition is inspiring to those of us on the board. And if there's something that the board can continue to do other

than the vote, which is coming a little bit later today to help you execute, please let us know.

>> SALLY WENTWORTH: Thank you.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: One comment I want to make is that, and you've heard me say this before but I'll always want to say it every year. The way we develop this plan from year to year, is not that the management of the organization gets in a room and makes this up. We rely on the staff to work through these things, there is an internal process around the projects and initiatives that we're going to adopt. You know people work on these plans sometimes they work on plans that we then say "Nah, we don't think this is ready," and they have, you know, they keep showing up and keep producing their ideas because, you know we value them. People have worked very hard to produce concrete plans, to produce the measurements - Charles was asking about that earlier. There's significant effort behind this and over the last several years, I'm very proud to say I think that the Internet Society staff organization, has gotten a whole lot better at this. I think that the plans used to be pretty slack, and I think they're not anymore. I think they have concrete measures in them, and I'm incredibly grateful that the staff are prepared to dig in that way and to produce these from year to year. Because without all of that work, you know, things like this would not be possible to propose to you. So there's a whole lot of, you know, sort of duck feet moving under that water. And I know this looks like a placid movement along the surface, but I assure you there's a whole effort behind this that is across the entire staff organization. And without all of them, we wouldn't be able to do this. So you know, a public thank you to all them.

>> TED HARDIE: Laura?

>> LAURA THOMSON: I just want to say thank you for preparing the plan, and I guess this is like probably the fourth time I've sat through sort of the presentation of these plans. And this one I'm most excited about, I do think what Andrew says is true, and every year it's been like a little sharper, a little more strategic, a little focused, a little more measured. And this year, I think it's great. So congratulations and thank you for producing this.

>> TED HARDIE: Okay, we're going to take a short break. Because we will return into executive session it will not be until about 12:30 London time that we'll return to open to

observers session for the approval of the action plan and budget. It will be very shortly after that, that we take another break to go to lunch. So, you may or may not want to wait until after the lunch break, 13:45 to return. But we'll take a short break now. Thank you everybody.

Thanks everybody. We are back from a closed session where we reviewed the financials with the CFO and staff. Thank you very much for that excellent presentation. We now have a series of resolutions to consider, which go through both the approval of the action plan and budget, and the individual approval for different ones of the board designated funds. Those are on the screen for those of you who have access to the screen. I will also read them aloud as we go. I'm going to ask after each one of these resolutions for your ascent by the raising of hands. So it's going to take a moment or two. The first resolution is to approve the 2023 Action Plan and Budget, resolved that the Internet Society Board of Trustees approves the 2023 action plan and budget as presented. Please signify your ascent by raising your hand.

Any opposed? Any abstain? Muhammad, I didn't get a response. You are for yay? Thank you, I missed that the first time through. I appreciate that. I believe that's unanimous, thank you very much. The next is to approve funding for the Internet Society Amicus Program, resolved that the Board of Trustees approves designating an additional \$85,000 US dollars to fund the Internet Society Amicus program, using the remaining from the reserves. Please signify ascent by raising your hand.

Any opposed? Any abstain? I believe that's once again unanimous. The next is to approve the funding for the Internet Society Compliance Program, resolved that the Board of Trustees approves designating an additional \$210,000 US dollars to fund the Internet Society compliance program using the remaining from the reserves. Please signify your ascent by raising your hand.

Thank you. Any opposed? Any abstain? Once again, unanimous. Thank you very much. The next is to approve funding for the Data Transformation, resolved that the Board of Trustees approves designating an additional \$345,000 US dollars to fund the Data Transformation using the remaining from the reserves. Please signify your ascent by raising your hand.

Any opposed? Any abstain? Once again, unanimous thank you very much. The final resolution in this set is to approve funding for the Corporate Structure Review, resolved that the

Board of Trustees approves designating \$250,000 US dollars to fund Corporate Structure Review using the remaining from the reserves. Please signify ascent by raising your hand.

Thank you. Any opposed? Any abstain? Seeing none, this also passes unanimously and we are at the end of the required resolutions for the budget portion at this time. Before we break for lunch, is there any other business at this time? We will return after the lunch break to open session.

Seeing none, we'll take a short break for the lunch and return in about an hour. Thank you.

Thanks everybody. We had a small agenda change during the executive session, such that we took the committee report from PIR during executive session before coming back down. So we do have one action item from that to approve the budget and action plan for PIR. If you could bring that resolution up please? Yeah, you need to just scroll up a little bit. Nope, the other up. No, just scroll up this page so that we can see the - the other way. Yep. No, keep going. Keep going.

Okay, so the resolution in response to the report from Jon and Jeff is as follows, approve the 2023 PIR budget, resolved that the Internet Society Board of Trustees hereby approves the 2023 budget of the Public Interest Registry as presented. May I ask everyone to signify ascent by raising your hands.

Any opposed? Any abstain? Seeing none, the resolution passes unanimously. Thank you very much. Now we return to the part of the agenda that is the committee reports. So because we delayed those a little bit to take the PIR budget, the next one is actually the Elections Committee report. Luis?

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Thanks. So, we're getting close to the new cycle of the elections for the year 2022-2023. We are on time as I reported the last time before we have any formal meeting. Now, we have a proper Elections Committee which is composed by Brian, by Charles, by Andrew as ex-officio member as myself. And we have three other members, which are Melchior Aelmans, Adarsh BU, and Arnold Nipper as submitted by the organizations and IETF, right? So then the - I have informed the members of the committee that we are ready to start working. We have submitted the elections timetable that we discussed in the previous meeting. So, we are ready to start working. We are looking forward to have a meeting - sorry a meeting by the end

of the month just to be sure that everybody is aware of this timetable. And that's it. That's what I can report.

>> TED HARDIE: Any questions to Elections Committee?

Okay, the next is actually a little bit up is Jon's, isn't it?

>> JON PETERSON: Nominations Committee, yeah. So I wish I could report the we were as on track as Luis is. But so yeah, we are getting up to it here, and Lauren and George have both been very helpful in wrangling people that we hope to populate the remainder of the Nominations Committee with, we're still at five people and want to get to 7. Now of course we're going to open nominations on December 2nd, which is in like three weeks or something. So it really probably would be good if somebody who was in charge of the thing, actually went ahead and made sure that all these ducks are in a row. So with a lot of assistance from Lauren, we will get that taken care of by December 2nd at the very least. And yeah, it's going to be quite aggressive. So I understand in this cycle, we're looking at pretty much, you know, nominations closing January 13th, so we are starting a little earlier than we did last year, and getting a little more time for nominations to take place. Then we have like 28 days or something to interview all of those candidates and actually produce the slate that Luis will take over. So this is going to be a bit of a sprint. Which I'm really looking forward too in the that January-February time frame. But yeah, I do think we are a bit behind, but I think we aware that we are a bit behind. George has properly castigated me already about this on least one occasion. And as I said, Lauren is helping out.

>> TED HARDIE: Any questions to the Nominations Committee?

>> JON PETERSON: Please castigate me some more.

>> GEORGE SADOWSKY: I don't want to question it; I just want to put it an addition that the way to get good slates is to recruit good people who want to be on them. And that requires everybody here in this room as well as people who aren't in the room. Thank you.

>> JON PETERSON: That's all I got.

>> TED HARDIE: Any other comments for the Nomination Committee? Okay, then Laura?

>> LAURA THOMSON: Let's just start over. I couldn't understand why you were all making faces at me over there. All right, I'm going to talk about the Trustee Selection Committee. I am going to give more detail than I would otherwise because this is the first time we've talked about it in open session, and although I don't think there is anyone on with this at the moment. On the Zoom someone may listen to the recording so I want to give that background on how we got here. So, as you may recall, we went through this governance reform working group, and the feedback from that process, one of the strongest pieces of feedback we had from the community was that we need to do increase the diversity of the Board of Trustees. So the action we took there was to go about appointing a new trustee that would be appointed by the board to increase the diversity of the board in the dimensions that we felt like we had lost recently, specifically. So the process to date has been as follows. We had a lot of assistance from Ilona on this, and I wanted to thank her for that. She and Lauren as well. She helps engage Bridge Partners, which is a recruiting firm that specializes in finding board members for non-profits. And that's been an interesting exercise. We have worked with them to figure out, you know what we're looking for and nominate some stakeholders based on talking to the committee and stakeholders, they worked up a job description which is circulated through the committee, and everyone approved. The current state is - or the next step in the process is they will present us with some candidates on the 30th of November.

The process for this is a little different from other recruiting processes, if you've heard us talk about this before I just wanted to remind you, unlike when you know we're hiring an engineer or whatever, where you've talked to a broad number of people. This, in the perfect case if all goes well, we'll talk to exactly one candidate. The first person they send us to be the person that we hire. And this is apparently the nature of what board position hiring, which I think is relatively new to most of us. They certainly don't want us to get into like, the double digits, I think two or three was sort of the expected number they thought we would have to talk to. So, that's the next step. We will see some candidates they want to present to us, and see whether we ought to talk to them on the 30th and we will report back after that.

I will say, last thing again, for the open session, which is that the goal is to have appointed someone to this role so that they can begin at the same time as the other Trustees of

the new to the board next year. Any questions? Okay, back to you, Ted.

>> LAURA THOMSON: Oh, there is always one question.

>> BARRY LEIBA: This Barry. And in clarifying that it will be a three-year appointment?

>> LAURA THOMSON: Yes.

>> TED HARDIE: Any other questions for the Trustee Selection Committee? Okay, hearing none the next is the PIR Nominations Committee report. I happen to be the chair of the PIR Nominations Committee with Charles Mok, George Sadowsky, Muhammad Shabbir, Laura Thomson is the other members. The work of the Committee kicked off with an outreach to the existing PIR Board Chair to ask if there were any adjustments needed to the role description from last year's role description. Normally, that would include the vice chair but because the vice chair is one of the two people up for renewal, it went solely to the board chair. And we received a response to that essentially saying that the role description from previous years is still valid and needs no adjustment for the current year.

The two people who are up this year are Saerin Cho who is term began in 2021 and extends to 2023. As folks will remember we were trying to create a staggered board in PIR.org after the previous experience where they were all renewed for very short periods of time during the attempt for sale. So she had a shorter than usual first term, but within that became the Vice Chair. The other person is Narelle Clark who has served on the board since 2018 and is currently the Compensation Committee Chair and the Finance and Investment Committee member.

So we will go through the process starting in December issuing a call for nominees, and then the intent is to finish on basically the same timeline as previous years so that they can be seated at the annual general meeting of PIR. George? Sorry, I saw your hand. Are there any questions?

Okay, the next is the CEO Succession Planning Committee report. Brian?

>> BRIAN HABERMAN: Thanks Ted. I'll see if I can make this as quick as possible. So the CEO Succession Committee has been focused on developing the desired skill sets for the CEO in the

situation where we need to replace Andrew when he runs off with his - did you win the two billion dollar PowerBall? No? Okay.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Yeah, I couldn't find the ticket either.

>> BRIAN HABERMAN: Well, anyways, but we've done in addition to that is we've actually expanded the desired skill sets to include the new managing director positions for both the ISOC and ISOC Foundation. We have a couple of skills that we're reworking. We were basically splitting two of them into in separate ones. And once we do that then we will make sure that Andrew is aware of these and how they might affect any performance plans that he puts in place for staff members who have been identified. That's all I got, questions? All right, thank you.

>> TED HARDIE: The next is the Compensation Committee report which is brutally short because the actual meeting that does the work of the Compensation Committee is after this meeting today. I can tell you that the agenda for that includes a call to order and three proposed resolutions, one of which will approve the compensation plan for Senior Vice President Sally Wentworth. One of which will approve the compensation plans for Rinalia Abdul Rahim. And one of which will close the meeting. So the basic works of the compensation in regard to the CEO is already complete, but for managing directors, it will be complete as hopefully shortly after this meeting closes. And the Compensation Committee takes those resolutions to the board. Given that the meeting has not occurred yet, any questions to the committee that you like us to consider during that meeting or indeed in general? Thank you. Thank you for expression of goodwill.

>> LAURA THOMSON: Please pay them well, they are awesome.

>> TED HARDIE: All right, seeing no other questions or comments I think -

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Maybe I have one comment on that.

>> TED HARDIE: Okay.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: So, as I mentioned earlier, we do need that - the result of that to be approved by this board pretty promptly. So when there is a e-resolution that comes to you,

please respond fast because it's on the critical path for me to finish a task for the reallocation.

>> TED HARDIE: So that raises a question. We have a break coming up, we could adjust things so that the committee met during the break and returned - okay, so if we meet during the break and then come back and approve the resolution as a board? Does anybody have an objection to that little bit of hopscotch?

So Ilona, can I ask you to draft the resolution for the board then, and I believe that has to take place in open session. But that assumes that we don't need another executive committee - sorry an executive session to discuss the resolution. So if at any point, you feel like having seen the proposed resolution from Ilona, you need that, let us know and we'll return to the previous plan. But otherwise, presuming that you agree with the Compensation Committee's advice, then hopefully we get this all done today and you won't have to worry about looking for the e-vote.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: And there is another closed session today?

>> TED HARDIE: We do have another? No, actually it's not. No, it is sort of an oddity of this, the closed session part was the PIR report, we came back into open session with the resolution and we have been an open session since. I think the agenda might not have reflected the return correctly but we are supposed to - yeah, all the committee reports are meant to be in open sessions. Okay so -

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: [Inaudible 02:15:32]

>> TED HARDIE: Okay, so -

>> LAURA THOMSON: Is the board discussion on the community advice meant to be in closed session?

>> TED HARDIE: So I'm going to ask that we go into closed session now, if you could stop the recording?

Thanks to everybody on the board for being here this week and for all of the actions which we've taken on. Before we close for this meeting of the Internet Society Board of Trustees, is there any other business for the good of the order? Hearing none, we are adjourned. Thank you very much again.