Internet Society
Board of Trustees Meeting 166 - Day 2
19 June 2022
Transcript

>> TED HARDIE: Welcome back to day two of the annual general meeting of the Internet Society Board of Trustees. This is meeting number 166 of the Society.

To start the day, are there any conflicts of interest or other issues to bring before the Board? Okay. The first order of business is to continue the report of the president and CEO. So over to you, Andrew.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Thank you. So put up the slides, I guess. That's great. Thank you. So this is to talk about the health and sustainability results from 2021. And the critical thing to understand here is that these are measures that we put -- oh, could we pause the automatic -- yeah, thanks. And back two, please. There we are. No. One more.

So the basic idea here is to measure our ability to advance our mission over the long term. If you could move forward one more, please.

So we've got five areas that we're trying to measure. One is talent. The next is finance. The next is our reputation. We try to measure Internet Champions, and we're trying to measure our governance. The last of these requires your approvals, and so we don't have any results for that yet.

We're doing this annually -- we started in 2021, and we do this measurement annually. So we do it in the first quarter of the year looking retrospectively. And the basic idea here is that we develop a mechanism by which we measure the organization. I don't think these are perfect measures. I don't want to suggest that they're perfect measures, but these are the ones that the Board approved last year, agreed to these, with the exception of the ones for governance. So it wasn't all of you, but the previous board said, yes, these are good. These are ones that we're going to continue with. So this is the basis on which we proceeded.

Next slide, please. Well, you can skip forward two because it's just a cover slide. So we're going to do talent here. We've got, first of all, this maintaining a high-performing workforce. The basic idea here is to measure, first of all, the

percentage of the staff that rate themselves -- rate the Internet Society as recognizing their value. So this is a -- we do performance analysis -- or performance assessments of the staff twice a year, and there is a self-reflection question that the staff respond to on those assessments that say how well does the Internet Society recognize my values.

So the idea here is that this is a proxy for a recognition by the employee that we recognize their value and that -- and the basic idea here is that that gives people confidence that, you know, we're investing in them.

The goal here is to rate three out of four in this assessment. As you can see, the average across the employees is 78%. So we're on target here, at least in this case. Bless you.

Similarly, we have a Denison Survey -- we do this annual culture survey, and there's a question about bench strength, the capability of people and that it's constantly improving. So this is really a peer measure; right? This is a measure by the employees of the way that the rest of the employees are, and the basic idea here is that we want to hit essentially 75% here.

In 2021, this was 79. Now, I should point out that this is not a percentile score of the employees. This is a percentile as against the Denison Survey. So this is a -- we're trying to hit the 75th percentile of the Denison database. So we're at 79th here. I will say that this has risen. I think I talked to you before about the results on the Denison Survey. And so, you know, I think this is an area where we have proven pretty strong.

Next slide, please. We also want to maintain -- build and maintain the expertise and skills. And so what we're measuring here is the frequency -- the percentage of the staff that participate in professional development activities. We were only getting that started last year, so we don't have any data for 2021, but we will continue to report on this in the future.

Next, please. We also want to develop the expertise of the project staff. So there's a distinction between the people who are working on the projects that the Internet Society is doing and the entire staff basis. And so this focuses just on the project staff because the project staff, you know, they're working on the projects that we have in the annual action plan, so we think that that's one of the areas that we want to measure. And this, again, is a professional development

measure, so this is a subset of the whole staff, the subset of the previous measure. And this was 86% in 2021. So, the staff are invested -- are, you know, spending the time to invest in their skills and upgrading them. So this is the -- those are all of the measures on the staff.

The next area is finance. Next slide, please. The first of these is to talk about public support. And in this case, it's really the percentage of our total revenues that are attributable to public support contributions. And as you can see, this is not where we wanted to be. It's too low. So this is an area where we clearly need to work harder. That being so low is part of the reason that the number did not go in the direction we expected last year. So this is an area for considerable work.

Next slide, please. The other one that we're measuring is the percent variance of annual expenditures so -- as against budget. So the basic idea here is that we're trying to measure how effectively we budget, whether we stick to the budgets that we set and so on. Historically, this is an area where the Internet Society was, like, I won't say bad, but maybe not as good as we would have liked, and so this -- in 2021 the actual variance here was 4.7%. This is inside our goal for the year, so this was a really successful -- this was a real improvement in the history of the Internet Society.

>> TED HARDIE: So just to confirm this is an underspend; right?

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: In this case it's an underspend, but the idea here is that this is an absolute value, so plus or minus; right? But in this case, we weren't underspent, yes.

>> VICTOR KUARSINGH: Can I ask a question?

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Yes, please.

>> VICTOR KUARSINGH: So do you have a target you're trying to get to or just as low as possible?

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Well, the target that we set for last year was within 5%, and so we made it. My real target, of course, is zero because I would like budgets to be 100% correct, but, you know, I'm also a realist. But, you know, I will say that, like, in my first year, one of the budget items was 70% away from the budget. So this is a fairly significant

improvement. We really have, I think, become quite a lot better at budgeting.

>> VICTOR KUARSINGH: Yeah. The reason why I asked is I was just wondering, is it aspirational or is it, like, compared to, like, best of class, size of organization, type of organization?

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Oh, I see what you mean. So, my immediate-term goal has been to just improve this, like to get this within some kind of thing so that the budget is, like, an actual guide for what the future is going to bear. I think probably in the future we will do some benchmarking against other organizations to see how they are. It's very, very difficult.

As Sae was saying -- it was in closed session, but as she was mentioning yesterday, you know, not every organization is as transparent as we are about budgets and so forth, so they don't always give you the kinds of targets that you would like. And for that reason, it's a little hard to get this kind of data, but we could -- you know, we could do it against other organizations that aren't as transparent as we are, and, you know, that might be enough.

All right. Next slide, please. This area is about reputation. Oh, and the slide after that. So this is a measure of reputation. So we want to -- we want to have a good reputation as trusted, as credible, and as relevant. And our theory, of course, here is that if we are -- if we have this reputation, then we will be able to lead people towards the Internet that we want for everyone.

And so we measure this on three axes. One, the total number of mentions, the total number of media inquiries, and the domain authority rank. So, the latter is a comparative one; whereas, the other two are just sort of -- you know, they're just counts. And I think we're going to sharpen the first two a little bit in the future, because what we're going to see is a trend over time, but we didn't have any base data to start with, so these are just counts to start.

>> TED HARDIE: So let me confirm.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Yep.

>> TED HARDIE: I thought we actually had data during the PIR proposed sale that listed the number of mentions.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Sure. Sure. So we have -- the problem is, actually, that that was our baseline.

>> TED HARDIE: Yeah.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: And it's kind of stupid to compare against that baseline, so --

>> (Inaudible)

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: But, right, like -- you know, so we didn't use it as a baseline because it's kind of a garbage baseline, but instead, you know, we did, obviously, want to improve things, and I think we found that that was the case.

We wanted to -- you know, we want to understand in an ordinary year how often do we get mentioned and how many inquiries -- how many inbound inquiries do we have? Because inbound inquiries are an indication that we have a reputation that people want to talk to us about.

>> TED HARDIE: Well, the reason I bring it up is, obviously, one of the things the Board right after the proposed sale fell through was concerned about was restoring the reputation of the Internet Society.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Right.

>> TED HARDIE: Given how many of the critics of it were kind of lobbing general-purpose critiques rather than focused on that particular deal. And so even though you, obviously, don't want to use it as a baseline, a retrospective --

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Yeah.

>> TED HARDIE: -- view of it to indicate how much things have improved would be very useful.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: So we have such numbers. We're not using them as the basic health measures. We're happy to produce -- I think we produced them once before, but I'm happy to report to the Board again on that if you would like. What that really was was a sort of like a kind of valence measure. You know, it's a measure of positive versus negative sentiment --

>> TED HARDIE: Yeah.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: -- and the way that it's measured. The content marketing communications actually follows that. What we

don't do is treat that as a health measure exactly because it's very difficult to know how that -- first of all, the sentiment analysis is -- like it's widely used in the industry, but many people think that it's a little fishy. And so we try to -- you know, we try not to use that as the overall health measure because we -- our theory is that the one that we really want to get is this domain authority rank, the ranking there; right? We want this sort of idea that there's a search engine score that says how likely are we to rank in the result pages.

So when, you know, somebody searches for something, the search engines are optimizing for a number of things, and one of the things is not just -- you know, it's not like the old page rank where it's just like the number of links, it's also, like, how credible are the links to that and so on.

And so our theory is that we want to be high in there, and that's really where we're trying to -- where we're aiming to optimize, because the theory there is that that's the reputation that we really want to have, that we're the authority on these topics.

>> TED HARDIE: Well, it might be worth thinking about what your media inquiry targets are, because, obviously, it depends on what campaigns you're running and how.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Right.

>> TED HARDIE: Like splinternet would naturally drive up your --

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Yes.

>> TED HARDIE: -- your media inquiries.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: It indeed has.

>> TED HARDIE: Yeah. And so the dependency you may have there is, like, what's the response rate when you put out a campaign.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Right.

>> TED HARDIE: Right. Is the media inquiry slope looking equivalent to the slope of a trusted organization, or are we still seeing some hangover; right? Clearly, it's gotten a lot better; right? Nobody is still, you know, publishing that the

Internet Society doesn't know what it's doing because they tried to sell PIR.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: No. Kieren McCarthy published one of those just recently.

>> TED HARDIE: Well, outliers are outliers.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: (Laughs)

>> TED HARDIE: But the upturn of that is that it would be useful for us to see how the -- how the campaign versus response by the media trends over time.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Okay.

>> TED HARDIE: Obviously. Because if one of our things is we can't do direct lobbying very often, education via the media is one of the primary ways we get the message out.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Right.

>> TED HARDIE: And if that's continuously improving, that's a really great sign.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Okay. So this sounds like a refinement of this measure that you want.

>> TED HARDIE: It may be a slightly different measure; right? I mean, the total number of media increase is still useful, but watching the response to a campaign where you're seeking media attention and making sure that the response media inquiries are from, you know, reputable --

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Right.

>> TED HARDIE: -- places and whether the number of media inquiries goes up as you build; right? That would be the useful second order measurement here.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Right. Did you capture that? Okay. So the action for us, then, is to refine this?

>> TED HARDIE: Yeah.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: All right. So I want to point out that this domain authority rank, this is a 2021 result. So the basic thing that you want is for that to be higher. So this is a rank of, like, 0 to 100, and higher is better. And, you know, in the

areas where we're -- I mean, this isn't on anything; right? If somebody searches for cat videos, we don't rank high. But, you know, so it's a domain of selected terms. But on those selected terms, we're doing pretty well there, and I think that -- I think we can be proud of this.

All right. The next area is the Internet Champions, and you can skip forward two, please. So the first area here is to grow the number of Internet Champions. And by Internet Champions, what we really mean is, you know, people who want to carry our message, who are -- you know, we're essentially growing our community, but growing the community of people who are pressing in favor of us, not just people who are supporters, but people who are, you know, pushing the messages that we believe about the Internet: It's open, it's globally connected, it's secure, it's trustworthy, and it's for everyone.

So we have -- you know, one of these is partner memorandum of understanding and the total number of these. So those should go up over time. Some of these are baselines. These are actuals in 2021, but we hadn't always counted them. So, you know, in the future this will be, you know, comparative year on year, but this is a baseline year.

We've also been measuring the total number of new individual members. So the idea there is if people are willing to join us as individual members, that's a sign that they want to contribute somehow to the Internet Society. This is also how you get into some of our -- some of the things. So, for instance, you have to be a member of the Internet Society in order to have a login, in order to join some of the lists, or, for instance, the education things and so on. And so that's a sort indirect measure of some of those things.

We also worry, of course, about new organization members. That's, you know, people who are coming in. And we look at the chapters. And there are two sub-pieces there. The first chapter is in good standing. So good standing is a fundamental measure of chapters. And, you know, for instance, a new chapter is in good standing, and when chapters are dechartered, it's because they failed their good standing for a period of time.

>> TED HARDIE: For the organization members, is that net new?

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: In the sense that it -- well, it's not net new. It's new members, so people who come in. So a member that left and came back does count as a new member.

>> TED HARDIE: Okay. I was asking, though, that if we lost a member.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: No. So it's not net new in that sense, yeah. This is new members, people who joined us. And we could lose -- so the total number could go down, and this would still be a positive number.

>> TED HARDIE: Okay. Do we have any sense of what the trend line is for total number?

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: It's basically flat.

>> Oh, what are some of the examples of the new (Inaudible) the types of (Inaudible).

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: So, for instance, one that we can talk about pretty easily is the Organization of American States. We had a memorandum of understanding with them. A lot of these memoranda of understanding are really partnerships that we're undertaking with people. You can't really have a contract with such organizations. Like governments don't really want to enter into a contract with you unless it's a services contract. And we're trying not to do services contracts in that sense because, of course, that's business revenue that we don't really want. So, instead, we're trying to figure out how we work with these organizations, and they're usually memorandum of understanding. So OAS is a good example of it.

>> LAURA THOMSON: I think it would be helpful to add churn because I think that answers a couple of the questions that people have asked. Like is it growing? Is it shrinking? Are people actually coming back? I don't know if that's helpful to you, but perhaps.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: It is. We can add that. One of the things we've tried to do is to keep the number of these manageable. And if we started to measure churn on all of these, it could be --

>> LAURA THOMSON: Yeah.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: But we can certainly look at it.

>> LAURA THOMSON: Yeah.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: It has been a topic of conversation on more than one occasion. You know, actually understanding net new is important.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Going back to the MOUs, updating the specifics of the (Inaudible), it might be -- I think it would be useful to know how many of these are the type like OAS, you know, international -- thanks, Richard.

With the MOUs, how many -- what types of orgs, you know, the cluster, how many are international organizations like the OAS or World Bank or whomever? How many are private companies? And just -- the clustering them in different grouping types.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: So generally we don't undertake MOUs with private companies because we under those circumstances --

>> ROBERT PEPPER: You want membership.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: -- what we say is why don't you just join us as a member.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Right.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: These are really for organizations that are partners of some kind, where we're undertaking things together or that sort of stuff.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: About the number of chapters that comply the good standing conditions, if we -- now we are on 92%.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Well, no. There are two things here. This is a -- this is a two-factor evaluation.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Uh-huh.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: So the number of chapters that are in good standing is the same thing as the number of chapters. All of the chapters are either in good standing or in rejuvenation.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Okay.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: So we typically have a few that are in rejuvenation at any one time, but the number of chapters in good standing is pretty -- it wasn't always this way, but we have emphasized over the last several years we really want to be putting the resources into the chapters that are active, and we will help with rejuvenation, but instead of kiting that out for

two or three years, we've been following, actually, the agreement that we have with the chapters.

And I think this has been healthy. We did have a few where we -- a couple of quarters where we cleared out quite a bit, and it was distressing to a lot of people to see that drop, but the chapter community seems healthier for it. So I don't think it helps anybody to have chapters that are hanging around for two or three years that aren't really doing anything.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Yeah, it's like the -- what we discovered in Russia and Ukraine; right? Yeah. And the -- so essentially all the chapters are in good standing --

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: And the performance evaluation is in --

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Is what changes that number; right?

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: That's right.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Yeah. So most of the chapters are on good performance as well.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: That's right. And that's the idea here, that what we want -- what we want to see here is a high degree, not just of chapters that are doing the minimum, but that are, in fact, up in the, you know, top 75% of the criteria. So that's not -- obviously, it can't possibly be that 92% of the chapters are in the top 75% of chapters.

>> (Inaudible).

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Yeah, it's not that. This is rather we've got -- we got these categories of, like, 25th, 50th, 75th, and what we want are people who are in that top 75 and above, and that's what this 92% is.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Okay.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: So the chapters are -- like this is actually a really healthy result.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Thanks.

>> BARRY LEIBA: So top 75% really means 75th percentile?

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Well, it's neither of those. What it really is is the categories. So we've given them cutesy names. On the website it's, like, gigabit versus -- and those are the

levels. But people complain about the cutesy names, so we just said the, you know, top 75%.

All right. Next slide, please. So we also worry about retention of the community; right? Are people remaining engaged? And so we had this percentage -- percent retention of individual members. We were hoping, of course, that we would improve the association management system in time to do this. It didn't happen. We had a number of things that got in the way of that. But this is one that we definitely want to pay attention to because we want to know if individual members come, do they leave? And we want to make sure that, you know, that they remain engaged.

And then similarly we want to do the same with our organization members. So this is where you see that net new -- net-new number. That is, you know, we saw how many new org members came in, and now we can see about 87% of the membership stays on. And so that's the place where you see the decline.

Next slide, please. This is -- in distinction from, you know, the retention of champions, this is where we want to build the capacity. And so the first thing has to do with the percent change of total online courses. Obviously, with only one year of data, you can't do a trendline analysis, so 2021 is the baseline year, and we will be reporting this in the future.

We also count the number of fellows. This includes fellows to the IETF, the IGF youth ambassadors, and the early career fellowship. In 2022, we'll also have the mid-year -- mid-career fellowship numbers. And so this will be a number.

This -- you know, people sometimes say, well, these are small numbers because, you know, we don't have groups of thousands. We have concluded over time that very large cohorts of fellows, we don't have the resources to really attend to them. So we've decided that smaller cohorts that we can spend more time on are more valuable. And it's a sort of, you know, like build champions, and then that group will get bigger. And this is why you saw yesterday, for instance, the discussion of the alumni program and why that's important, because the idea is if we can build this capacity and we can retain them in the community, then they -- you know, it's like the old -- now I'm really going to date myself. It's like that old shampoo commercial; right? They tell three friends and three friends and so on. So that's the idea here.

Next, please. It's distressing how many of us found that funny because it tells us something about our average age.

(Laughter)

>> (Inaudible)

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Yes. Yes. Although, like, you know, I don't know, it was cross-border, I guess.

This last one in this category is to increase participation in Internet Society activities. And this is a measure of the participation by community members in activities that we do. The data collection for this, like we depend on the new AMS. And because that has been delayed, it's not going as fast as we would like.

>> TED HARDIE: So will we be able to capture participation in chapter activities as well or OMAC activities?

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: That's part of the problem that we have, that breaking those things out is quite difficult. The basic idea is that once we have the new AMS, this was one of the big pieces of functionality that drove us towards Fonteva, because, yes, underlying -- the big -- one of the big features that that system has is this ability to break out and stratify different parts of the community and provide the underlying capabilities to, for instance, our chapters so that they can manage those things themselves. And that was a notable gap in the system when we launched MemberNova, and we never did manage to get the features that we wanted that way.

>> TED HARDIE: Yeah. It's also clearly an issue for OMAC --

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Right.

>> TED HARDIE: -- which is trying to increase the number of activities in which its members might participate.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Right

>> TED HARDIE: But if it's not trackable yet, it's very difficult for them to know what their success rates are.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Exactly.

>> TED HARDIE: So it's great that Fonteva will support it.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Yeah. Next slide, please. Well, two slides. So this is about the governance. We want -- this was one of the measures that we asked for, and we talked to the Governance Committee. We wanted -- we want measures of an accountable and effective Board of Trustees. We proposed these measures to the Governance Committee last year, and the Governance Committee wasn't able to come to consensus on this, so as far as I know, it never actually came to the Board.

But these are the three that we've got placeholders for, but you can change them to anything you want. You know, you're the Board. You get to decide how accountable and effective is measured, but these are three measures that we have proposed that people said they didn't like. So this might be an action for the Board to come to some consensus about what an accountable and effective Board of Trustees, how you would measure that, and then we would track it.

The community definitely has given us feedback that they want something like this. So I don't know what the measures that you would want to put in place, but I do ask you that you come up with something that we can include in this, because this is a report, of course, ultimately to our community.

>> VICTOR KUARSINGH: So question on that.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: M-hmm.

>> VICTOR KUARSINGH: Do we have access to the actual rationalization of what we didn't like about it with air quotes?

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: I think you probably want to take that up with the Governance Committee.

>> VICTOR KUARSINGH: Okay.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: I think it was in the report from the Governance Committee from last year.

>> VICTOR KUARSINGH: Okay. So it's in the report?

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: I believe it is, yes.

>> LAURA THOMSON: Do we know are these comparable to similar measures of Board effectiveness for other nonprofits?

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: It's a real problem because a lot of nonprofits -- well, so there are a few different issues here. One is different nonprofits structure their boards in different

ways. Like a lot of nonprofits, the way you get on the Board is you give a certain amount of money, and the Board is -- like the size of the Board is determined by how much money the organization brings in. So, you know, in those cases, probably the measures would really be in terms of maybe size of the Board and the size of the donations. So that's one issue.

Another is that not every nonprofit publishes all of the information that you would like. So I don't know if these are best practices. They seemed like, you know, possibly things that you would want to do, and so they were the proposals that we had. But, you know, the staff doesn't -- certainly I do not feel competent to tell you what the right answer is here. These are just ones that we proposed.

>> LAURA THOMSON: Thanks.

>> TED HARDIE: Do any other board members want to discuss these measures in particular?

>> ROBERT PEPPER: I'll maybe check it out. Not to -- I don't want to interrupt the flow because this is a really good presentation by Andrew.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Well, this is the last measure that we have in this presentation, so . . .

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Okay. Well, you know, these seem kind of random. I mean, the fact that -- you know, when I look at the second one, 100% or 95%, I mean, you know, we're actually pretty efficient. So is that a good measure or a bad measure? I mean, it's like if this -- if these are the metrics requested more generally as part of the, you know, Governance Committee and what the community raised, I'm not sure where those came from or what the problems were that they were trying -- and I've read the Governance Committee report. I don't think these measures fit any criteria to assess the quality of -- or effectiveness of the Board.

I mean, the attendance rate, you know, is pretty high. You know, we move agenda items, everything -- I mean, very few things -- I can't remember anything that didn't get done on the schedule you wanted. And then, you know, the last one, when we're not in executive session, everything is recorded and posted. So that's like 100%. So I don't know what the question is that we're trying to solve that these metrics would help us answer.

>> LAURA THOMSON: So I can think of a wider variety of things that might be useful here because I know a lot of what we heard from the committee was that they want to be accountable. And I know when you work in a private company, people say I want the executives to be accountable. What they mean is we want people to get fired.

So I wonder whether we need to aim for a more subjective here like -- and this is going to be very unpopular, I'm sure, but maybe it's more useful. You know, what is staff sentiment about the Board of Trustees? What is member sentiment, which is going to be terrible, about the Board of Trustees? But I do think – like is that useful? Because it's not the only measure, obviously, but it's something that you would add. I just don't know what is --

>> ROBERT PEPPER: But that doesn't go to effectiveness.

>> LAURA THOMSON: Yeah.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: I mean, again, I think it's a bit longer conversation about, you know, how would -- I think maybe a starting point, how would we think we're being effective or not. And I think one of the balances is that, you know, we're a board of trustees that, you know, we don't manage and run, for very good reasons, governance reasons, you know, ISOC. That's what Andrew does with the senior staff; right?

So I think it goes to, you know, the role of the Board. And I don't think -- again, you know, being part of some of the discussions in the sessions that we've had --

>> LAURA THOMSON: Right.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: -- as part of the governance committee, there's a wide range of --

>> LAURA THOMSON: Views.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: -- perceptions about what the role of the Board is that actually are not part of what the Board does.

>> LAURA THOMSON: Right.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Or, you know, I mean, there are some people who think the Board should be running the association and telling Andrew what to do. Well, no.

>> LAURA THOMSON: That's not what it is.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: That's not what we're supposed to do. So I think it's -- I'm just kind of befuddled about, you know, first of all, how we would think as the Board, how we think about our effectiveness.

>> LAURA THOMSON: Yeah.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: And I think that's something that we need to do as a board to think through.

>> TED HARDIE: Laura, do you concur?

>> LAURA THOMSON: I was just going to say, I agree with you. And one other thing that occurs to me that I'm surprised is not here, actually, given the discussions of the community is that there isn't a measure of board diversity, which seems like something that the community has repeatedly asked for.

>> Sorry. I missed --

>> LAURA THOMSON: Oh, sorry. Sorry. I sat back. I apologize. One thing that I think the community would want on here is, you know, board diversity based on all the discussions that we've heard. But I agree with you, I think it's a more complex conversation. So...

>> TED HARDIE: So we've got Barry and then Luis.

>> BARRY LEIBA: I have to disagree with Pepper a little bit on the second item, the percentage of board issues that get resolved, whatever. It's -- and there are plenty of boards that don't get their work done, and the fact that we do doesn't make that measure any less useful. So, you know, having that and saying we meet it stunningly is fine, but I think it is an important measure.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Barry, that's fair.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Yeah. We're talking about effectiveness, yeah, so that means input/output, yes, and mission fulfillment. So if we look into our mission as a board, then we have a number of things to be done. Yeah, I agree with Barry. Some of these things, just to be taken into account count as work, yes. They don't necessarily need to be completed, yes, because they are very complex operations; but, also, as you say, they are specific things that we need to fulfill. If we get a queue of things and we do not go through the agenda for a session, that will be a non-effectiveness measure; right? Result. Sorry.

But in the case of diversity, I will have to defer with you. Function is not related to gender; yes?

>> LAURA THOMSON: Oh, I mean more in terms of -- I wouldn't say effectiveness, but accountability; right? So this data, I think that the community wants the Board to reflect the community; right? So that could be things like does the Board -- geographic diversity specifically represent, you know...

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Yes. That is representativeness; right?

>> LAURA THOMSON: Right.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Yes, that the Board should represent, but that is a quality by design.

>> LAURA THOMSON: Right.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Yes. It's not a function of -- a quality of function; right?

>> LAURA THOMSON: I think that the key problem here is we don't have a definition of what an effective board is; right? So that's hard to measure when you haven't defined it.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: No, I was just going to agree with Barry. Yes, I mean, it is a metric on how effective we are. You know, and you're correct. I was, you know, looking at that saying, yeah, we do that, but is that -- I was thinking then -- I was thinking more diagnostically about what is it that we do and how to improve. But I agree with you, yes, that is a measure of effectiveness and, knock wood, so far what I've seen we're effective on that metric. Okay.

>> TED HARDIE: So, I just wanted to take up --

>> SAGARIKA WICKRAMASEKERA: So, we need to have the (Inaudible) on this third point. Have we defined that? How much we have to be transparent with the (Inaudible) community as a board? Was it predefined?

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Well, my understanding is that the policy of the Board is that all materials that are not taken in-camera are publicly available.

>> SAGARIKA WICKRAMASEKERA: (Inaudible).

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: So my understanding is that that's the Board's policy. And then a -- the measure here is, well, are you conforming to the policy? Yes or no? I mean, if that were 100% for many quarters running, that would be a good thing. And then if what you discovered was, like, you know, one year it, like, fell off a cliff, well, that would be a sign that, you know, that maybe accountability had declined, and you would need to have the history in order to measure that.

>> TED HARDIE: So I just want to go back and say first I think this does deserve a longer discussion, both with the Board as a whole and certainly in the Governance Committee to discuss what these measures of effectiveness are. And, secondly, that we actually have agreed with the community to develop methods which do drive things like increased board diversity.

And I think we can be measured on the effectiveness of those; right? First, did we deliver on them when we said we would? Did we, in fact, create a binding resolution for the Governance Committee to take to the Nomcom and make sure that its representatives or its members were diverse. Did we, in fact, talk to the Internet Architecture Board? Did we, in fact, go and make appointments along the lines that we have committed?

I think those are measures of effectiveness that do speak to the question of diversity, because they're commitments by one of the boards to reach for -- reach for that characteristic through a particular set of processes. And so we can always go back to the community and say, hey, we've found that it is more effective to achieve diversity by doing X than Y. So we're going to switch from doing X to Y, but we're still going to hit the overall target. That's something we can still do.

But in the short term, measuring against our commitments to community is pretty key. And I think some of what I see there aren't commitments to the community. The commitment is to making meetings and meeting materials publicly available is one that the previous board took pretty seriously because they had been approached by the community saying why are all your meetings, you know, happening behind closed doors; right? And so, you know, the decision to make them open, to put them on YouTube, all of those things were commitments to the community for increased transparency.

So I think we want to think about two things here. And one is: What are the existing commitments that we might measure here? And, second, are there new commitments we want to make? And once those new commitments are made, what do we want to

measure about them? And I think that might give the Governance Committee kind of a scaffolding to have the discussion.

Any other thoughts?

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: If I could point out one thing about this particular example, percentage of board meetings and meeting materials that are publicly available. If we had been measuring this all along, several of the discussions on the Governance Reform Working Group list over the past several years would have been -- like could have been fact based. We had several discussions there that were really based on kind of the impressions that people had about, you know, what things were or not.

But if we had been measuring this consistently, we would have been able to say, no, look, here is the number of things that the Board has done, and here's the number of those things that were done in public. And you would actually have that measure, and you would have been able to point to it.

Now, of course, some people would have said, yeah, but we want to know what is going on in the closed things. And then the answer would have to be, okay, but, look, this is the percentage that, you know, these are personnel items and such. Like you can't possibly do those in public. And I think, you know, it would have been helpful to have some of these measures so that the community could have been better informed about what was going on.

>> TED HARDIE: Is this your last slide?

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Good point.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: This is the last slide on this.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Yeah, I was just going to say that that actually is a really good point because it goes to the -- not the Board's perceptions, but the community's perceptions of what is an effective board. And I think that's actually important. So, yeah, I hadn't thought about that when I commented initially, yeah.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: And let me maybe make one more remark about this entire set of things, which is the reason we decided we needed to start measuring this and start publishing it and so on to the community is because we were getting feedback, you know, people don't know what we're doing. And this is a way of

saying, okay, well, here's what we're doing. And here's the evidence that we've gathered about whether we're doing the things we said we were going to do. That's been the goal all along to develop these things.

So as you, you know, digest these results and as we make these things available, as you will recall, there is a dashboard that's been under development that's been a little bit hijacked because of some systems problems that we've had, but, you know, as you digest these results, you know, think about other things that you might say, actually, you're missing a measure here, because, you know, we will develop the measures necessary in order to support that. But, you know, if there's something that isn't clear, just as we got some feedback, then, you know, we want to develop this so that it's a useful tool for the Board and ultimately for the community to understand, you know, is the organization healthy.

>> TED HARDIE: Okay. Thank you very much. I think the Board Governance Committee needs to take up this discussion. And the next step I think is to go on to our next presentation, which is --

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Also me.

>> TED HARDIE: -- path to 2025, the midterm update.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Yes. So we can put up this presentation, but it's not really a presentation, as you know. This is really much more of a report. And there isn't a presentation to go along with this because we tried to develop a presentation for this and came to the very quick conclusion that either you have a meaningless slide of, like, random words or you -- or you have, like, you know, wall of words anyway. And so it seemed better to have a report. So that's why this has come you to you in the form of this kind of report as opposed to a set of slides that I can present very conveniently here, but I -- you know, I'm hoping and assuming that people have read this.

The overarching goal here is to talk about three basic things; right? We had this idea, the path to 2025, that we build, promote, and defend the Internet. That's fundamentally what it is that we're doing about. And so what we did was we created a bunch of things where we said what is it that we're doing. So we say, you know, build -- we're going to extend the Internet to communities that do not have it and need it most. And then we created a bunch of targets for this. And then, you

know, on any given year, we produce evidence to the effect of whether we have done that or not.

And so what we see on the build side is that, you know, our aim was 50 communities by 2025. Over the period of, you know, here we are in the midterm, we've got 49 so far. So it seems pretty good. We seem to be pretty much on track.

Similarly, you know, if we look at the promotion sort of approach, we're trying to promote the model as the preferred model. And this is a very different sort of thing; right? It's easy to count, you know, okay, we wanted to go to this many communities. We've gotten into this many communities. It seems like we're on track.

Much harder to talk about, you know, by 2025 the Internet model of networking will be dominant. Okay. How do you operationalize dominant? What does that mean? And, you know, we've actually seen that we've got -- on the one hand, we've got some positive results in the sense that people believe in the Internet and they want to continue to work with it. On the other hand, we have the problem that the Internet model is under attack; right? We see a lot of places where people are skeptical of the Internet model or attempting to undermine it and so forth.

So this is a place where, you know, the message is a little bit more mixed, and I urge you to have a look at the report to make sure that, you know, those sorts of elements are being addressed.

>> TED HARDIE: So can I ask --

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Yes.

>> TED HARDIE: -- kind of -- here in what you have, you have, like, the GINI coefficient of autonomy.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Right.

>> TED HARDIE: And that's a useful measure. But is anybody measuring the attack; right? So is there anybody, a partner organization or other, that's actually trying to measure the strength of the attack on the Internet model in different geographies or by different things?

Because, obviously, you're trying to plan what your response is. And if you focus on increasing, you know, the autonomy of

AS's, that's wonderful. If in the meantime somebody passes a law that basically undercuts all of it, we're in a bad place. How can we measure that? That seems incredibly difficult but really important.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Yeah. So this is an excellent question and exactly the kind of question I was hoping this report would inspire, because we have a whole group of people who are working on exactly this. It's like an internal management committee called the Future Group. And one of the things that we've been working on really hard is to come up with measures of exactly things like that.

It's extraordinarily difficult to map, like, strength of political attacks around the world. That's a really tricky problem. It's actually really hard to measure even the extent to which something is trending in the wrong direction. Because, you know, like, the number of mentions in an international meeting of, you know, we don't like that is not the same thing as the frequency with which legislation is introduced that is contrary to the things that you want, which is not the same thing as legislation that is introduced that accidentally negatively affects the things you want, which is another part of this; right?

And so we're trying to model that. We engage, for instance -- this year we engaged an economist to try to help do some economic modeling of the ways -- of the ways the Internet is affecting development, and the theory there was, well, if we had that model, then we would be able to use that model against actual developments and see, hey, is this model working here? Is it working here? Is it working here? And apply that across different economies. We don't have it yet, but it's one of the things that we're trying to develop in order to -- in order to provide these measures.

So I guess the short answer to what you're asking is no, as far as we know, nobody is actually doing what you want, but we are super keen, actually, to develop such a measure or even, like, a model version of what such a measure would look like, because if we could even come up with, like, a simplistic model, it would be a big improvement over what we have right now, which is, like, you know, everybody panic.

>> TED HARDIE: Yeah.

>> LAURA THOMSON: I've spent a reasonable amount of time thinking about this.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Excellent.

>> LAURA THOMSON: Good. So I would be happy to work with you on this outside of this meeting, but I think there are a lot of organizations that you could partner with on designing such a measure, especially on trying to get some sort of more generally accepted measure. And some of those places are, you know, obviously, like, CDT or EFF or Mozilla Foundation. But, also, there are researchers, like, at NYU that look at things like freedom of information on the Internet and how, you know, how freely and accurately information is available in different parts of the Internet, which I think would be one measure there. But, yeah, happy to engage if that's helpful. Yeah, I know you are hiding.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Yeah. Ted, you actually raised a really good question, and that is: How do you define and track threats? And that's really hard because what you're looking at is trying to figure out what -- you know, what legislation is being proposed or regulations are being proposed in 193 countries. Now you can sort of boil that down; right? You could even try to do it by region. You know, we've tried to do that on, obviously, you know, some, you know, particular issues.

We've had to engage different law firms in different parts of the world that actually do that because they're watching legislation in their regions. We've not found a -- you know, one point of contact law firm or anybody else that tracks it globally. It's very expensive, and it's very spotty. It's not thorough. I mean, you can see these things, you know, if a proposed resolution at an ITU meeting, yeah, you see that pop up. But the question is what's happening in conversations or proposals, you know, at, you know, the ATU meeting or the CLT in Latin America or, you know, legislation that's introduced, you know, in, you know, Korea, or whatever it might be. But there needs to be, right, some tracking of, you know, these threats.

And, you know, we had the conversation of, you know, sovereignty, you know, in the name of digital sovereignty. What does that mean for the Internet? And this is something that we may want to do as the Internet Society bring together other regional organizations that may be tracking this, but to have, you know, sort of a sharing globally, because this is not being done, and so, therefore, the magnitude of the threat I don't think -- we don't sufficiently understand it, whether it's small or large or there are a couple of, you know, examples that everybody, you know, gets hair on fire, or -- I used to do that.

(Laughter)

>> ROBERT PEPPER: You know, I can't. Pulled it out. You know, so I think that's actually a really crucial question to understand the magnitude of the problem.

>> TED HARDIE: So I think you touched on a couple things that kind of relate to what I think we might be able to do here. The metaphor that comes to my mind is weather; right? At the moment we're at the is the rock wet version of forecasting. We can look out the window and say it's raining, or we can, you know, hang the rock and see whether it's currently swinging or if we touch it, is it wet.

We'd love to be in the many satellites and, you know, good weather radar world that's way, way beyond is the rock wet. But the interim steps we can take there to functionally create clearinghouses, where we say, hey, if you're one of our partners -- in many ways, like, the measurement clearinghouse; right? We can't gather all this data ourselves, but if we have an organizational member with the data or a partner with whom we have an MOU with the data that can send it to the clearinghouse and say, hey, a front is coming through in Rwanda. You know, here's what's happening.

And then once you have that, you begin to be able to do both reactive activities, but more importantly study. You can see, you know, if it gets raised in Mozambique, does Cape Verde follow? Is there, you know, a trend among the Francophone nations of Africa? Is there a -- is there a set of patterns that begin to emerge so that you can look to say, okay, here's the bellwether. We've got to be watching this because we know a lot of other things will follow along if this changes.

At the moment, that seems like a pretty big undertaking. It's much bigger in many, many ways than the Internet measurement clearinghouse; right? Because exactly what you're measuring is so politically charged, and it's not going to be the same as saying, you know, what was the AS pattern of growth in your area? How much V6 versus V4? Those are, relatively speaking, value-neutral measurements and therefore are a little bit easier to provide a clearinghouse. But it still might be very valuable since ultimately we are partisans; right? We are for a particular kind of Internet. And even though it is politically charged, it is still worth our gathering this data because it also helps us gather the allies we need to make the arguments we want to make because we can then hand the data to them and say CDT, here's what we got. EFF, here's what we got.

Mozilla Foundation, here's what we got. And each of them can then speak independently but still help us deliver the mission.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Yeah. So the --

>> TED HARDIE: We've got Charles up.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Oh, I'm sorry. I was going to ask -- I was going to ask Charles, because one of the questions would be for the organization -- I'm sorry -- the chapter members, whether that is something that, you know, the chapters could be alerted to. They're on the ground in all these countries, you know, to report this kind of behavior, and we could start with something that is actually not just visible and measurable, Internet shutdowns, because we don't have actually a really good global tracking of where all the Internet, you know, shutdowns --

>> TED HARDIE: We are starting to track that.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Well, yes, but -- yeah. And that's the first. Maybe that's where we start. But I think that can also be added to; right? And so I'm asking this as a question, not as a recommendation because I want to hear from the chapter members of the Board whether they think -- and then Andrew -- whether, you know, we think that that could be one way to begin putting together this database or, you know, the trendlines.

The other thing in terms of working with EFF and CDT and so on, they tend to be U.S. or European-centric, and they don't yet cover the world.

>> TED HARDIE: Thanks. So we have Charles and then Brian.

>> CHARLES MOK: Yes. I think a lot of the discussion so far is very similar to what I've been finding out in the last year or two when I was starting to look into these issues. And like Pepper was saying, a lot of these efforts out there, whether they be law firms or other commercial or noncommercial entities to try to come up with lists and lists of what's been happening in these -- all the countries in the world, it's just, first of all, very difficult to keep track of. And, secondly, there are a lot of details in country that doesn't get reflected in -- the reality isn't just simply like, you know, you'd read the title of the law and then you think this is what it is. So a lot of times that gets to be not very useful, the listings and the calculation and so on.

So -- and then we see a lot of organizations probably coming from their own ideological background, you know, they might be an organization that is very, very concerned about democracy or human rights or other. And then they sometimes would have the tendency to in a negative way -- well, in a negative way of describing it, jumping to conclusion to say that, you know, look at this and then this is bad. Well, most of the time that's true, but I don't think they provided the right justification for their -- for their conclusions.

So I'm looking at what ISOC is doing, and the Internet Way of Networking, for example, is -- in our credibility from a technical background is actually I think something that we should leverage with to work with these organizations, which I think many of you mentioned. And I do believe that that is the right thing to do, because we actually can help them in some ways justify or not what they are claiming, that these laws are having such and such of an impact. And we can come in from a technical or even, you know, from technical to economical, even other social conclusions to draw on based on the technical or the Internet Way of Networking kind of methodology.

So I think that is actually a unique opportunity that we have. And I think we do a lot of good work, particularly on issues such as Internet shutdowns, but then these issues are very broad. When you look at many of those indexes out there, they might be looking at surveillance. They might be looking at AI and so on.

So I guess we also have to think about what other issues that are more directly related to what we do. I mean, do we want to do an AI index? Is that what ISOC is doing? Probably not; right? So, yeah.

And the last point about chapters, Pepper, I totally agree. I think in -- I mean, now and in the future, we really should engage the chapters or even seek on the ground in different countries to get the local feedbacks about, you know, some of these -- even some of the Internet briefs that we are writing right now.

There are some cases I heard some of these chapters saying that, hey, you know, it's about my country, but you didn't ask me. So I think they're an asset that we can draw on to try to get more insight into the local perspectives of these developments and then how to organize it among different chapters to make it if not an index, a snapshot of what's happening in the world and so on. Yeah.

>> TED HARDIE: So we have Brian and then Laura.

>> BRIAN HABERMAN: Thanks, Ted. I think Charles and Pepper actually captured some of what I was about to say. But, you know, when I look at this report and I'm reading about, you know, like the GINI coefficient or measuring autonomy, you know, we have to be careful to make sure that we're looking at this in conjunction with other assessments, because that -- you know, those kinds of singular points tend to skew the way that people view things.

So simply because there is, you know, maybe some centralized, you know, infrastructure within a country, that doesn't necessarily mean that it's a centralized control. It just may be centralized coordination. So, you know, I just want to make sure that we're taking these metrics and we're actually talking to other folks in the measurement community to make sure that we're viewing things in ways that is well-accepted by the people who are going to be queried to validate the types of statement that we make based on these measurements.

>> LAURA THOMSON: So that's a useful framework that we've also used a lot which I think is directly applicable here is when you set out to do something like this, you would say, well, what are the things that as an organization that we are uniquely qualified to do? What are the things that we can do that other people can't do? So what are the things that the Internet say you can do here that other organizations can't? And I think there's two strengths that the Society has which are particularly helpful here, and one is that global view; right?

Because a lot of the organizations tend to be, like, in a single country. (Inaudible) or whatever. And those are incredibly helpful. But just the structure of ISOC is that, you know, we have all of these chapters. We have people we can draw on all over the world.

And the second thing is the technical strength, because certainly some of the organizations in the space are very technically oriented and some of them are more sort of the civil society socially oriented. And I think we do a got job understanding both. So I think there's, like, plenty of opportunity there where we can really make a contribution. So...

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Question. I think it would be useful to know how would we know it when we see it? So, for example, Charles and I were talking about this yesterday. A lot of the

domestic proposals -- national proposals for data localization are in the name of, you know, security or privacy, but, in fact, are, you know, nothing more than trying to, you know, have national intranets that are counter to the global open Internet.

The question is: What are -- and, again, we're not going to solve that here, but it may be something, Andrew, for, you know, staff to think about. You know, what are some of the indicators that would be a red flag or a flag that you'd -- that when you saw it, it would certainly raise a question about whether this is and could be a threat to the Internet Way of Networking and our vision of the global Internet? You know, that's just one. There are multiples.

Because if we can come up with things that are observable, then you can begin to see them and maybe measure them. And I don't know what all of those are, but I know that you've thought a lot about that and people, you know, on the staff have thought a lot about that. And that may be a good place to start, because if it's something that's observable, then we can begin to think about how do you observe it.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: So, I mean, this is essentially why the Internet Way of Networking project is coming to a close as a project and is now a framework in which we're supposed to do our work.

So if you have a look, for instance, in this report in the P1 section, promote the Internet model of networking as the preferred model, what we've been trying to do there is come up with -- and I take the point, you know, these are possibly ambiguous indicators, but what we've done is we've come up essentially with some proxies that are -- that we think are at the very least leading indicators of, you know, potential issues.

So, this point about the GINI coefficient of autonomy of networks, it's true that you could end up with just, like, centralized coordination as opposed to centralized control there. Our theory, however, is that centralized coordination almost always leads to centralized control. And, therefore, our theory is that the autonomy of networks is actually a really important indicator. And if that coefficient goes in the wrong direction, we think that that's an alarm bell. That doesn't mean it's a fact that it's going in the wrong direction, but we think it's a pretty good indicator.

Similarly, this sort of shared network reachability, the idea here is that we're trying to figure out, okay, well, V6 adoption is actually the thing that we're going to track there. Now, I admit that there are lots of networks where V6 is not that effective, but the fact of the matter is we're out of V4 addresses. If you've got a V6-only address and something else doesn't have a V6 address, then that's a pretty good sign that you've got problems with shared network reachability given that the reality is mobile networks are all deploying V6 only, and then they're doing some kind of NAT at the edge because that's the only way that you can actually deploy the number of devices you need.

>> LAURA THOMSON: Right.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Okay. Well, then, actually, V6 is a pretty good proxy indicator. It's not a perfect measurement, but it's intended to be that kind of measurement. And, you know, I could go through the rest of these things, but this is the reason this isn't, like, a PowerPoint presentation, because you've actually got to read all of the details of the pieces. But the critical thing here is that the model is why we developed the Internet Way of Networking theory in the first place. We needed to have that model, and we didn't actually have those before. So now we've got a model by which we can do this.

But that modeling point leads me to something that occurred to me only in this meeting, and I'm going to try this out now. I'm sorry. This is a thought that only just occurred to me, so don't hold me to it. But it struck me that the analogy that Ted was making with meteorology was a good one, but actually gives us a long-term goal. And that is with -- you know, with weather, you want to predict, like, is it going to rain tomorrow. And that's a thing that you want to have. But it turns out you also want to have, like, you know, a climate model, because it turns out that, like, whether it's going to rain tomorrow doesn't tell you whether hurricanes are going to increase in frequency in the future. And, actually, you want to know both things.

And so what we really ought to be doing here is figuring out how to build weather maps, but we need to build weather maps in order to feed into a climate model of the Internet. And to build a climate model of the Internet, we need to build these kind of weather maps. And in order to build those weather maps, what you need to do is build measures of conditions, and this actually leads us to a bunch of different things.

One of those different things is reporting stations, and reporting stations can come from people sitting on the ground observing stuff or they can come from, you know, Doppler radar or they can come from satellites or they can come from all of these different kinds of things because those different kinds of things tell you whether the one and the other are actually reliable things.

Maybe this is just, like, me nerding out, because quite by accident the other day I was reading something about weather reporting and how it affected the progress of the Second World War because there was somebody who wasn't really allied but was feeding one of the nations --

>> TED HARDIE: Ireland.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: Yes, I know. I was trying to avoid talking about which country and so forth.

>> TED HARDIE: Sorry. I think they've fessed up these long years since.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: That's true. So Ireland was reporting weather to the British and, you know, to the allies, which affected the sorties that they could run and so on, and it allowed them to plan a little better, because basically the fact was ground observation stations, long before Doppler radar was a practical possibility, meant that they could feed something and they could do this over telegraph so you would get this kind of information.

Well, like we have chapters. And this comes to the point; right? We could have people who could say, hey, this is actually what the political weather is like around these measures. And since we have the model of the Internet Way of Networking, you have a basis on which to do that evaluation.

So, you know, the goal at the beginning of this, of course, was to report on our progress on this build, promote, and defend model that we have for 2025, but it strikes me that the gaps in the model that we have here point to future work that we really ought to aim at about how would we -- like what are the steps towards building that kind of climate model. And if the Board thinks that that's a useful thing to do, then I think that's useful feedback for us in preparing our action plans for the next several years.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Yes.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Yeah, I think it's a great metaphor.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: I'm looking to see whether Sally and Rinalia want to kill me yet or whether this seems like a good idea.

>> (Inaudible)

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: All right.

>> LAURA THOMSON: I wasn't (Inaudible) said yes.

(Laughter)

>> TED HARDIE: It just said rain. I don't know why.

(Laughter)

>> TED HARDIE: They're practiced at neutral facial expressions.

>> LAURA THOMSON: You think that because they're sitting behind you.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: So I -- this has been a very useful conversation to me, but I just got what I wanted out of this. So I don't know if the rest of you have questions or whether we could break early.

>> TED HARDIE: Any questions from the trustees online? Rinalia, did you want to make a comment?

>> RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Can you hear me now? Okay. Just a comment for the Board that we are actually going to send out a survey to the whole community with this report to ask them how well do you think we're doing and where do you think we should be prioritizing our attention up to 2025. So just to make sure that you have that in mind as well. Thank you.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: So, I note in the Board's side channel that Brian said, you know, it will not be easy and it will require key partnerships. And, you know, I fully recognize that. The thing that I would say is, you know, I don't think that the Internet Society should do only comfortable and easy work.

The thing that has been striking me over the last, you know, couple of years is exactly this fact, that when I first encountered the Internet and started to get to use it and so on,

it was, obviously, a good thing to everyone who came in touch with it; that this was a tool that was so evidently a tool for human development and good that there was no question as to whether you should -- you know, you should do something with it.

And if you look at the drift of sort of interventions by governments recently, you look at some of the public discussions about the way that the discussion around, you know, the development of the Internet goes, that's no longer something we can take for granted. You know, people believe that the Internet is a hostile force. You know, people make jokes. I mean, they're on Twitter when they make this joke about how the Internet came to ruin everything.

>> Right.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: But that's not exactly -- like it's, you know, ha-ha funny only not. And there is this sense, actually, that the Internet is a hostile force in our lives and that it ought to be shut down.

And, you know, there are historical examples of technologies that are transforming that have all kinds of positive and negative effects. And, you know, whole countries have attempted to turn their backs on those technologies. And I believe that in a lot of cases that's a negative consequence for the societies that try to do that, or those are societies that then become just buffeted by that; right?

That they're -- it's easy, for instance, to ignore the potential of the automobile to transform your culture. And one way to ignore it is just to pretend that it's not a problem, and then people buy a lot of cars, and now you've got a nightmare. And that's -- those are the kinds of possibilities that are there. And at the same time, I think we have to acknowledge, the Internet is a marvelous tool for human development. It is a tool that gives people, you know, power over their lives in a way that no other human society has ever had the opportunity to have.

The last couple of years -- you know, it's great to see you all in person, and I'm valuing that, and I think it's marvelous, but the last couple of years would have been way harder without this technology, and I think that we have to acknowledge that. I think the fact -- and not just in the sense of, like, social isolation.

The last time we had anything like a pandemic of this sort, coordination among far-flung countries and their epidemiologists in terms of figuring out the -- you know, the vector of disease, the speed of the spread, and so on, it was not something that was easy to do. You had to do it by postal mail. You had to get, you know, peer review of results before anybody would, you know, put them on paper; whereas, now people are willing to share prepublication stuff and say I don't know whether this is right or not. Somebody find a hole in this argument. And some of the holes have been rapidly discovered, and some of them have been, like, not actually jibes with what I'm doing, and we were able to develop vaccines in a speed that, like, nobody has ever been able to develop things, responses. And without the Internet, without the speed of communication that we have, we just wouldn't have had that.

So I think that, you know, we have a responsibility to tackle all of that by saying, hey, here's this thing and it's good, and if you're undermining it, then we've got a problem. And so we're the Internet Society. We have to build, promote, and defend the Internet. And I think that, sure, I'm prepared to say, hey, hard to do. We got to get a lot of people on board. We got to, you know, convene a big community and so on, but I think we should. I think the Internet Society has at its core the responsibility to tackle that problem rather than, you know, any little happy thing.

>> BARRY LEIBA: This is kind of maybe an obvious statement, but it's a lot of the people who defend and benefit from the Internet are themselves people who are involved in undermining it with misinformation and that sort of thing. It's all -- it's a difficult balance all around, and we often have conversations about how to deal with misinformation on the Internet and manipulation via the Internet and things like that. To my mind, that doesn't mean the Internet is bad, but to many people's minds it does, and it's a difficult thing to deal with.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: So I think one -- oh, sorry, Victor, go ahead.

>> VICTOR KUARSINGH: No, just one comment. So to your point, when people think of the Internet being bad, do they have a hard time disambiguating things you can do on the Internet that might be bad versus the Internet itself; i.e. -- I don't know, another analogy outside of weather is power; right? Power is good, but if you fire up a bunch of coal stations, that might be bad, but if you can figure out how to do wind and solar, that's good.

Neither of those are intrinsically connected to the fact that, you know, we use energy, power, power generation, et cetera.

So I'm wondering if there's -- do we need to disambiguate those things or is that -- we have to live with that? Because a lot of these things that, you know, I don't know, people think are bad about the Internet might actually be the way a service works on the Internet or, like, it's not really mapped to the actual Internet itself from a basic construct.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: So, first of all, yes, of course, that conflation is a central challenge for us all the time, but it is, in fact, part of the reason that we developed the Internet Impact Assessment.

So the very idea of the Impact Assessment -- and I don't remember who originally came up with this term, but somebody on the staff did -- and it was a moment of clarity when he or she said it's like environmental assessments. And like it was a really great insight because it was this opportunity to say, you know, look at this. When we build a dam or a road or anything like that, we don't just try to assume, you know -- well, I mean, some people maybe do -- but most people, you know, they're not going to assume, like, only the benefits or anything like that. Instead, you've got to look at what are the consequences to the overall system.

And the same thing is true here. Many of the things that people are trying to tackle are indirect -- you know, only indirectly attached to the Internet. And when I started in this job, one of the things the Board was very clear about was that it didn't want us to be the Everything Society; right? It can't be anything that connects to the Internet is part of our scope of work because, like, pretty soon that'll be, like, all of the things in the known universe. And so we're going to have to, like, scope this somehow.

And the way we've been scoping it really has to do with this global Network of Networks. But, you know, there's a very strong desire and a very strong desire on public policy -- on the part of public policymakers, but even on the part of our own -- of our own members, our own staff, and so forth to have, like, a black-and-white, you know, binary condition. Is this -- is this an Internet issue or not? Is it the infrastructure? Oh, you only work on the infrastructure.

The problem, of course, is that because the architecture of the Internet, there's no such thing as only infrastructure.

Anything can be an application and transport at the same time, as we have seen over and over again. You know, things can be encapsulated and so forth. So each one of these things is a kind of spectral condition. And we have to be able to understand, okay, to what extent is our intervention going to affect this entire set of things? And that's actually the hard work we got to do.

>> TED HARDIE: So I have Luis, then Laura, then Barry.

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Thanks, Andrew. I agree with this perception that the Internet can be good or bad, and we know that tagging things as good or bad has been very -- is dangerous and it's not very evolution thinking.

One of the things that we have to recognize is that also there is a discussion still if the Internet is just infrastructure, as you were just saying, or it defines a new channel of communication as a whole. Yes. If we go into a very basic linear communication model even if it's in a network style.

But if we look into history, every communication means developed new technology, new media; yes? So when you got printing, then you ended with newspapers. And newspapers became a political issue, either a positive to show people what was going on, and political maybe on the bad side as a weapon to organize people into certain ideologies. That happens as well with the Internet. As soon as you get closer to politics, then things became to become labeled as good or bad. Yes? And that is not possible to put into a map, yes, because we have the layers of the -- of our open systems interconnection model. Yes, we have the layers, but we still need to see the context. And a very important part of that context is the politics.

So the -- I think we have been on the right path just being sometimes closer to politics discussion, most of the time being away, looking at ourself as a technical community. But, also, there is a lot of interesting community. What are we doing in public policy as comparing with the recent past? Yes? And they say, no, you should go and fight for the Internet in the politics forum elsewhere. Yes?

I think it's the right path now, but the -- and we should promote people to avoid this discourse of bad and good. Yes? Because that is not going to help anyone. It's like saying, well, newspapers are now good because nobody takes them into their political considerations, but in the past they were

considered bad because a lot of people were following the headlines, you know. Thank you.

>> TED HARDIE: So we have Laura, Barry, and then me.

>> LAURA THOMSON: I think as I think about this, there's a -- you know, a lot of analogous things that we have to think about. You know, the Internet, obviously, is a complex system. We're all systems people here. But, you know, I think there's analogies to public health, the environmental climate, as you talked about, where it's very easy to say this is so complex, I don't know how to reason about it. I don't know how to make a difference here. But I think the trick in all of this is having enough data to make good decisions about where the leverage points are. Like what are the places to apply force to really make a difference. So that's why I think we need to do this data collection.

>> BARRY LEIBA: Kind of getting into what Victor said about if people who think the Internet is bad want to – want it to shut down. When I was a kid, my parents always said, "Go out and play," and now the kids sit in their rooms with Instagram or whatever. And a lot of people don't like that. They don't want that kind of disconnection by connecting or whatever.

I took this picture of an ad on the London Underground. It's an ad for investing in Barclays Bank regardless of what your risk level is. And the examples they give of the risk levels is swiping right versus swiping right on your new boss. I mean, it's a change in our culture that's fundamental. My neighbors would have no idea what that means, but, you know, everybody now does.

And Pete Resnick and I have had an interesting conversation on the failure -- what he calls the failure of democratization of -- the Internet has failed to democratize information the way it had -- the way a lot of us thought it would. And his example of that is that social media, for instance, relies on eyeballs and how long you spend on the site. So the incentive is to be inflammatory, and it encourages inflammatory speech rather than reasoned speech. So I don't know what that -- I think it adds something to the conversation we just had, but I'm not sure what.

>> TED HARDIE: It's always interesting to follow somebody who's encouraging inflammatory speech because it gives you a lot of temptations. I'll try not to fall into them.

I put myself in queue because I wanted to go back to two things that Andrew said, one of which related to what the Internet was like in perception when he first started. And I think we said in other parts of this meeting that when a lot of these organizations were set up, we had a very utopian view of the Internet and a view that it would naturally by itself lead to utopian outcomes. And I think what we have discovered along the course of the way is that it will not naturally lead to utopian outcomes; that any outcome has to be fought for.

The second thing that Andrew said was that fundamentally we look at this Network of Networks and we figure that that's something we have to defend, that that's a key element of the way of Internet networking without which the rest of it will fall apart. And I don't disagree with that, but I'll point out that that's not our touchstone as a Society. And our touchstone isn't the Internet is for any network; it's the Internet is for everyone.

And I think that indicates to us when we're analyzing what it is we are fighting for, what utopian outcome we are trying to pull out of where we are now, it goes very fundamentally to the capability of the individual to use this enormous collection in the way that seems best to them. That may mean in some cases that they are collected into groups that are distressing, but the ability of the individual to make the choice with the best information they have and with the fullest possible use of the network is clearly something that helps lead us toward a utopian vision we can fight for.

The W3C long ago put together an order of different goods within -- you know, who should a specification first put at the top of its list of people that it's trying to serve, and the user is at the top of the list. And the Internet Architecture Board, inspired by that, quite bluntly, has written a document that, again, points out that the Internet is for end users. Internet is used for a huge number of things that don't touch end users, but if the systems we are fighting for don't serve them, we have not succeeded in making the Internet for everyone. So I think as we take a short break and think about what our path to 2025 is, it's important for us to think about both that original utopian vision and what the Internet we are fighting for looks like and how we can continue to make sure that the user is at the center of it and that the Internet is for everyone. Thank you. We'll take a short break here.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: How much is long is the short break?

>> TED HARDIE: Sorry about that. We'll come back at the top of the hour. And if you have topics for AOB, please let me know.

Welcome back, everybody. The first thing in this session is Rinalia had a follow-up question to the discussion that we just had --

>> RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Yes.

>> TED HARDIE: -- that she wanted to pose to the trustees.

>> RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you very much, Ted. So to the Board, my question is as follows, because staff needs the feedback. You have seen from the report that Andrew presented the results from two years of implementation, from 2020 and 2021. It would be great to get a sense from you on where you think we're doing great and where you think we should decrease priority or stop doing things.

For example, from all the seven objectives and targets, you would see that under build the Internet, we have essentially met the target, and we are exceeding it with the continuation of the two projects under CNs and IXPs this year. If you look at the encryption area, for example, we have exceeded that target.

And so from the discussion earlier, it feels to me that you may want us to focus and concentrate more on defend, for example. And it would be good to have some clarity on that as well. And I was really glad to hear the discussion and focus on P1, on the Internet model, the measures, because that is actually the hardest one to come up with the proxy measures.

So if we could have that feedback, that would be something that would be excellent and we can take back to the staff.

>> TED HARDIE: Luis?

>> LUIS MARTINEZ: Yes, Rinalia. Figures are very good. Obviously, there is a lot of room for improvement, as in any project of these characteristics. The -- I feel that community -- ISOC community is looking for results on public policy intervention by ISOC, not specific, but which forums we have participated, what has been the result. Yes? And how does that affect the Internet ecosystem? Yes, that's one thing.

And the other thing is the -- I like in the report that Andrew just presented, well, these are started, these continue,

and these are new projects regarding to community networks, but how is the state of those community networks? Are they still running? They are running good? They are running bad? Maybe some sort of current status report of those -- of the many community networks we have around the world. Yes. And, obviously, it would be very nice to have this visual map of all the community networks. We have help around the world.

>> TED HARDIE: Pepper and then Barry.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Yeah. So I think you did pick up sort of in the discussion, but things come in cycles; right? And I think what you were hearing is that at the moment -- and, you know, Andrew reinforced this not just today, and, also, it was blogged, you know, that we're now in a period where I think we have to do more defend than build. We can't stop on the build side. But, also, within build, it's shifting in terms of what that means, in terms of the Internet for everyone. But right now the -- and it may just be the lens through which I see things, right, what I'm engaged in, but I actually see the threats increasing, particularly from governments that want more control.

As we also see broader global trends against globalization, you're seeing globally more -- other manifestations of this; right? So growing trends against, you know, immigration, which is another indicator against sort of the globalization and openness. So I actually do think that we're facing and we're entering, right, an increasing period of threats to the core principles and goals and vision that we have for the Internet.

So I think -- you know, and it's going to change over time; right? But right now I see that for the next two to five -- two to four, two to five years as the biggest challenge to our mission.

>> TED HARDIE: Barry?

>> BARRY LEIBA: Yeah. I agree with what Pepper said. My spin on it is that the key to what you should be focusing on isn't what you've been sufficiently successful at something that you're done with it, but how much is there left to do on that. So I still think building -- there's still a lot to do on the building side. But I agree that the threats are increasing, and the defend is becoming more important. Not that the building is becoming less so, but the defending is becoming more important.

>> TED HARDIE: Are there comments from any of the trustees online?

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: So I appreciate what people have just said, but I think part of, like, underlying some of what Rinalia is asking is, okay, we've got fixed resources, like, what am I supposed to prioritize here. And it sounds -- like I'm just taking a sense of the room here, but it sounds like given the progress we've made on some of these and the bigger threat that is coming from other things, like, defense has got to be turned up. Is that -- is that the sense that I'm hearing?

>> TED HARDIE: So let me answer, and then it'll be the two of you. I think what you're hearing is that, and I think it goes to something that Laura was saying earlier. What is it that we're uniquely positioned to do? There are other organizations, including new ones like Connect Humanity, coming into the space of build, and I think the models that you've built out in community networks, especially in some of the most underserved ones, like the Arctic Circle or the Nepalese, where you've just shown the world how to do that, that it may be a moment where you transition to share those models with others so that they carry the work forward and we focus on the things that are more uniquely Internet Society.

And I think at the moment, that probably does look like defend, because my sense of it is similar to Pepper's, that the next two to four years are going to be extraordinarily challenging as the consequences of different governments attempting to assert control impact the way the Internet works in those parts of the world. And I think we've seen in the form of shutdown a good bit of fairly raw power exercised, and we've seen in splinternet a willingness to lose extraordinary amounts of reachability in order to claim control.

And I think we can argue against those. Promoting the Internet Way of Networking to some extent contributes to defense here, but I think as the attacks get more subtle, and I suspect they will, it will take more work, because especially when they are couched, as they often are, in terms of either national security or child protection, trying to get people to focus on the impact of these when they align with those goals is very difficult.

And I think Brian in chat mentioned the metaphor of the roadways; right? Would you shut down the highway system if you found people were carrying things you didn't like? And then trying to get people to understand the larger impact both in the

program that's currently promote, but also in defend is going to be part of it.

And currently I have Pepper, Barry, and Brian in queue.

>> (Inaudible) in the comment.

>> TED HARDIE: Oh, okay. So I have Pepper and then Brian and Muhammad.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: So I agree with – Ted, with what you said. And I think we also have to be -- so two things. One, there are pieces of build that actually go to defend; right? Because -- and I think community networks is one of those, because one of the things that we saw just last week was opposition from the Arab states against community networks because it actually was sort of distributing power, and that goes -- so that's actually part of the attack against the Internet that we want to defend.

So I think that there are going to be some continuing activities on build because they also support the defend. We are not set up for legal reasons but also just capacity and budget and bandwith issues -- we're not a lobbying organization. So the question is what can we do, again, as the Internet Society that we bring that's differentiated? And I think it's some of the technical -- both technical, architectural arguments, and then some of the work that's been done -- economics that ISOC has done, you know, the really important work showing the economic benefits to, you know, open Internet exchange points, which is about the open Internet Way of Networking and the benefits.

The effectiveness of the ISOC team this last two weeks on the ground in Kigali, being able to make both the technical arguments, the standards arguments against IPV6+; right? It's not a standard. And there were some, you know -- and it was very effective; right? The plus was deleted. And so it's about IPV6.

I think those are the -- we need to think about what we as the Internet Society brings as a comparative advantage to the need to defend the Internet and figure out what we as a -- you know, in terms of the staff can bring to support that and figure out in terms of the priorities; right? Because it's not going to be, you know, sort of lobbying kind of things; right? That's not where our credibility or capacity is, but there's a lot that we can do.

>> TED HARDIE: Brian.

>> BRIAN HABERMAN: Thanks, Ted. First of all, I want to figure out how Pepper is actually reading my notes. But I think the big thing here and what I want to make sure that Andrew and Rinalia and Sally hear is, you know, I see there needs to be two things. One is, you know, the thing that we've developed, you know, figure out how do we hand off those capabilities to other organizations that can then expand on those and increase the reach of things like community networks. So, you know, who are those handoff partners? Who do we need to set up those relationships with to make sure that that approach moves forward even if the Internet Society is not the one leading the charge anymore?

The second one is really focusing on that evolution. You know, what do we need to change within our build strategy to include some of those defense strategies? Because I will unequivocally say that these attacks are getting more subtle. And we need to start taking the lessons learned that come out of defend and figure out how they affect the build side of things.

So, you know, with that kind of framework, you know, this gets back to, you know, what Pepper was just saying, you know, ISOC has certain advantages, and we need to leverage those as much as possible. And I think those changes in the strategy, how we actually morph them into a, you know, a 2.0 or whatever kind of versioning you want to use there is going to be really important. But I think that the main thrust here needs to be on the defend part and what does it mean to the other types of projects that we're trying to run.

>> TED HARDIE: Muhammad?

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

>> TED HARDIE: Yes, you're audible.

>> MUHAMMAD SHABBIR: And I hope clear too. So, firstly, I want to tell to Brian that Pepper has some surveillance on you, so you need to be careful.

Well, regarding questions that Andrew and Rinalia have put forth before the Board, my take on this is that you -- as we were discussing in the previous session, that Internet is just a tool. And since we are on the topic of different analogies, I would give it the analogy as a knife. So knife can be used in different ways. And if someone wants to regulate knives, it

would be very difficult and naive for anyone to -- for any government to regulate knives because they cannot -- they cannot do so; rather, it would be counterproductive.

Internet at a very large scale is a household thing, as knives are, so you cannot regulate. It is -- and I think that everyone in the government, they know it, that they cannot regulate Internet now. But at the same times as it has been happening, as a student of history and international relations, I know that societies have been trying to regulate tools of information, communication, and power. So Internet today is a tool of power at first and then information and communication.

So you cannot have people trying to have control. When you see governments trying to regulate Internet, it's not against -- it's not something which is against the Internet. It is see that as an attempt to get power over the tool, which is being used for communication and exchange of information. It's their attempt. And see the efforts to shut down the communication, to shut down the Internet in that context.

So if the context is clear, then we would be able to formulate clear strategies for defense. And in that -- and it's not just -- I would also like to point out here that it's not just the governments that you will see trying to exert or get control on the Internet or the resources that formulate from of the Internet. So you would see different cartels, different powerful businesses to try to exert control over this tool.

So the job of the Internet Society I see getting tougher day by day. And I would like to build upon the comments that Brian said, that you need to transcend -- you need to transform your build strategy in a way that it sustains itself. It's not stopped there. You yourself as an Internet Society cannot stop building.

And while building, I would echo the comments by the chair that he's used in the earlier session, that it is for the people, for everyone. And building needs to be for everyone. We need to promote that we are -- since we are building, we need to build it for everyone. We need to change our strategies.

And then I would also like to state here that if Internet is built accessible from the -- right at the start and it's -- and, also, it is -- it is built resilient, it would be difficult to control and to disrupt in the middle of the way, though there will still be attempts.

So I would agree that in the next medium to long term, you need to focus more on in terms of resilience, in terms of defense. And while you try to defend the Network of Networks, you also need to -- and if you ask me right now, I won't have answers for you, but I'm just leaving a part for you that while you are defending the Network of Networks, how do you figure out the phrase that includes in your mission statement that it is for everyone, and how you ensure this, that whatever are you defending, it is benefiting to everyone, to the people at the end of the day?

>> TED HARDIE: Thank you. George.

>> GEORGE SADOWSKY: Thanks. There have been a lot of really good remarks in this discussion starting first thing this morning, and I've just been inundated by the collective -- I don't know, the collective wisdom of the group, recognizing that it's not complete.

I think the stress on defending is going to be -- is going to have to be major, really major in this next -- in this next period, as Pepper suggests. I'm a little bit more pessimistic than he is.

You know, in the 1990s we had what I'd call the Internet spring. Everybody was optimistic. Things were growing. We saw a bright and brilliant future ahead. I think we're now heading for Internet winter, you know, in a way that's a little bit terrifying because of a bunch of reasons. And one is that the Internet is and really always has been a mirror on real life, although different parts of it. And so behavior on the Internet – it shouldn't surprise us that behavior on the Internet is very much like behavior in the real world.

If you look around to what's happening in political trends and behaviors in the real world, it's not an optimistic picture, and it's one that I think is likely to affect and perhaps even dominate the policy issues that are now being discussed on the Internet.

Victor made a very useful remark on the disambiguation between the Internet and uses of the Internet. And I characterize this as governance of the Internet, which is really for the most part administration, although it depends upon a model of how human beings should interact, and governance on the Internet.

And I think governance of the Internet is still being fought over, but governance on the Internet is I think the major issue that we're really fitting real life into the environment of a very disruptive technology, and it's not fitting very well. And what's coming out are that the Internet allows one to exert power and to make money, and so the power and the financial aspects of distorting the Internet for one's own -- for one's own vision of the future in addition to things like infant or child pornography and so on are going to make the sledding in the policy space really, really very difficult.

The last thing I'd say is that somebody brought up the issue of leveraging the chapters, and I think that's something which we haven't done really well, and I think we need to because they are our scouts on the margin of the space. They know what's happening, and I think that some kind of a more intense cooperative relationship with them in terms of giving us information, being our lookouts, and feeling that they really are a part of this program to defend the Internet because it's worth defending and it's going to need defending is a really important thing.

So I'd emphasize tying the chapters into an intelligence system, to a data-gathering system using the weather model. It's -- they can do a lot, and I think we need a lot. Thank you.

>> TED HARDIE: So we got asked a pretty direct question from Rinalia, and I think we gave a pretty indirect answer, so I'm going to try and boil it down a little bit.

I think you heard very strongly that we believe defend needs additional resources. Given the limited resources of the Society, I think what you were hearing is that some deemphasis of other programs in order to accomplish that is in line with the thinking of the Board and that the question then comes down to: Which of those can be deemphasized without hurting the defense that we see as primary?

And I think I heard from Pepper in particular that there are some parts of build which speak to creating models that help defend the Internet and that retaining those is useful and that providing the models we have created for building community networks to others so that they can continue to work is useful.

I think you heard that reaching out to chapters and I assume OMAC and other members of the Society to make them part of this effort to defend will be a key element both in gathering

intelligence and making sure that they can multiply the forces that the staff organization has at hand.

I think at the core the question of what does it mean to defend the Internet comes down to a way of looking at the Internet that doesn't treat it simply as a tool. Even though I appreciated Muhammad's analogy to a knife, I think it requires looking at it not so much as a disruptive technology, but as an enabling technology.

It has created the capability of communicating across time and distance and among groups both larger and more widespread than any other history -- any other part of the history of humanity. And I think it's that we have to defend. There's a quote from ultimately Thomas Jefferson passing through the pop culture version in 1776 where somebody asks him, "Why write a declaration if you're going to go into rebellion?" And the quote reads, "To place before mankind the common sense of the subject in terms so plain and firm as to command their assent."

Ultimately our task is the same. We have to show the world the value of the Internet and of that communication medium in terms so plain and firm as to counter both government action and serious efforts to dissuade us from that assent. It's not an easy task, but it's definitely worth doing.

I think that brings us to the close of this. We have one AOB that we'll go into executive session.

>> Okay.

>> TED HARDIE: And I have one, if you wouldn't mind allowing me to share, that we can take now. And where is share in Zoom? Oh, here we go. I'm sorry. It turns out that I've never shared anything across Zoom before, so I'm going to have to go into my security settings for a second here and allow it.

>> Yeah.

>> TED HARDIE: The key thing about working for a company that makes a competing product. Okay.

>> ANDREW SULLIVAN: You have to unlock first.

>> TED HARDIE: Okay.

>> ROBERT PEPPER: Webex keeps reminding me even though I have the Webex app.

>> TED HARDIE: And here. Advanced, is it?

>> ROBERT PEPPER: So, while you're doing that, Andrew, the Thomas Jefferson quote, is very appropriate. The 21st century version of that is it has to fit on a bumper sticker and be understandable to somebody who can read it as the car drives by. It has to be that accessible; right? And I didn't know they had bumper stickers in the 18th century, but that was (Inaudible).

>> TED HARDIE: So, I think, Kevin, I ended up back in webinar mode because I had to relaunch to get the security settings.

>> KEVIN CRAEMER: Okay. I put you back in.

>> TED HARDIE: So I have a bit of the unhappy duty to recognize reality. Never a pleasant situation when reality is taking away from you such an excellent relationship, but for those members of the Board, for those observers who didn't know, Kevin Craemer has decided to retire after many years of excellent service. He was originally going to retire immediately after this meeting but has agreed to extend it to help make sure that the Society can select a successor.

And it's that sort of dedication which has been the hallmark of his service to the Board over many, many years, and we wanted recognize it. And, therefore, I put before you the following resolution: Whereas Kevin Craemer has provided outstanding service to the Internet Society; whereas Kevin Craemer has served as Board liaison with dedication, integrity, and distinction; and whereas the Board of Trustees wishes to recognize that service; resolved, that the Internet Society Board of Trustees acknowledges and extends its profound appreciation to Kevin Craemer for his many years of service to the Internet Society. May I have --

>> I will move.

>> TED HARDIE: I think I got everybody in the Board as a move there. So we'll put it down. May I ask by acclamation, please.

Kevin, we are very sorry that you couldn't be with us here today so we could thank you more personally, but please take with you the understanding that the Board as a whole and certainly myself as the person who has benefited most recently from your expertise have appreciated everything to a depth we really cannot express. Thank you.

>> KEVIN CRAEMER: Thank you, Ted, and thank you all on the board. It's been an honor of a lifetime for me to work with all of you.

>> TED HARDIE: And with that, we close the public portion of the meeting and the public portion of the AGM as a whole. Thank you to the observers. And we will go into executive session now.

>> KEVIN CRAEMER: When we go into the --

>> KEVIN CRAEMER: Use the other link.

>> TED HARDIE: Okay. Sounds good.

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