

Minutes of Meeting of the CDG Call of 27 April 2016

The agenda for this call was to discuss the document which had been cleaned up and merged as of Monday 25 April 2016 by Fahd B. The group was given the choice to either run through the track changes document, or go through the cleaned version. The group agreed to run through the clean version, and if anyone could not locate his/her text, it can always be added provided the group agree to it.

It was agreed to run through the document section by section.

To understand the needs of the region, identify the challenges currently hindering the mission of the domain name industry which involves other things like encouraging the growth of internet governance within the region, and others, and set a three-year strategy plan to continue to resolve these challenges.

This group needs to work with ICANN on developing the strategy and possibly assisting in implementation as well.

It may also be helpful to differentiate the mission between what it is the working group is meant to do and what, how the strategy overall is meant to be managed in a way. This strategy is part of ICANN's strategic goals, and this is actually an ICANN led initiative, where ICANN consults regional community.

But the group itself can work transparently and conclusively with the community. The work of the group itself can be community led, but in the mission, it would be helpful to sort of point out that the working group is going to assist or work with ICANN to both develop and implement a three-year strategy.

ICANN has a role in implementing the strategy, and so would the working group.

We can include a part to the mission statement, which is building on the work of the first Middle East strategy working group. Thus, the mission still refers to the strategy itself and not the venue because it says to provide a venue to come up with a strategy. We may also opt to leave this part out of the mission, and then maybe address how the working group is going to look at the previous strategy and come up with the recommendations on that within the section on scope as opposed to the section on mission, where more specific tasks can be outlined.

These calls are great way to have a synchronized discussion between all of us on this, and there is obviously a great deal of interest in the future of this group and its charter.

People are actually agreeing that we can finalize the text to work on and that it's probably better to have it over the mailing list. And then maybe once the document is cleaned up, we can have another call where the group can just finalize it.

But this said we are not trying to finalize any text in this call; we were trying to update the text on the mission statement, trying to find consensus around some text. This means that this is going to be a second version of the section on the mission statement. And the aim was to do this section by section. And then provide the group with an updated clean version of the document.

A suggestion could be that we could maintain two versions of the document. The original one, with all the edits and the track changes, and version two which is a clean one

We need to focus on someone who can take over, take the initiative and begin to clean it up, so everyone else will be able to chime in with a comment on the right side. WALID AL-SAQAF is volunteering to take the lead and the responsibilities part, to clean up the document

The next section is on the scope. The idea of the review is that after the group starts its work, the strategy working group starts putting in its work, then this is a working group working to develop a strategy for the region.

We have to consider the fact that there might be some things that come up that the working group would like to include. The general feeling is that the group is okay with the first few points of the scope, but then on the fourth point, there is some kind of disagreement or confusion maybe.

The next section on working methods needs more work. The working group in the past has pretty much been a closed group that consults with itself as well as with staff, and to staff's credit, it was mainly staff that was consulting with the broader community outside of the working group and made a large effort to do this.

The working group should possibly also include this in its working methods, and as part of the requirements of it conducting its work. As in the GNSO example, the working group consults with the broader community at different stages of its work.

It's also important to point out how the decision making is done, there is a collaboration between the working group and ICANN itself because the scope of the working group will include certain elements.

Pointing out in the working methods that the relationship between the working group itself and ICANN and how the coordination is conducted, it is an important aspect of putting the working methods. And we can say that decisions will be made within the group through rough consensus.

Membership section reveals some Questions: What do people believe should be the determining factor in membership? Is it more important that membership be representative of different groups? Or is it more important that membership focus on those who can actively contribute to the mission of the working group and the overall strategy? Or is it a mix between both would be something that is more desirable?

Diversity in many different ways is found to be very desirable in terms of representation. Sometimes it works well, sometimes it actually defeats the purpose that it is meant to serve. It's really important to make sure we have active members on this group who can really contribute effectively. That it's more important than a diversity of stakeholders

If the charter working group is suggesting a framework for the membership of the strategy working group, then it should also suggest a selection process. The selection process could be a simple one. So this is something this group should also spend some time pondering about. Normally the charter would identify the membership and how the membership should look like, and then call for members for the new Middle East strategy working group

This section will actually define the membership for the new strategy working group. Some of the confusion here may be the difference between the membership of the charter drafting team and the membership of the next MEAC strategy working group.

It would be very difficult to develop this section without developing the deliverables. So if we agree on what is going to be delivered, then we can agree on the milestones and target timeline.

Action Items

- Fahd will extract the Google Doc from online, and will just share it with the strategy working group,
- And Walid can take an initial stab on clearing up the parts that he signed up for, and maybe we would need others to clean up the other sections of the document.
- We can maybe agree on like 24 hours or 48 hours for people to continue editing and proposing, and then we go through a freeze period where, if you're going to have a clean version and then we can discuss it on the mailing list as suggested, section by section
- We, staff, Fahd and Baher, can share with the group a clean document, hopefully by tomorrow (28thApr.2016)
- If any of the group members stops any text that is missing, was not included, or was taken out, just flag this to Staff and we'll make sure that the text is back into the document.
- The goal here is to start from a clean document after making some progress about some of the sections, and then Amr can, start putting some input on the working methods, and so forth
- By end of next week (6thMay2016), the group will have reached consensus on the text, but at least a semi-final document.
- The week of May 9th, we would like to have a final call for this group to finalize this document as a charter document for the strategy working group.