



Date/Time:

29 March 2017 / 18:00

Place:

University of Bern, Hochschulstrasse 4, room 501 (Kuppelraum)

In attendance:

1. Roxana Radu
2. Richard Hill
3. Michael Hausding
4. Markus Kummer
5. Lynn Sorrentino
6. Lukas Mergenthaler
7. Robert O Riordan
8. Alexandre Suter
9. Simon Leinen
10. Michel Chevalier
11. Riad Baazia
12. Reto Reck
13. Bernie Hoeneisen
14. Norbert Bollow
15. Marcel Waldvogel
16. Charles Geiger
17. Jens Kaessner
18. Wolf Ludwig
19. Jorgo Ananiadis
20. Philip Tobler
21. Federico Galati
22. Olivier Crépin-LeBlond
23. Hernâni Marques

Opening

Meeting opened at 18:36 by Chair, Roxana Radu

Election of two vote counters:

Michel Chevalier and Jorgo Ananiadis were elected by Acclamation as Vote Counters.

Vote counters counted number of present members → Total number 23, Majority: 12

Agenda Bashing

Presentation & acceptance (or rejection) of reports

Preceding GA (minutes)

Michael Hausding shared minutes from GA.

There were no objections to the Minutes.

VOTE: Minutes approved by acclamation - everyone approved

Board (incl. Activity Report 2016)

Activity Report is posted online at <https://www.isoc.ch/archives/2615> in agenda

Discussion points and edits on this:

Add Swiss IGF as partner in the Partnerships section

WSIS 2016 not WSIS 2017 change

Change PEP Foundation to not list Hernâni under Partnerships

No objections to approving it, once changes are done and posted.

VOTE: Changes and Approval of Report done by Acclamation. Approved.

Public Policy Aspects committee (PPAC)

PPAC Report is posted online at <https://www.isoc.ch/archives/2615>

Highlights here are the FR and DE letters on surveillance of citizenry.

VOTE: Changes and Approval of Report done by Acclamation. Approved.

Financial statements and Reporting

Introduced by Michael Hausding

- Collection of membership fees: 88 people paid the fee of 40 CHF

From the Financial Report (shared):

208 Members in the database

5 New members in 2016

Invoice per email via smallinvoice.ch

4 reminders per email

Last reminder letter if address available in December

88 Members paid

21 Membership fees waived

46 Members removed (Email-, Post bounces, asked to be removed)

58 no action

- Minor bugs in the membership system fixed this year

- **ASK OF MEMBERS:** General Assembly asked for removal of members who did not reply.

Bernie question: What are criteria for removing the members? Less people means less importance of ISOC-CH. Roxana replied we will discuss today and make decision on this. Markus noted again in agreement that more members means more importance of the org in terms of stature in CH.

Charles Geiger question: if there is overlap of members of ISOC global and ISOC-CH. Reply was per Michael and Roxana that if you register with CH, you are global member. But we have no information about registrations with ISOC global, even if based in CH. We have reached out to all members with an address in CH via ISOC global to invite them to the GA. Point taken to not remove if global members are in CH. If email bounced, them remove.

- Profit and Loss Statement reviewed.

Question: Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Why is it on the sheet 3,803 vs 3,802 CHF (rounded up?) Michael noted the actual report has the detailed figures in it to view.

- Budget 2017 reviewed.

Budget 2017 - this is provisional budget. Please see the Financial Report for details. Proposed Budgets with and without the PEP Foundation project listed. (NOTE there are two budgets).

Question: Robert O'Riordan asked where is the budget for the 19,000CHF?

Michael: wants approval to put the funds into action:

- Budget 2017 Requests for Approval by the GA include:

1. Approval of the Balance Sheet 2016

2. Approval to put the profit of CHF 3'802.10 to the ISOC.ch capital

3. Approval to allow the board to review and remove the 58 members from the chapter who haven't paid or replied back.

4. Approval of the Budget 2017

5. Approval to withdraw CHF 4'000 from the ISOC-Geneva fund for public-policy forums in 2017 (we will try to get additional funding for this too, to replace capital fund - depends on if we find additional funding.)

Question: Michel Chevallier asked about the funding being withdrawn (4,000CHF from Geneva budget) are they the same - not extra, correct? Michael: yes, this is correct.

Question: Bernie Hoensenien: Clarify wording on item 5 above to read Approval to withdraw CHF 4'000 from the ISOC-Geneva fund for public-policy **forums in CH in 2017 (to meet conditions tied to ISOC-Geneva fund).**

Noted: Markus Kummer . also the work listed should feed into this budget IGF in Geneva, and feed into the policy making note above in item 5, please. Michael replied: this is part of the overall objective, and proposed for the work of ISOC-CH in 2017. Also he noted that if we do not

exceed the budget, then we don't have to seek membership approval budget spend. Roxana noted that we discussed this in 2016 AGM, adding a bit of flexibility in budget and reporting to members.

Question: Marcel Waldvogel asked: if there is a referendum on gambling law? Roxana replied that in past we received funding from ISOC HQ for these items and we added 2000 CHF from ISOC-CH budget for advocacy to have a referendum on critical issues (of relevance to our mission). In 2016, we spent 1000 CHF of CH budget and 2500 EUR from ISOC European Office. Marcel asked about a provisional budget extension, is it useful? Michael replied that this is not needed as we would discuss it, and also possibly ask ISOC HQ for reimbursement. Michael noted that Board has to make a decision on spending, within guidelines.

Question: Michel asked about costs for referendum work and it was noted that costs include postage, collection of signatures, etc.

Question: Charles Geiger asked about which of 2 budgets to vote on? Michael: we will vote on both. If we get funding of ISOC HQ then we operate on that budget. We do not pay PEP project from Geneva ISOC CH funds. Hernâni also has noted that some of the PEP grant application to ISOC HQ will be used within CH to raise awareness of privacy concerns etc - and is budgeted in the grant application over the 2 years of the project. the PEP Project is in the Technical Aspects Committee realm.

Question: Robert O'Riordan asked what it actually means to say "Public Policy Forum"? Michael and Roxana replied that it is about open public discussion - similar to today's event before the GA started.

Oversight Committee Report

Charles Geiger read report out loud. It will be posted on ISOC-CH.

Question: Olivier asked about decimals in the report version, as without decimals, leads to public reading as inaccurate. Michael will make a note on Balance Sheet and Profit and Loss Statements should be corrected and remarked upon. "These are rounded numbers" and Olivier's point that it may cause questions.

VOTE: Michael: Anyone against voting by acclamation?

Bernie suggests it should be explicit since it is about money.

Request for Approval by the GA

1. Approval of the Balance Sheet 2016
2. Approval to put the profit of CHF 3'802.10 to the ISOC.ch capital
3. Approval to allow the board to review and remove the 58 members from the chapter who haven't paid or replied back.
4. Approval of the Budget 2017
5. Approval to withdraw CHF 4'000 from the ISOC-Geneva fund for public-policy forums in 2017

VOTE: 1 abstention and vote was 22 to 0.

Discharge of Board members

VOTE to discharge Board

FAVOUR: 5 abstain and 18 for and 0 against.

Side note of appreciation to all members including active member Bernie. (THANKS!)

Elections: Members of the Board

The outgoing members of the Board, except for the Secretary, stood for re-election. There were no other candidates. The outgoing candidates were:

- Chair: Roxana Radu
- Vice-Chair Internal: Markus Kummer
- Vice-Chair External: Richard Hill
- Treasurer: Michael Hauding

- Secretary Lynn is moving on, we are open to applications for Secretary and Wolf Ludwig announced his candidacy.

Announced: Candidate Wolf Ludwig -. Founding member of European at large org at ICANN, former journalist, founding member of EURODIG, Coordinator of Swiss-IGF. ISOC CH member for a couple of years too.

VOTE took place as secret ballot

VOTE: Total 19 ballots, 1 blank, 1 for Wolf only, and Wolf has 17 votes, there are 17 for Board as proposed and 1 abstained for voting for Secretary. The Election resulted in a new Board as listed above with Wolf Ludwig as Secretary.

NB: VOTE Counters: Michel Chevallier left at 19.45, replaced as vote counter with Simon Leinen.

Election of Members of the Oversight Committee

CANDIDATES:

Federico Galati introduced himself for this role as new candidate.

Charles Geiger as auditor

Marcel Waldvogel - as backup

Joni Orponen as backup

VOTE: 21 for and 0 against and 0 abstain.

NEW MEMBERS OF OC are: Federico and Charles with two backups of Joni and Marcel.

Budget 2017 voting

First budget

VOTE: 22 for, 0 abstain and 0 against

AOB

Discussion on supporting referendum on the gambling law - Bernie

Noted: Bernie noted there is a pessimistic view by doing a referendum. If people approve network blocking, then in future challenging of network blocking gets much harder. Not sure of the argument here being strong enough for this. The Pirate Party is supporting a referendum. There will be probably enough finances for signature collection (average with fees, postage, collection is about 3 CHF per signature).

Hernâni noted that minimum funding should likely be 100,000CHF but 150,000CHF is likely better to combat this as the opposition is possibly more well funded.

On April 10, interested stakeholders and political parties will meet in Zurich and discuss the next steps regarding a potential referendum.

Question: Is there a Project plan on time to ensure signatures are validated in time. overestimated numbers to be collected in last instance here. Time and money needed for this work as well as the validation at the end. Discussed this and lessons learnt by Hernâni Marques. So this is mitigated for this next time if we do decide to pursue a referendum.

Noted: Jorgo noted that the referendum will likely happen anyway since parties that have big financial responsibilities, will pursue this and delay the law to be able to make money in this time. If we join or not is another discussion point. And will we clarify our positions on censorship as an overarching issue instead? We should wait until the April meeting happens and next round of Parliament discussion (nearest date in Parliament is in June 2017).

Noted: Jens Kaessner - noted that he worked on drafting of law, but not speaking in this role. When you collect signatures, it is on law in its entirety and thinks this law will not pass a change by referendum - but that people might learn from experiences with this law. He wants to add too that this may be a first instance of blocking and that many other groups will pick up on this and there will be other battles that will be more likely winnable. This one is unlikely. He recommends avoiding signature collection as ISOC. Not much of a point of doing this with effort involved.

Noted: Charles Geiger: agrees with Jens. it is un-winnable and we have some interesting bedfellows... this could tarnish our reputation.

Wolf Ludwig noted this is touchy and there is no chance here to win. For the time being it may stop a stupid law and gains a lot of public discourse, but having to promote this concept of discourse as democratic process is an aspect to support referenda, but taking chances on touchy subjects leads us into potential bigger challenges, including things like copyright law issues. He is in favour of trying to support it, but it may fail.

Question: Alexandre Suter asked if the law is final - or could be changed? Bernie noted that the National Council put network blocking back into the law, however added provider compensation. The Committee of legal affairs of the Council of States has later removed provider compensation (maintaining network blocking). Next instance is Council of States... so Alex noted the law has some differences and issues in it to still be resolved. Is it worth lobbying for this? Bernie noted that 3/4 of the council members voted to include network blocking in this law. Also he stated that in his opinion there should be no blocking, but fear is same as what Wolf said too, may damage the long term potential of open internet freedoms here.

Proposal: Richard Hill proposed that he agrees with much of what has been said. He does not agree that we are likely to lose. Gave some examples. Agrees that the debate is worth it, even if we may lose. But it is premature here. Will referendum committee focus on only blocking? Or other stuff in the context of the law? What are their arguments? He proposed that the Board

should consult membership of ISOC CH through PPAC on whether or not to support with referendum when it happens?

Noted: Markus Kummer noted that he agrees. But the line in the sand should be gambling, and should not be expanded (copyright, etc). Collecting data and shed what happens and then later analyse the data and discuss it at that point as part of a public debate. What should be ISOC CH objective: stopping all of the proposed law - as we may lose more.

Noted: Norbert Bollow noted that as soon as there is noise on a referendum, and then it does not happen - it fails for whatever reason - losing a lot of credibility at this point. As soon as there is public awareness on this ISOC CH can support this aspect.

Noted: Alexandre Suter supports what Richard Hill says, cannot support until we know exactly what this referendum is about. Also what Markus said, prepare a motion in Parliament to task Federal Council to prepare report after law is in place after 1-2 years to measure effectiveness of the law.

Noted: Jens Kaessner noted it is a vote for all the Swiss voters (accept law... yes or no?) And will not be discussion of the heart of network blocking. This is the issue.

Noted: Hernâni Marques noted another example of a law rejected for similar points (limiting a small aspect to network blocking), gave examples of various politicians' points of view, and the political will is not clear here. if there is no resistance then the Parliament sees this maybe as carte blanche to do other laws to restrict net freedoms. Symbolic to lend support.

Noted: Alexandre Suter: on issue of tax reform, as noted by Hernâni, the law is being sold to public as not affecting the public in the end and that it is a good idea.

Debate closed.

VOTE on proposal by Richard Hill that the Board should make a decision after the referendum is announced and after consulting the PPAC list: 16 for waiting, 0 against waiting, 1 abstained. The proposal was accepted.

Charles Geiger left meeting at 20:15.

Robert O'Riordan left meeting at 20:30

Closing: Meeting was closed at 20:30 by Roxana Radu, Chair.