

Minutes of Meeting - CDG Weekly Call – 09 May 2016

The purpose of this call is to more or less wrap-up the charter document that is currently displayed on Adobe Connect.

No need to go through every section of the document, the group is more or less in agreement on most of the text in there.

After the call, Fahd starts cleaning up the document with Walid, since he actually signed up to clean up the document.

Fahd circulated an email on Saturday evening, requesting that we add text to section since the group suggested that we can actually work on them probably towards, once the other sections are more or less final.

So, again we keep going section by section. Since the first two sections, the mission, and the scope, the text is more or less clean; so we start with the following section, which is the **working methods**.

So for the first two sections, we may have some minor comments; three very quick remarks. First, it's proposed that we replace *needs* with *requirements*, just to avoid the redundancy because we've already said the needs in the previous sentences.

Maybe on this call we should be more focused on the essence of script rather than same wordings whether it could reflect what we want or something like that. Otherwise, we can keep on updating the text as many times as we want. We hope that after this call, we can come up with a clean document, where the majority of the group members are in agreement. The heavier weight of the text is more or less in the document.

For the scope, is it clear that we have agreed on whether we want to insert that the scope is limited to the Middle East and adjoining countries region? Second comment is that we can have the sentences joining together: The scope of work of the Middle East and the adjoining countries strategy working group is to develop a three-year strategy plan, but should cover also developing, establishing, building, or includes developing. And the final point on bullet number two, at the very end, we mean to say, and what worked well.

Next session, working methods

So there is some text that have been added, but more or less the text that was there is kind of okay by the group.

For the first paragraph, will hold face to face meeting as deemed necessary and appropriate. It doesn't read well, it gives both options that it may not hold the face to face meetings if there is no need, but replacing *will* with *may*. If it's necessary and appropriate, then the working group may or may not hold face to face meetings.

For the part that says the working group will agree among themselves, or by no formal opposition on logistical matters, we mean here is that we will agree by explicit consent, or by no formal opposition. So maybe inserting, **by explicit consent** or **by no formal opposition** would be better. And, if we mentioned

Google Docs, then we might mention others as well. And if we, at any point, would like to use these other tools, it would be limiting. Is it necessary to include them or not?

In the section where it says, moreover members should participate actively, we can just say membership participate actively in the work. It's a good opportunity now to decide on which language we want to keep in the working methods, and which ones to delete. It's more about putting the things in right language, and different people might have different opinions about that. When we write well, it mandates that we have to do it; we have to use the word *may* because it does not oblige us to do it, or to not to do it.

Regarding the tools, if we used something like **etc. or such as**, because such as does not oblige us to use the same. It is just a guideline, okay, we can do this, this and this. It does not oblige us. If we don't have **such as**, then it is an obligation, but keeping it with such as or etc. in the end, we can edit as much as we want in the list, so we're going to add more to that list, by no means, it means that the list has to be full of all possibilities.

The members are actually striving to reach consensus, and not rough consensus. And in case consensus could not be reached, then it would be rough consensus. The definition of rough consensus via the IETF. The IETF actually was the first group to adopt this sort of rough consensus methodology. And it's from Wikipedia and it reads, "Working groups make decisions through a rough consensus process. IETF consensus does not require that all participants agree although this is, of course, preferred. In general, the dominant view of the working group shall prevail. However, dominance is not to be determined on the basis of volume or persistence, but rather a more general sense of agreement. Consensus can be determined by a show of hands, humming, or any other means on which the WG agrees, by rough consensus, of course. Note that 51% of the working group does not qualify as rough consensus and 99% is better than rough. It is up to the Chair to determine if rough consensus has been reached.

Let's note the comments made by Naveed, such as which is not definite, it could be including those and others. As part of the paragraph, the first paragraph is more or less enough, because it does the explicitly, does explain what is necessary or needed, which is a rough consensus. And if that is not achieved directly, then there can be help from ICANN.

So maybe the first paragraph makes a better, more diplomatic text that brings in a good notion of what we should do together: members will work to reach rough consensus if this is what the group agrees to. This language sounds as if we cannot reach consensus, then it's going to be escalating to ICANN staff. And this is why we try to reflect in the alternative text that ICANN staff will be facilitating our discussions, helping us to reach consensus.

But we don't want it to sound as if we're not in agreement, then we're bringing up the issue to ICANN staff and escalating to ICANN staff. So, this is the reasoning behind, the alternative text.

ACTION: We take these two paragraphs to the mailing list, and maybe the group can work on the wording of this paragraph. And maybe within the next 24 to 48 hours.

BAHER's Q: Why are we referring here to the review of the strategy? If this is something about the membership of the working group, should this be included in this section about working methods? Or it should move to section on membership; should this text remain under working methods or moved to the membership section?

If we are seeing and the working group is for three years, then they should be continuously meeting and seeing if the strategy is being fruitful or not. So a review does not mean a complete review or analysis, it's just to see if things are going well and if we need to add something or maybe to subtract something from the strategy.

Regarding the membership, if we, the community agrees and move there, because this is the place where it's first put it. It is more about how you work together. But if this is the essence of this text, it's about how the working group is going to review the strategy during its lifetime, then fine. We may need to tweak the text a little bit, clarify that further.

Next section: Deliverables

BAHER' s Q: Point number four, an online dashboard would be things about the actions taken by the working group. Who is going to deliver this dashboard and how? It could be that the facilitator who is in ICANN staff does this, just like they did with the earlier group. For example, at Internet Society, they have secretary, or someone working within the staff, who simply just adds the links to any meeting or activity that's been done.

"Online dashboard" is a very broad term. It could go from very basic sort of kind of thing, to a complete system that, something similar to phase four. This little detail is required from the charter working group, it's important to point out and to emphasize that the strategy working group has to come with some KPI to measure performance progress and so forth, but then to sort of make some commitments, on behalf of other groups about something to be developed, without certainty about this thing, that's a bit risky.

This is quite some detail about what we expect, so we might need to dilute it a bit, so we need to work on point number four to make more expressive of what we expect, and not to dictate about we want this, this, this, or this. Up to the working group about how they come up something. We should only propose about what is generally expected of them.

The working group won't have time to review the old strategy. So the analysis might not be one of the deliverables here, so this is something that others might want to comment, because analysis somehow is what have already been done to some extent, and some part of it we are already reviewing it under this chapter and scope.

Just a piece of information for the rest of the group it's about Baher E and Fahd B are currently assessing and reviewing the current strategy, which actually ends of 30th of June. They'll be sharing this information with the current Middle East strategy working group on the future and Middle Eastern and surrounding countries strategy working group

If we had a deliverable called old strategy analysis, a document that would analyze the previous strategy, it is not what we mean here. That just meant that we build on the previous strategy, see what didn't work very well, build on what worked well, and this is already stressed elsewhere in the document. But if it is a deliverable, then it is more of an analysis document. Then it will need a lot of work unless it's going to mainly use the document already produced, or the working group is going to already use the document.

Next section: Membership

Do we really need a selection committee, do we even have the time for it? A strong commitment cannot really be guaranteed by having a selection committee. We can guarantee strong commitments, abiding,

for example, the members with a minimum number of absence, or a required number of attendance, or required number of working hours. The members can self-nominate themselves or someone else might nominate them, or something like this, but we can specify how we can go about it.

This is important point. The membership, the charter working group has to agree on what to include, what not to include under this section. There are three different item points that can go on this section. One is the strategy working group itself, and whether this group is going to be limited or open in its membership.

The point is, the selection criteria, and whether the selection criteria will be less to a separate group like the suggestion here is to have a selection committee. So are we going to leave this for the selection committee to develop a criteria? Or the charter working group is going to develop the criteria, and then the selection committee will do the selection accordingly? And the third point is about is the process itself, the nomination process. Whether this is something for the charter working group to develop, or it's the selection committee. And of course, assuming that there would be a selection committee according to the text. The group may also agree that a selection committee is not, but then the question remains about the process and who is going to make the selection and how.

So, we have these three things that we need to think about: the group itself and its membership, the selection criteria, and the nomination process.

Walid proposes having the members of the earlier strategy working group, compose any membership committee to assist the ability as new members to dedicate enough time to the work. The selection committee might be composed of some non-contesting members of the old working group, because that might be a best way to evaluate the needs and requirements that a member should have in order to be a member of this. Naveed is strongly opposed of an open group for that. It has to be a closed group, because only then you can expect some kind of commitment.

If we do have a selection committee, it's up to the selection committee to put the criteria, upon which it will achieve the members. Regarding the nomination; it should be included in the charter, how the members are nominated. And it doesn't have to be left to the selection committee.

We had this discussion earlier, whether the membership should be open or limited in terms of the number of members and we have gone through the pros and cons for both the open and the limited options. And the cross-community working groups on ICANN accountability and IANA transition, they boasted a good compromise, to me at least, which was having a core membership group, but keeping the participation open. Everyone is able to participate, but again there is a core membership group who, manageable in size, and also who can hold the pen, and push things forward, and draft things, and so on.

The participation and the input were kept open. This sounded like a good compromise, but again it's up to the group to decide whether this is a good approach or not. We can always cut off members that are not participating effectively, after the first year.

This section needs some more work to be done. It depends on how easy or complex the group on this membership process. It is better that we take this discussion to the mailing list.

Next section: Working Group identification.

Some members of the group feel that there was a need for a chair, a vice-chair, a secretary, a facilitator, and then the members. This is something that we can leave that open to the working group itself. If they

want a chair, a vice-chair, a coordinator for something. So we should not bind them to having a particular thing, so either we say that these might be the rules that we can have in the group, just to leave that open. But if we specify that these are the rules, the different rules that the group will have, so that would have like the group to have those particular rules, and that might not be thought provoking, and if they need adjustment later on for something else, so that will have some problem or some opposition because of not following the charter.

The charter working group wants to include something in the charter about rules of some of the members like chair, vice-chair, etc. But let's try to keep these specific codes to the minimum possible. Again, in order to give more flexibility for the working group to organize itself.

Next section: timeframes

We should review this, whether we need a plan because that is again going to be an obligation for the group. And keeping this timeline, strongly depends on when that group is created and how many members are we going to have, and how active there are going to be. We should not have these dates and all of that. We have deliverables that is enough, if we want to make that stronger, we should work on that deliverable section and should exclude this timeframe section, because that is a kind of a binding that we might not be following later on in that group. So let's continue this discussion online on the mailing list, and let me also suggest a way forward.

Now we want to bring the work of this chartering working group to conclusion by end of this week. And then Fahd together with Walid would clean up the document and come back to us with some clean text.

Let's try and in light of today's discussion and inputs, to finalize the text on the Google Doc, until end of business day on Wednesday, and then take the last couple of days of this week to clean up and finalize the document.

Well, if there is a need for another call, we can have one, if not, we will continue and hopefully finalize the work on the mailing list. We can also have a meeting on Monday rather than on Wednesday.