GNSO Work Prioritization Model
TRANSCRIPTION
Monday 12 April 2010at 1900 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO Work Prioritization Model meeting on Monday 12 April 2010 at 1900 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-20100412.mp3

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 Knoben – ISP

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

You may begin.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Operator. Hello. How are you? Good morning, good evening everyone.

Glen, help me do a roll call please.

Glen de Saint Géry: Certainly Olga. Yes, good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. And again my apologies for this mess up.

But I'm glad we're on the call. We have on the call Jamie Wagner, Chuck Gomes, Olga Cavalli. And for staff we have Ken Bour and my self Glen de Saint Géry.

Thank you Olga, over to you.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Glen. And you may have noticed that as we agreed I sent the GNSO list on Friday evening as the two document, well not two documents, but letter into the body of the email and the link to the document.

And there were some comments and some feedback from Stéphane and two other people.

And now we have got it together to review the possible motion that we are going to submit today, right? Today is the day that we should send it?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Well we can do it tomorrow but...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: ...we should be able to do it today.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. So Ken has been so kind to draft it and so we have a draft version in the Adobe Connect screen.

And I think that we could review the check unless someone else has any other thing they want to talk about or and then if we have time we can talk about possible feedback that we already received and we may receive from our - to - about our document.

Chuck Gomes: Well we probably should do kind of combine both of those things at once.

Olga Cavalli: Oh both. Okay.

Chuck Gomes: For the motion. At least one part of it because I'm looking at and I'm sorry I didn't have time to do this before, but I'm looking at the...

Olga Cavalli: Me either.

Chuck Gomes: ...timeline. And I was trying to figure out how we could add the 15 calendar days or the 15. Excuse me, 15 calendar days or 10 business days. It looks pretty hard to do I think because that's the only kind of easy change we could make to the timeline. And that affects the motion based on the comments received.

                 Has anybody else looked at that?

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I looked at it also. And I do - I think that it turned out just because of the way the time works out that this time around, the first time, that that's - 10 days is about all we really have.

Chuck Gomes: Well we could add - that's right because 21 - the 21st is right after the Council Meeting.

Ken Bour: That's right and so and now we could take a little of staff time away from the one - from the 1st to the 11th. We don't need that many days in preparation. So we could, yeah, we could do a little longer.

                 And so let's take a look at that, 21 May happens to be a Friday. We could go to June 4. We could go to...

Chuck Gomes: Well let's see. If while you're looking at that, let me get the calendar in front of me here so that I can see.

                 So we're talking about starting it, the individual writings on the 21st, right?

Ken Bour: Correct, yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay so if we - going to June 4 would that give 10 business days? Now...

Ken Bour: It would.

Chuck Gomes: ...if it turns out well it does except for the - in the U.S. there's a holiday in that thing, in that block I think.

Ken Bour: Well we could go to June 7 which is Monday.

Chuck Gomes: And that would probably accommodate the - that should accommodate that request. Would that work?

Ken Bour: I think so.

Jamie Wagner: The 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, it would be 12 working days.

Chuck Gomes: Well how do you figure?

                   Oh, because you count the 21st.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, you count the 21st. If you count the 21st that's right, we could do it on the 4th.

                   Jamie one of the things I was accounting for at least in the U.S. I know there's a holiday in there. I don't know if there are any holidays in any other regions.

                   But by adding an extra day we've accommodated one holiday in there which might not be counted as a business day.

Does that make sense?

Jamie Wagner: Well but even so, the 4th would accommodate 12 days.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. The 4th would be - let's see, so that's 7.

Jamie Wagner: If there is - I think people are asking for 10 working days. Is it correct?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Jamie Wagner: So if we count the 21st as the first day, the first business day then there will be 21st, those five days of the next week, six days.

                  The 31st is - it's a holiday, yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, right.

Jamie Wagner: So we have...

Chuck Gomes: So that would be 10 working days then if we go to the 4th.

Jamie Wagner: Yeah 10 working days on the 4th.

Chuck Gomes: That would be okay.

Jamie Wagner: Okay we can (leave) to the 7th. We can (leave) to the 7th to have some...

Chuck Gomes: Well even the 4th works, doesn't it?

Jamie Wagner: Yeah.

Ken Bour: Yeah, this is Ken. I think the 4th works.

Jamie Wagner: Yeah. But we can give the weekend to the counselors.

Chuck Gomes: You think it's better to give the weekend to the counselors or to staff?

Ken Bour: No. We can give it to the counselors.

Jamie Wagner: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So then make it the 7th. Does that work?

Ken Bour: Okay. This is Ken. I'll shoot it to 7 June. And then I'll start the staff from 8 to 11. I think three or four days. The reason that I stayed away from the week of the 14th to the 19th is because sometimes that's a travel. And there's a lot of hurry.

                       But we really have that week too on the staff for preparation.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Ken Bour: So from the 8th, right, we've got - we have enough time to prepare not only the consolidation and the analysis and getting ready for the session. I think that's enough time. So I think that's fine.

Chuck Gomes: Now do we have any - I think don't we have something in our - either Section 6 or the annex that talks about 10 calendar days?

Ken Bour: We do.

Chuck Gomes: So we could just make an amendment to that and change it to a minimum of or make it 10 business days.

Ken Bour: Well this is Ken. What I'd recommend at this stage since we may have a lot of changes, what I would simply do is say because the procedures are not going into the GNSO Operating Review. Nothing's going in officially right. So I would just - let's make the accommodation and the timeline. And let's announce that we have - that we're taking that under advisement and that will be a likely change made in the next iteration of the document.

Chuck Gomes: That makes sense.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah.

Jamie Wagner: Yeah, let - the Council is entitled to approve and to change something. Let them - let everybody have a sense of participation.

Ken Bour: That's good. So yeah, I would suggest...

Jamie Wagner: Yeah.

Ken Bour: ...and since we just published the document, it probably doesn't make sense to start changing it already.

                But we can absolutely note that that's been a request. And we've already accommodated it in the first timeline.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Okay?

Olga Cavalli: Yeah.

Ken Bour: Anything else?

Jamie Wagner: Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: Ken I didn't get it. So we are not proposing a new timeline? We're just giving this one and then...

Ken Bour: No, no. Let me restate that if I may. We are - I am going to change the timeline in this document that you're staring at. So I'm going to give you a - I'll send to the list a new timeline that allows actually it'll be - whatever the number of calendar days is, I'll do the calculation and make sure that we post it right.

                  But it's something like 14 or 15 days, right?

                  And so I'll just put that in there. And I can even footnote it that we adjusted it from - but no one's actually seen this timeline except us, right?

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Ken Bour: What they've seen is they've...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Ken Bour: ...seen the draft document.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Ken Bour: So we could make it an accommodation and put a footnote that says extended to 15 calendar days, you know, for...

Chuck Gomes: Well we don't even need the footnote, do we...?

Ken Bour: Not really.

Olga Cavalli: No...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...because they haven't seen the timeline. We'll just accommodate it in the motion and the...

Ken Bour: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: ...accompanying timeline.

Ken Bour: Correct.

Olga Cavalli: Exactly

Jamie Wagner: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: And no change needed for the motion itself other than the timeline.

Ken Bour: I think that's right.

Anything else then with respect to the - okay, so I think if we're good on the timeline, and I take that we are, does anybody think that on the last box, the last row, I just put Brussels Council Meeting. If we have the actual date I can stick it in there. I just didn't - I didn't look it up.

Chuck Gomes: Pretty much the Wednesday. But Brussels Council Meeting is fine.

Ken Bour: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: We don't - we haven't got an actual schedule yet. And I suppose there's a remote chance that could change. It hasn't in years but...

Ken Bour: So it would be 23 June, right?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. But I - Brussels Council Meeting is fine.

Ken Bour: Okay.

Jamie Wagner: I would add only June.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. So you could say June. June Brussels Council Meeting or...

Ken Bour: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: ...Brussels Council Meeting in June, whatever.

Ken Bour: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: This is Olga. But if the chances of it changing are very few, why don't we include the date?

Ken Bour: Yeah. This is Ken. I'll do that. I'll put 23 June Council Meeting (Brussels) or something like that.

Jamie Wagner: Okay.

Ken Bour: That'll be - it'll be clear. Okay, good, anything else then on the timeline?

                 Great, how about the resolution?

                 By the way I hope I've given you control over the size of the text. I meant to.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Ken Bour: Okay, good.

Chuck Gomes: I haven't even had to adjust it either.

Ken Bour: Would anybody like me to read it?

Chuck Gomes: Aren't we all okay with the resolution? Didn't we all review it already?

Jamie Wagner: I didn't review it paragraph by paragraph. But I'm completely confident on Ken's work.

                   And I have one observation that I sent in an email to Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah.

Jamie Wagner: Some - is that I think the main concern of everybody and the topic that possibly could be submitted to the constituencies to get some notice of our work would be the project list.

                   And I think it would be advisable to send to the Council the project list in advance for each counselor to submit it to it's constituency or Working Group or...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Yeah you're talking about well in advance of the 20 May meeting?

Ken Bour: Well this is Ken. I just want to make it clear that step one of the timeline between the 26th and the 30th of April is for staff to put its recommendations together about the project list. And then between 3 and 12 May that's when the counselors.

                   And I think what Jamie may be talking about getting it out not just to the counselors but to their - the constituencies and the stakeholder groups. Is that what you're talking about?

Jamie Wagner: No. I mean the counselors may be - may want to send this - submit this list to their constituencies. I mean not (their stand) but they want - they would like to submit so - I think as well.

There is - because our - isn't this already done, this first step?

Ken Bour: No, it's not done. I don't - this is Ken. I don't believe it's done. I mean what we did as a team is we went through and, you know, we took our own stab at the project list that should be eligible and not eligible.

But, you know, I'd have to get with (Liz) and (Rob) and some other people and sit down and really go through it, Margie. Make absolutely sure. Marika is another one. And make absolutely sure that everybody is in agreement that we - the eligible and non-eligible and everything is classified properly.

And I think that that's...

Jamie Wagner: Okay.

Ken Bour: ...an activity that I would go ahead. And I might even start it now or at least after the Council Meeting.

But we have to get that done according to the timeline by the 30th of April and then...

Chuck Gomes: Now let me make a suggestion to accommodate Jamie's concern because you're right, Jamie. Each of us will want to send it to our respective groups.

So going back to the timeline, in the 3 - the 12 May block there...

Ken Bour: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: ...why don't we make 3 May a separate row. And the Chair asks for the Council approval and via email and ask that they be forwarded to the - you know their respective groups.

And then make 4 to 12 May, you know, the review and discussion by the Council and their groups.

Does that make sense?

Jamie Wagner: Yes. Chuck I think my concern is covered by the timeline.

But it's only I have - I suppose that the project is what already approved by the staff and it was already a consensus.

If it is not, I understand the timeline. I just thought that the project list could be anticipated. Still I thought it was already approved and consensus but...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Jamie Wagner: ...if it's not I think the timeline...

Chuck Gomes: I still think that's right the two tasks. That task into two.

Jamie Wagner: Yeah, okay.

Chuck Gomes: Does that make sense? I mean...

Jamie Wagner: So.

Chuck Gomes: ...to make sure that...

Jamie Wagner: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: ...realize it needs to be sent out to the Council list by the 3rd. And then the rest of that time is used for review and comment.

Jamie Wagner: Our next meeting will be on the - let me...

Chuck Gomes: The Council Meeting's on the 20th, right?

Jamie Wagner: I guess. Okay. So it will be - but if this - oh okay. So we have - we'll be in this - we will have only - let's see. No, no, it's okay, (30) days to pass to the constituencies. I think it's okay. I think no problem.

Okay, we can separate the two, the asking and also the approval.

Chuck Gomes: Does that make sense Ken?

Ken Bour: This is - yeah. I just had to step away for just a second but...

Chuck Gomes: I did too so.

Ken Bour: Yeah, what language should I use for 3 May? Chair - is this where the Chair is asking for the counselors to disseminate the list to their constituencies?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. That's when the - I assume that the Chair - well let's see. Let me ask a question.

Is staff then by the 30th of April going to - or by the 1st of May or whatever going to distribute the eligible projects list to the Council or is that - or am I going to do that as Chair?

Ken Bour: It's probably an open question Chuck. We haven't thought that carefully through.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, and it's not - I don't care one way or the other. If I'm going to distribute it then what I would say on the 3rd of May is the Chair not - distributes the proposed projects list to the Council list and ask that it be distributed for - to constituencies and stakeholder groups. I would just say groups because then you get the at large and everything else, for review and comment.

And then the 4th through the 12th of May will be time for review and discussion. Actually why is it just...?

Ken Bour: Yeah...

Chuck Gomes: ...4th through the 12th? Oh wait a second.

Jamie Wagner: Yeah my...

Chuck Gomes: Why do we have that complete eight days in advance of the Council Meeting?

Ken Bour: I just assumed that anything that was going to require a Council approval would need to be done eight days in advance.

Chuck Gomes: Well the thing that's got to be done eight days in advance is the projects list and we're doing that way before then.

Jamie Wagner: Yeah.

Ken Bour: Yeah, it could be that I made an error here. I just I didn't want to crouch up, right up on top of the Council Meeting.

And so I just pretended that we needed an eight day period to get the project list formalized before it was presented to the Council.

But of course the Council's the one that's working on it. So maybe that's not necessary.

Chuck Gomes: Well what's necessary is for the proposed project list to be distributed at least eight days in advance. Well we're way ahead of that...

Ken Bour: Correct.

Chuck Gomes: ...because that's going to happen on the 3rd.

Ken Bour: Yeah, okay.

Chuck Gomes: And so...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...we could actually extend that through 12 May to the 19th of May, couldn't we, and take out that complete eight days in advance of Council Meeting?

Ken Bour: Yeah.

Jamie Wagner: Can I suggest something?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Jamie Wagner: I would add in the second line in the timeline say that on 13, after 13th the staff will distribute the project list so we would not modify. I mean only depends, you know. Instead of period I would have a timeline of event. The 30th of April staff distributes the eligible and non-eligible project list to the Council.

And the next event would be well Chuck, I don't know if Chuck must ask for Council approval.

Chuck Gomes: Well.

Jamie Wagner: I don't see the need for this event. What I see is an event of eligible project list approved by Council as the next event after distribution. Is it - am I wrong?

Chuck Gomes: No. I think you're right. I think though that we do need the Council in the meeting on the 20th to approve the project list or make any edits to it before the prioritization occurs.

Ken Bour: Yeah, this is Ken, I...

Jamie Wagner: Yeah, I wasn't...

Ken Bour: ...understand Jamie what you're saying. But I like showing the timeframe for each of these steps just so that it - people understand, you know, I've got a couple of weeks here. I've got one week here, 10 or 15 days here.

We could do it the other way and let people calculate it themselves. But I think it - I don't think it hurts to show the length or the amount of time being...

Jamie Wagner: Okay so but I would then add the events. We have one event that is the distribution of the project list for the Council. And the other is already there, the project list approved by the Council.

Ken Bour: Yes. I'm going to add another row for 3 May. The Chair distributes the list and asks that it be distributed to the constituencies and stakeholder groups for review and comment.

Then I'll - then the next one will be 4 to 19 May and that would be the time in which the Council begins digesting and deciding if they are accepting staff

recommendation. If there are any changes, and hopefully they would be made in that timeframe so that on the 20th it could be approved.

Chuck Gomes: Well they could be made on the 6th as well.

Jamie Wagner: I think...

Ken Bour: They could but...

Jamie Wagner: ...there's - I think the second line would extend from the 14th - 4th to the 20th.

Ken Bour: Well I just said the 19th, the day before, right?

                  But, yeah I mean theoretically it could be.

Jamie Wagner: And...

Chuck Gomes: It's probably better to say the 19th just because for some of us and I think that may be one of those meetings or no, I guess it's really early in the day so you really virtually have no time on the 20th to do anything.

Ken Bour: Yeah, frequently there - you might only have 20 or 30 minutes for this topic, right. And so if somebody waits until the 20th to decide they want to change the priority or change the classification that could be a 30 minute discussion.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Ken Bour: It'd be nice to have that on the list ahead of time, right?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Jamie Wagner: Okay.

Ken Bour: Okay, well I'll make those changes to the timeline as we've discussed. I've noted in here on the board so you can see what I'm looking at.

                 Go ahead.

Jamie Wagner: The general rule is just to add the events. I mean one event is Council Meeting. The other event is the distribution of the list. And this should be very straightforward reading.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Ken Bour: Okay.

Jamie Wagner: And if there is another event (I think)...

Ken Bour: Well there's an event in every row. There's an event in every row.

Jamie Wagner: Yes.

Ken Bour: On 31 May the counselors will have completed and delivered their ratings to probably to a staff email account at that point.

Chuck Gomes: That'll be...

Ken Bour: But I think that (should be)...

Chuck Gomes: ...7 June or let's see...

Ken Bour: That'll be 31.

Chuck Gomes: Oh no, that's...

Ken Bour: 31 May. Well it's now going to be...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Ken Bour: We changed the date but...

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Ken Bour: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: If you - yeah, that's fine.

Jamie Wagner: I would suggest that you create a formal event. I mean let's say that at the 31 of May staff communicates who are the counselors that submitted individual ratings to everybody. There was a communication to the Council say - indicating who participated of this first rating and have a formal event of communication because you say from the 21st to the 31st of May, individual counselor's ratings are being completed but...

Ken Bour: Yeah but Jamie...

Jamie Wagner: ...what happens...

Ken Bour: I understand. As a practical matter this isn't going to happen this way I don't think. I mean what's going to - what's likely to happen and I've done these kinds of things before with surveys and other tools is somewhere in the middle of that timeframe we would send a note out saying hey, just want to let everybody know we've received five or six of the counselor ratings and here's the ones we're still - I mean we would be doing that communication probably not just one time at the end. It would be during even the middle so that it would serve as kind of a reminder.

And I don't know that we have to put all that - all those steps in this timeline. I mean we just - I was thinking that for this timeline we just want to give the

counselors a sense of how this thing could be done. And are we going to be able to fit it in. And it looks like we will.

Chuck Gomes: Well one way of accommodating - I think a real easy way to accommodate what I think Jamie is suggesting is and instead of 31 May it's going to be 7 June if I remember correctly.

Jamie Wagner: Right.

Chuck Gomes: For 7 June we add a row that says last day to submit individual ratings.

Jamie Wagner: Or a communication from Ken saying who submitted because from then on we will consider. If somebody submits after the last day, we will consider it, not - no communication provided.

Ken Bour: Well we might. But this is Ken. But, you know, it's the first time. And if something came in on the 8th of June...

Jamie Wagner: Okay.

Ken Bour: ...and we haven't started our analysis, we might be able to flex the rules a little bit.

Jamie Wagner: And...

Ken Bour: But I think what...

Jamie Wagner: Okay, sounds good.

Ken Bour: ...Chuck just said that makes sense to me and we could put an event there that says June 7...

Jamie Wagner: Okay.

Ken Bour: ...7 June last day to submit individual ratings. And that would be a good trigger. I mean there's no - even though we might be flex it a little bit, we sometimes do that with public comment periods, right. We say the last day to do a public comment period is 10 April. And then somebody comments on the 11th and we accept it.

Jamie Wagner: Okay, more flexible then.

Chuck Gomes: Now I don't think this timeline needs to include all internal actions we're going to take, okay. This is more of the actions that we need to - that the Council needs to see.

                So any reminders we send out I don't - other than the ones we've already identified like for me and for staff don't need to be in this timeline.

Jamie Wagner: Yeah, but my suggestion was that to create a formal staff - formal communication that would finalize. But I think it gets more flexible with - if the last date, submit and then we can submit contributions even after that...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: We don't want to say that though.

Ken Bour: So but I...

Jamie Wagner: Yeah, you might not want to say that but...

Ken Bour: Yeah and Jamie but there will be a formal communication. I mean there - we - there may be several of them.

                And but I think those are kind of in the details, I...

Jamie Wagner: Yeah. Okay, no I mean...

Ken Bour: Yeah.

Jamie Wagner: ...if there was a final communication. No these are - what my thinking or my first thinking was to communicate. Well these are the ones that were refused and no - this finishes the individual contribution.

But okay, I don't see the need to do that and it's more flexible the way you are suggesting. And I think it's better, okay.

Ken Bour: Okay. All right, again I'll make those changes.

And then - and everybody is okay with the resolution.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Ken Bour: Okay, and...

Jamie Wagner: Yes.

Ken Bour: ...is there - well okay so do we want to talk about anything else, some of the comments?

Chuck Gomes: Well just before we move onto that and I do want to talk about what Wolf's suggestion was.

But the - Olga you're going to make the motion. And Jamie's going to second it, is that right?

Olga Cavalli: You mean the group is okay with it?

Jamie Wagner: Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: That's fine?

Chuck Gomes: Good. What I - I thought Wolf raised something that's kind of interesting. And I don't know if it affects the Section 6 in the annex or not. Again we don't need to make any changes to it now.

But I thought it might be nice if we spent five minutes talking about his suggestion but because he connected the prioritization exercise with the ICANN budget exercise.

And there's probably some value of thinking about that in the sense that - I mean we have picked the annual meeting as the time for this to happen, the prioritization to happen at least once a year. Is that the best timing or would it be better, you know, in the first meeting of each year so that we could deal with we're closer, the budget process is in place and we could look at that. I don't know.

But I thought he raised a very interesting question.

Jamie Wagner: To link - a formal link between the prioritization work and the budgeting process. Is that you and him are suggesting?

Chuck Gomes: Well I can't speak for Wolf because I'm not even interpreting what he was suggesting well.

But right now we have our or at least once a year prioritization exercise happening by the annual meeting. Well the annual meeting happens towards the end of the calendar year.

But at that point we have no information on ICANN budget or operating plan.

Ken Bour: Yeah, this is...

Chuck Gomes: We don't get that until after the strategic plan is approved by the, you know, either the first meeting in January or the last meeting in the calendar year.

Ken Bour: Yeah, this is Ken if I might make a comment. Stéphane actually raised another question that bears on the same one which is, are we really sure we can only do one prioritization a year.

                 If you extrapolate from Stéphane's comment then there could be a second one that's done at sort of the first part or the first quarter of the year which is closer to the budgeting process and then another one that's done at the ICANN Annual Meeting. That's just another thought. You could do two a year.

Chuck Gomes: Well doesn't our language already allow for more than one if it's needed?

Ken Bour: It does.

Chuck Gomes: That's what I thought of when I saw Stéphane's comments.

Jamie Wagner: Yeah. Yeah, I think at least one.

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Ken Bour: But I think he probably just assumed that if you write it that way your intention is really to only do one unless something comes up.

                 But my sense is that he was going more for it should be done at least twice a year and then more often if necessary. I think that's where he was coming from.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, well we'll have to clarify that.

Ken Bour: So.

Chuck Gomes: And...

Ken Bour: That question though about - Wolf's question about the tie into the budget, that could be one of the things that the Council discusses as part of its review of this whole procedure.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, right.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Jamie Wagner: Yeah, I think if we can mean this to be discussed, yeah. But I didn't pay much attention to Stéphane's comment because I think we can do more than one prioritization session a year.

                 And one thing that is (substance) that he suggests that this will be considered. Anytime there is a suggestion, understand it will be considered, if there is a need for this that it will be considered.

                 I think the way we work - we wrote it this concern is covered.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. So it's something that - I mean we - that's a good thing we can talk about at the Council level on this.

                 And it's, you know, again I think didn't we come to the conclusion that, you know, trying to do two a year might be kind of awfully time consuming if we force ourselves to do that. If we need to we need to and we'll do it.

Jamie Wagner: Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah.

Ken Bour: Yeah, that - Chuck that's my understanding as to how the team got there, yes.

Olga Cavalli: So this is Olga. We should - should we answer all the feedback we had in the list or we should wait until we talk about this at the Council Meeting?

Chuck Gomes: Well it'd probably be good Olga if you responded to both of those messages and say let's talk about this at the Council level.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: We did discuss it on our call. And you might even share with regards to Stéphane's that we think the possibility of having more than one is built in there already.

                 But if he thinks it should be mandatory for more than one that can be talked about on the - at the Council level.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: And Wolf's idea too we should encourage him to I think to, you know, bring up his point at the Council level so that, you know, because we're a ways off from finalizing the actual procedures and so we have sometime to deal with those things.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I think it's also nice to note that the two comments that we did get were largely complimentary.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Ken Bour: Certainly...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: And we're all waiting for (Adrian).

Ken Bour: Well it's certainly nice to have the first two come in complimentary than the other way around. Okay.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, so Ken you're rewriting the timeline and sending out the new version.

Ken Bour: Yes. I'm going to - that's correct. I'm going to prepare this for the list. I'll send it out with a new timeline.

                 And then I think the - Olga I guess you're going to make the motion and Jamie's going to second it, right?

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Jamie Wagner: Yes.

Ken Bour: Excellent.

Jamie Wagner: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Jamie Wagner: I think it's - yeah.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah. I think we're done.

Chuck Gomes: So unless the Council gives us more tasks and they might, for now we don't - we won't schedule any other meeting.

Olga Cavalli: Not for the moment. And I thought that we may have more feedback on the list but I was surprised it was only (Terry) and I think David Olive and

Stéphane, all of us in relation with timeline and not enough time for something (else) or but I thought there was going to be more feedback.

Ken Bour: I didn't - this is Ken, I didn't...

Chuck Gomes: It was nice to get (Terry)'s early so that we're able to accommodate it.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Ken Bour: I'm sorry. Did I miss something? Did you say David Olive commented on it?

Olga Cavalli: Yeah, let me find.

Ken Bour: I only saw two. I only saw (Terry) and...

Olga Cavalli: Maybe he sent it to me. I think it was a message.

Ken Bour: Oh.

Jamie Wagner: I just thought Stéphane - I didn't - oh, okay, (Terry). There is one by (Terry), yes.

Olga Cavalli: (Terry) and it's...

Jamie Wagner: The only one and Stéphane, Stéphane and (Terry).

Ken Bour: Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: No. He just said he will review it. No, I'm sorry. He didn't mention anything timeline. He said he was going to review it and then it's Stefan about the frequency that we are already tasked.

So and it's (Terry), that's it. Okay, David said yes, thank you and I will review it.

Chuck Gomes: So we're going to get a few minutes back today?

Olga Cavalli: Yeah.

Ken Bour: That's up to our Chair.

Olga Cavalli: I think we're done. So Ken, send us the next - the new version and send the motion to the Council list. And Jamie will second it, okay.

Ken Bour: Sounds good. Well and before we adjourn the call, Jamie could I ask you to hang on for just a second?

Jamie Wagner: Excuse me?

Ken Bour: Yeah, after the call is adjourned would you mind hanging on for just a second?

Jamie Wagner: Okay.

Ken Bour: There's something else I would like to ask you. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Hey guys, it's been fun working with you so far. Thanks for all your help. Talk to you later.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you. Bye-bye.

Chuck Gomes: Bye.

Ken Bour: Bye-bye everybody, except Jamie.

Jamie Wagner: Bye.

Ken Bour: Hi Jamie?

Jamie Wagner: Yes.

Ken Bour: Hey I was wondering if you might be agreeable to do a favor.

Glen de Saint Géry: (Kelly), sorry. Can I just put the recording off?

Ken Bour: Oh I'm sorry. Thank you very much Glen.

Glen de Saint Géry: (Kelly)?

Coordinator: Yes.

Glen de Saint Géry: Are you there?

Coordinator: Yes.

Glen de Saint Géry: Can you put your recording off please?

Coordinator: Yes.

Glen de Saint Géry: But can you keep on the two people, Ken Bour and...

Coordinator: Yes.

Glen de Saint Géry: Jamie Wagner.

Coordinator: Yes, thank you.

END