

Internet Society
Board of Trustees
Meeting #187

Review of Organizational Performance
–Katie Benggaard

March 6, 2025

EDIT BY
ISOC.LIVE

Internet Society Board of Trustees -Meeting #187 - Seattle - March 6 2025\

07 Review of Organizational Performance – Katie Benggaard

Katie Benggaard: Hi everyone. My name is Katie Benggaard. I lead strategy and impact for the Internet Society. Sally just spent some time talking to you about our progress so far, and our priorities for 2025. What I'm going to do is do a bit of a look back, where we take a few moments to celebrate the impact that we've made over the past five years, as well as speak to highlights related to results that we achieved in 2024.

There is so much wonderful activity effort. I'm so privileged to be able to represent the staff, the community, and present this information to you. A couple of things to note, for in terms of input, you would've received a very in-depth report related to success measures for 2024. There you can see a full outline, by project, of our success measures, our targets for 2024, as well as our results for 2024. Again, that's a very in-depth report, which I will take as read. If you have questions about any of those specific results, I can speak to those.

There's a second report which was shared publicly recently, it's our five-year impact report. It's the first time we've ever published a report about the impact we've made across five years, so I'm personally extremely excited to bring that to your attention.

The presentation I'm about to share with you will toggle between our five-year impact as well as our 2024 results. It's really a moment to celebrate the impact that we've made

to build, promote, and defend the Internet, and I know I'm excited to turn the page to look forward to our 2025 strategy.

A couple things to note as we walk through this presentation. You'll notice some common themes, which I'll also point out as we progress. The first thing is about strong results, which Sally noted earlier.

2024, we saw really solid results amidst a year that was full of transition, specifically a CEO transition. It was also a year of change in terms of shifting from our 2025 strategy to our 2030 strategy, and co-creating internally and collaboratively our programs to support our future work. So, against this backdrop of transition and change, our staff remained focused and delivered very solid results in collaboration with our community and partners.

That leads me to my second theme, which has to do with collaboration with our community and our partners. This is how we scale, and, over the past five years, we've seen wonderful evidence and had excellent lessons learned about how to approach this to ensure that we're effective as we proceed with making impact in the future. We know the power of the impact that one person can have. When we think about the power that our collective community and partners can achieve, that's something that's very powerful to consider. And so, I'll draw your attention to examples of that throughout this presentation.

And last is a theme related to evolution as you consider this.

Where we've been for the past five years, where we started, what was happening in the world in 2020 as we started this journey we have grown a tremendous amount and in many different ways as an organization. And so you'll see themes of evolution throughout this presentation as well. And with that, we can move on to the next slide, please.

Again, in the context of our 2025 strategy, which was focused to build, promote, and defend the Internet, I'm happy to share some five-year results.

This is a mix of our connecting our community network efforts, our work to support IXPs, as well as our sustainable technical community support.

Across the past five years, from 2020 to the end of 2024, we supported 85 community networks. This support also includes over \$3 million in funds granted. We've also supported 56 IXPs -- either we have helped to establish, or provided ongoing support to those IXPs, and grow them and develop them in terms of traffic demand -- with over \$3.5 million in funds granted. And last, we've supported sev 45 technical communities with just over \$230,000 in funds granted.

You can see here the snapshot of our efforts over the past five years, but what I also want to note is this snapshot is a reflection of our model for connectivity. You can see that we invest in standing up and enhancing CNs and IXPs. We also invest a great deal in the technical communities, and the people that sustain and support these communities in the long term.

And, I just think that's a really important thing to note, that it's not a single moment in time that we're present, we have ways of supporting communities based on where they are in their lifecycle towards connectivity.

Here you can see the results for 2024. Again, there's an in-depth report you can refer to related to these. We had a total of 11 success measures in support of Building the Internet. 10 of those success measures were achieved, and one was not.

Here you can see the 2024 results related to Connecting the Unconnected. We built four new community networks in Africa and Asia, and we improved existing networks. A total of six. This actually exceeded our targets for this year. We had opportunity to invest more, and so we did. Our original target was to support build and support six, and we built and supported 10.

Another thing to note, related to this project, has to do with the resource and offerings that we provide to people that want to connect. One of the resources that was launched in 2023 was the Do-It-Yourself Toolkit for Community Networks. In 2024, we monitored the performance of this toolkit. We wanted to know how were people receiving it? Are they using it? How can we improve it? We observed that in fact it is a useful resource.

We saw a couple of notable data points related to the performance of the toolkit. One is that when we open a grant window, we see tremendous traffic of these types of resources, which is a really cool thing to note in terms of patterns and trends that we observe.

Another thing is that, with regards to this toolkit, people, when they get to the page. They stay on the page. They're spending a lot of time with the toolkit. We also conducted a survey last year, where we surveyed the users, the intended audience of the toolkit, and they found it extremely useful.

Part of that reason has to do with the nature in which it's organized. It really helps the user go through the life cycle, from point zero to sustaining, of how to set up your own community network, and it's in plain language that people really received well and found it useful.

So, this is to say, for those resources that we make broadly available to anyone, we are not only launching them, but we're closely monitoring their performance so that we can improve moving forward.

Here you can see results in 2024 for the Fostering Sustainable Peering Infrastructure project. You can see we established two new IXPs, one in Paraguay and the other in Senegal, and we also enhanced an additional 10 IXPs.

Some things to note related to just general highlights of what we're observing...

Pulse has indeed become an important resource for advocacy and governments, signaling its importance and credibility. There's a lot of data to support the performance of Pulse. We see it mentioned year over year, the number of references of the Pulse platform increases, with last year, a total of 138 references. Sally also mentioned how we have made improvements to user experience, and launched new tools in 2024. We continue to see really good uptake, both internally and externally of the Pulse tool.

Another highlight to note is that AfPIF achieved a significant milestone. We transitioned our role as organizer, and I believe that was there was a ceremony that Sally attended, or actually probably hosted a little bit, with the official handover. That actually happened late last year. And so, this is a wonderful model, where we are continuing our support of AfPIF, of this event, of the peering community, and we are handing it over to the community itself to lead and sustain. That handover ceremony represented that dynamic, and our role in supporting others to carry these initiatives forward.

Also, related to local traffic and our work to increase local traffic, we have something called a 50/50 vision. Where we want to see more traffic local, and in turn that will improve affordability and resilience. We have had direct interventions specifically in Maldives and Bolivia, a lot of collaboration with local partners in those countries and our chapters as well, and, thanks to our Pulse tool, we've been able to observe that local traffic has increased in the Maldives to 67%, and Bolivia to 62%, which is really a testament to, again, the theme of collaboration, all those parties that were involved, to see that our efforts and interventions are having the intended impact and result that we seek.

This next section is related to Defending the Internet.

Here we have this snapshot of our impact over the past five years. This really represents the advocacy work that ranges from local efforts to educate and train policy makers, our work in the United Nations, efforts to lobby or advocate legislatures or parliaments, and regional work as well. This is a well-rounded portfolio of work that I'm happy to speak to.

Over the past five years, we have proposed or created over 100 statements, open letters and submissions, 50+ policies we have opposed, that we can count. Internet impact Assessments completed -- over 20 over the past five years, and filed 6 amicus briefs.

This is a story here of the evolution of our organization. Five years ago, we did not have Internet impact Assessments in place. We did not have an Amicus Brief BS.

And I will halt.

Ted Hardie: So this is a wonderful statistic, but I just have to ask, have we ever sent anything that said, Go you, we love this policy?

And we probably want that up here, since this is public record. We do want to say, occasionally we do actually support governments when they do the right thing. And hey, that's not 50 times, but..

Sally Wentworth: And we do, we did in preparation for this report go back and look at really solid policy outcomes, where we weighed in, not necessarily in opposition, but we weighed in with a voice of how we thought that policy should evolve, and we saw really good outcomes.

But yes, this is the metric of things we were...

Ted Hardie: Obviously, a bunch of this is reactive, right? And it's much much easier to understand that you need to react when it is in opposition, but I think, for tracking purposes, for the future, when we weigh in, it would be really useful to know when we weigh in with a positive comment, because I think ultimately our relationship to these governments will improve if some of the times we say, Go you.

Sorry. It was such a funny thing to see on this slide that we should have...

Katie Bengaard: Okay. Thank you for that. It's worth noting that our guiding constructive project sets the tone for providing that type of positive reinforcement, and soon our tracking and metrics will follow suit, where we do capture those instances and have a more well-rounded view of this.

But again, back to this notion of how we've evolved.

We are so well positioned now, thanks to the tools and resources and programs that we've put in place over the past five years, not only to address things proactively, but reactively as well. So, this is a really wonderful output to show our efforts related to advocacy over the past five years.

We see here results for 2024, and we had 11 success measures for 2024, and all 11 were achieved.

We see evidence of others carrying our message forward. One of our metrics in 2024 was the number of voluntary public statements, and/or favorable policies, by

policymakers in support of strong encryption. Our target for 2024 was six, and we ended up achieving 22.

A big catalyst for this had to do with the reaction in the EU to the Hungarian presidency statement -- it was an anti-encryption stance that actually got a lot of reaction and there was a snowball effect that we observed in the EU. So we saw a really strong result in that encryption project related to public statements and others carrying our message forward.

We also, under are Defending the internet and the United Nations project, hit our target where the Internet Society's, or the Internet's, best interests were well represented in UN processes and negotiations, that 10 country delegations adopted pro-Internet language in public documents in 2024. Again, a wonderful signal that others are carrying our message forward.

We are excited to see the community driven advocacy efforts we observed in 2024, in our Countering Internet Threats project. 100% of our advocacy was conducted in collaboration with our community. That was very exciting to observe. We're thrilled by the eagerness of our community to participate in our advocacy efforts. We are working hard, our staff, to draw in our community, and the community in the regions.

One of the ways we did that actually had to do with one-on-one outreach, we saw that was a very effective way to target our chapters, to communicate to them about advocacy, what resources were available to them, to educate them on those resources, including the Internet Impact Assessment, observe these chapters take up efforts to advocate.

We saw a really wonderful example of this with the Malawi Chapter doing an Internet Impact Assessment overview before the Malawi Parliament. They took that training and they applied it in their local community and country to make positive change for the Internet.

We also are steadfastly committed to multistakeholder engagement. We see that in our stance in reaction to the Global Digital Compact, which we were involved in, to the extent that we were able, in 2024. Although we ultimately did not endorse the GDC, we're willing and ready to support and participate in a multistakeholder implementation.

You might recognize someone in that picture. That is Sally at PTC most recently. Sally spoke to the policymakers program a few minutes ago. We continue to see really strong demand. It's got a groundswell where people want to be a part of it.

And so, this is a really wonderful story, which I can tell, or you can explain who that person is with you in that picture, Sally.

Sally Wentworth: I think this is Noia, from Tuvulu, and I had a bilateral meeting with her in Honolulu, thanks to an introduction from Maureen. She's now the CEO of the Tivalu Communications Corporation, I believe it's called, the major telecom provider there in Tivalu, and we were talking about ways we might collaborate, what are the challenges in Tivalu and so forth, and she's quite strong technically. That was very clear very quickly in the conversation.

I asked her about the IETF, and I mentioned that we had this policymaker program, and she looked at me and smiled and she said, I was a fellow to the IETF back in 2008, and Fred Baker was her mentor, and she's still in touch with him. She still participates remotely, occasionally, in the IETF, and has contributed to apparently some IPv6 drafts, that's her area of interest. And so, it was a really nice little moment to see how the fellowship program, from all those years ago, is still relevant to her and the work that she's doing.

We also met with Keila, who is the head of the regulatory agency in PNG, and he was one of our policymaker guests, right around that same time at one of the IETF meetings in Vancouver, and, as a result of that meeting, went on to support the IXP in PNG, and is now very interested in partnering with us to figure out how we strengthen that IXP in PNG. That was a lot of acronyms right there.

So, really useful ways in which the relationships developed in those programs go on to...

These are people that are moving up in their careers, and in their countries, and have significant positions of impact years later, that we can't always predict.

Katie Bengaard: Thank you, I love that example. From 2008 to 2024. This is a wonderful example of the outputs of our policymaker program, the valued connections, and to see the arc of these relationships is wonderful.

In fact, our policymaker program has had such demand recently, that we are considering ways to host these sessions outside of IETF. That's something we'll explore later in 2025, but it is a possibility to address the demand that we see for this program.

The other thing to note is related to Amicus. As I noted, Amicus was something that was launched within our past five years, maybe four years ago, in 2024. It's worth noting that we submitted four briefs, one of which was outside of the United States, in Mexico. That was one of our targets for 2024, was to expand our reach beyond the U.S.

In addition, another one of our targets, that might be a little more qualitative for 2024, had to do with increasing awareness about these briefs. The briefs in and of themselves certainly achieved that, but we were very proactive last year in terms of communications, blog posts, emails, other things, to external lists that we would post to,

sending directly to partners and people we know across the industry, all in an effort to raise awareness about these issues, as well as our intervention.

NDSS, this is the Network and Distributed System Security Symposium. We have been hosting this for over 30 years. We continue to see really exciting results for this event. . . Last year, we maintained our position, the NDSS as number two computer security research conference in the world. The event last year in 2024 also sold out. We hit max capacity at 600 people.

I'm happy to share, hot off the press, news from NDSS. Last week there were 697 registrants for the event. We've received early feedback from delegates, workshop chairs, sponsors, and others that it was a wonderful event, and it's worth noting that we see that the event grow. One of the metrics we observe, as well, is the number of papers submitted for NDSS. In 2023, the total number of papers was 90. In 2024, it was 160, and in 2025, 240 papers were submitted. So, we see the increasing growth and excitement around this event.

Scaling our Impact.

Again, this is one of the key themes that we observed over the past five years, how important it is to collaborate with our community and partners. What we'll see here in these next slides is some examples of how we do that.

This is a snapshot of by the numbers.

At the end of 2024, we had, oh, nearly 130,000 Individual Members, 131 Chapters and SIGs, 82 Organization Members, 97 Partners, 325 Alumni, and we saw that 81% of chapters received grants to support non-admin efforts, which is wonderful to see that level of engagement. These are grants such as Beyond the Net, and possibly CN funding, that they might have pursued.

Also of note, the Alumni, I'll get into this a little bit later, but consider 325 alumni, after just a few years of really thoughtfully investing and being very proactive about nurturing this group of people. It's wonderful to see that we've achieved 325 in just a few short years. It's an exciting thing to see, because it signals what is possible over the next five years.

Also of note for this, of our 82 org members, we saw 41% participating in advocacy efforts. Our target was 25%. One of the key things that happened in 2024 was the launch of the ISOC Insiders program, which was a one-on-one pairing matchmaking with staff and key points of contact from org members. We believe that this was a key driver to see that result in our org members participating in our advocacy efforts.

Here, you can see, for this portfolio of work in 2024, we had 22 success measures, 20 were achieved, and two were not achieved.

Again, back to the alumni. This program is under the guidance of a new Head of Alumni, a full-time dedicated resource. We're seeing growth with the fellowships. We see strong collaborations with our programs. Our awardees, our IHoF winners and others, are also connected with our alumni. There's cross mentorship, so this is a really rich area with high degree of collaboration with different parts of our community and organization.

We know that healthy and diverse chapters are key to building local communities that thrive. Here we see chapter evaluation results, where 95% of our chapters are engaged and effective. In 2025, we improved our evaluations process, both the tool that we use, as well as creating flexibility in the schedule of the evaluation.

You can see the diversity of our chapters, and the distribution regionally. We've got 37 chapters in Africa, 17 in APAC, 30 in Europe, 25 in LAC, 3 in the MENA region, and 8 in North America.

Our training model has grown and evolved so much over the past five years. We've taken special focus on a train the trainer approach, back to this notion of force multipliers. We trained more than 300 tutors since 2021, and in turn, they have trained an additional 1,078 learners, so this is, again, a model for scaling. This is a really interesting and unique approach to achieving broad scale and broad reach, but maintaining a local and personalized approach to learning.

That concludes that presentation. Thank you for your attention and I welcome your questions and comments.

Ted Hardie: Victor?

Victor Kuarsingh: Just a quick question here. Looking at the the chapter health in kind of distribution, I love to see, especially in Africa, the number of chapters we have there, and working healthy. Anybody else wonder, APAC, why, given the size of that continent, and the population, what would it take to see more pop up there? Is it just the political climates? Is it something else? You get where I'm going? It just strikes me, as I think about it, I don't always think about these things, but as I dig in there.

Sally Wentworth: It's a good question. We are spending a quite a bit of time this year focusing on our outreach in Asia Pacific. Chris and I will both be in the region. Chris is spending a lot more time there after Bangkok. I'll be back in May. We Have a new Chapter Engagement Manager in the region. We have recently elevated two people in the region to more senior positions to try to do more outreach, all in an effort to address some of this, because, I think it is a huge region and driving a lot of innovation, obviously, coming out of Asia Pacific, and so we've been paying a lot of attention to that.

I don't know that I have exactly the answer, but it is something that we've got a good eye on, and, as I said earlier, a particular focus on Pacific Islands because the connectivity challenges there are considerable. They're different than what we have addressed in other parts of the world, so we've got some learning to do there.

But, I agree with you. We would like to see this number go up.

Victor Kuarsingh: And, by the way, don't take the comment as, Hey, what are you going to do about it? I want the answer now, it's more, Hey, this is a thing, this disposition, and yeah, there's something to be dug into, that's all.

Sally Wentworth: Agreed. Yeah.

Ted Hardie: Okay. I currently have Barry, Caleb, Russ, and Maureen in queue.

Barry?

Barry Leiba: Thanks for the report, Katie. Very impressive. I wanted to go back to where you talked about the submitted papers for NDSS, you said submitted papers, but it sounded like the numbers were accepted papers. I just wanted to check on that. I believe these are submitted papers, which is at least showing interest in the pipeline, but they're not all accepted. I was there, there were a little over 200 papers presented, accepted. There were 1300 papers submitted.

That's why I wanted to highlight there were more than twice as many papers submitted this year as last year. Last year was something like 650, and this year there were over 1300 papers submitted. The interest has just mushroomed. . It's really good,

Ted Hardie: Caleb?

Caleb Ogundele: Thank you. I have an observation, based on what Victor mentioned. Africa has 54 countries, and I saw seven there. Obviously that seven includes chapters that are still going through rejuvenation, pre-rejuvenation, because in another report I saw 31 active chapters, and I want to believe that the remaining six are those that are still going through rejuvenation and all of that.

So, I'm just trying to connect all the numbers, but the emphasis of what I'm saying is there's still a lot more work to be done, because Africa has 54 countries, and we have just that seven. And so, while that same strategy you're planning for Asia Pacific is ongoing, please to think about Africa, in that equation.

But, the main crux of what I want to talk about is the policy maker highlights that you had in your report, both of you. Here is a suggestion that I think I have. I feel that you'll have more impact when you try to domesticate and localize some of these issues. Not

saying you should take it away from the IETF regional meetings, and things like that, but again, if you keep putting it at IETF meetings, there is a strong possibility that you will not reach a bigger audience of those policy makers.

And here is where I say the connection between how you work with chapters also in this regard.

If you try to regionalize some of these things, most of the issues that policy makers have, they can connect it within their region. Take, for example, the African Internet Summits that you guys have, or maybe the African Internet Summits, the one being co-organized with AFRINIC back in the days, and stuff like that, now, if there are specific policy making discuss around that, I feel that ISOC can be part of it. That way you can reach out to more people within the region, because they can participate.

On the other hand, I also feel that ISOC can also collaborate with NRIs, national Regional Initiatives, around the IGF space, because I know that they have a parliamentarian segment that they usually have when they're having some of these things. It's always good to not just have the politicians in the room.

One thing I've realized specifically, maybe from the region where I come from, the politicians will move on, they'll probably lose election in the next cycle, or they will come back again, but those who have continuum in the power dynamics are the top civil servants, who will likely not retire very soon. So, having them get involved, just I like the picture that Sally posted about someone working in the civil service, the telecom civil service, and then it shows that you're connecting with the civil servant.

Bottom line of what I'm saying is, I'd like to see more ways where we can bring this down to the regional level of, let's say, ECOWAS, or West Africa, or things, and then you can engage more at that level. You can get more people. In fact, the advantage of it is that the visa issues, which you mentioned, will not be there because most Africans can also participate at a regional meeting without having to stress themselves for visa.

Ted Hardie: I wasn't sure if anybody was going to respond to that.

Sally Wentworth: Oh, Russ would like to.

Ted Hardie: Oh, okay. You're next in queue anyway. Go ahead.

Russ Housley: The program started because things were being said about the IETF at ITU meetings that were false. And Sally said to one person, have you ever been to an IETF meeting? And they said no. And she said, come and see, and you'll see that what you're saying is just not the case.

I think we need to continue that, but I have certainly no objections to expanding it, but it's a different focus, so it needs to be a different program to, say, the technical work being done at the IETF for the Internet, is important as well as the ITU meetings.

And what you're talking about is something different, to address the policy in different parts of the world, and that's something that I just think you can't just take the cookie cutter that we already have for the IETF thing and apply it.

Ted Hardie: Was that the focus of your original intervention? Okay. So keep your thing up, but does anybody else want to speak to this topic?

Caleb Ogundele: I think I get the part of where you're coming from, that it's strictly focused on the work of IETF and all of that, which leads us to a previous conversation, we've probably had here, where we've said there is no possibility of even IETF ever going to Africa.

The possibility is so low.

Ted Hardie: That is not this board's responsibility.

Caleb Ogundele: Of course, I know. I'm just reacting to that. But, it still boils down to the fact that we'd like to see more participation, and see how you can expand that program more, and thank you so much for all the work you guys are doing.

There's something that I've been told while growing up, that the reward for good work and hard work is more work. So keep at it. Thanks.

Ted Hardie: Sally has another thing on this point, and then to Russ.

Sally Wentworth: Thank you for that feedback. Caleb. We are experimenting, as Katie said, this year with a request from the Australian government for us to host an IETF policymakers program without the IETF. It's a little weird, but we're going to do that in Australia this year. We may be able to pull in some of the Pacific Islands into that. We're going to see, we're still figuring out the logistics.

One of the reasons we can do that is that there's a very strong local technical community in Australia that we can pull in as speakers, because one of the things we do in this program, we try to have fewer ISOC staff speakers, and pull in more from the IETF community. Because, if you want to know how a piece of the Internet works, it's really useful to have some of the people who are actually working on that come in and give those presentations. It also builds the interaction between the policymakers and the technical community in a way that we have seen be productive outside of the meeting, because they send messages and say, Hey, we're thinking about this. How does this really work? Would this be a bad idea? Those relationships keep going.

So, we are going to experiment with that this year in Australia, and see if we can pull this off outside of the IETF. If we go beyond Australia, the challenge that we're going to have is the ability to pull in the technical speakers, and we just haven't figured that out yet. But, we're not opposed to it. We're just, this is the first time we've had the formal invitation to do it and it's great. We're very excited by that, and that speaks to the success of the program. We're going to see if we can take it on the road, so to speak.

We'll report back probably next year, after the Australia program, and see how it goes.

Ted Hardie: Russ?

Russ Housley: The origins of NDSS come from the IRTF. It was started first by the Privacy and Security Research Group, and I was the second program chair. It's awesome to hear how that has grown. It's drawn in so many academics.

But, I wanted to ask about the not achieved part, where it was published, the Policy and Advocacy Toolkit. Was there anything that we could have done to help you here? And that's really the question.

Sally Wentworth: Yeah. The policy toolkit, we decided to do a little differently than we had done the first toolkit that Katie mentioned, and the way went about it, was to actually go to some policy events, at CITEC in Latin America, the Asia Pacific Telecommunity meeting in APAC. The Africa meeting we had to postpone because there were some logistical challenges, so we didn't end up doing that until later in the year, which pushed off the timeline for the toolkit.

What the team wanted to do was actually have the toolkit developed collaboratively with the policymakers, so that we would get a really good understanding of the kinds of questions they wanted answered in such a toolkit. That worked really well, but it did delay the publication.

Just earlier this week I got a preview of the toolkit, and it looks really good, and it should be published at the end of Q1. It should have been published in time for us to go to Bangkok, and speak again to the APT, so it should be published this week. It's on track for this year, but we missed the deadline, and that's why we missed the success measure.

Ted Hardie: Thank you. I have Maureen and then Kathleen.

Maureen Hilyard: Thank you. I just wanted to follow on from what Victor was mentioning about Pacific. One of the things that I did want to acknowledge is the strong support that we've had in the 20 years that I've been involved in the Pacific, from the ISOC in Australia, and also

Internet New Zealand,, which is related to, to ISOC, but with Internet New Zealand, they've just gone through a big management change, so they're only just basically at the rejuvenation group there.

But, I'm really pleased that Sally will be going to New Zealand. I hear Chris is going to go and visit ISOC Australia, and it would be really good for them to actually just be encouraged to continue that support, because I think that's a sort of thing that we need, not just with PICISOC actually, but like more across...

Papua New Guinea has got its own sort of system going there, and it's a really big organization, and they're really big on policy, which is something that a lot of the other smaller islands really need support in, and that's something that PICISOC could help with. Thanks.

Ted Hardie: Thanks Maureen.. Kathleen?

Kathleen Moriarty: Thank you, and thank you Katie for the overview. It was helpful to have your commentary on top of just looking at slides. I wanted to go back to the amicus briefings, and Chris, maybe we can chat offline as well.

In thinking about, the UK's not going to change their stance, right? Because of the differences over time, like it'll take time to get that type of change to happen for something like encryption. If you think back to the response in the UK, versus the US post-Snowden, UK expected that level of surveillance.

And so, if the people don't rise up, and the people aren't looking at it more from an individualistic and more privacy centered view, like happens in the US, and Germany is a great example for obvious reasons, it's hard to see the type of change we would like to see because of the cultural impacts.

Even if you think about Brexit, why did that go through the way it did? In the US, the recent, some are okay with some things versus some are not, and some of this goes to exposure of who travels and who doesn't. Who has this more global experience and who doesn't, so I know this is bigger necessarily than ISOC, but that cultural piece makes a big difference in terms of having the type of influence towards more encryption than...

And so, when you mentioned engaging local communities in the response, that's critical because the government's going to respond more to their own people, and their own voice versus external parties. I did sign on to the letter as well. I believe in this, but I think some of those impacts are something that feed into this larger picture.

So, I just wanted to shed some thought on that.

I know I've mentioned it before, but, I in one of the courses I teach, students have to write up the differences on surveillance, and I go through grading these three times a year. So, I just graded a whole... with updates where they're looking at all of the laws between four different nations, and societies, and cultural influences. And the impacts are very real. So, that's something I have a continued update on, thanks to that activity,

Ted Hardie: Chris,

Chris Locke: We can debate the why and wherefores of UK culture, and why we're such a subservient group of people, off board. But, just in terms of what we can do, at the end of last year, we hired Al Gaff as our Director of Community Communications because of his experience in managing communities, and the work we need him to do with our chapters and org groups, but also because he has actually come from ORG, the digital Rights group in the UK, so he has firsthand experience of understanding how we drive the message of digital rights and privacy, et cetera, in the UK.

As we look at how we can support more, his ability to help us think through that will be invaluable.

Kathleen Moriarty: Thank you.

Ted Hardie: And I want to go back to something we were talking about earlier.

There are definitely cases here where we can make alliances with people who have strong voices that are recognized within the United Kingdom. I think one of the issues that is always of concern to any government is responsiveness to the concerns of their own citizenry, and certainly there are lots and lots of people in UK and UK organizations like Article 19, et cetera, that have serious concerns around it. I don't know if we currently are part of ... Oh, yes, we are, EDRI which is one of the groups that coordinates the civil society positions in relation to digital rights, and, in particular, they might be a good coalition to be the front speaker for this kind of thing.

Are there any other questions for Katie?

Thank you very much for the presentation and for the longer report. There were a couple of questions in the chat on the longer report, but I think Sally has already answered them.