

**GNSO Work Prioritization Model
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 02 February 2010at 1700 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO Work Prioritization Model meeting on Tuesday 02 February 2010 at 1700 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:
<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-wpmg-20100202.mp3>

Present for the teleconference:

Olga Cavalli - NCA Chair
Jaime Wagner - ISP
Chuck Gomes - Ry SG
Wolf-Ulrich Knochen - ISP

ICANN Staff
Ken Bour
Rob Hoggarth
Glen de Saint G ry
Gisella Gruber-White

Apologies: Stephane van Gelder

Coordinator: Please go ahead. The call is now being recorded.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you. Thank you very much. Gisella, could you help me please making a roll call of participants?

Gisella Gruber-White: With pleasure, Olga. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone on today's Web Prioritization Model Group call on Tuesday, the 2nd of February.

We have Olga Cavalli, Jaime Wagner, Chuck Gomes, Wolf-Ulrich Knochen. From south we have Glen de Saint Gery, Ken Bour, Rob Hoggarth and myself, Gisella Gruber-White. We have apologies from St phane van Gelder, and over to you Olga. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much, Gisella. And let me welcome Rob to this team. We have worked in other different teams. Rob, it's a pleasure having you here. We will miss you, but I'm glad that you are with us in this group.

Rob Hoggarth: Thank you, I have been working.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Nice to have you here. I enjoy working with you in other working groups, so I will do now. Okay, Ken sent a very long email with many details that, I must confess, that I read it, I think, three times. And there was a part of it that ended being very dense to me, so I decided to read all the comments from Chuck. Jaime just sent some very interesting comments, and also Wolf.

And I'm having a discussion with you now. I think that the purpose of Ken's email, and please correct me if I'm wrong, is how to move from a two-dimension graphic to a one-dimension list of projects, and how to get a right number for its prioritization. Am I correct, Ken?

Ken Bour: Yes, that's correct. I was looking at various alternatives and options, some of which, as you correctly point out, are dense and perhaps overkill. But I just wanted to be thorough and to give you guys as many options to consider as I could think of that would result in using the model that we have toward producing a single-dimension prioritization, which is what we had hoped to do.

And if you struggled with that material - and I apologize. My intent wasn't to put anybody under any intense pressure. But it is not a straightforward process. There are many ways we could go, and so - yeah, I'm not sure exactly what the best approach today is, in terms of trying to figure out how we get through Step 6. You know, one option might be just to kind of go back to the questions and try to see if we can try to answer some of those questions that I posed at the end of that document. I'll put that document up in a second, by the way.

Or we could go through the elaborate document in a little bit more detail, look at the comments that have been made, and talk about them. So I'm not really sure what the team's preference is here, so I'll just stop there.

Chuck Gomes: Well, this is Chuck. Let me kick off something here, see if it's helpful. If it's not, we can go another direction. But I think Jaime made a couple statements in his post that - certainly I agree with them. And it may help guide us.

Number one is that value is more important than the resources needed. I think that's true. Now obviously there's a limitation to resources and we have to live within limitations. But the bottom line is that value is more important than the cost, using that term broadly.

Ken Bour: Could I just interrupt quickly, just to make a comment?

Chuck Gomes: Sure.

Ken Bour: I wasn't suggesting that that statement wasn't true.

Chuck Gomes: I wasn't assuming you were, Ken. I just think that this may help us move forward if we focus on that a little bit.

Ken Bour: Yeah, yeah. The only point I wanted to make in the modeling is that when we use the same rating scale for both dimensions, it's not possible mathematically or arithmetically to make a difference between those quad groups.

Chuck Gomes: Right. No, I understood that. In fact that rung a bell with me, as you can tell, in my comments, too -- that that may be part of our problem, is that it basically assumes the same there.

Now I also thought that, Jaime, you made a good point with regard to the fact the cost -- the resources needed -- really comes into play. Obviously if you

just don't have enough resources. But also in cases where the values are comparable. So I wonder if we agree on those assumptions, that that helps us - oh, and one other thing. You know, I've never bought into the idea that we need to produce a linear prioritization. I think it'd be perfectly fine if we grouped projects and then prioritized those groups, rather than trying to do it perfectly linear, you know, order of priorities.

So I'll leave it at that, and throw it open.

Olga Cavalli: Can I say something? This is Olga. Chuck, I totally agree with you. And I'm sorry about the dense issue. It's my limitation. It's not that the material was...

Chuck Gomes: I had trouble, too, Olga. Don't feel bad.

Olga Cavalli: So please, Ken, I really appreciate the work that you do for us and please don't misunderstand me that - I read it two or three times just because my English has some limitations, and it takes me more time than reading in Spanish. Well anyway, my apologies for saying that.

And I agree with Chuck, and I wondered if we needed - and it's also a question for the group, if we really need this linear list of prioritized projects, or if we can leave with the two dimension. Because I think it's visually very rich, and that maybe it helps us grouping them among the GNSO.

Jaime Wagner: Can I come? Jaime?

Olga Cavalli: Sure, go ahead.

Jaime Wagner: First of all, I must apologize to Ken. I was a little bit harsh in my points here. And but I do feel that when we speak of priorities, we should at least try to come to a list, and a one-dimensional list. But I think the work that Ken did, mostly Ken, and he guided us until now, and the work of a two-dimensional rating is indeed valuable.

But it is valuable to get an insight of both of the projects and relative value, so relative resource usage. This is, I think, the council should do the work we have done so far. So but I favor a final output of one-dimensional list. Yes? So this is what a priority list is.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck again. Looking at the two-by-two chart, okay, and the way the Delphi results mapped out on that right now. I'm looking at that and I see, okay, if you go - if we consider value the most important, okay? If you look at that, there are three projects that came out at Value 6. And they each, according to our ratings, require different amounts of resources.

So why couldn't we consider, okay, those are three assuming - and obviously it's got to be the full council doing this, not just us. But let's just treat us like we're the final say here. And, you know, okay, those seem to be the highest value. Now if you go back and revisit that, do we really think they're all equivalent value? We can tweak it or something.

But, okay, now if those are the three highest value ones, and if there are enough resources to do all three at the same time, why couldn't we group those at the top as a group, rather than deciding which one's more important than the other?

The bottom line is we're going to have to - the GNSO will never work if we're not working quite a few projects at the same time. That's why I don't think we necessarily need one list, linear. We don't really have to decide whether the working group model is more important than the RAA, PDP or whatever. As long as we have some general guidance as to priority.

Now if, for example, on those three projects that are rated 6 right now, we decide we don't have enough resources to do all three, then we could go back and say, okay, what do we eliminate? You know? But until we're forced

into that situation, why force ourselves into making a linear list? I don't understand that, Jaime.

Jaime Wagner: Well, let me try to answer. First of all, following my reasoning, we would do a linear scale. RAA, PDP would be the first, WG second and FDI third. Even though we have resources to take all of them and put them into work, I think priorities list should say that if we favor - the one that should be favored - I took it the wrong way. FDI would be the first, yes.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, yeah. I agree. Yeah, I thought maybe you were reversing it. Thanks.

Jaime Wagner: Yeah, yeah. That would be the first, yeah. Even though we - if there is a - if functional, like an orientation from, not only in resources, resource allocation, but also in - any decision should be made would favor the project that we do prefer.

But I agree. All of them have the same value. So the one linear scale would be mostly value.

Chuck Gomes: And so we could take, using - okay. To produce a linear one, we could take this chart that we've produced and easily produce a linear list, okay? Considering value first, okay? So the list would go like this, then. If people are looking at the chart, it'll be easier to follow me.

Going in order from the highest priority, it'd be FDI, WG, RAA, CCP/JIG, IRZ and GCOT -- those are - obviously we have a couple there that are tied -- CSG, IDNF, CED, Abuse, IRTB, GO and Travel. I mean that's real easy to do, okay? And I follow that from this chart.

Now one of the problems, one of the things we need to realize, though, is like, for example, and I pointed this out in my comments, you take something like IRTB, that would be third from the bottom -- it's a requirement that we set on ourselves in the GNSO to review policies every so often, and the transfer

policy needs to be reviewed. So because it's low doesn't mean we can throw it out, but we can maybe slow it down or something like that. So...

Jaime Wagner: Yeah. But that's what priorities are for. I assumed all the prioritized projects will be tackled along the way. But how often, which, how strongly we will face them, and how - the speed of it will be - the word is missing for me. The speed of the project will be guided by priorities.

Ken Bour: Somebody help me out. What's STI stand for? I'm blank.

Olga Cavalli: Sorry? What's the question, Chuck?

Ken Bour: STI. What does STI stand for? I can't find it.

Glen de Saint Gery: Special Trademark Issues, Ken.

Ken Bour: Oh, yeah. Special Trademark Issues, okay. Why is that still on there? That's a different question.

Olga Cavalli: ...our exercise, and...

Ken Bour: Okay, that's fine. It's all right. So it's one that's kind of...

Jaime Wagner: One thing - this is Jaime. One thing that I do favor is that the value ratings should be done in different - in not only once. Because value sometimes is mistaken by anxiety, and the circumstances change. So sometimes when an issue is very discussed in the list and this can misguide the judgment.

Chuck Gomes: Well, Jaime, this is Chuck again. An interesting thought is that, okay, so maybe we need a broader scale for value, so that there's more differentiation. And that might accomplish what I think you just suggested. So, for example, if we had a ten, eleven-point scale for value, and keep the resource needed at

seven, the point is that we've got a lot of ties in value when, in fact, we probably don't rate STI, Working Group and RAA and PDP all the same.

Olga Cavalli: May I comment? I think that the broader scale could be a little bit - trying to find the word. I think it's difficult to define, when you have a bigger scale, to define the difference in between values in the scale. For the experience I have in other projects, already having a seven is like too much. Five is ideal. That's my experience in other projects. Maybe Ken can add something about that.

Ken Bour: My concern there, Olga, though is that it doesn't give us enough differentiation. I noticed you've got four projects there that are all come out at six in our Delphi ratings, and I think it's real easy to argue that they're not all equal in value.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah, you're right.

Jaime Wagner: This is Jaime again. I would agree with Olga that a higher scale wouldn't resolve the problem that I raised. The point I raised is that in different circumstances - I mean in a different time, or fifteen days, can be a difference in the perception of value from the council members.

So because one of the issues here is very discussed - but to be in the (unintelligible) doesn't make the - I don't feel the value increases or diminishes in the one-month circumstance difference. But the perception, yes. Because we are contaminated by anxiety sometimes.

Chuck Gomes: What if for value we were to start off - sorry for jumping around a little bit. But what if we were to start off by asking every participant in our case -- and we can do this exercise probably very quickly ourselves -- is just rank order all the projects from highest to lowest, and then just assigning numerical values. Then we could easily come up with a composite ranking for the whole group. Would that give us a better picture of value?

Olga Cavalli: Chuck, the approach that you mentioned, going from the left to the right considering resources, I think it's a very interesting approach.

Ken Bour: This is Ken.

Olga Cavalli: ...do a ranking. Yeah, Ken, sorry for interrupting.

Ken Bour: That's okay. I'm not sure if you'll remember, but a couple, maybe three or four calls ago we - I actually suggested that, you know, this four-quadrant approach has a level of sophistication and, as we can tell, some complexity to it.

And one of the critical assumptions that I think is going to cause us problems the way we have it set up, is this cross-contamination or correlation between the two dimensions which, according to the theory, should be independent variables. They should not have a lot of cross-correlation built into them.

And so, you know, one of the things that we could easily do, just because the number of projects that the GNSO is looking at is less than 20, right? And probably will always be in that range, is just to absolutely do as Chuck suggested: try to develop a simple, one-dimensional ranking on value only, and put them all in order, one through 15. And yeah, we could try that as a team.

Chuck Gomes: Well then, Ken - it's Chuck again. Then we could take the results of that and put it in this two-dimensional thing. I don't know if it would produce different results or not.

Ken Bour: I'm not understanding that point, Chuck. Are you saying keep the original resource? If you develop a prioritization one through 15, aren't we done?

Chuck Gomes: Well, but that only takes into consideration value, and we do still have to take into consideration the resources needed. So I was trying to say, okay, so we determine our values that way, and then we - then I guess we rank resources needed separately and use the combined rating.

In other words, I guess what I'm saying is we do the values separately from the resources needed, okay? And then we map the pair on this chart, just like we've done now. I'm curious what that would - result in anything different. Or is that essentially what we did?

Ken Bour: Well it's a little different in that we considered sort of the average project, and then those that were far above and far below. And so that was a calibration technique. But the prioritization would presumably not have that characteristic, right? You just say on value, STI's number one, and something else, Travel, is number 15.

And then you go over to the cost and you say the most expensive, resource-hogging project is X, and the one that gobbles up the least is Y. And so now you've got two. And I suppose we could - I'll have to play around with this. I think we probably could put those onto a single graph to chart them.

Jaime Wagner: This is Jaime. I'm not quite sure if I understood what Chuck was saying, but to give a new prioritization of cost of our means, resources needed, would - I didn't understand you, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Let me try again, and frankly I haven't tested this so I don't know if it works. But so we do the prioritization one through fifteen, okay? And then we come up with a consolidated prioritization based on all of our input, you know, averaged into one, okay? Separate from that, okay, go ahead.

Jaime Wagner: Just a point, but to come with a prioritization, we are already considering resources needed.

Chuck Gomes: But I wasn't. In the prioritization I was talking about, the first step, it was totally independent of any resources needed.

Jaime Wagner: Okay, okay.

Chuck Gomes: Just on value.

Jaime Wagner: Okay.

Ken Bour: Right. This is Ken, though. But you would - I think what Jaime just said is really important in that it is also possible to rank projects in order from one through 15, without splitting value and cost. Or if you could look at, say, this project is the most valuable because it delivers the highest amount of benefit in consideration of its cost.

So in other words, the question is just a more complicated question, but it generates a single prioritization, and it embeds or incorporates both dimensions into one question and one prioritization.

What we're trying to do, and we're fixated now on this because we've been doing it now for so long, is we've broken the two dimensions apart. And I think what Jaime may be suggesting is what if we just put them together, and consider one question. Is that right?

Jaime Wagner: Yeah. Yeah, but I think we would not be able to forget, each of us that already did this exercise, will not forget this model even though. And it will be engraved in our minds when we come to a priority list. I don't think that I was clear when I spoke, because I think our work on value should be put into different approaches.

Value is value alone, and the value doesn't change with time. The results that the project will give to GNSO will be the same. But what changes in time is the sense of urgency. I mean when there is a call from the board to make

something until such-and-such date, the perception of value changes. But the value in this doesn't change. But the perceptual value, the urgency changes. But this doesn't change the value.

So I think we should consider this urgency related value. That was what I was trying to say to make a different rating of value in different times, or to consider urgency as a separate, as a third action. But I don't know if it would add something. Was I clear?

Chuck Gomes: No, you said it. Jaime, I think I understand what you're saying, and urgency does have to be considered. I agree with that. In fact you look at this two-dimensional chart again, and you can pick out items that are more urgent than others. The PDP and the Working Group ones, in my mind, are pretty urgent because they affect everything we do. The Geo and Travel aren't unimportant, but they're not nearly as urgent as those other two. So and that's an important factor.

The more I'm experiencing our two-dimensional model, the less enamored I am with it. And by the way, Ken, none of this should be taken negatively on your part, because you've helped us. All that you've done, including the hard-to-understand argument in the one paragraph last time, it's helping us, you know, work through this. So it's all valuable, even if we don't end up using all of it.

Jaime Wagner: Yeah, completely agree.

Chuck Gomes: So I'm looking at this chart and, you know, how does it - there's so many other issues that come into play. The Geo one for example, which is the lowest and the easiest to do, you know? It's one that we have to participate in, so regardless of where we prioritize it, it's going to have to be done.

The Travel one is low, but it's a need that a lot of people have and it doesn't take, I don't think, a lot of resources there. So, you know, I'm just not finding

that this chart really helps us very much because there's so many other factors that come into play.

Jaime Wagner: Well, Chuck, I'm sorry but I disagree with you. At least for me, I'm a newcomer. This chart is very helpful and it helped me to put things in relative perspective. That is very straightforward to understand. So I do feel that this whole exercise should be undertaken by the whole council. I'm just adding if we should treat urgency as a different dimension, a side of value itself. Or it should be put together as we have done. We consider urgency and value altogether.

Ken Bour: This is Ken, and I see Wolf's hand was up.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, Wolf speaking. So I can fully agree to what Jaime was saying. So for me as well, the chart as it is right now, it's really, it's also helpful, you know? The question is really -- and that question was raised in your text as well, Ken -- in what specific ways will a prioritized list of projects assist the council? So that is the debated question.

And so I understand through this chart as being helpful for me, just to locate those projects in this graph, you know? With this kind of - to see what is going on relatively with each project to each other. And I have problems right now to transform it from this graph to a one-dimensional list, as well as you have, Chuck. Because I don't know what to do with that list then.

Because I also see from (unintelligible) point of view that we have to do some projects in future despite of their location in that chart. And that's one thing. But this chart anyway helps us to see where we are going to locate it. And maybe we can communicate that to those people who put prioritization on us. Let me say, from the board's point of view, or from the community or what else, yeah?

So that's all what I can see. And I think at the end, for me personally, it would also be enough to have some normally some kind of fundamental list, but a kind of sort of - what would you say - grouping, Chuck, or clouding. A cloud of projects where it can see, okay, these clouds, that's what you really have to do at first. And we can, within that cloud, we can, let me say, also be a little bit play around. But depending on the (unintelligible), and we shouldn't try now to over - to be big expectations for the accuracy of that cloud. That's what I would like to point out.

And at the end, you know, it was my comment which I made. I was only thinking about, you know, whether a kind of quantitative rating or ranking or scaling could be helpful instead of having more detailed ratings here.

Olga Cavalli: May I say something? This is Olga.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, Olga, your hand's up.

Olga Cavalli: I like this two-dimension graphic approach. I think for me it's very helpful. And it's literally very clear. So I would like to have it as a tool. And I also understand Jaime's concern about the urgency. Please remember that we also thought about having a third dimension, and we said not to go in that direction because it was very complicated.

My suggestion would be, and it's somehow related with what Wolf has just mentioned, maybe we can have some groups or clouds or grouping of projects, and then the council could order them in relation with the urgency. The problem that I see with that is that urgency will be very different from different stakeholdables, because just some projects are more related with registries, registrars' ruling and others are more related with non-commercial issues, and so that naturally will arise.

But that will be an interaction in between the GNSO and then this cloud of projects could be ordered in a linear list. That's my suggestion.

Jaime Wagner: This is Jaime. Can I comment?

Ken Bour: I noticed that Chuck had his hand up.

Gisella Gruber-White: Oh, yeah. Chuck has the mic, sorry.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, the - I'm just, you know, by the way I like the two-dimensional. It just can't be used in isolation I think is what my concern is. It's because there are other factors that aren't really measured here. But I'm really interested in the urgency issue separate from value. I mean they can be combined, but what's running through my mind now, it wouldn't be very hard, probably, to do the two-dimensional matrix. And instead of having resources needed on the bottom, have urgency.

And you're right, Olga. Urgency will vary by constituency, but that's the same thing with value. Value will vary like urgency, too. So we know that. Hopefully that averages out. But it wouldn't be very hard to use the two-dimensional chart like this with value on the y-axis and urgency on the x-axis. And it would give us a pretty nice picture of priority without looking at resources. And then take that information and map it against - not on the same chart, because it gets complicated. Map it against the resources needed and modify our priorities based on that.

Jaime Wagner: Can I?

Gisella Gruber-White: Sure, Jaime, go ahead.

Ken Bour: Try again, Jaime, go ahead.

Jaime Wagner: Well I would like to agree with Chuck because it's a two-way agreement. I think we should make an effort, a quick effort, to have these two dimensions: value separate from urgency. Because urgency relates indirectly to value.

The urgency relates to terms and time and also to the loss of value -- the risk of loss of value. So I think I favor an exercise on the two dimensions: value against urgency.

But here the difference that is here, we should come up with one referring urgency and value come up. And then we could put in the chart raising resources needed. And what I would like to agree with Chuck differently from my first opinion, is that we could (unintelligible) things like that. We could have this chart like we have here without the need to put in that one dimension, one final dimension.

If we are much more thorough in our consideration of value and urgency, I think we could leave this chart, this two-dimensional chart, considering resources needed as a guideline. Not only for us and for the council, but also as Wolf said, it would be to others that demand work from GNSO.

Ken Bour: With the group's indulgence, Rob Hoggarth, who is not in the room and therefore can't raise his hand, has asked via Jabber if he could speak.

Rob Hoggarth: Thanks. Yes, I raised my hand virtually. My apologies for not knowing the answer to this question. I don't know if you guys have considered it, and I realize it risks taking the discussion in other directions.

I don't know if you've gone through this as you've considered the concept of weighting, W-E-I-G-H-T, you know, because you keep referring to urgency. And I can see how that would develop when there's a board request, for example, in the FDI instance. You might weight a particular project more strongly with PDP. That might be compared with a PDP that's, you know, on-point and consistent with the GNSO issue or not.

So I just don't know if you guys considered that. If it adds extra levels of complications, please ignore the suggestion, but I just wanted to get that two cents in.

Jaime Wagner: I think weighting would be the same as rating, no? In a different scale.

Rob Hoggarth: Well I guess one of the challenges you all have is, you know, if you go back to the fundamental reason for this group and, you know, for the whole purpose of the exercise, it's to make decisions as a council in terms of what you work on and what ideally you can't work on. Although we wish we could do everything.

And you have to in some way assure that everyone's operating on a common system. Jaime, you might rate something more urgent because it's of particular interest to your part of the community. And Chuck may rate it higher based on his. I don't know if there's even the capability of having a common rating system to find a way so that you're comfortable, that when Chuck rates something, you guys are at least thinking about it in a common way.

Because I think the fact that different people will bring different scales to things adds another level of complexity that you all may not want to deal with either.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck, and I know Wolf's got his hand up. I'll be real brief. Just in response to that, Rob, and you weren't with us when we did this, but that's one of the reasons why I like doing these ratings as a group. Because it helped us come together somewhat in terms of understanding and rating and so forth.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. Wolf?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yeah, okay. Wolf speaking. Well with regard to urgency, I think urgency should not substitute resources needed, as you were asking here, Ken. Because it's an additional parameter which overwhelms the others -- may overwhelm the others. Because, okay, it's something which comes on top and which we can, as council, may not have influence on. Because it's put on

us from the board or from the community pressure or what else it comes from.

So I would say okay, leave it as it is -- the chart -- with value and resources needed. And then after having located the project within that chart, then we can put in addition the question on each project - and, you know, the projects which seem to be not prioritized in this list which I mean, below say the four-point-zero line, so what is it about? (Unintelligible) those questions. (Unintelligible) those projects.

Because I think anyway, we will have to do a number of projects which are not far below of the existing projects in parallel. So well the first question would be for me, if the number of projects we have at the time in our (unintelligible), which are turning out either too much at the time being, what are we talking really about? Do we talk about numbers of projects beyond the number of, let me say, five or six or what else? And all depending on the amount of work to be done.

But let's ask ourselves critically, is it what we are doing right now? A number of project, if it's too high, do we have to withdraw from some projects for the time being and (unintelligible) them.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Wolf. This is Chuck. By the way, I want to be real clear. I was not at all suggesting that urgency replace resources needed. They're separate issues that have got to be dealt with. What I was suggesting is we first map value against urgency, because those are, you know, have similar meaning, I think, that are more closely related. And then, based on those results, we then consider the resources needed to modify whatever results we got from that.

And by the way, I think you could do it the other way, which is I think what you said, Wolf, is that you could do value and resources against each other and then consider urgency, and modify your results that way. I think that

would work, too. I think my own opinion was is that urgency and value go a little bit more closely together than resources needed.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Jaime Wagner: This is Jaime. I entirely agree with Chuck. I was not saying that urgency should (unintelligible) resources needed (unintelligible). But I would like to add a comment to what Chuck and Olga were discussing a little bit ago when they said that value and urgency would be perceived differently from by different parts of different communities.

What I think is that I totally agree with value, but urgency has - I interpret urgency in two ways. One way is a very objective way that urgency relates to time terms. If we have time terms they are objective. We have a schedule and this schedule works for everybody in the community. So there is a term and it's objective and okay.

What is subjective is there is another point of urgency that is subjective, that is anxiety. Then somebody will have more anxiety with something that has more value. This is the difference. I mean subjective urgency is equal to value, because you have anxiety in front of something that is (unintelligible) of perceived value for you.

So when I add the concern with urgency, I was not considering subjective urgency or value or anxiety, being what it is. But I was considering objective urgency. If there are objective terms and dates and mandates to do that in a sort of time frame, then the urgency can be considered. Hello, everybody?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, Jaime. It's Chuck again. So in a case like the GNSO improvement work teams that are listed on there, the Working Groups, the PDP, the CCT, CSG, GCOT -- all of those things. The board wanted all that done in six months, so they gave us the six months. I think Rob can correct me, but they

said they wanted it all done in six months. So we had an objective time frame that we needed to get that done.

So is that what you mean by objective? A specific target that it was supposed to be completed by, rather than our own subjective evaluation in terms of the time sensitivity of it?

Jaime Wagner: Yes. And also if the time frame, the time term has to do with other things that are going and would imply some loss, I mean even though when there is not mandates from the board. And I mean, for instance, say that something that relates to the new (GTOB)s that will have an event, and something should be done before this event, even though there is not a mandate to do that, there is a term, a time term, that should be considered. This is an objective urgency that would imply loss if not done until that date.

Olga Cavalli: This is Olga. How do we move forward with this idea about urgency and a possible third dimension and list of priorities?

Jaime Wagner: My suggestion would be to do like - it's not mine, it's Chuck's suggestion -- to do an exercise, the next exercise, on considering urgency and value as two dimensions, and then come at this first exercise to the one that is already done with resources needed. And leave the map the way it is, but only with the first consideration of value against urgency. I think this is what Chuck recommended, and suggested, and I fully agree with that.

Chuck Gomes: Well it would be interesting to at least see if that, you know, worked. I don't know whether it will be helpful or not, but I don't think it would be too hard to do. Ken, what do you think?

Olga Cavalli: That was my question to Ken.

Ken Bour: You know this whole discussion reminds me -- and I was Jabbering with Rob about this -- it reminds me of the Stephen Covey time management matrix

which looks at exactly the two variables, urgency and importance. So if you substitute value for importance, and urgency has its time sensitivity or criticality, I think we would probably change the - well obviously we would change the definition for one axis, right?

And probably the scale would change, right? Because we wouldn't say average urgency far above, far below. What we might say is urgent, and then on the other side, maybe a seven would be not urgent. And we would find words in between that connote variations there. So in this case the scales would look a little different, I think.

We could really, I think, to get through to this next step, we could keep our value ratings that we've already done and just ask the team to do an urgency rating for each of the projects on the existing list. And then I could throw that chart together in a hurry and we could take a look and see what it is. That's point one.

My second comment is that the more I have been involved in this project, and the more I think about it -- and I have spent a fair amount of time -- I'm beginning to become less enthralled with the concept of resources needed or cost or however else we want to characterize that other thing we used before.

And here's the reason. If we ended up with a - well, even a four-quadrant model that looked at urgency and looked at value, what ends up happening at the end is, just as you would do if you were an individual and you've got a bunch of things to do, and you can only do 12 of them, and you've got 15. Or you can only do 10 of them. You assign your resource, your availability, based on urgency and value, right?

So you would do the quadrant one things, which are the most important, the most valuable, and the most urgent first. And then as you have more time, you would start to do the things that are important, but maybe not as urgent. You have the same quadrant two, quadrant three problem because you have

things that are urgent, but not important, or not valuable. And you have things that are valuable, that are not urgent. And so you still have to figure out how to deal with those two quadrants.

But obviously the things that are low value and not urgent would be in the bottom quadrant, and presumably they would be the ones that you wouldn't work on. So maybe the idea of resources needed isn't so much a variable in the plan as it is an exercise of decision making that occurs after the valuations are done. Let me stop there.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, this is Chuck. One thing -- going back to something you said very early on. I would make sure that sevens, or whatever scale we use, are the higher ranking on both axes. I wouldn't go the other way around. I think you worded it the other way around where one was higher. But that's a minor point.

Ken Bour: Yeah, thank you, Chuck. And I did learn that lesson and had to do the conversion. So we won't make that mistake again. I hear you.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, now the - by the way, I think it's easy to do the exercise you're talking about. I'm almost to the position where, with regard to the resources needed, on each project when we consider it, we're going to have to evaluate whether resources are available to do it. Because with regard to people resources, not staff -- I'm not talking about staff right now, that's obviously a different issue.

But to the extent that we as stakeholder groups and constituencies can get new people involved, we may be able to come up with the resources, even, you know, new resources, to help us do certain things. So we have some flexibility with regard to resources, at least from the community point of view, assuming we can continue to grow the participation in those things. And that may be a false assumption. I understand that. So, yeah, and I'll just leave it at that.

Jaime Wagner: I would like to add one consideration. This exercise on urgency, as I see it, I don't think we should consider subjective urgency. I think urgency should be - a computer should do the rating of urgency as I see it. Because if there's not a term, it's not urgent. If there is a term, then the lower the term, the higher the urgency. So another thing to be considered is, is this time term negotiable or not. If it is negotiable, it's not a real term. If so, this is what I think we should not have many discussions on the rating itself.

But yes, we should discuss what is urgency and how should urgency be considered. I think we should not consider the, what I call, subjective urgency. Because this is the fear of loss, the fear of losing some value. So it's indirectly linked or chained to the value perception. So we should consider only objective and time term and the proximity of a time term.

Chuck Gomes: Jaime, it's Chuck again. I see the value from an objective point of view, but I see a problem. Basically what we could end up with is a bunch of projects with regard to urgency at the seven level, and a bunch at the one level. Because, you know, and I suppose we could differentiate the sevens a little bit if their time frame is short. But you have an awful lot of projects on our chart right now that would be down at the one, just because there is no time limit set.

Jaime Wagner: Okay, then they have not urgency. But the ones that have the time frame, I mean if the time frame is next week, it's much more urgent than the other one that has next month. And I see that we have a bunch of projects at the one level, because they are not urgent.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, right. It's not as helpful, though, for those projects because they're all lumped in the same place. So there's no differentiation.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I'm intrigued by this idea of objective determination, but I'm having trouble trying to think how we might actually do it. So for example, let's take the one that Chuck used earlier, which was we have a bunch of work

teams whose products were all due a year ago. Do they become sevens on a scale? Or, if they're already past due and not done, were they really not urgent?

I mean it still seems to me that there are interpretations to be made. If something is a year overdue, is this now even more urgent? Or less urgent?

Chuck Gomes: It's objectivity, totally.

Ken Bour: I don't mean to throw a - it's just I'm having trouble trying to think how I would grab some objective determination and apply it to these projects.

Chuck Gomes: I'm going to have to jump off guys, to another meeting that started about a half hour ago. But I will cooperate with whatever you decide.

Ken Bour: It is now one o'clock or just certainly thereafter, so I guess we should think about wrapping up.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, thank you, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: Ken, could you please help us with trying to figure out how to exercise this idea, I mean, about - I do think that objectivity with urgency are not very compatible. I think different people will have different visions about urgency, and that's fine. That's okay. So I'm not sure how to implement all this. But maybe, Ken, you can think about something to help us?

Ken Bour: I would be happy to.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Thank you so much. And I think that we should be finishing, unless we have more comments.

Jaime Wagner: Ken, I will send some thoughts to you. You don't read Portuguese, yeah?

Ken Bour: No, sorry. Although I'm about one-quarter Portuguese by ancestry, I don't speak the language.

Olga Cavalli: I can translate. I can translate, Jaime.

Jaime Wagner: I will translate or I will send to Olga and she can help me translate it, okay?

Olga Cavalli: I speak Portuguese, so I can translate.

Jaime Wagner: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: If it's not too long.

Ken Bour: Okay, and then I'll try to get - should we go for a doodle for - or try the same time next week?

Olga Cavalli: I will be traveling next week, but you guys can meet anyway. I mean, I will be in Geneva.

Ken Bour: Okay. Is there any time next week that you are available?

Glen de Saint Gery: Ken, could we rather keep that date? Because with all the calls, it becomes very trying. Sorry, this is Glen.

Ken Bour: Thank you, Glen. Great input. So we will keep the same time, same date. And do our best. So, I'll try to get...

Olga Cavalli: I may join if it's at night in Geneva time. I mean at 9:00 or 10:00 in Geneva time, but I don't know if it's other - if it's the other people's agenda.

Glen de Saint Gery: In Geneva time it will be six o'clock, Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah, and, yeah. Today it's Tuesday. I'm not sure. I may also be traveling in between Germany and Geneva.

Jaime Wagner: So it would be at 1700 UTC next night?

Glen de Saint Gery: That's right.

Ken Bour: That's right.

Olga Cavalli: But don't be fully sure that I will join, because I will be traveling and sometimes that complicates things. So try a time and a date that fits you, and I will try to join if it's in the evening or night of Geneva.

Ken Bour: Okay, and I'll take any input, Jaime, that you have to give. And I'll try my best to synthesize today's discussion into some thoughts, and noodle it around a little bit, maybe talk with Rob and see if we can propose something that we could actually do at the next session.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Ken.

Jaime Wagner: I will send you some thoughts on urgency. That was what I have here.

Ken Bour: Okay. That sounds great. Okay, well thank you all.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, everyone. Good-bye. Thank you.

Ken Bour: Bye-bye.

Glen de Saint Gery: Thank you. Bye-bye.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Bye-bye. Thanks, Ken.

Ken Bour: Thanks, Gisella. Thanks, Glen.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thanks, bye.

END