

## **Organization Members Advisory Council Report to ISOC Board of Trustees**

Co-Chairs- Nikhil Agarwal, Zensar Technologies; Olivier Dubuisson, France Telecom Orange; Nick Trio, IBM- on behalf of ISOC's Organization Members.

### **Public Policy focused AC meetings**

Drew Dvorshak has communicated to the Officers a consistent and growing desire, expressed by member representatives, with backgrounds and interests relevant to the work of the Public Policy team, to have some physical Advisory Council meetings co-located with meetings/conferences that attract policy-oriented professionals. This is similar to how co-locating meetings with IETF takes advantage of the critical mass of technically focused individuals who can contribute to that area of ISOC's work.

Following the most recent ICANN meeting in Sydney Australia, an AC meeting (Chaired by Nikhil Agarwal, Zensar Technologies) was held to address this demand. This meeting was very well attended by member representatives, many of which had never before represented their organization at an AC meeting. Attendance rivaled that seen recently at meetings co-located with IETF despite the time zone challenge to remote participation by US and European-based individuals and an unexpected delay caused by the ICANN Board meeting running 30 minutes over time.

#### Recommendation:

At least one AC meeting per year should be held following an ICANN meeting. Response to this first one clearly indicates that this serves a need. The timetable should be adjusted to allow for possible over-runs in the Board meeting. Additionally, one member representative stated in comments at the end of the recent meeting that we should have another policy-focused meeting this year in conjunction with IGF in November. We support this and will work with Drew Dvorshak in assessing the feasibility and planning.

### **Agenda and Discussion Focus for Advisory Council Meetings.**

As a relatively new slate of officers, we have been discussing and addressing with Drew Dvorshak over the past several months, what had been a consistent complaint and point of dissatisfaction for some member representatives that the Advisory Council was not used to its potential by ISOC as a source for advice. Nor did it provide an opportunity for members to offer any opinion or ask questions regarding ISOC's work "before" work plans were finalized and all decisions already made. Agendas consisted largely of updates and presentations of recent activity from staff, to members with intent to inform.

#### Acknowledgement:

The feedback garnered over the last 3 meetings indicates a level of satisfaction that ISOC staff have made noticeable progress availing themselves of the talent and contributions its members have to offer, and also improving the value of the experience for members. Most notable improvements has been a) the advanced provision of detailed background

materials for all to familiarize themselves with and come into the meeting prepared with specific questions and comments b) More recently, specific questions and/or statement of goals and purposes for the discussion. Frederic Donck's agendaized preface is a very good recent example because all came into the conversation with an idea of two aspects he was asking for contributions on. And there are action items still being pursued to gather information and perspective for him.

Recommendation:

We recommend that this continue and strengthen to the degree that Advisory Council meetings be comprised mainly of agenda items where staff and/or the BoT are similarly seeking input/opinions on program direction/focus as appropriate. Informational updates/debriefs from staff are useful and would be all the more so if they included a request, given developments, for AC reps. to contribute to next steps in ISOC's engagement process within the forum(s) that is the subject of the update.

We understand as officers that, given the type of organization that ISOC is, the general direction of its work is set by expert staff and the BoT, and in order to be of the most value to either constituency, "advice" must address the particular areas and questions identified as where organizational member perspectives would help. This punctuates the importance of preparatory materials and specific questions/topics in providing direction/context /focus to guide the contributions.

Building on that, we look forward to working with Members, Staff and BoT to developing an equally systematic way to demonstrate the connection between advice or contributions and visible outcomes in ISOC's work. We feel that this is necessary to demonstrating the importance of active participation in AC dialogues and directly impacts that assessment of the value of membership.

**ISOCs' User-Centric Internet paper/platform**

Comments for consideration submitted by Olivier Dubuisson representing France Telecom Orange.

The following was submitted by, and builds on concerns that Olivier Dubuisson, articulated to staff at the San Francisco AC meeting in March 2009. It is submitted for consideration of the Board and Staff as future work on UCI and "Net Neutrality" is developed (e.g.) The ISOC study paper on Net Neutrality announced as part of the Public Policy team's Policy Study Paper series.

"The paper rightly presents the User Centric Internet as a positive achievement. But when describing the forces that could threaten this achievement, it embarks on an interpretation of a situation that may have been prevalent in one part of the world (the USA), a number of years ago (before 2007). Since a few years, the Net Neutrality debate has expanded to other shores and has evolved to include more moderate and balanced views than those reflected in the paper, written, again, some years ago. For one thing, it is now recognised that intelligence at the edge cannot exist without an economically viable and intelligent

network. Arguing for one more than the other is to yield under the pressure of those trying to antagonise two "camps" who are really trying to be partners in their quest for a sustainable Internet."

Recommendation:

Future work on issues of UCI or "Network Neutrality" should include consultation across all parties involved that are represented in the ISOC membership. This particularly includes Network Providers as it is our understanding that the AC consultation around the UCI paper did not include commentary from that perspective. As AC officers, we stand ready to aggressively promote participation from across the membership in any future dialogues.