

**Internet Society
Board of Trustees Meeting 168 - Day 1
November 2022**

Speakers: Ted Hardie, Andrew Sullivan, Mirja Kuehlewind, Barry Leiba, Laura Thomson, Victor Kuarsingh, Adebunmi Akinbo, Luis Martinez, Jon Peterson, Robert Pepper, Dr. Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Charles Mok, Muhammad Shabbir

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

>> TED HARDIE: In this particular case because of the participation of the local folks, we wanted to make sure that they had a chance to do theirs without waiting until the end of the Foundation meeting. So that's why the organization is as it is.

So with that welcome, let me first ask if there are any declarations of conflicts for today's meeting. Hearing none, I believe Andrew has something short he would like to explain.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Yeah. So there is one other thing. Some of you will be aware we have a reallocation of some responsibilities that we'll be starting in January. For the most part, that doesn't actually have any effect on people's jobs, but there are two exceptions to that, and that is Sally and Rinalia, who are here with us today, and who will be leading a number of the discussions rather than me. So I just wanted to make clear why that was happening. There is nothing weird about it. That's, in fact, our plan for how things are going to go forward in the future, and I wanted to make sure that everybody understood why that's happening.

So, you know, this is part of the reallocation of responsibilities that is happening at the beginning of the year. That is not really changing the way the Internet Society works, but this is the exception to that. Thanks.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you, Andrew. As you will note from the agenda, our next scheduled speaker would be Lars Eggert.

Unfortunately, Lars is down with COVID, so we'll receive a written report from him in the future. That means our next speaker is Mirja Kuehlewind as chair of the Internet Architecture Board. Mirja.

>> MIRJA KUEHLEWIND: Yes. Good morning, everybody. And greetings from Lars. I just was chatting with him, so he's well. I did send some slides, yes. So I'll send a few more slides as I'm here so we have a chance to ask questions and we have maybe a bit of discussion if you want. And, also, if you have any general questions about the IETF or the IESG, I can try to honor them as well even though Lars is not here.

Okay. I can keep talking. Ready for the next slide. No, that's okay. Yeah. So that's a report from the Internet Architecture Board. That means I'm focusing on topics that the Internet Architecture Board is working on. And we can go to the next slide, I think.

Just for people who are maybe not completely aware what the Internet Architecture Board is doing, which is, like, often the case, the Internet Architecture Board is one of three leadership groups in the IETF. The other one is the IESG that is led by Lars, and then there's also the LLC board, which was established only a few years ago when we organized.

And the responsibility for the IAB is there's a couple of, like, formal things we are doing like selecting and confirming people in certain positions. And we are responsible for the oversight of the standards process and liaison management. So this is, like, including appeals, and there was also some responsibility for the RFC Series, which we just reorganized, so I just update the slide. Not true anymore. But we are the touch point for IANA at least. We are also the contact point for ISOC.

And then there's a bunch of technical things that we're trying to do, which we call architectural oversight, which basically means that we have a group of experts who try to figure out in the IETF if there are any topics that need more discussion, that need more attention that are not well-addressed yet.

Okay. Next slide. This is the current IAB. We have 12 members that are selected by the NomCom, by the community, and then we also have the IETF chair, Lars, and the IRTF chair, Colin, as members of the IAB. And I'm as the chair of the IAB am selected by the members of the IAB.

Next slide. And we submit a report in a written form before every IETF meeting. I think you received the report already, and you can download it in the proceedings of the IETF meeting. And this has, like, all the official stuff that we're doing, all the statements, all the appointments, everything if you want, like, the full list.

And just very quickly, maybe some things that might be of interest for you. We just published two reports from two workshops that we held last year. So those are ready, and if you want to read them. And there's one document that's coming up about an architectural consideration, which will be published very soon.

Next. Yeah. More interesting is maybe this one. This is the very recent research workshop that was held a few weeks ago. The focus was on management and encrypted network or management of encrypted traffic. And this is an ongoing discussion. With this workshop we were trying to not talk too much about, like, why do you break our systems when encrypting your traffic. It's more about, like, what can we actually do. Like how can we help you? How can we change network management and these kinds of mechanisms to make them work with encrypted traffic and make them also work in a more secure Internet.

There were no concrete, like, action items that came out of this workshop, but we had a really good discussion, a better understanding among the participants, and also an understanding that this is not an easy task and there will not be, like, one solution that fits all. We have to look at every problem separately and find a good solution for it.

So recordings are online, papers are online, slides are online, and the report is hopefully coming very soon.

Next one. There is an upcoming workshop very soon in the first week of December. Does it not say this on this slide? Yeah, it does say a different header at the top. So we received a bunch of submissions, like more than 30 submissions, so there's a lot of interest in this topic about environmental impact. And we're mainly trying to figure out what is the impact of the Internet. Like how can we measure it, what does it mean, and is there something we need to do. So let's see what will happen there?

Next slide. As we are talking about important technical topics, I would just want to outline we have these weekly calls. They are open for observance if you're interested in it. But the interesting part here is that once a month we actually do a call

that is focusing on technical topics only. And this just gives you a quick list of, like, technical topics that we had over the last couple of months. So there was something on inter-domain routing security. This is not a new topic but still an open problem. And we're trying to figure out if there is maybe a way to, like, address this problem again or, like, now maybe there are different things that we can do now than, like, over the last couple of years.

And we had a discussion about limited domain. This is something that comes up very often in the IETF, where people say we want to operate this product in a limited domain so it doesn't have to be -- doesn't have the same properties. When we say it's actually better to develop a protocol that can be used in a widespread scenario and is very safe and has all the properties that we also would expect from an Internet protocol.

>> TED HARDIE: Mirja, you have a question from Barry.

>> MIRJA KUEHLEWIND: Sorry. I didn't see that.

>> BARRY LEIBA: Hi. This is Barry Leiba. Are these technical topics announced or could they be announced on the IETF announce list?

>> MIRJA KUEHLEWIND: They are currently not announced. We decided that we don't want to strain the list by announcing all our calls, but maybe only announcing the technical ones might be a good idea. Okay. I will keep that in mind.

>> BARRY LEIBA: Thank you.

>> MIRJA KUEHLEWIND: Yeah. Limited domain. So the question was, like, is there actually something special that's an ongoing discussion still. We talked a lot about data privacy. This is a topic that comes up very often and for different protocols, and there's a new document out there talking about the privacy partitioning principle. Centralization is a topic that we've been talking about a lot over the last couple of years. And we have a document which is not written by the IAB, but, like, supported by the IAB, written by a community member that we tried to move forward.

And then we had this invited talk about partial Internet connectivity based on a paper from John Heidemann, which was also a very interesting discussion about what is the Internet actually. What does it mean to be connected? Which kind of

properties do you have to have to say you're connected to the Internet?

Okay. Next slide. Technical work, we have a couple of technical programs. Actually, we only have one at the moment. We closed the other one. But on this slide I actually would put your attention in the lower part. We also have these what we call administrative support groups. So that's really just to support the IAB in their responsibilities, where we need additional members. And we have two new groups. So we have the group that existed basically forever for coordination between the IETF and the IEEE just, like, now it has a formal home. It's more visible. And the interesting part for you might be that we also now created a formal group for the coordination between IAB and ISOC policy coordination. So that means that we do, like, calls from time to time, like once per meeting cycle or once per month or whatever. We have to figure out we handle that. So we have, like, a few more people focusing on discussions and touch points between IAB and ISOC.

>> TED HARDIE: So just to confirm a little bit about that, is that something that's being coordinated through the people who are the observers at the Internet Architecture Board from ISOC?

>> MIRJA KUEHLEWIND: Yes. So the members of this group are the liaison that we already have in the IAB, some members from the IAB, some members from the IESG. And then what we do depending on the topic, we also invite other people from ISOC to join, for example, to give us more information about -- last time we were talking about the IGF or other meetings where ISOC has, like, more expertise than we have.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you.

>> MIRJA KUEHLEWIND: Next slide. Talking about policy, we recently -- and you'll find this in the report. I just wanted to say quickly we recently published a bunch of statements where we comment on calls for input from different organizations. And we do this kind of on a little bit of random basis. It's, like, if an IAB member comes up and says, "This is important. We should do something," we might do it. But this is also one of the things where this ISOC coordination group might be very helpful to, like, detect those things; but, also, like, if both groups, the IAB and ISOC, reply to a response that we at least know about it and maybe have a chance to talk about it and are to some extent aligned about it. It doesn't mean that we have to say the same thing, but at least we should be aware what the other group is saying.

Next. Yeah. In talking about policy, this may be also interesting for you. And there are recordings of the discussions. We have this IAB open meeting, which we do for maybe, like, two years now. It's just another way to engage with the community, get feedback, have a discussion. But what we also did for the last two meetings we were inviting speakers, and these topics were, like, to some extent policy related. And because we saw that's actually a good forum for us.

So this meeting we had two talks about censorship in Iran, really good talks. Like if you're interested in it, watch the recording. It was a really nice session. And I think it was very well received. Got a lot of positive feedback, but, of course, there were also a few people saying, "Why do we have these kinds of talks in the IETF. Why do we need to care?" But I think it's a positive way forward to bring attention to these topics. If we do something -- I know this is a different question -- and, like, at least leadership was very positive about this as well, especially this talk from Mahsa. And that's the second speaker here.

She explained very well, like, what happened in Iran over the last couple of years on, like, censorship. How is it developed, the technique, and what are the kind of censorship they are applying right now from a technical point of view. But she also made a request at the end that the IETF should do something to circumvent censorship. And I think, like, bringing this to the IETF and starting a discussion is actually a nice thing.

The talk from last time about the Digital Market Act, that one was also very well received. It was -- the professor was from an economics and law-based background, who was also an advertising role to -- not advertising -- consulting role to the EU, so he could explain this very well. And it's very relevant for our work, because there's now the MIMI working group, which is, like, motivated by these things in policy.

Okay. I have one more slide or maybe actually two more slides. Just quickly to mention, we had two side meetings this time. These were not organized by the IAB, but they are touch points here, and we are aware of these side meetings. So there was one side meeting organized by the DCMS together with ISOC to have a meet-up with policymakers, with local policymakers mainly. So this happened because DCMS actually came to us and to ISOC and said, like, you are in London, so we should, like, make use of that. And this was now organized as, like, a public side meeting, so everybody could join. It wasn't our side meeting in general, which is a little bit hard to find, but it's publicly

visible. And it was basically a panel between somebody from the DCMS and Lars, me, and Colin, and have a discussion about how we can communicate in the future and, like, what are the touch points, basically. I think that was received positively. And we've been -- we are talking with ISOC to restart the policy program and also figure out if, like, a forum like that is interesting for the future as well. So thank you for the support there from ISOC. I think this is really good to have this.

And there was a second meeting that was organized by Article 19 and the Center for Democracy and Technology. So very similar format, but, like, actually a closed meeting. So it was not under the agenda. It was only invited people. And there was not only a panel discussion, but also some drinks. So like a meet-up session, but also a little bit of discussion about how the IETF works and why people should be involved or these kind of things just to make you aware.

Next and final slide, hopefully. Yeah. So this one I just wanted to point out because Ted reached out to the IAB informing us that you had a discussion about attacks on the Internet or impact on the Internet. And I sent a small reply already, but maybe this is something we want to discuss now.

We had a discussion about that at the last IETF meeting in July -- or not about that, but, like, about Internet governance in general and any kind of, yeah, attacks or dangers there. And that was triggered by a paper that was kind of actually proposing to have, like, some more overarching government group or whatever. And the outcome of our discussion was mainly that we should maybe put more effort in explaining how the current government systems works and that all these different groups actually, like, have a very defined role, and they work well together and what the principles are behind this and also the principles of the Internet and what will break if you change the system.

So what we're trying to do with very slow progress is to write, like, a document that explains these things and then points to existing RFCs or existing documents as much as possible, as well, but having everything in one place and also publish it in more like a white paper style thing and not like an RFC so it's maybe more accessible to a different audience.

So that's our plan, but if you have more input, I'm happy to hear it, or maybe this is actually a topic where we should have a broader discussion at another point of time and take some time for it. Okay. That's it from my side. Thank you.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you very much. And I noticed at the end you were talking about a broader joint discussion. That was one of the things the IAB suggested in its response to the Board of Trustees' question on how to make effective some of these discussions of defending the Internet. And I think there was a positive reception from several members of the board that scheduling a joint discussion would be a great idea.

I will say that I think the obvious time to do it would be something like the overlap time between a Board of Trustees meeting and an IETF. And the next time that will happen will be in Yokohama. So we could aim for that. There is a bit of a point about that, though, that I'll make. So we might want to do one in advance of that, just a regular call, a little bit easier to schedule and a great deal faster.

And that is the other is that at the end of an IETF, the IAB tends to be very, very tired. It does a lot of work over those days. And so having a deep policy discussion when people are ready to go out for an ice cream cone and a nice sit is probably not going to be the most effective. So we'll be in touch about scheduling that. And I think probably at least initially we might do that on a call, either one of our calls or one of your calls, and we'll work from there.

And I think one of the questions you asked in that was whether or not it would be a public call. Generally speaking, the Board of Trustees does as much as it can in public, but if the IAB feels that there are things that it wants to discuss in camera, you can let us know, and we can have an executive session for that as well.

>> MIRJA KUEHLEWIND: Yeah. Actually, for us, our discussion happened to happen at the last IETF meeting. And when we meet in person, these are actually not public calls, so -- but, yeah, I have to go back to the IAB and check out what they want.

>> TED HARDIE: Any other questions for Mirja? Laura.

>> LAURA THOMSON: Thank you for that. I just wanted to see if we could get a copy of your slides. I know we have the report, but you mentioned one particular topic you thought we would be able to watch, which is linked in there, and I would like that. So if you could send those, that would be terrific. The slides are?

>> MIRJA KUEHLEWIND: I just sent the last update this morning, but you should get them eventually.

>> LAURA THOMSON: That's okay. I did not see them. Thank you. Sorry.

>> TED HARDIE: The update this morning was made just in time. Any other questions?

>> MIRJA KUEHLEWIND: Ah, remote.

>> TED HARDIE: Go ahead.

>> ADEBUNMI AKINBO: Okay. My apologies. Just well done. But that was a mistake on my part. Sorry.

>> TED HARDIE: I'm sorry. I cannot hear you. Can you say again?

>> ADEBUNMI AKINBO: Okay. So my system was malfunctioning, so it was a mistake raising my hand in the first place. My apologies. Let's move on.

>> TED HARDIE: No worries. Thanks for being here as an observer. Okay. Well, thank you again, Mirja, for covering and for the report. And we look forward to the further discussion.

>> MIRJA KUEHLEWIND: Thank you. And I will leave you. And enjoy your meeting. I'm just happy to go home.

>> TED HARDIE: I think the next thing would be the IETF trust. Victor.

>> VICTOR KUARSINGH: Yeah. I'm here.

>> TED HARDIE: I'm sorry that you aren't able to join us this morning in person. I hope you feel better soon, but thank you for presenting this report.

>> VICTOR KUARSINGH: Yeah, no problem. Just to clarify, will you drive the slides from there, or you want me to drive the slides from here?

>> TED HARDIE: Can you drive them from there?

>> VICTOR KUARSINGH: Absolutely. Just one moment. Make this a little bigger. Sorry for the slight delay. Are those visible?

>> TED HARDIE: Yes, they are.

>> VICTOR KUARSINGH: Excellent. Okay. I am covering the presentation today. Glenn was unable to make it. So I'll walk

through the slides. These are the same ones that folks would have seen earlier this week at the plenary, so I'll do my best to represent the data.

I am the newest member of the trust, having come in during the summer, and so here we go. Sorry. Got to get to the next slide.

The trust is made up of five members. This is the formation of the IETF trust since the IASA 2 changes a couple years ago. Three of the members, which include Glenn Deen, Kathleen Moriarty, and Joel Halpern, are nominated through the standard IETF NomCom, and they serve a rotating three-year -- there's three-year commitments for each one of those appointments. Stephan is the member currently on the trust as appointed by the IESG. And I am currently on the trust as of this year as appointed by the Board of Trustees, the ISOC Board of Trustees.

The purpose of the IETF trust -- and this is something that's been not always well-known by all the members at IETF and across the greater community, but in short, the next couple of slides will kind of walk through what the trust is supposed to effectively do. What's the core responsibility of the trust?

It's effectively there to manage IP assets and to enable those -- and to protect the ownership and to be able to enable use of those assets. And when we say IP in this context, since this is the Internet standards committee, it's the intellectual property, not the protocol we know and love. And these hold IP assets for IETF, IANA, ICANN in the Internet community.

This includes things like domain ownership, as you can see there from the list in the bullet points. It includes copyrights like IETF logos, photos, videos. An example of that that was brought the other day is, you know, as normal business goes on through the IETF meetings, there might be photographs taken from members or various scenarios, and all of those are included in the assets that would be managed by the IETF trust.

There are granted rights that are a part of the overall IETF process as per RFC5378. There are trademarks that are a part of the assets that are protected or managed through the IETF trust. And then, obviously, software artifacts like the IETF tools, IETF YANG Catalog, and such items there. So this is, like, a general overview of the types of things that the trust would caretake as part of those duties.

A bit of a pictorial to describe -- this is probably the best picture I've seen so far to kind of describe some of the contributions and how that relationship works with the community. As the community does, you know, there's ongoing work within the community, there are these contributions and a lot of ideas. If you look at the top part of the diagram, it goes towards the IETF -- the ideas go to the IETF. It goes to contributions. And there's a cyclical relationship to the IETF and the IETF trust in terms of our RFC copyrights that are a part of that, but then there's a right to use of those rights, and then there's granted rights as per RFC5378, which go to the trust and granted towards the IETF trust. And those are licensed out. Now, there's an effective pattern of, you know, grants. Grants are really there for everyone to use, but they still need to be managed through the actual trusts themselves.

So that's kind of like a basic overview of the functions of the IETF trust.

So updates since IETF 114, the LS4 badge artwork assignment was completed. Another large change that occurred over the last couple of months is the change in legal representation. There was a need for that based on the previous representation was representing both the IETF and the trust, and there seemed to be some challenges with that or at least not being able to represent it in the best way. So there's a -- there's new representation with Andy Updegrove, who's now on board to represent the trust.

There's been some corrections to RFC citations in the trust FAQs. The next slide will go into just those updates. And a conversation that's actively underway, and there was a meeting even earlier this week on some of those points, is the restructuring of the actual IETF trust. That's currently active work.

Just to briefly -- this is a compilation of some of those changes to the FAQs. There was an error made in the FAQ around TLP modification that was reported. There's been some corrections to citations to RFC3978 with respect to RFC5378. And there's a link here with the old and new text updates. So people can go and reference those for themselves and see those updates.

The restructuring -- just to give you actually a background. So currently the trust today is a Virginia trust. It's set up as an actual trust. And the trustees hold personal liability as part of their roles in the trust. And so there's a move towards a corporation. Here you note that it shows Delaware corporation.

Often in the U.S. the state you choose is particular to the -- it just basically defines the case law around what could be used, you know, as part of that corporation and if there's any litigation, et cetera.

But the reasons for this conversion is to resolve a few key items which are listed here. One is trademark registration issues. The second is around obtaining sufficient insurance coverage. This is actually one key item. Today insurance has to be purchased with respect to the trustees. That's becoming increasingly difficult to do in terms of both opportunity and cost. So that's another key driver.

There's personal -- and related to that, there's personal liability to the actual trustees themselves, which has been, you know, an ongoing concern and challenge. And so based on that, there's work, as noted, to convert from the current model, which is a Virginia trust to an actual corporation, at which time the trustees would no longer necessarily be personally liable, but they would now be on the corporation. The corporation would then become liable those artifacts and IP works.

So there's a lot of active work going on right now with respect to getting the bylaws set up, how the corporation would be set up, et cetera. There's lawyers involved as that gets all written up. The name of the trust had been a bit of a back and forth. I.e., the original discussion was could we just be called the IETF Trust? That seemed to raise a lot of eyebrows and was not well received because "trust" means something in certain environments. And so the title now agreed to is the IETF Intellectual Property Management Corporation. It seems a bit elongated, but that was what was agreed to. And that is what will be used to register the corporate name and I think various other items that are ongoing there. And, you know, it will be reflected in corporation documents and bylaws as those are written up.

In terms of some of the work ongoing with respect to this conversion, here is a bit of a chart that itemizes some of those tasks. Just for clarity, these tasks are not all serialized. A note I think that was mostly on the slide, but it is not, these are -- but these are just an itemization of various -- of various tasks. Some of these, obviously, can be done in parallel. So you can see there's still quite a bit of work to do. Quite a lot of the foundational work has already begun and/or been completed.

So this is now an old slide, so I'll skip it. This was the office hours from earlier today. And that's the last slide. What I'll do is -- I guess we can open up for some quick questions, if there are any. There was a -- one other discussion point I'll probably raise. On Thursday there was a meeting with various of the IETF and the trust discussing funding. One of the challenges around -- one of the active discussions around funding for the trust is as a nonprofit in the U.S., the challenge of is there enough diversity of funding to maintain that position, I think those on the board would understand that that's a challenge with any nonprofit.

And so there had been discussions around whether those should be done by the trust themselves, i.e., solicit funding directly to the trust, or to leverage the IETF engine to be able to generate that funding and manage it through there. I, unfortunately, was unable to make that meeting. I had some basic updates from there. And I think Ted or other members that are in the room, who may have been there that day, may have heard those updates, but my understanding as of right now there seems to be an overall agreement that leveraging the IETF as the source of those funding and maintaining that as the ability to bring in funds seems to be the more preferred method. And that seems to match, you know, discussions amongst the trustees themselves. In that body of five members doesn't leave a lot of room to execute on trying to develop a funding model -- execute a funding model, and the trustees and the thoughts are that, you know, they should be focused in on the actual execution of the trust mandate, which is to manage the IP assets.

So that's my last main point, and I hope that wasn't too quick and I was able to go through the material in an understandable way. And now I'll leave room for some questions.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you very much. Just two points. One, in addition to this, there was a discussion as part of the general area dispatch meeting of a document that Lars had written, which was intended to set out the expectations of the trust. And during the discussion of that, kind of two points came out, one of which was it probably needed to narrow as a document to focus specifically on the expectations from the IETF community since post-IANA transition there are some other assets in the trust that relate to IANA, but that once that it was narrowed, it was also going to be delayed because they felt like attempting to finish that document while the form of the trust was being altered was a little bit difficult to work through two different things at the same time. And there was not sufficient urgency in writing up those expectations to try and get those done in

advance of the transition so that they will pretty much wait until the transition is done and then consider what, if anything, need to be written down about the expectations.

On the funding, I did have a conversation with Lars about that. And I think that the issue there is that as Victor notes, hiring a different funding -- fundraiser for the trust would be both expensive and confusing since it will have a relationship to the IETF but not be the IETF LLC. The way forward with that appears to be that they will ask Lee-Berkeley to include this within her remit as the fundraiser for the IETF, but ask that the funds go directly to this new management corporation as a 501 -- as a different 501(c)(3) in order to make sure that those funds contribute to the public support test for the 501(c)(3) that is being created.

So rather than funneling everything through the IETF LLC, instead, the IETF LLC will act as a friendly provider of fundraising services and not a supporting organization, but just a helpful friend to do something very similar but to bring the funding directly into the 501(c)(3). If they work out a way to make that simpler so that the funds can go directly to the IETF LLC and then be distributed to the trust, they might do that. But the current plan is that the fundraising would be provided on a pro bono basis by the IETF LLC but result in funds going directly to the trust.

Are there other questions or comments about the trust?

>> VICTOR KUARSINGH: It's always an exciting topic, Ted. So...

>> TED HARDIE: Having been on the trust, I must say it must have changed a great deal if it's always an exciting trust. So I think, as folks will note from having looked at the board book, there are a number of reports that we received as written reports as opposed to presentations, one of which was from the IETF LLC. And I believe we're going to look at just two quick pages from that that I wanted to call attention to.

The first of them is in the report as page 4, slide 4. And if you look at that, what you'll see is a quick review of what the current board work is for the IETF administration LLC. And I wanted to bring this to your attention because, of course, periodically we have to appoint somebody to this board. And so it's useful for us to review periodically what they're doing so we know what kind of person to appoint. As you can see from this, they're working on retrospective on the COVID mitigations. They're focusing on fundraising. And they're working with the

IETF trust to support the bootstrapping there, preparing for their budget, and looking at what's the new normal for hybrid meeting attendance and how do we adapt?

That's one of the big ones, because historically, although not all of the funding for the IETF has come from meetings, it has been a significant stream, and it hasn't been clear how significant a stream of funding it will be in the future. And the IETF LLC is looking both from an administrative perspective. How big a hotel do we need? How big a conference center do we need? And from a fundraising perspective. This particular meeting actually had over 800 local attendees, which is a big increase over Vienna, which was the first one we did that had an in-person component after COVID. So the trendline is definitely up, but we don't know where the plateau sits.

>> What was the average prior to that?

>> TED HARDIE: So it depended on region, but for a U.S. one, 1200. So about two-thirds of what it would have been in the past.

So, again, looking at that, what would the venue contracts need to do to evolve to take that into account?

And, also, the IETF has had separate COVID guidance for its meetings compared to the local jurisdiction, in particular here, for example, you were required to wear masks in the meeting rooms except when speaking, and advised to wear masks in any informal discussion except when eating or drinking. And that's not the local jurisdiction's guidance anymore at all. It might have been when we first made the decision to come back here, but it has evolved locally, but we did not change. So there's a question: At what point do we shift that?

The other thing is it's somewhat difficult for the IETF folks to understand what the local norms are. Our next meeting will be in Japan. And even if the local law might not require masks, Japanese norms around wearing masks are very, very different from the norms you would find here in London or in the U.S. So I think it's important for us to kind of work through how much of this needs to be perhaps more regulated in the IETF community given local norms versus local laws. So that discussion is happening in the IETF LLC.

The other thing on the next page, if you don't mind, I just wanted to give everybody a quick look at their budget. Victor, did you have a question?

>> VICTOR KUARSINGH: Yeah. I had a just quick question on the previous slide. Sorry. So you did mention it briefly, but I wanted to just kind of ask it more specifically. Does the LLC have an idea of how long they feel that COVID-specific focus and/or mitigation policies will likely be in place? I know it's a very open-ended question and hard to answer. Just is it something that they feel like will be an indefinite period of time? Will it be the next couple of years, or it's more like meeting-by-meeting type of assessment?

>> TED HARDIE: I don't have any vision into what the IETF LLC's view of that is. Barry, do you?

>> BARRY LEIBA: Yeah. I talked with Jay about it the other day, actually. So it's certainly something that is revisited meeting to meeting. Part of it is consulting with the community about what the community wants. There's a balance of how many -- how much need is there for masks versus how many people will not come if we aren't masked and that sort of thing, trying to maximize the participation in that regard and make -- and get what the consensus of the community is. So it's being considered meeting by meeting.

>> VICTOR KUARSINGH: Okay. Thank you.

>> TED HARDIE: So we'll return to the budget slide. So I also just wanted the board to be aware of how their current accounts look compared to the budget for the year. This is page 5 in the -- in this slide deck if you want to look at it locally. I'm not going to go into this in any detail. I just wanted to call your attention to it. Obviously, there's some red on that. Some of that red is investments, which has definitely happened to not just the IETF LLC but far more broadly. So it's important for us to be aware of it.

I will also say that there is a big push from the LLC to try and bring in funds through their fundraising efforts while the match that we offered is in place. I think at the plenary meeting Jason pointed out I think six times given that there are only six slides in this deck, the fact that the match got basically, as I mentioned, as many times as there were slides is worth us knowing. They're definitely anxious to take advantage of that. Please, if you have more questions about the deck after you've read it, we can take them up on the list.

Okay. I think our next are either the ChAC or OMAC. Have either of those folks joined (Inaudible) [00:40:41]?

>> They haven't.

>> TED HARDIE: Okay. Do we have Olivier at this point? Because we can bring him forward.

>> (Inaudible)

>> TED HARDIE: Okay. So we'll take a short break. We'll caffeinate. And when the ChAC or OMAC folks are ready, we will reconvene. So please be ready to come back at the top of the hour.

Oh, you're here. Oh, good. Sorry. I think perhaps your indicator in the videoconferencing system didn't tell us that you're here. So if you are here, are you going to present locally, or would you like us to present your slides?

>> ADEBUNMI AKINBO: Presenting, I will (Inaudible) [00:41:34] it.

>> TED HARDIE: Okay. So we'll go on with those reports now, then. Please begin.

>> ADEBUNMI AKINBO: Okay. I'm ready. Could you put up my slides, please, from your end.

>> Yes. Just a second, please.

>> ADEBUNMI AKINBO: Thank you. Okay. So while we're waiting for the slides to come up, just for those who may be new to ChAC, ChAC is the voice of the chapters to the Internet Society through the president and the CEO and, of course, the Board of Trustees.

Our approach is moving from local to global, talking to each representative from each chapter around the world. ChAC SC is actually -- the steering committee is made up of nine people geographically elected based on their intent to volunteer for the service. So with the support of the staff in ISOC, we've been meeting a lot, which depends on how we are advised or we are collaborating.

That being said, whilst still also waiting for the slide to come up on your side, my name is Adebunmi Akinbo. I'm speaking from Nigeria. I'm in Africa. And I'm the African and geographical representing chief.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you very much for joining us today, Adebunmi, and I believe that your slides are now ready. Just

indicate that you'd like them to advance by saying, "Next slide."

>> ADEBUNMI AKINBO: Yes. Thank you. Okay. Again, while the slides are still coming up, as of last year, when we were doing this presentation, we were looking at amending our rules and procedures, which, of course, we've been able to do with our amendment.

Okay. Thank you. We're up. Next slide, please. On behalf of the Chapters Advisory Council, I want to say well done to everyone here at the meeting.

Next slide. Okay. These members of -- okay. Previous slide. Yeah. These are members of the steering committee. I'm the vice-chairman. The chairman is actually unavoidably absent basically because some months ago he was involved in an accident and has been undergoing some hospitalizations and treatment. We always wish him speedy recovery.

That being said, next slide. Okay. So as part of our outreach, we've been able to be involved in different regional calls, especially of what we have mentioned is Africa, where we get to call all chapters together and discuss. Of course, the main objective of such calls across continent is to always discuss on how to exchange information, transfer knowledge, and sharing basic workable applications of our initiatives and also collaborate on a different level.

Next slide, please. As a steering committee, we've been able to discuss issues in the ITU and the UN, which has, of course, led to a lot of -- more awareness about the challenges, which is, of course, the level of entry into these discussions. What aspect of our discussion are we going to discuss about? How do we approach such discussion? What are the roles of government, and how do we approach government in ensuring that the ITU/UN discussions become much more useful, you know, enjoying the fact that ISOC represents the voice of the people when it comes to the Internet.

We are also looking at how to build frameworks to engage chapters either directly through the steering committee or indirectly through the continent. Our achievement in 2022 has basically been being able to discuss with OMAC, which I believe should be right here, you know, on the board in this meeting. And then staff have also been successful to share different matrix with us.

Next slide. Different matrix of the steering committee to ensure that we understand what the issues are and how to address such issues. Earlier this year, Eduardo Diaz made a request, and, you know, talking about interpretations of working committees. The challenge behind this is that ISOC often translates all discussions into French and Spanish. So the discussion was basically should we continue with this, encourage more people from the French-speaking and the Spanish-speaking continent to be able to participate.

It's a big challenge, basically, because when it comes to interpretation, it's sometimes very, very expensive to handle and also cumbersome. So agreeably we looked at it. We put it up for debate.

Next slide, please. We put it up for debate. And while debating, we've discovered that translation of agenda, translation of notes, translation of comments often raise a lot -- excuse me -- offer up a lot of issues. We put it also to a vote, and I believe that at the last meeting where we had a vote, 86.49% of people believe we should carry on with English, thereby, you know, being able to cross the challenges we feel we would undergo when it comes to cost and the fact that it becomes -- it slows down the system of discussion. Often slows down the system of discussion.

Next slide, please. One of our basic topics for the year also included digital sovereignty, which we were able to get input from chapters across the globe. Of course, 22 chapters participated and 2 SIGs also participated. This looks to us like a high number basically because of various meetings we've held, various of these we've held in the past, and we believe these inputs validates our findings towards understanding and drafting a white paper on digital sovereignty.

Next slide, please. So from time to time, we have had to discuss issues concerning membership and the growth of chapters across the globe. Fortunately, chapter formation have also come with its own challenges. One of those are geopolitical challenges.

Next slide. Now, when we say geopolitical challenges, these are, you know, concerning countries that often have issues of breaking away with other countries. You know, without mentioning any country, a country that says it wants to stand alone, and we believe strongly that by standing alone it has to give itself a new name.

Before now ISOC has always followed the ISO 3166 as a standard, which recognized names of country, dependent countries, especially with the geographical interests, and the principal subdivision. But in this case, the challenges we are having, there are countries who do not have such standard, which do not follow such standards. And the steering committee over the past few months have discussed to a large extent, and we believe that we can come up with these following recommendations, as you can see on the PowerPoint.

So the six points are pointing at how to formalize our reference, how to be quick about understanding (Inaudible) [00:50:08] such applications when they're going through reviews, the formal objections are taken care of, how about the naming. How do we name them?

So these are our own suggestions, and we believe that the board could look through them and consider giving us a formal support or more advice in moving forward from here. We want to be as apolitical as possible. That's our major objective with this particular challenge -- naming challenge.

I'm from Nigeria. If Nigeria decide -- as an example, decides to be in two or three different sovereign countries, so to say, and Nigeria does not recognize the two other packs who have decided to take up a new name, would ISOC (Inaudible) [00:50:57] to recognize those names? And that would create a political issue that ISOC would also be involved in if ISOC goes ahead to, you know, recognize them. But if ISOC choose not to recognize them, we're also denying them of some fundamental human right. So like I said, the chapter steering committee -- the ChAC steering committee is looking at a way to be as apolitical as possible.

Next slide, please.

>> TED HARDIE: Do you actually want to take discussion on the -- on this particular point at this time, or do you want to take the discussion on this at the end?

>> ADEBUNMI AKINBO: I wouldn't mind if anyone wants to take discussion at this point.

>> TED HARDIE: Let's bring the slide back, then. And I really want to call out your last point there. In any case where a chapter formation is not possible, it's really important for us to find other ways for the individuals in the possible situation to participate in the Internet Society. And I think in many of

these situations where it is not clear whether a state has been formed according to the ISO 3166 process, what we would prefer to do is to encourage those individuals to participate in ISOC in ways that don't actually require them to spend a lot of their time trying to argue about that point, but get on with trying to grow the Internet.

And in many ways, I think that that process is a distraction from our actual mission. It's clearly not our mission to help identify what states exist in the world. So if there's other things in particular you feel that we ought to encourage staff to do or programs that are needed for those who are stateless or who are in this condition, advice from the ChAC on that point would be welcome.

>> ADEBUNMI AKINBO: Thank you for the response. I'll take that to the chapter steering committee.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Well -- so this is Andrew Sullivan. The way chapters are defined right now, statelessness is not a thing that we could support because chapters -- the way this is stated in the chapter principle is through a presence local to its community of interest a chapter focuses on issues and developments important to its community. So you could talk about a stateless community in a given location, but it has to be in a location. There's a geographic principle here that is a part of chapters. And if it's nongeographic, that's what a SIG is.

>> TED HARDIE: So I'm sorry that I was unclear. What I was trying to get at was if there were programs needed to accommodate these folks as individual members --

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Oh, I see.

>> TED HARDIE: -- parallel to the programs available to chapters, that would be something that we can do because those individual members do not have this chapter locality question. So I think that was my point, and I apologize that it was not clear. Luis?

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Yes. Luis Martinez. Something that I have observed is that many chapters that do not -- or many individuals that do not have a regional presence or a local presence, they sometimes try to adhere to another chapter. And the tendency, at least what I see in Latin America, is to avoid other members from -- not from the country to get into the chapter now.

A long time ago, it happened a lot that maybe you were in Dominican Republic and you joined the Puerto Rico chapter. But now these days because of many changes in rules -- financial rules or maybe regarding to charity organizations, these foreigner members are sent off to their countries again. So maybe we need to find another method to have these members from a place where there is no Internet to join either -- I'm thinking about the international committee under a flag in Switzerland or any other way to join ISOC without joining a specific chapter.

>> TED HARDIE: So we can already do that, right, both through the SIG mechanism and as individual members. And I think that there's been work going on, as we're all aware, for a long time to revamp the membership systems, and hopefully with those new systems our ability to interact with the individual members will increase even if they're not part of a specific chapter.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: It's also the case that the -- the rules about who may join a given chapter are entirely under the control of that chapter. They're not one of the things that we specify. So there are lots of chapters that permit nonlocal membership. If I recall correctly, the New York chapter, Washington chapter, and the Hong Kong chapter, are all examples of chapters that will allow you to join. Whether Hong Kong still allows that, I'm not sure.

So this is really up to the rules of the local chapter. And as you say, that might be constrained by local banking regulations and so forth. There are lots of reasons why -- you know, why those things could be -- and so for instance, while the New York chapter, just to pick on it, permits nonlocal membership and, in fact, foreign membership, you know, like non-U.S. membership, not every foreign national would be eligible for membership in the New York chapter because of U.S. rules.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you very much. I think we can probably move on from this point now. So if you want to go to your next slide, Adebunmi.

>> ADEBUNMI AKINBO: Okay. Thank you so much for the contribution. Like I said, I will be taking this to the council for further discussions. We really appreciate it.

Okay. So we are having our next council all-chapter advisory council members meeting 15th of November. And if you decide to

take, you know, a look at the list, you will find on this slide the links.

Next slide, please. Okay. So here I say a big thank you. Thank you for discussing particularly the issue of chapter formation path. Before I drop my page, I should state this clearly. For some of us in some of the parts of the country, for example, I'm a resident in Nigeria, and I'm also a member of the U.S. and Kenya ISOC group. I would love to, you know, take that on my shoulders. But the question is more about what about my rights to have my own sovereignty. How do I decide and who helps me to decide if I cannot have my own chapter -- ISOC chapter in the name I decide that I want to have it?

This is a take-home. This is not open for discussion. It is a take-home for all of us here on the board to consider, because at the back of the individual's mind, he or she believes strongly that if the Internet is for everyone and I come online, then my takeaway should be the fact that if I say I'm this country and my country believes that it can stand alone, I think the best case to look for support would be on the Internet itself.

And we finally -- how we finally address this situation would help us rather than, again, you know, using the word, keeping it in a stateless state by advice and such individual members to actually participate fully in other organizations, other platforms, or other chapters.

Do not forget we have a chapter for galactical members, which means it could also be, you know, outside the Earth and still be a member of the Internet Society. On that note, for the record, Adebunmi Akinbo for the Chapters Advisory Council. Thank you so much.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you again for your presentation. Are there questions or comments from the board? Please.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Thank you, Ted. Thank you, Adebunmi. Yes. This is Luis. I have two questions. The first one is: What can you comment on current elections, the ChAC? Yes. How is the process going? How many seats are going to be changed or if there are any seats to be changed.

And the other one is related to the role of ChAC as a bridge between the chapters and the Board of Trustees. Yes. When the ChAC was created, it was thought to be a good medium to connect the chapters with the board trustees. And I'm not sure this has

happened efficiently at least. So I was suspecting in this report to read more about not only the communication between chapters or between the international organizations and the chapters, but how about the chapters and the rest of ISOC? Yes. The items seen in the report these sorts of communications. So I just would like to know if there is a plan or you feel it's okay the way the ChAC is acting towards communication for the internal organization at large. Thank you.

>> ADEBUNMI AKINBO: Thank you so much, Luis, for that question. Past it was our own undoing not to -- to have left out elections in the report. My apologies on behalf of my board. And, also, communications. Communication is actually very key. And that is actually what we are working on at the moment. Not to stir a hornet's nest -- not to stir up a hornet's nest, some of our members believe strongly that we should as a steering committee be asking more questions, if possible, doing a flashback to past issues, for example, the sales of PIR and all other issues that we believe are of concern to them. However, we believe strongly that we should be looking forward to, first of all, addressing the issue of how our members see the Chapters Advisory Council. We're still in that discussion. At our next meeting on the 15th of November, this is one of our major discussions put up for the open mic for people to discuss how they see the Chapters Advisory Council and how they want the Chapters Advisory Council to run.

That being said, bringing back to the elections issue, at the moment we are running the elections very, very smoothly. Apologies. We are running the elections very smoothly. The chapter advisory council was able to appoint a chairman for the elections committee who are proposed to be the outgoing secretary of the current Chapters Advisory Council. As it is the law -- as it is in the bylaws, it is statutory for all the nine seats to be changed. We do not have a sitting bow-out procedure. All nine seats will be changed. At the moment, all of us are up for election. And those of us who wish to probably have a comeback probably to, you know, volunteer to serve, have put in our applications and have gone through the process of -- finished the process of campaign.

On November 10th, campaign ceased and elections have come in. By the 25th, election would have been concluded and the results will be out. So that said for the elections.

And, you know, without much ado about nothing, yes, the Chapters Advisory Council would look ahead towards having pockets of meeting with the Board of Trustees prior to dates. It

would go a long way to address a lot of issues, you know, in the idea of communication.

Probably we have been set back a little based on the accident that got our chairman involved, and we have not been able to have much discussions around certain things. We have been able to move forward basically because of reporting. Let me use that word. Reporting based on the number of chapter members who actually function in different working groups. We hope to work on that.

If I come back, those are going to be issues that we're going to be addressing. If I do not come back, the minutes of meeting rules state clearly these are the challenges we need to address. Having to have more than one, you know, meeting with the Board of Trustees, having to have a series of feedbacks from the board trustees to the chapters and also the SIGs. I hope that answers your question, Luis. And thank you so much for that question.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you very much for the response. Are there any other questions from the board? Okay. Once again, thank you very much. We appreciate it, and we appreciate the continued efforts of the ChAC to work for the mission of the Society.

>> ADEBUNMI AKINBO: Thank you. Thank you, Ted.

>> TED HARDIE: Okay. We are running a little bit ahead, and it looks like the folks from OMAC and the local chapter have not yet joined us. So I'm going to ask to bring forward the item on signature authority. This is something you've seen in the past and it should be fairly short. Ilona, I believe you said you would be ready to present that.

>> ILONA LAVINE: Sure.

>> TED HARDIE: Okay. So my apologies for a little bit of hopscotch with the agenda, but we're just trying to fit that in before the other reports.

>> ILONA LAVINE: Okay. So I don't have the slides. I did send an email earlier this week, and it contains two policies. One is for the Internet Society. One is for the Internet Society Foundation. And it's the policies on the signature authority and authorization.

As Andrew mentioned, Rinalia and Sally are getting promoted to the managing director, and so we had to relook at our policies. So what you have in your emails are the updated

policies. And because this is the board's authority to pass those policies, we ask that you take a look at them. And if there's any discussion, or if not, we'll call for the resolution.

>> TED HARDIE: So this was sent out ten days or so ago at this point. And it's fairly similar to the signature authority policy we had before with the changes to update, to recognize the new rules for Rinalia and Sally. Are there any questions about the policy?

Okay. So we'll have to take the two policy pieces related to the foundation during the foundation meeting. But functionally what we're looking for at the moment is to make sure that people are okay with the new policy and with the new delegated authorities table, which is Schedule A. And I'm not seeing any questions about that. No?

So I guess the next question is if we can have the resolution up. It looks like we have it. So the proposed resolution is a resolution for the signature authority and delegation of authority policies - Internet Society. Resolution states: Adopt updated signature authorization and delegation of authority policy. Whereas, the Board of Trustees, via Resolution 2021-43, adopted a signature authorization and delegation of authority policy; whereas, the Board of Trustees desires to update the policy; resolved, that the Board of Trustees hereby adopts the updated signature authorization and delegation of authority policy as presented.

Now, we'll take the Internet Society Foundation one during its thing, but is there any discussion of the resolution? Seeing none, may I ask you to raise your hand either in person or in the tool to signify assent. Okay. Thank you very much. I believe that's unanimous. So we just approved the signature policy changes that you've seen in email.

Okay. So the Foundation meeting will have a very similar short section to disclose that.

And I guess the next question: Do we have the OMAC folks that have joined us? Not yet. Okay. We're expecting the local chapter at the bottom of the hour, which would be 10:30 local time here, so we'll take a short break until then. And if we could pause the recording, please.

Welcome, Olivier. We were thankful that you are able join us today, and we look forward to your report. Please take it away.

>> DR. OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. And I'll just turn my camera. I hope you can hear me well. Thank you, and welcome to London. I guess we are -- I can't say we're your local host because I'm not actually local, unfortunately. I would have wanted to join you guys, but I'm currently in Albania. I actually arrived from Turkey a couple of days ago, and so a bit far away.

Christian de Larrinaga is in Bath, but he -- only for a short while and couldn't make it to London. We're a bit scattered at the moment around the globe, but this is what the Internet helps us do, which is to work remotely and be able to continue running the chapter from wherever we are in the UK or abroad, which is a good thing.

Now, I think the last time you guys came to London was -- was it four years ago or five years ago? It was a little while ago. And we had some events that took place back then. We managed to organize some events with the government. And, unfortunately, you come in at a time when the government changes on quite a regular basis in the UK. So organizing things has been particularly challenging. And for us it's been particularly challenging to also organize other events, because whenever we wanted to have ministers or people proposing policy and so on, things -- you know, the goalposts have kept on moving for quite some time. And we always thought that there would be another day, maybe wait another month for a little bit more stability, and then we will be able to get a nice, good, stable panel and develop the discussions, and things were always pushed back.

Anyway, in the past years -- well, I think I've noticed a number of you around the table are new. I do have to congratulate one of -- one person in particular -- and that's George Sadowsky on his achievement, the Jonathan Postel Award. So well done, George. I was thrilled to watch the recordings of the proceedings on your award ceremony.

But I think I know a few other people around the table. And I'm not sure to what extent you know the background of the UK chapter or UK England chapter of the Internet Society. It started in the late '90s as ISOC London chapter, and then it was expanded as ISOC England chapter because at the time there was an ISOC Scotland chapter, and there were discussions to have also an ISOC -- another chapter in the other parts of the United Kingdom.

The Scottish chapter faded away, and we ended up being the only chapter covering the whole of the UK, thus being called

ISOC UK England, which is a little strange for some because some don't know quite the difference between the two, but it's UK England, and it's been going since the late '90s. 1999, I think, was the time when Christian de Larrinaga expanded it to this.

We have about 1,700 or so members listed, but as with any chapter, they don't all take an active part in the running of the chapter, so we do have a nice footprint being able to disseminate information to a large number of people, but as of the active members, you'll find there's a much, much smaller set of people that are involved in both the discussions on our policy mailing list, but also the discussions that take place when we have either face-to-face meetings or webinars.

We do have a lack of face-to-face meetings in the past years because of COVID, of course. And the UK was particularly badly hit. So people are generally more reticent these days to actually go to face-to-face meetings, and they really enjoy the idea of being able to have face -- well, not face-to-face, but online meetings using Zoom, and that's been very well accepted.

So the last year we had one hybrid event, which was with the British Computing Society, and it was about the threat to DNS. And we had two aspects of this, one being the technical threats, including the DOH and the needs for IOT, the potential architectural changes for 5G, but also the political threats such as nationalization of DNS resources and other moving goalposts that we see on the policy side of things.

We also had -- and that was a hybrid event. So we had a few people that turned up. And it was interesting to see that we had more people online than people coming to the face-to-face meetings, while in the past this was completely different. We had more people at the face-to-face meeting than online.

The other event we had last year was -- another interesting event we had last year was rebuilding and enhancing trust in algorithms. The chapter has maintained an interest in algorithm diversity and algorithm neutrality for quite some time. And the lack of neutrality is one of the things. It's more like algorithmic bias of some sorts. And we have worked with Angidal Koerner (ph) and his group of researchers with the EPSRC. So there's a sort of research grant funded called Reintrust (ph), a follow-up to a previous project in the previous years at the University of Oxford, Edinburgh, and Nottingham.

And the things that were discussed there and that were studied were: What are the user expectations and requirements regarding the rebuilding of trust in algorithms?

A few years ago the question was: Do people have trust in algorithms? The answer now is no, they don't, because they feel almost due to the advent of fake information and the whole discussion that takes place about people being in their own bubbles and so on. And so more transparency is required in those algorithms. And the question is: How can one create that transparency?

And so this group was really -- has done some serious and very deep work on this. And to what extent the user trust can be regained through technological solutions or through some way to show that algorithms can be trusted with the limitations that we have today, where most of the companies that use these algorithms are saying this is proprietary information, so they can't actually share what exactly the algorithm does because of (Inaudible) [01:17:09]. That's the way they see it, and that's their word.

So that's the stuff that we had last year. Now, of course, we also had a process, which is a long-standing process that we thought was going to be much shorter than this on the UK online -- well, it started as online harms. It started way before May 2021, where we had early signs that such a bill was coming up.

Now, for those that don't know it, the Online Harms Bill, which, in fact, now, has been renamed Online Safety Bill, aims to make the UK Internet the safest in the world. And we're thinking, well, okay, safe is fair enough, but safest, for who and for what. And what do you mean by making the Internet the safest in the world?

The main flaw with this bill is that it paints with a single stroke pretty much the whole what we would call in technology the stack from the lower layers all the way to the application layer. And it is imposing a whole number of rules and of recommendations that require tracking, that require recording, that require a full analysis of traffic and that effectively have a number of unwanted consequences. That's the word. Unwanted consequences. Such as, for example, the weakening of encryption.

There was a recent debate, actually, regarding this Online Safety Bill at the UK IGF, which took place just I think it was

last week. And it was interesting to see how far apart the sides are, where the proponents and the supporters of the Online Safety Bill are saying one thing in saying, no, it doesn't weaken encryption. It's not a back door. It's none of what you're accusing it to be, but at the same time it has all the flavors of that because they're saying that's what -- well, what it needs to do is something. And when they explain it, it basically is what they say it isn't.

So it's a complicated one. And we have been, of course, working very hard with the Internet Society, as well, with the help of staff to try and bring some sense into this debate and to try and move away from the emotions and actually have some technological questions and answers and proposals in order to have a bill that is not going to start breaking things and start having -- creating more harm than it actually is supposed to be preventing end users from.

So that was one -- that's one of the ongoing issues, and it's not finished yet. The bill still hasn't passed in Parliament. We had some prime ministers that wanted it done within a couple of weeks and others slowed it down, and, of course, then the political debate went elsewhere. And so there's still a part that one can play. The difficulty being, though, that we are up against a highly emotional set of arguments that are basically saying, well, you know, children are being abused, and child sexual abuse material is available online, and terrorists and all these people are make use of the Internet in a certain way, and this bill is going to be the one that saves us all from all of this material and makes the Internet -- the UK Internet much, much safer.

>> TED HARDIE: Can I drill down on this point a little bit?

>> DR. OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah.

>> TED HARDIE: Because I know this is of interest to the board. Clearly the bill as it's currently written has a number of concerning elements, two of which I think you already touched on and I wanted to kind of get a little bit of discussion around. One is encryption. It looks in the bill right now as if it is an offense under the bill to turn over material to Ofcom, which has been encrypted, which functionally means many service providers that would normally be cooperative, which no longer have access to unencrypted versions of traffic, if they turn over the encrypted versions as a response to an Ofcom inquiry would be chargeable as offenders under the bill, which certainly seems like it's highly problematic given the current mix of

traffic on the Internet and the fact that providers themselves don't control that; right? I mean, it's something where the encryption takes place between an end-user device and a service, neither of which may be under the control of the provider.

The other of which is the elements that Ofcom will be charged with for verification of identity. And there's a great --

>> DR. OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Right.

>> TED HARDIE: -- deal of concern especially to category 1 providers, who must verify identity, not simply that someone is an adult, but the identity associated with the adult. How is that debate going, from your perspective, on those two elements, and what do you think that means for how the Internet -- can the Internet be for everyone if the Internet must always be attributable? There's a big question there.

>> DR. OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Unfortunately -- you're absolutely right, Ted. Unfortunately, the debate -- and you will -- I don't know whether you've seen that discussion at the UK IGF, but the debate was a little bit like seeing two sides that are saying their points but not meeting in the middle. And Alec Muffett was the gentleman who made the points that you made and others. One of the points being, well, if the UK implements such a system, what stops another country like -- well, a country that is less democratic than the UK implementing exactly the same thing and using it to actually control their people?

And the answers were, well, that goes beyond the debate that we need have here. It's a case of, well, you know, we're going to create something, but we don't really want to know what it's going to cause and the consequences of what we're creating here.

The other thing that came out of that discussion -- and it is, by the way, the first one that is -- that I felt was one that was balanced, because often you get people from the same side. The chapter tried to organize a discussion with the different parties in the early part of the year, and we were unable to do so. Whenever one side heard, oh, they're part of it, oh, no, well, no, we don't really want to engage into a discussion here about this. We want to engage in a discussion about this in Parliament or in another forum but not in a forum that is outside the realm of Parliament.

And this is the problem when you've got the technologists, who understand what they're talking about, they're not able to actually access -- to directly access a debate with people that

are of enough -- of a certain level to be able to make changes in the policy itself.

What transpired it appears from the discussions at the IGF, at the UK IGF, was that we're going to pass the bill, and, yes, it's got a lot of problems with it. And when we'll implement it, we'll see what works and we'll see what won't work. And personally find this flabbergasting to put together a policy where there is a question mark as to whether it will actually be implementable in the way that the policy is drafted. It's very disappointing to see something like this where you're going to end up with -- or you're very likely now to end up at this stage with a piece of legislation that is not going to be fit for purpose and that is going to cause all sorts of additional problems.

I don't know if anyone else has a comment on this or a thought about this. And I'm just sharing my personal views. I haven't had a chance to discuss it with my colleagues in ISOC UK, but I know that several have also admitted deep, deep concerns about this being some very flawed piece of policy that is just being pushed through for political reasons because we need to do something. And then they can just put it, oh, tick the box. We've now made the Internet safe. So --

>> TED HARDIE: Well, if all it really took was ticking a box to make the Internet safe, we would have done it a long time ago. Pepper?

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Yeah. So, yeah, hello. I would agree completely. And, actually, it's worse than that because there's a contagion factor because the UK is seen as, you know, one of the better countries for evidence-based rule making, evidence-based legislation, and this is clearly not evidence based. And so for those countries where it's even less well intended, you know, it's going to be used as a reason to, frankly, try to fragment the Internet, break it down, and create in the name of security, safety, protecting children, you know, digital sovereignty, and we're going to see this as, you know, used in many places for, you know, not so well-intended reasons even if here it's completely ill informed, at least it's to some extent well intended. And so I think that we do have to worry about the contagion factor.

>> JON PETERSON: Jon Peterson. I mean, is it our assessment that it is merely ill informed and not that there is no ulterior motive to this? Because, I mean, it seems to me almost impossible that someone could really think that this is going to

work unless they have a level of ignorance that I would not even ascribe to a cabinet minister; right? So, like, I have seen the government, yeah.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: So this is the issue. And, Olivier, you can -- sorry.

>> JON PETERSON: Because I --

>> ROBERT PEPPER: You know, the political -- so this is the issue where you have politics, not policy. And it's -- the goals are, again, we have to do something, so we're going to do something.

>> JON PETERSON: But we don't think there's an ulterior motive to actually create a splinternet in the UK behind this, right, that is merely using this --

>> ROBERT PEPPER: I would just like to --

>> JON PETERSON: Yeah. That's my question.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: And I don't believe that's the case.

>> JON PETERSON: We don't believe that's the case?

>> DR. OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I don't believe that's the case at all.

>> JON PETERSON: Okay. It's just ignorance.

>> DR. OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's just an unintended consequence. And no matter how much we mention this unintended consequence, it falls on deaf ears because of the emotional debate from the other side, the very strong lobbying that has taken place not just recently but for many, many years to say we need to make sure that now we make the Internet safe.

And "safe" means whatever it means. I mean, okay, it means basically stopping any kind of traffic that might be -- that will be considered harmful to specific segments of UK society. And that, of course, includes hate speech, et cetera. That includes a whole lot of things, not just child sexual abuse material. But it's -- the thing is some seem to think that there is a silver bullet. You do something and then it will be safe. And that's where there's a deep flaw. Unfortunately, the politics in the UK right now work a little bit like this, where we need a silver bullet in order to be able to, you know, stay in power for a little more time. There's so much chaos at the

moment, we need to show that we care and that we're doing something and that previous governments have not.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Yeah, Jon, just to your point --

>> TED HARDIE: Laura. Pepper, it's Laura's turn.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: I'm sorry.

>> TED HARDIE: Pepper, Laura is next.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Yeah. Sorry. This is --

>> TED HARDIE: We'll come back to you, I promise.

>> LAURA THOMSON: If what you're saying is relevant to the current point, please continue.

>> TED HARDIE: Go ahead.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: No, I was just going to respond to Jon that the official UK government position at the ITU Plenipotentiary was to oppose splinternet, was to oppose data localization. So at the government level, right, among the, you know, the FCO people, I mean, the people who actually understand these things, was to strongly oppose those kinds of efforts and along with, you know, the U.S. and others and were affected and pushing back on those efforts. So I actually don't think it's intended -- ill intended in that sense, but there's -- it's politics, not policy.

>> LAURA THOMSON: So I'll chime in there. I think our perception of this issue here is that I don't think any of those folks in government understand the concept of splinternet; right? Like I don't think they know what they're doing essentially.

And then my question for you, Olivier, is: What can we do to support you in this? Because it seems like I think we're all pretty much in agreement that this is a terrible idea and will have terrible consequences, but I'm not really -- I don't think any of us really know how to move it forward in a more positive direction.

>> DR. OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thank you. I think you should just keep on doing what you've been doing so far. You've really been very supportive of the chapter and, of course, with your bilateral discussions independently of the chapter through

the connections that you have in being able to engage with the -- with those concerned -- with the policymakers.

But as Pepper says, there's a lot of politics in this now, and we are faced with some public servants that are basically saying I'm sorry. At the moment I can't do anything. I'm told we have to go this way. And, you know, I know we were saying the opposite before. And this is where, then, the discussion goes into the bill will be voted, and at implementation it will have to be changed or, you know, we'll have to see if it can be implemented or not and how it can be implemented.

And there'll be a -- I would imagine there'll be a lot of discussions with the -- it's all about social media, really, with the main social media companies, the likes of, you know, the GAFAs -- well, yeah, the GAFAs effectively. And it's not -- it's not a -- it's not an accident that you actually have such a strong presence of Facebook and Apple and these companies that are heavily involved in content these days based in London because that, obviously, is where they're going to have to do a significant amount of work.

The critic, of course, the concern is that they might end up with a solution or some middle-of-the-road solution that only they, the big companies, are able to sustain, and any smaller organizations and smaller companies will just not have neither the manpower nor the technology to do. And that, of course, is another type of splintering or -- well, it's more like -- it's not even splintering. I think it's basically reducing the number of actors that are out there and, you know, some sort of -- it's not even consolidation because you're basically shunting away whoever it is that is not able to follow. And that's a concern that we should have too. But, yes, you've done a really great job so far.

And I think that if we can continue that dialogue, and, of course, the chapter will be fully behind the efforts of the Internet Society on this. And we hope that it will be in the other direction too.

I wish some of my colleagues who knew a lot more about this in-depth were with us, but trust me this is an issue which we have many, many concerned discussions about with many, many concerned folks around the UK, including people that were previous policymakers and that just don't understand why we are edging towards the edge of the precipice when the UK has traditionally been at the forefront of policymaking and supports

the multistakeholder model, supporter of one Internet, supporter -- all the values that the Internet Society supports.

So it's quite bizarre to be in this situation today, but, unfortunately, that's where we are. It's not the first thing that is bizarre in UK politics at the moment.

>> TED HARDIE: So Andrew and then Charles.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Thanks. So just a couple of items that I will point out. We are working -- the staff is working closely with people in the UK on this topic. We co-authored an impact assessment on the Online Safety Bill. And, of course, we've been working on these ideas of, like, digital sovereignty. That report is about to come out. We -- you know, we developed the impact brief precisely so that it was possible to provide these kinds of things so that policymakers would not be able to claim, oh, it's just we don't understand this.

I do think there is one other thing that is important to recognize here, and that is it's very easy to fall into the habit of thinking of governments as having a unity; right? So, like, what is the government policy on this? But, of course, within an organization as large as the UK government, you have factions. And some of those factions are -- I think Jon's question was appropriate. Some of those factions simply don't care whether they wreck the Internet. They're interested in other things, and, like, if the Internet happens to fail, either that's, like, just too bad or, for that matter, maybe a good thing because what they're really after is sort of more social control or something like that.

And I think that we are seeing the emergence of that -- like the UK is not in any way unique in that respect; right? We're seeing that all over the world in places where we used to think, hey, weren't these people our allies last week? You know, we have to ask ourselves, hey, is this -- you know, do we have the kind of support that we want. And just to foreshadow a little bit, of course, we will have some more projects on this very topic for next year. So when we talk about the action plan for next year, I guess tomorrow, that will be one of the things that we'll be asking this board to approve to make sure that we can, you know, continue to press forward on this thing because it's an urgent problem.

>> TED HARDIE: I have Charles and then Jon.

>> CHARLES MOK: Yeah. I think a few points to add for myself. First of all, I think it's not unique to the UK definitely. It's very much the same situation in many of the democratic countries around the world, including Australia, including Canada, including the U.S., even though probably in the U.S. laws were proposed, but they weren't passed yet, or maybe they will never get passed because it's the U.S.

So -- but -- or Germany. I mean, the hate speech laws in Germany a few years ago were very well copied by other countries, including Singapore and so on, and expanded on by, you know, countries that are less democratic. So this is an issue that has been around for a long time. And so I think the situation in the UK is definitely not unique.

But I also want to point out another fact to consider, which is that when we talk about the Internet, the concept of the Internet to us is very different from the concept of the Internet for many of the lawmakers and politicians. To them, the Internet is Facebook, Google, and so on and so on. So to them this is evil. They equate the Internet with those companies or, you know, some of those factors that are represented by some of the behaviors of these companies. So I think that is also one issue that we need to try to explain better to the wider community, including policymakers, that the Internet isn't about those companies alone.

>> TED HARDIE: Jon.

>> JON PETERSON: Yeah. Just a clarifying question. Maybe even a question about Ofcom's remit, but do we anticipate the offenders whom they would be trying to seize data in this instance would be more the Vodafone, right, that this is connected to or Apple? Like is there anything in the legislation that would lead us to think this is a way they're going to pressure operators to give this, or is it really the Metas, right, and the Apples and the Googles that -- does anybody know?

>> And the (Inaudible) [01:37:59] even.

>> DR. OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think that Charles put his -- you know, his finger on it. I don't think they even go to that level. They just see it as social media, Facebook --

>> JON PETERSON: But I was talking about Ofcom's remit in particular.

>> DR. OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, yeah, yeah, yeah.

>> JON PETERSON: So does Ofcom have the same regulatory power over Meta that it does over Voda?

>> DR. OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, once it goes into a bill, it's not down to the agency that actually is --

>> JON PETERSON: Oh, okay.

>> DR. OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: -- proposing the bill. Then it becomes law. Then it's -- I don't know what agency (Inaudible) [01:38:32].

>> JON PETERSON: I know you called out Ofcom, Ted, in the passage you were reading, which is why I was asking that much more narrow question.

>> DR. OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. I mean, Ofcom's remit has expanded over the years.

>> JON PETERSON: Okay.

>> DR. OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It used to be just Oftel, telephone services, then they became Ofcom with all sorts of things that were added to this, and now it seems that they're expanding their remit.

You know, the people at Ofcom are actually very reasonable people, but it's just, you know, the pressures -- the outside pressures from the likes of GCHQ, the likes of those other pressure groups that are saying, no, no, we need something much stronger than this, and you are the people that have to push this forward.

But, you know, I should emphasize the whole point which I find absurd, which is let's implement this flawed bill -- sorry. Let's pass the bill, and then we'll think about implementation. And if it's not implementable, well, we'll have to find a solution. That doesn't sound like proper policymaking. That's the big concern that we have because it might be the first of a number of other bills, also, that will be passed this way and even more restricted.

A few years ago we had the regulation of Investigatory Powers Bill, which was also something that had some parts of it that went way further than we'd ever seen before, one of them being that an Internet service provider needs to coordinate the work with a security agency to be able to hack into somebody's computer. They're not allowed to tell the person that they're

doing this. And the government is then allowed to go in there, take information, remove information from your machine, if it has -- if it manages to have access to it, something that would never be allowed in the real world without a warrant is something that could be allowed in the virtual world.

And the question is: Has it been used since? Probably not. Probably not possible technologically these days because people implement their own firewalls on their machines. But, you know, this is -- it's part of a set of bills that are supposed to make the landscape a lot clearer than what it is with the multiplication of small bills that were voted over the years, and yet it's actually not making it clearer; it's actually making it a lot cloudier and a lot -- no pun intended, by the way -- but a lot worse than what it's supposed to be.

And it just leaves us as a community of people who know their way around technology baffled as to what the intent is at the end, although we don't think there is malicious intent. There appears to be some way of, well, let's have more control from a certain part of the political field. And they're seeing this as an opportunity for them to have the added control over information. And that's a concern as well.

>> TED HARDIE: And to give you kind of a more direct answer, I put something into the board chat that gives you a pointer to the bill. And on page 70 you'll see how Ofcom assesses each different one of these. So under part 3, for example, search engines are included. Clearly not Vodafone at that level, combined services, user, user services, et cetera. So the remit is definitely different.

And it's interesting, because DCMS, which is the group that actually is the sponsoring ministry for this, in many other ways has very sensible ideas about the Internet. And I think perhaps the message we have to give to pick up on something that Olivier said before is silver bullets are for werewolves. And of all the problems the Internet has, lycanthropy really not one of them. We really have to get them to understand that this is significantly more complex than any silver bullet will ever address and that some of this extension of power once extended is impossible to retrieve.

I think the point that Olivier made before about the law being passed and that an implementation changed is a significant departure from the rule of law. It's not simply problematic for the Internet; it's problematic for the entire system of the rule of law to have the government say we'll pass something that's

incredibly broad and then work out later how it applies to the actual lives of its citizens, because that then becomes a matter of government intent rather than the rule of law. Given the possibility of government intent shifting over time, as it certainly has from government to government, even in a country as stable as the UK, that's problematic for us.

The other thing that's incredibly problematic is the point Charles was making that these things are written with Twitter in mind, and we're currently seeing Twitter dissolve into a whole bunch of other services that might not meet the threshold that this currently implies because it's built with thresholds in mind of who has to comply. And, you know, if you're now in a federated system like Mastodon or one of the possible replacements that does this, nothing might apply. And the entire intent of the bill to try and make sure that there is a way to see whether a service is being used to disseminate hate speech or child sexual content or something like that disappears because the bill was written to the incumbents rather than to the actual underlying systems. And I think it's problematic on so many different ways.

I'm incredibly grateful for the work that the staff is doing on it, but I think that the board has to be ready from the point of view of defend, which we've discussed in the past, that more and more folks that we saw as allied with our intent and our efforts on the government sphere may no longer -- if not actually adversaries, they're no longer allies, and that's the situation we have to deal with. Charles.

>> CHARLES MOK: Just one quick point. Talking about the political side about this whole thing and building allies, I'm still thinking that we can expand a bit more on the aspect and the point about censorship and that sort of implication if such kind of laws are passed with the hope of solving one particular or few problems such as hate speech or child porn materials and so on, but having the side effect on some of the other countries.

So realizing that there are other factions in governments or the legislature and so on or the political parties that are more concerned, actually, about the issues of censorship in other countries -- could be Iran, could be Russia, China, and so on -- realizing that, you know, trying to let those factions understand the side effects and so on so that they might be also a kind of -- you know, when the whole discussion are going through the legislature and the government, you know, we could have those factions coming out at the right time, hopefully, to

counterbalance the sort of push from the people that are concerned about the most populous issues like child porn and so on.

>> TED HARDIE: So I'm afraid we drilled down so far into this that it's going to be a little bit hard to get back to the rest of your presentation. But, Olivier, if you wanted to continue now.

>> DR. OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, thank you. Well, just a couple more mundane matters, I guess. I was going to talk briefly about the IPv6 matrix. I think some of you might be aware of it. It's this website and crawler that crawls the world. So 1 million largest information servers and checks for IPv6 connectivity.

We were running it for ten years on a very old, old set of servers which finally gave up on life, and we had to revive them. In the middle of COVID, we managed to extract them. They were running at the University of Southampton. And thanks to some heroic work by the people over there going around the bans on being able to even get out of your house, they managed to take those servers out, send them over to London. We took the information out. And we've now fully virtualized them, having done a deal with -- having found a sponsor for the virtualization engine for the hosting, basically, in Mythic Beasts. They were very kind to -- when they saw one of our presentations say, "Oh, we'd be interested in hosting this." And so they're providing the space.

We got a -- we received a large grant award to be able to basically rewrite the software because it was written on an operating system that was more than ten years old. So you can imagine the number of security holes in the operating system. And, of course, the big problem being that the libraries had to all be updated, et cetera, et cetera.

Anyway, to cut a long story short, it's back up and it's running every month. And it's -- you can go to ipv6matrix.org, and you'll see the results. We haven't changed the interface. We just kept it to what it was, but the information is pretty much the same. And the crawler was completely rewritten from scratch. And we were happy to find out that the results continued in the correct line. So there was no big error or mistake or something that had gone wrong in the Version 1 that dated from I think it was 2010, which in Internet terms is probably a lifetime. So that's still running.

And then we've also got a lecture -- an online webinar coming up with something a little bit different. Jesse Sowell from UCL -- a researcher at UCL is going to speak to us on Thursday, the 17th of November about the operational inferior complex of the Internet. And here he's digging into the complex relationships between different companies that are providing you with this Internet service, whether it's at the connectivity level or it's actually at a higher level.

As you know, there's the Web itself, but there's a web of companies that work with each other that exchange information about you sometimes with contracts and sometimes without contracts. And he's certainly doing some research in digging into this. And it's, again, another fascinating thing because it's, I guess, another aspect of what we call the Internet ecosystem. We're well knowledgeable about the Internet ecosystem when it comes down to it in a governance, but here it's about Internet commerce and how the Internet actually is funded and funds itself.

And I guess as we now reach the point in time when there are some major changes, and you might have all read that recently that advertising is not bringing as much -- as much money as it used to before to those big, big organizations and they certainly have -- there are some cuts that have affected a number of the big companies out there. It's interesting to dig into the actual way of how the whole ecosystem works together.

Anyway, I know very little about it, but Jesse knows an enormous amount, so I invite you. And I will make an announcement I think probably later today or tomorrow about the webinar on Thursday. I invite you to take part into it and to learn along with me. Perhaps some of you know more than I do.

So, anyway, that's all, really, for the chapter. As I said, I'm really sorry that none of us were able to meet with you in person, but we are looking forward to a future time the IETF will be in town again. I'm sure that there will be a future occasion.

By then I probably won't be the chair anymore. I've been chair for quite some time. We've got elections that are coming up. So I don't know. I'm told I might do just another round just to make sure the ship sails after the rough weather that we've had with COVID and with all that.

But beyond this, I'm open to any other questions. Thank you.

>> TED HARDIE: Well, thank you again for being here today. Are there any other questions for Olivier? Luis?

>> LAURA THOMSON: Yes. Thank you, Olivier. This is Luis. We have heard a lot of strengthening the Internet, but what about grow the Internet in the UK? Are there still challenges that are seen from the chapter here in growing the Internet apart from the critical infrastructure? Are we looking still of areas should be connected to the Internet, maybe the North, the Highlands, or something like that, Orkney Islands, you know, Shetland.

>> DR. OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Luis. Actually, yes, thank you for pointing this out, because that's one point which we did have a discussion about, also, internally.

The UK has or had a broadband plan. I think it was Boris Johnson that had a few years ago come up with a broadband plan where there was going to be fiber to X number of homes, and, you know, very, very high percentages and so on. Unfortunately, it hasn't lived up to its hype, and so we're still far away from those numbers.

There are still some parts of the country that are in actual black holes where there's no fiber, very little copper, which is a difficulty or at least the speed on ADSL or XDSL, whatever DSL type it is, is very low and even black spots when it comes down to mobile connectivity. 3G is sometimes -- 3G, not 4, 3. Forget about 5. 3G is sometimes hard to get by. I know of at least a couple of friends that live in the hills just outside Bath that have such problems. And so it's -- and so you don't have to go even as far as the Highlands to reach this.

There is, unfortunately -- due to the changes in government, there doesn't seem to have been a follow-up on this, and this is something which there needs to be really a follow-up on.

There is a second problem with UK legislation, which is the very tight legislation around community networks. In some parts of the world, wherever there was a black spot somewhere, people managed to arrange things with each other, and, of course, the Internet Society has been really helpful with this as well. I remember the project in Georgia being such an amazing success. Projects I should say.

And there have been some of our members that have been interested in implementing community networks. Unfortunately,

the legislation around being able to run your own wide-area network by being able to just even lay a cable across the street to the other side of the street or actually have a wide-area network that is a radio network of some sort, legislation is so complicated that many have tried and have failed and because it involves costs and it involves time. It involves talking to not just one agency, but many different actors. And there appears to be no interest in the government -- from the government in making this easier. So that's why we haven't seen that many successful wide-area community networks in the UK.

And those that have been implemented were actually usually implemented with the help of a local telecommunications firm that has the actual licensing agreements to be able to do what it needs to do to roll out the network, and that means it's usually been done in the built-up areas and not in those parts of the UK that are the furthest from the -- the furthest from a town center.

>> TED HARDIE: Victor?

>> VICTOR KUARSINGH: Yeah. I had a question on the -- you had mentioned rural access for Internet. What's the status on utilizing lower band for reaching rural areas? Is it still -- in the UK is the use of 600 megahertz still a challenge for the -- you know, to be able to be used for those reaches? Anyway, I'll leave it at that.

>> DR. OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks, Victor. I'm going to be frank with you, I don't know, to be honest. I haven't followed this very closely. I know that Christian de Larrinaga has. If you want, we can follow up with you afterwards and let you know.

My understanding is that there hasn't been much -- well, there hasn't been anything that's helped recently to make things easier. So I would have to check for that.

>> VICTOR KUARSINGH: Sure, yeah. We could follow up offline. That's no problem.

>> TED HARDIE: Luis?

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Yes. Thanks, Olivier. So it means that in this previous theme about the detailed regulation may be another obstacle for growing the Internet because you have current regulation that makes very difficult to set up a wireless LAN or air LAN. And now if you add these problems with content

regulation that the Ofcom is leader to, then it will mean that it will become very, very difficult to set a legal network working in your community.

Do you foresee an advantage in adopting Wi-Fi 6? Because I'm not sure about the status of the UK towards Wi-Fi 6, but maybe the same as the other side of the channel, which may be only the lower part of the band, useful as open. Thanks.

>> DR. OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks, Luis. I fear that, unfortunately, the debate and the discussions around the Online Safety Bill have pretty much stopped every other discussion out there on the other topics. So it's taken all the air out of the room, and everyone is focusing on this.

There have been some arguments -- and, again, political arguments -- we here have politicians -- who have said, well, before trying to make the network safe for children, we should actually try and get all of the children in the UK to be able to access the network, which is what the broadband plan was supposed to be. And that, unfortunately, isn't the case.

But, you know, the politics is such that they try and find convincing arguments to get more electors, not to actually get things done. Sorry. That's a personal -- personal point of view.

But, obviously, you know, the -- I think one of the questions that was asked during the UK IGF was: What are your plans regarding -- and we had the shadow minister that was -- shadow telecom minister that spoke, and the question was: What are your plans? What do you hope in the next 12 months for the UK Internet? And the answer was, well, we hope to get in power. So -- to be elected. So that's the first step, I guess, for politicians, not quite the first step for technologists and policymakers.

We're -- I think that once the Online Safety Bill is -- well, we can't really say the debate will go away. The debate will continue. But there certainly needs to be a lot more discussion on the use of Wi-Fi 6, on the use of these bands in the UK to help with community networks and with bringing better connectivity to those places that don't have it.

As I said, the debate is somewhere else at the moment. It's unfortunate.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Thank you. And let's hope it's solved soon.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you. And thank you again for the presentation.

I believe that our colleagues from OMAC did not end up joining us; is that correct? Okay. So I'll just call the attention of the board, then, to the board report, which they sent, and in particular to its last statement, which is responsive to our request for advice.

Their response there was: With the current threat to the Internet in mind, the OMAC would advise the Internet Society to expand its outreach and advocacy to a larger audience worldwide in order to get them involved in defending the Internet for everyone.

Organization members are still keen to receive insights on Internet policy and regulations, and it will support them in making informed decisions for their organizations and to support the advancement of the Internet. With this in mind, the OMAC would suggest to increase insights and knowledge sharing in a simple, concise, and shareable way to grow engagement and support.

So are there comments on the OMAC thing? Barry?

>> BARRY LEIBA: This is Barry Leiba. Yeah. It's unfortunate that they couldn't get on because I had a couple of questions about that. So I don't know how sensible it is to raise those questions now. But --

>> TED HARDIE: In case there's discussion on the board, please do.

>> BARRY LEIBA: Okay. Well, what I wanted to ask was whether they had any specific angles for the first part of it, the expand outreach and advocacy in what areas, in what regard, something more specific than that very general statement, and how they thought that we might do it. And the second part is: How can we leverage the organization members to accomplish what they're asking in the second paragraph?

>> TED HARDIE: I think the proper thing for us to do, then, is just to take those questions back to them in email. So we'll do that. Muhammad?

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: Yes. Muhammad Shabbir (Inaudible) [02:01:07]. Yes. Adding to what Barry has asked, I would like to

ask: What specific areas are they looking to -- for the Internet Society to give them advice on?

>> TED HARDIE: Okay. Barry, can you take the token to craft that email, including Muhammad's portion?

>> BARRY LEIBA: I can, yes.

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you. Okay. I think that brings us to the close of today's session for the Internet Society meeting.

Before we suspend, is there any other business? Okay. Seeing none, we'll suspend the Internet Society meeting until tomorrow morning at 9:00 a.m. London time. We'll take a brief break, and then the Internet Society Foundation meeting will begin at 20 till the hour, 11:40 here in London. Thank you.