

# Minutes of Meeting

## MEAC-SWG Call 7 – Wednesday 31 August 2016

---

The seventh call for the MEAC-SWG took place on Wednesday 31 August 2016 at 10.00 – 11.00 UTC. The call had 7 members and observers of the MEAC-SWG, and 3 ICANN staff members.

On the Call we had Walid Al-Saqaf (Chair), Abdelhamid Al Abbadi, Chokri Ben Romdhane, Manal Ismail, Nadira Alaraj, Zahr Bou-Ghanem, and Zied Bouziri. And from ICANN Staff, we had Baher Esmat, Milena Timurcuoglu, and Fahd Batayneh.

The agenda for the call included

- 1) Welcome and an appeal for more member participation in SWG;
- 2) Update about progress with the strategy flow diagrams;
- 3) Update about the process to clean tracks 1 and 2;
- 4) Towards creating the first draft of the strategy document; and
- 5) AoB.

### Welcome and an appeal for more member participation in SWG

The chair welcomed those on the call. He then stressed the need for more SWG members to contribute to the work in-hand as the amount of work injected by the SWG members in the past couple of weeks has faded.

*Nadira Alaraj* cited the dip in contributions to the imbalance of stakeholder representation. ICANN staff did stress that when the call was open for members to join the MEAC-SWG, it was an open call. Also, some of those who applied suggested not to “wear the hat” of their employers, but rather suggested to serve on the MEAC-SWG in their personal capacity as “end users” or “volunteers”. Finally, the Sols of all 48 members of the SWG are posted on the SWG’s working space online at <https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=59642230>.

### Update about progress with the strategy flow diagrams

The discussion was in relation to the 3 focus area charts found at <https://www.lucidchart.com/documents/view/5ad5e86b-9759-40da-9f8e-eb33eddaf60f>. The Chair was thanked for the immense work undertaken to develop these charts, and those on the call felt that the charts provided a clearer guidance on the way forward and what should the strategy document look like.

*Manal Ismail* suggested merging FA1 “DNS Security and Stability” with FA2 “Domain Name Industry”. The Chair indicated that doing would require consensus by members and suggested that Manal take this discussion to the mailing list to get feedback from the SWG members. The Chair did however agree with Manal on the need to move any actions from one diagram to the most relevant one to eliminate any confusion.

ICANN Staff suggested renaming the three focus areas. The suggestion was to include the term “infrastructure” in FA1. As for focus area 2, those on the call indicated that it was more to do with the DNS business and market. So it was suggested to add an emphasis on that by adding the terms “business” or “market. As for FA3, and while ICANN still remains an advocate of the multistakeholder model, it was suggested to rename the title in accordance with ICANN’s 2016-2010 Strategic plan + ICANN’s mandate in relation to IG and not leave it as “IG multistakeholderism”, which was found to be too broad and leaving it may suggest that ICANN is stepping out of its “names and numbers” area of operation. The new names of all 3 FAs are to be discussed and agreed-upon by the SWG through the mailing list.

Additionally, it was agreed to change the third overarching goal title from “IG Multistakeholderism” to include ICANN’s mandate or role so that it becomes clear that the goal is to simply make ICANN’s work to promote IG multistakeholderism more effective but only within its own scope and mandate related to “names and numbers”. The exact title is to be agreed upon through discussions on the mailing list.

On discussions around FA2, *Chokri Ben Romdhane* suggested utilizing the MEAC DNS Study as much as possible. Members on the call also suggested empowering the DNS Entrepreneurship Center (DNS-EC) as a rich venue for implementing parts of FA2.

Under FA3, it was suggested to remove the action item that reads “Setting up an ad-hoc task force tasked to devise a method that vertically integrates civil society, government, business, and technical community engagement efforts of ICANN”. Nadira and Chokri agreed to follow up with this idea and see if it could fit under another action item.

### **Update about the process to clean tracks 1 and 2**

The Chair, Vice Chair, and ICANN Staff worked together on cleaning up track 1 and track 2 documents.

The track 1 document existed to assess the 2013-2016 Middle East Strategy. Later on, it moved towards showing what was missing and what did not work, and suggested to the new 2016-2019 strategy workarounds.

As for the track 2 document, it was intended solely to study the ICANN 2016-2020 global strategy, and come out with items and objectives that were not part of the 2013-2016 strategy. This was to ensure that the 2016-2016 MEAC Strategy goes in line with ICANN’s overall 2016-2020 global strategy.

Efforts will continue to clean up the two tracks and merging them into content that will be part of the eventual strategy document. Some of the ideas may be reflected in the diagrams and others may fit under other sections in the strategy document.

### **Towards creating the first draft of the strategy document**

The Chair, Vice-Chair, and ICANN Staff will collectively work on feeding the findings of track 1 and track 2 documents to develop the draft 2016-2019 MEAC Strategy.

The Chair proposed that the diagrams serve as the core part of the strategy document in the chapter dealing with the strategic focus areas (was chapter 5 in the last strategy document) to avoid the need

for tables and other excessive text. However, he did leave the door open for discussions around the final format of the document's structure.

The Chair said that the other parts of the strategy document, i.e., the introduction, Implementation plan, which contain statistics and operational and stakeholder information, will be updated by the ICANN Staff, who can always seek advice from members when needed.

### **Other Business**

ICANN Staff raised a couple of points. The first was the need to eliminate redundant objectives, recommendations and actions from the diagrams. The other was the need to consider the level of interest and readiness of stakeholders to collaborate when adding them to any of the proposed action items.

The Chair pointed out that it is difficult for members to know if those stakeholders are ready. He did however highlight the fact that unfulfilled actions in the earlier strategy document due to lack of interest by stakeholders were deliberately removed in the new strategy document. He added that there is an implied assumption that stakeholders that have been found active in the earlier strategy such as the Entrepreneurship Center in Egypt and others will remain interested.

The Chair urged ICANN Staff to inform the SWG members if any of the principal stakeholders mentioned in the action items have lost interest given that they cannot foresee this themselves.