

**GNSO Work Prioritization Model
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 06 April 2010 at 1700 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO Work Prioritization Model meeting on Tuesday 06 March 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-20100406.mp3>

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#apr>

Present for the teleconference:

Olga Cavalli - NCA Chair

Jaime Wagner - ISP

Chuck Gomes - Ry SG

ICANN Staff

Ken Bour

Glen de Saint Géry

Apologies:

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen – ISP

Coordinator: Excuse me. I'd like to remind all participants this conference is being recorded. If you have objections, you may disconnect at this time. You may begin.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much, operator. Thank you. Glen, please be so kind to help me do a roll call.

Glen de Saint Géry: Certainly, Olga. Good morning. Good afternoon. Good evening everyone. On the call today the Work Prioritization Model Call we have

Jaime Wagner, Chuck Gomes, Olga Cavalli. And for Staff we have Ken Bour and Glen de Saint G ry. Thank you, Olga. Over to you.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much, Glen. Thank you. Hi. I hope you had nice Easter. Thank you for joining. Ken, thank you for the documents. I reviewed them in general, and I think they are fine. Should we try to finish them today? That's the plan for today, I guess.

Ken Bour: That would be my recommendation, Olga. This is Ken.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. We will do our best to find a common text that everyone is happy with. So also, I would like to comment about something that was suggested in your last email, and Chuck made a comment about the OSC involving - or presenting this to the OSC. And, should we discuss this now at the beginning of the call, or do we have to talk about this maybe a few minutes after we're finished? Any idea?

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I would suggest that we get our documents in line and the letter, and then we can perhaps talk about logistics and that kind of stuff.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. I see the document with (vology) in the Adobe. Should we start with it, Ken? Is that your advice for the first step?

Ken Bour: Yes, Olga. It is. The - and right now, it's just you and me in the room, so...

Olga Cavalli: Oh, but I thought that Glen said there was Chuck and then Jaime?

Ken Bour: They are on the phone but they are not in the room.

Olga Cavalli: Oh, you're right. Very (interesting).

Ken Bour: Yes. Chuck is in his car and Jaime is in a Taxi, so - and Rob said he might be about 20 minutes late. So, it's just - right now, we'll just - so, I'm going to -- this is Ken -- I'm going to have to try to do my best to describe what I'm looking at and see if we can get concurrence as we move along. It shouldn't - maybe - this shouldn't be too bad. Let's see.

Is that all right for me to proceed?

Olga Cavalli: Jaime, Chuck, is this okay for you?

Jaime Wagner: Okay. Okay.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Jaime.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. That's fine.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Chuck.

Ken Bour: Okay. This is Ken. I'll begin. I want to just make a note that in our - so, I'm going to start with Section 6, and then I'm going to proceed to the Annex. I'm going to do this relatively quickly because I think everybody's had a chance to review the document, and there are very few changes to make. Some are just a repetition of what we decided last time. I'll just cover those briefly to make sure there's no - still no outstanding issue.

In the...

Chuck Gomes: Ken, this is Chuck. Just to let you know, I did not have time to review what you sent this morning, but I'm sure that's just the (sum) - a compilation of what we've been talking about on the list. Is that correct?

Ken Bour: That is correct.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you.

Ken Bour: And, I'll go over that in a bit more detail as we reach those particular sections of - so starting with Section 6, the top purpose. The only change that was recommended last time was the footnote, and I think it was Wolf who asked that we change that to say, "Procedures relating to the Council's project management role will be discussed subsequently." There's no other debate about that. That change is - will now be removed and cleaned up. And so, I'll pause there.

Then moving on, there were no changes in the rest of 6.2. In 6.3, in the Methodology section, as somebody noted, that the word paragraph should become section. That's changed. And in 6.3.1, we used to talk about primary and secondary factors. That now just reads rating factors. Actually, rating factor -- singular -- because we're only going to do value, right?

Olga Cavalli: Mm-mmm.

Ken Bour: And so, that's the only change to 6.3.1.

Then down under the procedure, 6.3.3, the sentence used to read, "The work prioritization process involves four major steps, and applies to rating value and under special circumstances, difficulty." That latter clause has been stricken, so it now just says -- let me get the - excuse me one second. Glen wanted to get into the room. The - it now just reads, "The work prioritization process involves four major steps:" and they are the same steps that we had before. And, that completes Section 6. Everything else is now in the Annex.

Jaime Wagner: Okay. Perfect.

Ken Bour: All right. So, why don't I just slide on down to the Annex. There were no changes -- let me just say it differently -- the first change was in New Project Additions, Section 1.2b, and let me just see if I can give you guys context for this.

Okay, you might remember we had some discussion about what happens after - when we're looking at a new project, we're trying to determine what to do with it. What we had written was, "The Chair will announce staff's recommendations," this has to do with its eligibility or non-eligibility and classification. We said, "The Chair will announce staff's recommendation and ask for Council approval." This is newly added language. "If an objection is raised, counselors will be polled to determine support. If the project is categorized as non-eligible, no further action is required. If it's categorized as eligible, it will be prioritized at the next scheduled Work Prioritization Session."

So, the new language was if an objection is raised, counselors will be polled to determine support. And, I guess I just want to ask if that's - does that sound acceptable?

Chuck Gomes: Ken, just one thought there. What happens if the next Prioritization Session is a long ways off? Should we work it with just a little bit more flexibility in case there's a need? This is first time I thought of this, so I'm just throwing that out for discussion.

Jaime Wagner: What is your concern again, Chuck? Could you repeat please?

Chuck Gomes: Sure. What it says - if it does need to be prioritized, the way its worded right now is that we wait until the next Prioritization Session. There might be occurrences where it needs to be prioritized a little bit sooner. Hopefully, that doesn't happen very often. But, we might want to word it so that at the next Prioritization Session or at such time the Council decides. Does that make sense?

Jaime Wagner: Yes. This is Jaime. Can I suggest something that - a Prioritization Session - a special Prioritization Session should be called in this event?

Chuck Gomes: Well, it might not necessarily be (needing) an event, would it? I mean, is it possible that the regularly scheduled one might be okay?

Jaime Wagner: I mean...

Chuck Gomes: We don't know.

Jaime Wagner: ...in the case - I mean, in the event that there is not a regular one, that it will take too much time to have a regular Prioritization Session, then a special Prioritization Session should be called. I'm trying to cover your concern.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, that works. What you just said works for what I was trying to do.
Yes.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I don't know if this is helpful or not, but in 6.3.2, up in the Section 6 area, we have a section called Frequency and here's what it says, "A formal Work Prioritization Rating Session of all eligible projects will be conducted at least once per fiscal year, time to be approved at the ICANN Annual General Meeting." The next sentence says, "A Prioritization Session may be conducted more frequently if recommended by the Chair and approved by the Council."

So, I would suggest that if a new project comes up and the decision is that it can't wait, that sentence covers us in terms of being able to have Prioritization Session.

Chuck Gomes: That's fine, then. I think you're right.

Olga Cavalli: Ken, could we add a sentence mentioning for example such - in such a case that project, or just put in an example in it so it may be more clear to the people that's reading it, or it explain (unintelligible)?

Ken Bour: Well -- this is Ken -- I think that right now, it provides the most flexibility, right. Because, the Chair can recommend a Prioritization Session for any number of reasons, and - I don't know; do you think we should narrow it down, or...?

Olga Cavalli: No. No. No. Just adding in cases like, blah, blah, blah, but maybe it's not necessary. Just trying to consider what Chuck and Jaime were saying.

Chuck Gomes: And with the clarification that Ken made in Section 6, I think it's probably okay. Do you agree with that Jaime?

Jaime Wagner: Well, I'm - well, I don't have the wording here. I think it covers it. I think leaves room to the - make that at the Chair's discretion to convene a special meeting or not. And, I think in this case, we should define that it's a mandate and not a choice of the Chair to convene such a special meeting.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I'm not sure I understood. Could you say that one more time, Jaime?

Jaime Wagner: I think that the way it's - well, I'm doing this by ear, and I'm not reading the text. But, what I understood is that the way it's written in the (unintelligible) session, it's discretion of the Chair. It can, or he can or he cannot convene a special meeting. And, we are trying to say here is that in the event there is a disagreement, a special Prioritization Session should be called. It's not a choice. It's a mandate for the Chair to call such a special meeting.

That's my understanding of this. Did you understand it now?

Chuck Gomes: Well, I'm not sure it necessarily needs to be a mandate does it? It's going to be based on need, and are we giving the Chair the authority to make the decision, or is it the Chair can recommend it to the Council, and the Council can agree or not agree?

Ken Bour: This is Ken. The latter is what's written.

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bour: This is Ken. Let's take an example. When the - this new project, the Vertical Integration came along, right. It's a new project. Let's assume we had already rated all the existing ones. The question would be, do we need a special Prioritization Session to do the Vertical Integration priority? And, maybe the Chair would say, "You know what. We have the resources. In fact, we're teeming with resources wanting to work on this project. We do not have a need to prioritize it at the moment. Does everybody agree on the Council?" Everybody nods their head in agreement; and therefore, we wait until the next session, right.

Jaime Wagner: That's okay if there isn't a disagreement. The point is when there is a disagreement, what happens if there is a disagreement?

Ken Bour: This is Ken. Chuck, that's a question I'm wondering. If there's a disagreement in general on the Council, and it can't be ironed out, is that - is then a motion provided and a vote taken at the next meeting?

Chuck Gomes: Sure. And it may not actually be some - anything really formal. We may just take a - poll the Council, and if there's a simple majority of each (house), we go with that decision.

Ken Bour: So in other words, the procedures themselves don't have to specify what to do in the case of every disagreement that might happen. The Council has procedures for resolving disagreements.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. And, we would always try to first to reach a position that's supported by the maximum number of people. But, if it comes down to

where we have to actually poll the Council membership for - the voting thresholds cover that.

Ken Bour: Does that help, Jaime?

Jaime Wagner: Okay. There is - I would like to avoid a deadlock. It's okay.

Chuck Gomes: Another general point for us in this team to keep in mind, if we don't get it perfect by the time we send it - in fact we probably won't. But let me say it that way. Again, if we don't get it perfect in what we send to the Council, it can still be changed at the Council level. So, it's not as if it's in concrete. So - whereas, I think we all want to get it as close as we can to being in good shape, we don't have to be so precise that - as if there can't be any changes later. There can be.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. Yes, and I just wanted to echo that. One of the reasons that we tossed a lot of these miscellaneous details into the Annex was really to make it even easier to change things that would be sort of practically in the mix. And, all the stuff we're talking about, changes to existing projects and new project additions is all in the Annex at this point. So yes, I would say we're probably okay.

And, I want to just keep in mind that the Annex only applies when a prioritization session is going to occur. It doesn't apply - it gets called into question as soon as a session has been called, and then it says okay, the first step in the process of a session is to ensure that changes to existing projects and new project additions are incorporated. So if a new project addition comes up at a time other than when a Work Prioritization session is scheduled, I think that has to be dealt with in the other management stuff that we haven't written

yet, right. That's going to be in the normal project management world that we have punted at this point to another team.

Chuck Gomes: Right. And just to let you know, logistically I have arrived home. It's going to take me a little bit before I can log on and get in. I'll try and stay on my cell phone on mute in the interim here, okay.

Ken Bour: Okay. And Jaime just managed to get in through 3G. Wow! I'm impressed.

Olga Cavalli: It's a mobile meeting.

Ken Bour: I am very impressed.

Jaime Wagner: I am...

Ken Bour: Okay.

Jaime Wagner: I am in the Library of the Congress, now.

Ken Bour: Okay. You've already - very good. All right, so I'm going to continue on here. And let's see. All right, so Step 1 is okay of the Annex. Then in Step 2 - the only thing that I did in Step 2.2, which has to do with the individual rating sheets, is there was a sentence that said this same process can be used of course for difficulty, if and when that factor comes into play. And as we discussed last time, we wanted to take all the references to difficulty out, so I just struck that sentence. Otherwise, that whole section is the same.

Now proceeding to 2.3.2, this has to do what happens if a councilor doesn't get his or her individual rating in on time. And, Chuck made some suggested language changes to that. I took his and I reworded it as follows.

I'll just read it so that it's - you'll be able to catch what it says. "If a councilor misses the ten day window for submitting individual project ratings, the first staff analysis will be prepared without that input, and there will be no opportunity to revisit that step once it is completed. During any subsequent sessions (see Step 3 below) all attending councilors will be permitted to participate in the discussions and vote during the polling rounds, even if they did not submit individual ratings."

And my question would be is that clear to everyone? That work?

Jaime Wagner: Perfect. That works and is good.

Ken Bour: And, I'll ask for Chuck, because he made - I did a little bit of modifying Chuck to your language, but not in the substantive way. I wonder if his cell phone went off.

Jaime Wagner: I think Chuck is floundering with the mute (button).

Olga Cavalli: Yes, he's on mute.

Ken Bour: Chuck, if you're listing...

Chuck Gomes: I am. Just is that okay?

Jaime Wagner: I hope he can...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Sorry, I was at - wasn't in a good time to talk. Could you read it one more time, Ken?

Ken Bour: Yes. I'd be happy to. So it says, "If a councilor misses the ten day window for submitting individual project ratings, the first staff analysis will be prepared without that input, and there will be no opportunity to revisit that step once it is completed. During any subsequent sessions (see Step 3 below) all attending councilors will be permitted to participate in the discussions and vote during the polling rounds, even if they did not submit individual ratings."

Chuck Gomes: That is fine.

Ken Bour: Okay. Excellent. I'll accept that in the next version.

Now in Step 3, I just made a minor deletion of the word teleconference, so that we're not locked into having it only via telephone. I think that was discussed earlier, right? Delete the word teleconference.

Then in Section 3.2, we had - we agreed to a sort of one to two minute time limit, so I made that change. Instead of two minutes, it's now one to two minutes. And then, each project should be targeted to be completed within ten minutes on the first round. That was in 3.2.2, although that probably means nothing to you if you're not watching the screen roll by.

Olga Cavalli: Ken, can we perhaps read the paragraph? It's not very long.

Ken Bour: Certainly. So, in 3.2.2, what it says is, "For each project to be discussed," just contextually we're in Round 1. "For each project to be discussed, staff will display the range and will indicate which councilors rated the project at the most extreme scale values. Initially, those councilors will be invited to provide a rationale for their ratings. Each councilor is asked to honor a one to two minute time limit in providing an explanation. To minimize the total time for this step, councilors are encouraged not to repeat rationale that has already been offered."

"Other councilors are permitted to ask questions for clarification, and answers should be constrained to one to two minutes or less. Once the extreme values have been discussed, any councilor may provide rationale for other rating values that have not been aired, following the same general guideline. Each project should be targeted to be completed within ten minutes." Stop.

Is that okay?

Jaime Wagner: Yes. (This is not) a general guideline will be not Draconian, (really).

Ken Bour: Right. And then, there was no change in Section 3.2.3, which said what happens at the end of the first discussion round. That just - we go into the polling process. Then in 3.2.4, let me read this. Okay, so we've - we're still in round - no, let me think about where we are here. Sorry.

So, we're in the second round. "Staff will inquire as to which councilor rated the project at the most extreme values so that they may provide their rationale initially, followed by questions and answers, and an additional open discussion period similar to the first round, except that

each speaker should honor a one minute time limit, and each project should be targeted to be completed within five minutes.” End.

Now Jaime, I think this was a suggestion that you made that - then in the second round, we tighten things up.

Jaime Wagner: Yes, because arguments tend to repeat themselves.

Ken Bour: And actually, that’s the end. There is no possibility for a third round, because the next paragraph reads, “At the conclusion of the second round of discussion, that will initiate a new poll, except that this time if the range is less than or equal to three, the median will be accepted. If the range is greater than,” oh, I’m sorry. “If the range is greater than three, one final round of discussion will take place, and a third poll at which point the median will be computed as the council’s rating.”

Now, we don’t say explicitly at that point that the rules in 3.2.4 should apply, but I can add that if we think that needs to be said.

Jaime Wagner: Yes. I think that for this third and final rating, there should be - I don’t think you have to add another paragraph, but only to say that in 3.2.4 that this rule applies both to the second and to the third round of ratings.

Ken Bour: Okay, I can do that Jaime. So, note that applies to all subsequent -- okay.

Jaime Wagner: Just a matter of - part of - can I leave my - you need me to mute my phone?

Ken Bour: No, we...

Jaime Wagner: (Ambient noise).

Ken Bour: This is Ken, I don't hear any background noise at the moment...

Jaime Wagner: Okay. Thanks.

Ken Bour: ...coming from your phone.

Okay, so I think we've finished the group - Step 3. Step 4 is really just results, and doesn't say anything, and there were no changes to it. And that concludes Annex.

Chuck Gomes: Hi, this is Chuck. I'm back on now on my land line, so...

Ken Bour: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: ...not quite in the room yet.

Ken Bour: That's okay. Well, we just finished the Annex. We're not...

Chuck Gomes: Yes. I heard that.

Ken Bour: What I'd like to do at this point then is I'll just minimize that and bring up the letter, and we can talk about the letter a little bit, and that we've got a few minutes left.

Is everybody okay then with Section 6 and the Annex? I just want to make one final - I'll clean the document up. The next time you see it, I will have it in what I would hope to be final form.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Jaime Wagner: You can't say "I hope it will be."

Ken Bour: I sit corrected. It will be in final form.

Jaime Wagner: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: And, we need to give it - if my calculations are correct, we need to have it to the Council not later than the 13th.

Ken Bour: Correct. And, I hope we can talk a little bit about logistics, and just make sure we know who's going to do what, when, and all that sort of thing, so that we don't - there's a quarterback who's got the ball and knows who to throw it to.

Okay, good. I'm going to go ahead and minimize this section, and I'm going to bring up the letter now. Cover letter - and, this has Jaime's changes as well.

Hopefully, let me make sure that synch is not set on, so that you guys can control the sizing to your own computers. Is that - have I done that correctly?

Jaime Wagner: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: Okay for me.

Jaime Wagner: Yes.

Ken Bour: Okay, good. Thanks. That button is hard to read.

Okay, so this is a draft of the letter which is my second version after Jaime's corrections and suggestions. The first paragraph in the letter, I didn't show it red lined, because I took the two paragraphs that were original, completely redid them, and then I sent them to the list, and I think the feedback was generally that it was okay. So, I didn't show red line there.

Jaime Wagner: It's okay.

Ken Bour: Do we want to take a minute and look at that first paragraph?

Olga Cavalli: Ken, this is Olga. Only one comment. As commissioned by the GNSO Council, I'm not sure it's - if it's (unintelligible), or just - I remember Chuck made a comment, and I raised my hand. There was not a specific call for a formation of a group. It was then spontaneous with the people that were interested. Just saying that maybe the wording is not exactly what we want to reflect here. But, I'm okay with this.

Ken Bour: Well, would you like me -- this is Ken -- would you like me to say organized - as organized by the GNSO Council, or as approved?

Olga Cavalli: Yes, because commissioned sounds like very (wrong), at least to me.

Ken Bour: Yes. Okay. That's fine. Any other suggestions for changing the word commissioned?

Jaime Wagner: Recommended is okay.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, I'm fine with that.

Ken Bour: Okay. I'll change that.

Now in the second paragraph, I asked whether everybody thought we should keep the goals in. I didn't - I don't remember if Chuck commented on that, but Jaime said keep the goals in. The goals are still in, so we could - if that's okay, we'll skip that. My only reason for asking the question was because we were trying to get this letter a little bit shorter, and that - I thought that was something we might be able to jettison.

Chuck Gomes: I (could) go either way, so that's fine.

Ken Bour: Okay. Now in Paragraph 3, you'll see - on the Adobe (room) you'll see some red lining. It's a little bit messy, but Jaime had made some suggestions, and I pretty much incorporated them, I think. So instead of just talking about the scope of the team and all that, we just start with the (DT) believes that prioritization is an important first step of the Council's broader project management role, which should be further defined and will require appropriate tools to assist in the active and effective management of the workload.

Then, there's another paragraph, or however that was clobbered. And then, we say to facilitate these managerial responsibilities, the (DT)

recommends that, and now it's a one and a two, rather than a extended paragraph. Just a process be developed to allow timely tracking of GNSO projects on an ongoing basis. And two, its process be supported with a Web based software kit using the original language.

Now the next paragraph, Jaime didn't explicitly delete it, so I wasn't sure if it was supposed to be included or not. But it reads, "Information from such an application suite, properly summarized and analyzed by staff, will enable the council to make better informed decisions by understanding and evaluating more clearly the resource constraints impacting existing projects, as well as the effects of new work that must be integrated into the total portfolio."

Jaime Wagner: I think (that it was originally) a redundant paragraph.

Olga Cavalli: I agree.

Ken Bour: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: And, that's probably a good point. Yes. Certainly, it shouldn't be a separate paragraph, I don't think. It's part of the previous one, and I think they're probably right that it may not be needed there. If we did keep it, I would say make it a part of that previous paragraph right after the two recommendations. But, I'm not advocating that we keep it.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. At this point, I'm not advocating that we keep it either, and I'm happy to delete it. And I think if we do that, it'll - we'll get it on one page. And so, there's probably some value in having a one page cover letter.

Olga Cavalli: This is Olga. I think we have to delete it, because it goes into details that is not the purpose of the letter. Because, we talk about tools, but the letter - the purpose of the letter is other.

Ken Bour: I'm sorry. Are you talking about the paragraph that begins with...

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Ken Bour: ...information from?

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Ken Bour: Okay. Yes, I think we agree that I'll...

Olga Cavalli: It's the detail about the applications, and it's not specifically talking about the purpose of the letter, which is presenting the methodology.

Ken Bour: Okay. This is Ken. No disagreement here. I will - then, I will create the next letter and set it up in final form -- I think -- unless there's any - unless there are any thoughts anybody else has about what we should say in the letter that aren't already covered.

Chuck Gomes: Ken, in that regard what I would suggest is that once everybody that's active on our team has you know, said they're okay with it, that Olga send it as soon as - with the document as soon as possible and not wait until the 13th, if we get those approvals before then.

Olga Cavalli: Great. So Ken, this is Olga.

Ken Bour: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: When can we have the clean version so everyone can - in the group can review it?

Ken Bour: This afternoon.

Jaime Wagner: I will say here, and fully (state) that it - my approval is done already, okay. So, move ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Actually, I would say the same thing right now. I'm satisfied. It's probably worth a quick read in case there's any little minor thing. Ken's really good about doing it really thoroughly and accurately, so I would be comfortable like Jaime is.

But we do have some that aren't - now, who's missing besides Wolf?

Olga Cavalli: I think basically Wolf, who has been active in most of the calls.

Chuck Gomes: So, maybe we can just say let's let Wolf do a crack at it...

Olga Cavalli: Okay, good.

Chuck Gomes: ...and if he's okay with it, go.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Jaime Wagner: Don't forget (Adrian).

Chuck Gomes: Well, (Adrian) hasn't been active on this, so I think you know he'll have his shot at the Council level. To bring him into it cold at this point would set us back.

Jaime Wagner: I'm joking.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: We were only joking.

Chuck Gomes: I figured that out. So...

Ken Bour: Okay, this is Ken. So yes, I understand. I will clean everything up. I will put it on the list and we'll give - it sounds like we'll give Wolf-Ulrich a few days maybe. Maybe until Friday.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. No longer than Friday, unless there's some special circumstances that prevent them from doing it by then.

Ken Bour: And then if I understand correctly, Olga you would be prepared at that point to send the set - the package to the Council. And, does it go to Chuck? Or, does it go to Glen?

Olga Cavalli: No, it goes to the Council. I can send it to the -- Chuck please correct me if I am saying something wrong -- I...

Chuck Gomes: You are Olga. She can send it straight to the Council list.

Olga Cavalli: To the Council, yes.

Ken Bour: Okay. Very fine. I was just trying to be clear that it doesn't go maybe to the Secretariat, who then sends it to the - you just send it to every member of the Council.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: So they can have time to review it.

Ken Bour: Okay, super.

Olga Cavalli: And Chuck -- this is Olga -- Chuck, what's the procedure once we turn this to the Council in the next conference call? What - it's we'll have to explain...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Yes. As you know Olga, it's already on our agenda for the 21st.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, I saw it.

Chuck Gomes: And so, what - the purpose of that agenda item so far is just to do a brief overview of the process, and I will be - and you and I will both be encouraging Council members to review it before the meeting to try and answer any questions and then to talk about okay number one, is the Council okay with the process? If they're okay in that meeting, we can go ahead and talk about - okay, is it okay to do a (Doodle) to schedule a Prioritization Session? Initial Prioritization Session or whatever.

Now, we're not going to wait until - I'm assuming that we're not going to wait until the Annual Meeting to do the first Prioritization Session, so we will need to schedule a special one for this. Did that answer your question?

Olga Cavalli: Yes. Thank you. And Ken, are you available to join us in the call, or is it very complicated for you?

Ken Bour: No it's not complicated, and I have already been asked for another matter to be on the call, because the CCT's material is being reviewed also on that call.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Ken Bour: And, I am currently on another project. I'm working on consolidating the two reports of that team. So yes, I can be on the call. Can I ask how much time - Chuck, do you remember how much was allotted for this discussion?

Chuck Gomes: I can look. Just a second. I think I've got the agenda right - I do. I have the agenda up, so bear with me a second. Thirty minutes.

Ken Bour: Okay. All right, so that only allows a very - sort of very brief introduction. Now...

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bour: Go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: What I want to do is to assume that everyone has read it. And, ask - and give a few highlights, and then ask if there's any questions. Now if people haven't read it, they will be at a disadvantage. But, if every time we have something like this we have to do a thorough presentation, and people aren't responsible enough to do their homework, our Council meetings will be terribly long.

Now...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...I assume that we can't go over 30 minutes. I haven't really analyzed the time too much on this one. It could be that we have a few minutes extra, or that we pick up some time. In fact as I recall, I don't even think I finalized the minute count. So, it could be that we could make it 35 or 40 minutes. But, I'll look at that and we'll see. And then if you will - if you guys will - you and Olga will communicate in terms of what you think is maximum time.

At the same time, I still don't want to go - use the Council session to go through what we're proposing in my minute detail. That would take the whole meeting, and we can't afford to use whole meetings in that way.

Jaime Wagner: I suggest that we - well, fully appreciate the way you are intending to touch with only - with highlights, and focusing on the (fixing) the next - the schedule for a special Prioritization Session. I think this will be the main point of discussion, that a special Prioritization Session will be needed and this will take two hours.

And I think also that we must touch (in that) the point that some - I don't know if - to ask the Councilors if the material will complete or some framing materials should be - they need anything else besides the Annex and the - that we are giving them.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. If I might comment a little on that training question. As you might remember, when it comes time to do the Prioritization Session, and I think I would like to come back to that question for just a second, but not right - let me just finish this other thought first. One of the roles that staff will play is to coach and guide Councilors through this process, just as we did when this team went through it.

So when it comes to that individual rating sheet, you know spreadsheet, it'll be accompanied with very simple instructions. And as you may remember, that spreadsheet was also designed so that you can't mess it up. It has certain areas that are protected, so you can't change the formulas, and all you can do is you go in and put your ratings in. It'll actually be simpler this time around, because there's only one dimension instead of two - one factor.

With - and the same thing with the - when we get to the group session, whether that's held in person or whether it's held in a teleconference. One of the first things that we'll do is just go back over real quickly what the process is, how it works, and then you know maybe we can even do one sample polling just to get comfortable with the logistics, and then move right in. So, I don't think there needs to be any serious or difficult training process in this. It's pretty straight forward, I think.

Chuck Gomes: And, the individual exercise that people will be going through too should be a training session of itself. A self-instruction type mode, as they go through the exercise.

Ken Bour: That's right. This is Ken. And, we would always be available to answer any questions that come up, right. If somebody had trouble with the form or something like that.

Jaime Wagner: I think we should dispense, and not emphasize the need to - for any training like (unintelligible). And, that's because you - but I think that the process will not be the main concern of Councilors. I think the project list and project classification - this first project list and classification will be the main concern and the main discussion of everybody.

Ken Bour: Yes. This is Ken. I think that's naturally a good segue into coming back to the discussion about when and how does this session get done, and what would the team recommend. My thought on it, and I think it came from Rob actually -- last time where he and I had a separate conversation about it -- is that maybe the Saturday or Sunday in Brussels would be the time to actually have the Work Prioritization Session, where each project is discussed, the polling, and all of that is done.

Now, if that - if you agreed with that -- if there's time, like a two-hour block on Saturday or Sunday in Brussels -- then I think we should back up ten days from there and make sure we do the individual ratings ahead of time.

Now, if we back up 10, or 12, or 14 days to do the ratings, the individual ratings, I think you have to back up another maybe two weeks or so also to provide for discussion around what Jaime just said, which is the project categories and classifications. Now, whether that can be done on a list or in a Council meeting, I don't know.

Jaime Wagner: Yes, well...

Chuck Gomes: I think we would try it on the list first and see if that works, and probably can get a pretty good idea on the list whether that's being successful or not.

Ken Bour: Okay. So then, let's say -- well see, Brussels is in June, right?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Ken Bour: All right. So, let's back up to May and let's say we have a Council meeting in early May. Maybe we recommend that staff create its recommendations for Table 1, Table 2, and all the classifications, which by the way could largely be what we see today with the addition of Vertical Integration, if that's not already in the list. Or maybe, we just clean it all up and present that to the Council maybe at its - actually, we could present it at this meeting, couldn't we? Is that something that you'd like to do at this - at the meeting in which the procedure is announced, is to also provide the Council with a starting set of Table 1 and Table 2?

Chuck Gomes: Well, I don't think there's going to be enough time in this meeting to adequately do that. Also, really the first objective in this meeting is -- if

possible -- should be to get the - get a sense of the Council that they're okay with this process.

Ken Bour: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: But if we're not, that totally changes things.

Ken Bour: Okay, that -- this is Ken -- that sounds good. Go ahead.

Olga Cavalli: Chuck, this is Olga. One question. What happens if they don't agree with the document, or they want to suggest changes, or it all comes back to the working team, or...

Chuck Gomes: I need to think more about that one. It's been running through my mind a little bit in the last few minutes. I as Chair am going to abuse my position and try and encourage strongly that we don't make any changes. That we go ahead and try it. If it doesn't work, fix it later.

So, I may be a little bit more assertive in that regard than I might be in other situations. At the same time, your question is very legitimate, Olga. If the - if there's some people who want significant changes to the process, then we'll probably have to - and again, I'm going to try and discourage that, but if they do, then we will - I'll probably ask for very specific recommendations and give a very short window for that.

Now at that point, it may make sense -- and I'd like your reaction - each of your reactions on this now -- to just have it - any changes like - unless they want to totally revamp the whole procedure, and in which case I think they'd better form a new group, but if it's just some tweaks

to the procedure, that we try and do that within the framework of the Council and handle it that way. What do you guys think?

Olga Cavalli: This is Olga. I hope they like the document. But as you know, there were comments about our procedures, our time (unintelligible) our job, so maybe there are people saying something, and I think they should be heard.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, absolutely. They should be heard.

Olga Cavalli: And so, let's see what happens. And then, maybe they can have -- as you said -- a short window of time, maybe to send their suggestions to the Working Team, and then we can revise the document.

Chuck Gomes: Now one of the things we need to recognize is that we could end up on the 21st with a situation where the - there's not enough agreement or not enough people have looked at it in detail that we have to postpone approving the process to our next meeting. Now, our next meeting is on - not until the 20th of May. So, that's making it really difficult to pull off in Brussels, although it might still be possible if there are no more changes.

So, that can be another argument for you know trying to get agreement to at least use this as a test case and then prove it later.

Olga Cavalli: Chuck, that's a (thousand votes) if they agree on the methodology.

Chuck Gomes: Well, I'm going to approach it in a little more informal sense. For example, does anyone object to using this process as a first methodology for doing this.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Now if somebody objects, then that - I'll ask why and whether they think that's an easy fix. If not - and then it could come down to where I'll call for a vote rather than drag this thing out you know, long periods of time more.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. Can I ask this question. Do you think Chuck we should pre - not pre-empt but prepare for the possibility that the Council is prepared to accept this procedure and have a resolution ready that has - you know, whereas the team was formed, (da-da-da) and the Council approves the introduction of Section 6 and the Annex into the GNSO Operating Procedures?

Chuck Gomes: Actually, that's a good idea for a couple reasons. And maybe the most important reason is just that if we have a motion on the table, it may motivate people even more to make sure they thoroughly review this and check with their constituencies and stakeholder groups.

Ken Bour: Thank you. And, how should - I'm happy to take a stab at drafting that resolution. And then, how does it actually get to the Council? So, would Olga send the documents, the letter, and the resolution?

Chuck Gomes: Yes. Keep the resolution separate, but send the documents first, and then what would be good is for Olga to make the motion and someone else on this team could second it.

Olga Cavalli: How many days before the...

Chuck Gomes: And also, the deadline for motions is the 13th as well, so if we can get the document sent to the list by the end of this week, that would be great. And then on next Tuesday at the latest, the motion would need to be made. It could be made sooner. It could be made shortly after the...

Olga Cavalli: We submitted the documents.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. Exactly.

Ken Bour: Great. So, we should - because - okay, just looking at the time. So, if we give the team and basically, Wolf-Ulrich until Friday, then we want to release the documents probably on Friday, right?

Chuck Gomes: Yes. And, if you can in the meantime get the motion out to the list - to our list, we can all work on it and it can be ready to go you know a day or so after the documents go out.

Ken Bour: Yes, maybe the 12th or the 13th at the latest, right?

Chuck Gomes: 13th at the latest, 12th would be even better.

Ken Bour: Right. Okay. That sounds good. Now, I'm just -- this is Ken again -- I'm anticipating that someone - even if someone who is in favor of this whole process might say, "Okay, well if we approve all this you know, what's the timeline for getting the prioritization done?" And, I think it's good to have an answer ready for that in case it comes up, or to send it somehow. Maybe it's even part of our cover letter.

And does anybody agree or disagree? Or, should we just take that, say we'll get back to you on that?

Chuck Gomes: No. I think it'd be better if we're prepared on that. Because again, we are looking at a short window here, and if we have to go back and work something for each question that's asked, it's going to drag it out. So, the - and in fact, should we make that part of the motion? Very brief estimate - mapping out for example a Brussels process like you described. And maybe, put it as an attachment to the motion - a link to the motion, rather than making it a super long motion?

Ken Bour: This is Ken. Okay, I've got two tasks. I'm going to draft a resolution and I'm going to draft a timeline with just enough detail so that it looks like it's doable, and I'll think my way through you know, how do we get the project list done, and when staff has to do its thing. And you know again, following the procedures in fact.

And then, I'll send that to the list and we'll have a few days to work both of those out, and then decide if the timeline should be kept separate or included as part of the resolution. We can work that out in the next few days, I think.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. In fact, if it's done in a modular way that way, it'd be really easy to add it to the motion or pull it from the motion, just so that the motion is structured in such a way that one, the (resolved clause) has to do with a possible time frame. And if the Council likes that, they can just include it in the same motion, or we can deal with that separately.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. Great. This is by the way some of the logistic questions I hadn't thought about that we're now - as we started thinking our way

through - okay, what happens next, and what do we do when with the - that's - these are the kinds of questions that pop up, and I'm glad we're getting them addressed now.

I do have one more technical question. It's a kind of a minor one, but do you think that the cover letter should be in email format with the document attached, or should we have an email that says there are two documents attached, a cover letter, and a - and the Section 6 document?

Olga Cavalli: This is Olga. And, this is strictly personally speaking. I hate to open a document. So if it's linked or if it's in the email, for me it's better. But, it depends.

Chuck Gomes: Well, let's put the cover letter as an email...

Olga Cavalli: As an email, yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...and I - we have to pretty much - the two documents, or one -- whatever it is, the Section 6 and the Annex -- are going to have to be separate documents. It'd be too long a email. So, they can be - I would suggest that you send them as attachments and as links.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I don't think I can make them links, because they're not posted on any Web site.

Olga Cavalli: No. I know. It's just - I just said...

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bour: But what I can do though is I can make a PDF and a Word document for those that don't like Word. I could attach...

((Crosstalk))

Jaime Wagner: Can I suggest something?

Ken Bour: Yes.

Jaime Wagner: This is Jaime. Can I suggest you put the Word document - the letter will be the first part of the email, then down in the body of the email behind the letter, you put the Annex and the documents - the two documents in the body and also the Annex, so -- as an attachment, so they will be present as an attachment and in the body of the email. That's what I recommend.

(I'm not very big)...

Glen de Saint Géry: Ken?

Ken Bour: Yes?

Glen de Saint Géry: This is Glen. May I suggest if we perhaps put them in the draft documents, then you've got an easy link.

Olga Cavalli: I was exactly thinking about that.

Ken Bour: Okay. So...

Glen de Saint Géry: And secondly, just a note that Wolf-Ulrich Knoben is on holiday this whole week, so I don't know about the practicality of getting him to go through a document before Friday. He may be able to do it, but I thought I'd mention that.

Chuck Gomes: Well, let's send a message to him today asking if he's - if it is possible for him to respond, and letting him know that if we don't hear from him in 24 hours, we'll just go ahead and proceed - 24 hours - maybe we ought to do 48 hours.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. Who's sending that note?

Chuck Gomes: Probably the Chair.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. I can send it to Wolf.

Jaime Wagner: Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. How much time can we give Wolf? Maybe he has a phone that he can review the emails or will see the (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Let's give him 48 hours. So in other words, that'll be on Thursday, 48 hours from now. If we haven't heard from him, we're going to assume that he is not able to respond.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: And for the sake of time, we're going to go ahead and proceed. I mean, he can - again, he can suggest changes just like anybody on the Council can after the fact.

Jaime Wagner: And, I would say just that we are giving him the chance to give his opinion, and if we don't hear from him we will be sending Friday to the Council, so he will be able to give his opinions on the Council. But people, I will have now to disengage from the call. I'm entering the conference here. Okay? Bye-bye.

Chuck Gomes: Bye-bye.

Ken Bour: I think we're finished actually.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. Good.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I hate to do this after Jaime just left, but I'm disinclined to actually put the text of the two documents into the email body. I think it'll become very (unwieldy), and I think it will be a mess formatting-wise, because...

Olga Cavalli: Now Ken, the suggestion made by Glen I think the best.

Ken Bour: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: There is a page in our Web page for draft documents, and then so we can put the letter into the body of the email...

Ken Bour: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: ...and then we add a link to this space with draft document. We have done that with other documents - with other working things, and it's quite nice.

Ken Bour: I'm happy to do that. And so, what we have to do in step order is to approve the documents, finalize them, which requires us to wait a little bit until we hear from Wolf, or make a decision to go.

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bour: And then, I'll firm the documents. I'll get them to Glen. She'll get them posted. I'll get the links and then I'll fix the letter - the cover letter. And so yes, we can get all this done, for sure.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you. Thank you very much, Ken.

Ken Bour: Anything else? Oh, well we have a meeting next week.

Olga Cavalli: No, we don't.

Ken Bour: We're done, huh?

Olga Cavalli: We have a motion to (drop).

Glen de Saint Géry: Are we then going to cancel the meeting?

Olga Cavalli: I don't think it's necessary.

Glen de Saint Géry: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bour: This is Ken. May I make a suggestion that we keep the meeting on the 12th scheduled for now, and then maybe make a decision on Friday if we think we still might need it?

Olga Cavalli: Okay. That's okay.

Ken Bour: We could always cancel it on Friday. If everything is going well and all the documents are clean, and it's proceeding properly, then we probably don't need a meeting. But that way, we'll have it scheduled just in case.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Fine.

Ken Bour: Okay. Anything else?

Olga Cavalli: Ken, are you providing us a draft for the motion so we can review it in the working - in the team list?

Ken Bour: That's correct. This is Ken. I will be preparing a draft motion. I will be preparing a timeline, and I will be cleaning up and sending final documents to the list as quickly as I can.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Thank you.

Ken Bour: Great.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, everybody.

Ken Bour: All right. Thanks. Great work everyone.

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bour: Bye-bye.

Chuck Gomes: Bye.

END