GNSO Work Prioritization Model
TRANSCRIPTION
Monday 22 March 2010at 1800 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO Work Prioritization Model meeting on Monday 22 March 2010 at 1800 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-20100322.mp3

Present for the teleconference:
Olga Cavalli - NCA Chair
Jaime Wagner - ISP
Chuck Gomes - Ry SG

ICANN Staff
Ken Bour
Rob Hoggarth
Gisella Gruber-White

Apologies:
Wolf-Ulrich Knoben – 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. Thank you very much operator. Good evening, morning,

                   afternoon and thank you for joining. Gisella, would you be so kind to help me

                   make the roll call?

Gisella Gruber-White: With pleasure, Olga. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to

                   everyone on today's WPMG call on Monday the 22nd of March. We have

                   Olga Cavalli, Jaime Wagner, Chuck Gomes. From staff we have Ken Bour,

                   Rob Hoggarth and myself Gisella Gruber-White. And we have apologies

                   today from Wolf-Ulrich Knoben. Over to you Olga. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much Gisella and I was talking with Ken before starting the

                   call that I must apologize I have been very, very busy this week with some

domestic issues and with a training course that I am organizing here in Sao Paolo so I am in Brazil now.

And I could follow the list and this is why I sent the message to the list yesterday if we could have any version with all the suggested changes and text. And Ken has been so kind to send these two documents so thank you very much for that. I just could open them just an hour ago.

And the idea for today's call if you agree is to revise first the document that is called 6 Chapter, and try to agree on the certain text and then follow with the other one. But we should focus first perhaps on the first document if that is a good idea for you.

Chuck Gomes: Sounds good.

Olga Cavalli: Great. So Ken, I give the floor to you. You know the document much better than me so could you please help us going through the document and trying to finalize it step by step?

Ken Bour: Thank you Olga. I'd be happy to. Yes, as she indicated, I would suggest that we just march our way right on through Section 6 of the GNSO operating procedures or if that's where we propose to put it at least for now.

And Section 6.1 is purpose. 6.1.1 - so far there haven't been any changes other than Jaime suggested putting in a new D. So why don't we focus on that? I responded to that and Chuck has responded and then Jaime also provided some thoughts.

We just need to decide whether that stays in or comes out or moves to a different place.

Jaime Wagner: The wording I suggested may be not the best but what we discussed in our exchanging letters was that if there was a consensus building up, if it was imminent to the masses consensus.

And I agree that it is imminent, but anyway it is (outside) consensus that is agreed among all the councilors that if an average stake is for that to reflect - to accept this average reflects consensus, this is something that is implied and is indeed I think a form of fostering concerns among the councilors.

Ken Bour: Jaime, this is Ken. May I make a suggestion that maybe I think I understand the point that you're raising, which is the taking of a statistic whether it's median or mean or some other thing, we are making a judgment that when we get to a range that is small and a median value, that that represents our definition of consensus. Is that the point you're trying to make?

Jaime Wagner: Yes. And even though for this draft to be accepted there is a consensus implied because even if there was an average, a median, if the process comes to an average and I don't accept this average as reflecting my opinion or my possible agreement.

If I disagree completely with this average then the whole process is in jeopardy. I mean it lacks something.

Ken Bour: Yeah. This is Ken. I think I understand. May I suggest that it's less of a purpose of the work prioritization program than maybe a factor or maybe we need to say that down in the place further on in the document where we actually discuss the building of this group consensus.

And maybe we need to make our assumption clear there. I would just move it from purpose there down a little bit further.

Chuck Gomes: Ken, this is Chuck. A little different approach although I haven't got the answer to the title - I don't think consensus building is a purpose. But I do

think that the sentence that follows is a purpose, to have a method to reach a reasonable consensus on priorities among councilors in the GNSO community.

I don't know what to replace consensus building with, but I think the rest of that really is a purpose. I don't believe though that like you're saying I think, that consensus building is a general purpose of this prioritizing projects and the methodology. It certainly is consensus building with regard to priorities but that's a much narrower aspect of consensus building.

And more often people when they think of consensus building as the policy process itself and so forth. Does that make sense?

Ken Bour: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: I have a question. Maybe Chuck can help me more than what I understand. I think that we already have some consensus building methodologies in GNSO.

And am I wrong if I think these should apply to all what we do? Or I don't know if you understand my point. We already have some consensus methodologies for different things that we do and we agree. Is not that applicable for this?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah it does. We do have - again, I think the basis of D is right. It's the title that I have a problem with.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. Let me make some suggestions there. I mean we could possibly just title it methodology colon and then say to develop or to a discipline and calculations that would purport to - I'm trying to wordsmith out loud here.

But the idea would be we are coming up with a methodology that is the equivalent of reaching consensus mathematically or arithmetically or statistically or something. Is that the idea?

Chuck Gomes: So what we would say is methodology colon and then to have a method to reach a reasonable consensus on priorities among councilors in the GNSO VA? I could live with that. That's better to me. What do you think, Jaime?

Jaime Wagner: Well, I think we have a semantics problem because consensus building is something, is an expression that we in the context of GNSO has a precise definition I think in the operating procedures.

So relating to policy making and when I was talking about consensus building here it's pertaining to priorities. It's consensus around priorities. And even though I agree this is a narrowing of the large consensus building among policy making, I think it is an important consensus to have consensus among and affecting priorities.

If people disagree with certain priorities they will disagree. This is a fundamental consensus that we speak of. We should have it otherwise it would be many fights on where to put resources and (attention).

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I'm wondering if we should stay away from the word consensus since it has other meanings in the community. And what we are trying to do is to come up with an agreement approach.

And so this is a technique for reaching group agreement on a rating. And if we leave the term consensus out then we don't clash with other meanings that it has inside ICANN.

Jaime Wagner: Okay. That's okay for me. I just didn't realize that there was such a strong concern or huge interpretation of this wording. And I agree that agreement can be a good replacement.

Chuck Gomes: So we're really talking about - okay. So I still like starting off with methodology colon and then say to have a method to reach a reasonable agreement on priorities among councilors in the GNSO community.

Ken Bour: Okay. This is Ken. I'll try. I still have some concern as to whether that is a purpose of work prioritization but I'll defer obviously because of the team's agreement and I'll just go ahead and make those wording changes as we discussed.

Chuck Gomes: I hear what you're saying because we're saying the goals of work prioritization are - yeah, you're right. It doesn't - it really isn't a goal of work prioritization itself.

The methodology - one of our goals as a group and the council is to have a methodology. So you're right. We probably (just replace it).

Ken Bour: Right. I always look at it this way. We do work prioritization for what reasons? And what reason I don't say is to build consensus. Consensus building is a portion of the work prioritization methodology or approach but it's not the reason we do it. That's all I'm saying.

Jaime Wagner: But I think even in the methodology, lest we do any prioritization effort among in the group, what we are trying to have as a group is not agreement on which are the priorities.

And just imagine (definition) without this purpose. And so then we will have a priority without having agreement. It cannot be. It's imminent and just because it is imminent and obvious, this is not a reason for it not to be stated. One of the main goals is to have agreement between all the councilors and all the FGs as to which are the priorities where to put effort and where to put resources.

Chuck Gomes: So there is a fix to this I think. It's not the method that is the purpose, it's the reasonable agreement that is the purpose regardless of priority.

Jaime Wagner: Reasonable agreement on priorities is what is sought independent of the methods.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Did you follow that Ken? It's an easy fix I think.

Ken Bour: You just want me to change the word methodology?

Chuck Gomes: It's not to have a method. It's to have or to reach a reasonable agreement on priorities, okay? If you take out the method part, the method is not the objective.

Ken Bour: Right. Okay.

Jaime Wagner: Yeah.

Ken Bour: I'll try to wordsmith that and we'll use the word agreement. I'll also try to make sure we replace all uses of the term consensus in the document with agreement and the annex as well so that we don't run into different opinion about the words.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. That's good. Could we back up to B? I'm sorry I didn't catch this sooner and maybe it doesn't need to be caught but it says to help the council redirect limited resources where needed.

                 Wouldn't that be better and unfortunately it overlaps somewhat with C and I don't see any easy way to avoid that. But it's not just a matter of redirecting resources. That is one possible outcome. Would it be better to say to help the council manage limited resources where needed?

Redirection of resources is just one possible way of managing. Now again, it overlaps with strategic management as well but I don't see an easy way to avoid that. And one of our goals is not necessarily to redirect resources. It's to manage those resources, some cases of which will mean redirecting them.

Jaime Wagner: Okay.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. That makes sense to me.

Jaime Wagner: It's a more general term managing than redirection.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Right.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Ken Bour: And I made a note to take out where needed but I guess we can leave where needed in place, right?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. I think that's okay.

Ken Bour: Okay. Yeah. All right. So yeah, redirect I will change that to manage. That is a more general term. Sounds good. All right. Are we all right on 6.1.1?

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Jaime Wagner: I'm having trouble here trying to enlarge the letters. How can I do that?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. It's a little small.

Ken Bour: Well, I have it at 150% at the top. Do you see a slider at the top where you can change the...?

Olga Cavalli: No I don't see it.

Jaime Wagner: I don't see it.

Ken Bour: Hang on a second. Let me try something.

Olga Cavalli: Now I see it but I have the problem I told you.

Jaime Wagner: Now I see it.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. I got it. All right.

Olga Cavalli: (It's liney).

Ken Bour: I'm sorry guys.

Jaime Wagner: Now you put it.

Ken Bour: I put it on synch so that when I move it it would move for you. But apparently it doesn't also grow the size. I have it very large on my screen it doesn't show up that way to you.

Chuck Gomes: That helps a lot.

Ken Bour: Okay. Good. So you guys can make that as large as you want it but you're going to have to now control as we move through the document you'll have to slide up and down because I'm no longer controlling it for you, okay?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Okay.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Ken Bour: All right. So I'm on 6.1.2.

Chuck Gomes: Looks good to me.

Ken Bour: And I think A, it looks like it shows change there and I think that came from something Wolf had done but I don't think there is a change there. And yeah, I added personnel and budget resources or somehow we added - I think somebody added budgets there.

Chuck Gomes: Which is good.

Ken Bour: Everything is okay on 6? All right. So I'm just going to make a note 6.1.2 accept changes.

Jaime Wagner: I can agree with that.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah.

Ken Bour: Okay. Let's go to I'm going to scroll down now to 6.2 and there were no changes to the opening paragraph. There were no changes to 6.1.2.

Chuck Gomes: In 6.2.1.

Ken Bour: I'm sorry - 6.2.1. Thank you. In 6.2.2 I tried to make - I noticed that my nouns were getting mixed up. What I would like to suggest is that we use the term category when we refer to prioritized and non-prioritized.

And the word classification when we refer to pen name, monitor, implementation inactive and so all I was trying to do was to stay away from using - changing those nouns and moving them back and forth.

Jaime Wagner: But then you - excuse me, it's Jaime. Wouldn't it be better to define a table category and class referring to the four classes and categories for the two categories prioritized or not and then define those two words?

Chuck Gomes: Well, the classifications are essentially defined in 6.2.2, right?

Ken Bour: Chuck, this is Ken. I think what Jaime is referring to is maybe at the very beginning we say we are using the term category to apply to prioritized and non-prioritized and we're using the term classification to apply to the type of.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Jaime Wagner: In the very first paragraph I'm suggesting. In the very first paragraph to open two categories - I don't know how to pronounce it - prioritized or non prioritized and the prioritized projects are subdivided into four classes.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. That sounds good.

Ken Bour: All right. I'll work that into the opening portion of 6.2. And then I'll try to make sure we use those terms consistently throughout the document and you guys can catch me if I make an error somewhere.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Ken Bour: All right. Moving along then in 6.2.2 D, we have a comment there and that was from Jaime.

Olga Cavalli: Jaime.

Jaime Wagner: Yes. Well, I think there was a clarification by Chuck that (there are different tasks) for implementation and for policy making. So if the tasks are different my comment doesn't make sense.

Chuck Gomes: Rob, is that a correct statement on my part?

Jaime Wagner: I think Rob is not on the call.

Rob Hoggarth: No. I'm on here. I was muted. I believe that is true, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: It may not always be universal but for the most part I think it's true. And in cases where it's not we might have to deal with it differently. But generally it's been true to date.

Ken Bour: Okay. This is Ken. The next - we're okay on that one. Then the next one is a comment of - that was Liz's comment on considered - it's blue - it's colored on mine. It's the last phrase in D.

And she was asking if we were referring to implementation issues that might be taken up by the GNSO in the future. Chuck responded to that. I don't think so. The intent as I recall and then he answered that. That answer was also what my understanding was. And so I just - is everybody okay if we just leave that the way it is?

Jaime Wagner: Let me just catch up. Referring to implementation issues that might be taken up by the GNSO in the future. Yeah. Well, I think this is why I brought about the text here demands that councilors when they make their prioritization exercise should take into account the possible burden of implementation projects on itself.

And then Liz came up with these suggested - I mean her question implied that the trademark SVI project would be such an implementation project that will require this kind of consideration when prioritizing. Then it came to me that the question that if we leave this prioritized implementation projects out of the priority and then we are already taking a part of the staff resources then this in the end is equivalent to give them a higher priority.

I mean they are first considered and then they have their resources. But if it's not the same resources then we have not - there is no need to consider implementation projects.

Chuck Gomes: Right. I think that is true in most cases and when it's not we might consider an implementation project like we did with STI or IRT, whatever. We would probably then lump it back into the prioritization exercise. So there will be cases where there is an exception because the IRT was really an implementation exercise. But it did require GNSO resources and staff resources, the same staff resources again, the same category essentially.

Ken Bour: So this is Ken. It sounds to me like this discussion is leading toward deleting everything from the word while through GNSO - in other words, the entire second sentence. Let me just give my reasoning.

So it's not - if a project is in implementation then we are concluding it's not utilizing community resources and it's not using GNSO policy staff resources. If it comes back to the point where it's doing either of those two we put it back in the Table 1 list and we put it in the prioritization process.

Chuck Gomes: I think that is correct. This is Chuck.

Olga Cavalli: I agree. This is Olga.

Rob Hoggarth: This is Rob. It's simply a case of the term policy staff being a little bit too broad. Essentially you are distinguishing between policy staff and for example services staff. Is that a worthwhile consideration?

Chuck Gomes: I think it is, Rob. Now another thing we could do instead of just deleting that sentence and I'll just throw this out for thought. I'm not opposed to deleting it.

What if we were to change that sentence to say to the extent that community resources are not directly being used and policy staff resources are not being

directly used, a project may not need to be prioritized. Now again, I'm not pushing that. I'm just throwing that out because that's I think consistent with what we have just been saying.

Jaime Wagner: This is Jaime.

Rob Hoggarth: Go ahead Jaime.

Jaime Wagner: You said in the same page of following ideas, I want to remember that we were when we first came to this classification of classes they weren't related in the beginning to the start of a project. So the project would be in full running or it would be the standard.

But then at first I was thinking that implementation was a phase and not a subject that when it finished policy making then it would make many of them enter an implementation phase. This is not a status of standard (as we go). And that's why I thought those implementation projects would also have to be prioritized.

But if we are not any more using the system - if the goal is to manage resources and those implementation resources are not the same, I wonder if it will be a status of a phase to declare that some project has reached its implementation phase.

And as I understand it some implementation projects could require indeed community resources.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck again. I think I hate to bring this up but I think we're going to have to go back and revisit the definition of the implementation category. And the reason being is that as we noticed there are some implementation projects that will kick back into the prioritization schedule.

So what we mean by that implementation was that is it a category or a classification? I forget.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I have a recommendation that (takes) all of this. Let me give it a try. Is that okay?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Ken Bour: So I would leave what we have but I'm going to read it and do my best to - I want to incorporate portions of the second sentence into the first one in this way.

The work effort has completed the recommendation phase, has been approved, is ready to begin or has already started implementation comma and is no longer consuming large amounts of community and/or policy staff resources period. If any of those are false it goes back into the prioritization list.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. I think that's good.

Jaime Wagner: Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah.

Jaime Wagner: Yeah. I think this resolves our conflicts here. But I mean it's not a general - what I tried to remember in my previous comment was that there is a general understanding of an implementation phase.

But now we are kind of narrowing this general understanding with specific definitions in our context. I always have some fear about that because it creates a different language, a jargon of the community. And if we could - I would always prefer to stand, to maintain general interpretation of a rule. I don't know if I made myself clear.

But okay. I think this resolves our conflicts but it will create future understanding problems I think so.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I recommend also removing the word phase. I'll just call it implementation and then put the paren with (implement) and then put the language I just read but take the word phase out because you're right.

That does kind of imply that it's part of an overall GNSO managed thing and this is the implementation phase. But in ICANN it takes it out of the GNSO when you go to implementation.

Jaime Wagner: Yes. Okay. Well, removing this - yes. Okay. Removing the word phase I think it gets more because we are defining something that has a very specific meaning within this context.

And I think we should not use wording that may have a general understanding that is different.

Ken Bour: Okay. This is Ken. Just summarizing that then, I think we're finished with 6.2.2 D. I'm going to remove the comments, I'm going to make the changes that I just outlined and any other discussion on that? Okay.

Jaime Wagner: And I would also remove the council needs to understand the impact and that.

Ken Bour: Yes. The way I wrote it on my notes here is delete the entire second sentence and then put in the stuff I read.

Jaime Wagner: Okay.

Ken Bour: Yeah. Okay. Absolutely. Thank you. So in 6.2.3 it looks like we have a comment. Jaime, it's yours.

Jaime Wagner: Let me see. (Narrow - enlarge it too much). Okay. The part I feel here that after (let me reason) - after submission of the staff recommendation to the chair the GNSO council will modify any classifications if necessary and approve the final prioritized and non-prioritized projects prior to beginning implementation.

Well, I think that we are making two things here - categories and classes. And I think that at first to modify a class project is - well, now it's suspended. I think we should have a formal method to declare that the project is now suspended. And this formula should not be of the kind to create too much bureaucracy.

I mean I suggest a way that the chair declares this class modification. I mean the reclassification of a project in front of some evidence that can be provided by the staff and then if there is no opposition this will be ratified by the next formal consensus prioritization session that will take each four months or each month of the year.

If there is an opposition from any councilor then I suggest a special prioritization session be called to decide on this new classification. Did I make myself clear?

Chuck Gomes: I think you did and again, I thought you did in your note. And I was okay with what you suggested.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I'm not sure I know how to actualize it. I'm not sure I understand. Maybe I don't really understand it at this point. So before we start a prioritization effort we have to get clear on the list just as we did, right?

We took our time and we put things in List 1, Table 2 and we said okay, these are the projects we're going to work on and these are the ones we're not going to work on. That has to be done by the council. The methodology that I

have proposed in this draft is staff makes a recommendation. I'm sorry. Go ahead.

Jaime Wagner: Ken, please - maybe I am confused with one word that you used here. Council will for any classification because classification refers to the four classes and not to the two categories. That's why in 6.2.3 you say that. After submission of the staff recommendation to the chair the GNSO council modify any qualifications is to modify we are talking about the four classes, yes? Community (planning, money and loaning).

Ken Bour: If you think that if we change the word classifications to categories does that solve the problem?

Jaime Wagner: Yes. Yes.

Ken Bour: Okay. I'll make that change.

Jaime Wagner: But it still will have to deal with the problem of changing qualifications after.

Ken Bour: I'm a little bit tangled up here because what puts something in a different category is the classification. They're interrelated. And so we can call prioritized and non-prioritized categories but what makes a project put in Table 1 or Table 2 is its classification.

The classification is what makes it go one place or the other. And so what I was suggesting here is staff is going to come up. They're going to come along and say before the next prioritization we think that Project N, Project Y needs to be implementation. It needs to be in the prioritized list.

The chair is going to put that notification out to the council and say anybody have any problem if we move Project Y from prioritized to implementation status or classification and therefore it gets categorized as non-prioritized? Everybody says that's fine.

And now the lists are complete and now we start the - if somebody says no, I disagree with that then there has to be discussion and somebody will have to figure out how that gets done. I don't know whether we need to make a ruling about how that gets finished.

Jaime Wagner: No. Ken, now I think I understand where my point is because you are referring here in this paragraph to the first passing, the first prioritization session.

Ken Bour: No I wasn't.

Jaime Wagner: And I'm thinking about the process when irregular. How will be the status of a project changed, how the classification of a project will be changed, the class of a project will be changed?

Ken Bour: Jaime, this is Ken. I was not in 6.2.3 I was not referring to the first one. This would happen any time prior to any prioritization effort beginning whether it's annual or it's called.

The staff would be asked for recommendations to make to the status change of any project and then the council would discuss those, agree or disagree, make any modifications that the council could overrule staff's recommendation and that's what I was trying to get at here.

Jaime Wagner: Okay. So what I'm bringing out we would have to wait for a council meeting to modify some private or extended and we would have to wait for a council meeting or even to call for a new meeting on in order to change its class.

And I was devising a process that would take effect immediately and that would not remove councilors or the council's authority to overrule some decisions. My process just...

Ken Bour: This is Ken. What I had thought would happen is let's say we're coming up on the annual time before an ICANN meeting we're about to do a prioritization. Let's say it's our third one.

We're three years into this, right? And just before that the chair of the GNSO council says okay, in preparation for our session that we're going to have to do prioritization this year we want to get the project list straightened out. I have Table 1, I have Table 2. We have a short item on the regular council meeting agenda that precedes that and we go through and they say now staff is recommending we make four changes to the list.

We're going to put these over here and these over here. Is everybody okay with that? And if everybody - once that is done that's going to be just a regular council agenda item. Then the meeting gets scheduled to do the prioritization based on the prioritized categories. That's how I envisioned it. Maybe I didn't say it very well.

Jaime Wagner: Yes. Okay. It works. I only mean that in the interim between two prioritization sessions a project that was active can become inactive and it will be recognized only at the next regular prioritization session or it will be declared inactive.

What I was suggesting is it could be declared inactive by the chair and the decision would take full effect as to priorities' sake immediately and not have to wait for the next regular prioritization session. I mean and if there was an opposition then it would wait or would be called a meeting only to solve things. Do you understand it? I'm not sure if my suggestion is not understood because of my poor English or if it's not understood because it's too (new) or time consuming.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I think part of the problem may be that we are in a scope section of the document and we're not in the methodology section. In the

methodology section I think the very first step that I recommended - this is down in 6.3 - is to confirm the prioritized project list.

So that maybe - let me think about this. I think what you're saying Jaime, it sounds like you want there to be flexibility to change the classification and category of projects at any time, not just when we're doing prioritizations.

Jaime Wagner: Yes.

Ken Bour: Okay. And so - okay. I guess I'll have to think about that.

Jaime Wagner: What I now realize is that when you change the classification and I think certainly there is a mixture, some of the constituencies refer to some and others (face that) as well.

And I think in that case in suspense standings of something if it is referred to staffers. And in this I mean to inform the community that a project is now pending something is something that I think should be done as soon as possible. We are now pending something.

Well, the staff recommends to the chair, the chair declares, well, this project is now pending from this information or this action from the other groups of ICANN so it's not any more a prioritized project. This information has an affect on resource allocation I think.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I think I see another issue here, a problem and I know why it's coming up. This whole Section 6 and the annex are primarily written to do one thing and one thing only and that's to get a prioritization done.

It is not intended to write the prescriptions about how the council should manage the prioritized projects after they are prioritized. It's only to get the prioritization done. Now as you have heard me say before I believe this very strongly. That prioritization is only step one of a much bigger discipline of the

council to manage the project workload. But that's not what this section and the annex are purporting to do.

The comment that you just made about changing the classifications midstream doesn't have a place to fit in here because this whole method, this whole Section 6 is all about prioritizing. And so if we are between prioritizations, we are not in this Section 6 at that point. We're somewhere else.

Jaime Wagner: Well, okay. That's an understanding I had not. I should read this with this overall understanding.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. Does what I just said make any sense?

Jaime Wagner: Yes. But it was not the filter I had before.

Ken Bour: Yeah. It just occurred to me that if we try to write into this section the various aspects of how the council is going to use the information about the priorities I think we're going to get tangled up a little bit.

I would almost suggest that we have a Section 6.5 or 6.6 or something down the road later that says okay, now that the prioritization is done in 6.1 or 6. - whatever we're talking about, now we have what is it we do with this work? And that is a completely different question and we have not dealt with that question yet.

Jaime Wagner: When I asked you - but Ken please, when I asked you if you were referring to a first prioritization you said no. I'm referring to the prioritization process not only the first one to have a prioritization but the others also.

So then you know this interpretation is the first use - something that even you had not.

Ken Bour: I stick by what I said. This is Ken. I was not referring to the first prioritization and I'm still not. But I am referring to a formal prioritization step meaning that the only time that this Section 6 comes into play is when it's time to do a formal prioritization.

              Now it doesn't have to be only once a year but if the chair calls for one, right? Let's say that a number of projects' statuses have changed and the chair says it's time to do another prioritization. That would be Section 6.

Jaime Wagner: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. I'm struggling a little bit here. We seem to have gotten off on to a lot of other directions. If I look at 6.2.3 it discusses how to change categories and/or classifications.

              And what I though Jaime was suggesting is a simpler process for doing that, that after the staff makes recommendations the chair could make a decision on that and then provided there were no council objections it was done. Now we're going off into lots of other things. I'm confused.

Jaime Wagner: It's the same thing. We still are in this. But what Ken is explaining right now is that the purpose of this Section 6 applies only to a prioritization session and not to what happens in between sessions.

              And my recommendation is changing status is something that applies to between sessions that can be approached in another part of the document.

Chuck Gomes: So you weren't recommending that easier approach for the regular prioritization session or even special prioritization sessions. You were recommending it for in between?

Jaime Wagner: I mean Chuck, my recommendation in the end is in a prioritization session it tends to be the equivalent to what is written here.

I was referring to a more expeditious way to change the classification in between formal prioritization sessions in order to take effect immediately and not have to wait for a regular prioritization session that may take a year for it. Yes I was referring to - as to your answer, I was referring to what happens in between.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I don't see an easy way to do that because we have decided now to do these only once a year formally unless there is a special reason to do it. And we're into a sort of different area.

We're talking about now how does the council work with the prioritization list, how does it manage it in between prioritizations? And we don't change the priority but we might take a project from Table 1 and put it in Table 2. And that isn't something that is covered here because this is trying to just get the prioritization itself done.

Chuck Gomes: And it would not only apply to a full prioritization exercise but also one when a possible new project is introduced.

Ken Bour: Yes. And we do have that.

Jaime Wagner: But the problem - I think we didn't tackle this problem, Ken. And I think it's really - we still have to deal with the problem of a new project. But we also have to tackle the problem of the removal of a project from the prioritized list.

And that can be because of the project spending has some input from the board. Do you understand? What I was suggesting is that we might have a session that creates and acknowledges this changing of classification of a project and with a map to do that and (what we would like that to be) the chair would declare the change.

I think even though we didn't put it in the first document, I think we could add a section on this, the removal of a project form the prioritized list that is done by reclassification. In some instances it's obvious.

Ken Bour: Yeah. This is Ken. That's fine. And I think I said that earlier we can create additional sections or maybe even a new chapter. In fact at one point I had thought that we might retitled this whole thing not GNSO work prioritization but GNSO project management or GNSO work management.

And prioritization would only be one sub-chapter or sub-section of that whole document. And so I think there is an awful lot of things we have to talk about when we get into the management issue versus just the prioritization issue. And I don't know that we have time to tackle all that between now and April 13.

Olga Cavalli: Ken, this is Olga. I think that you made a good point and the task that we have been assigned by the GNSO is developing a methodology for prioritizing the projects, not finding a broader way to manage all the projects. So we should focus maybe on our mission.

Chuck Gomes: Let me ask a question. This is Chuck. We have spent an awful lot of time on this one point. How critical is it to spend so much time on it? I'm having trouble valuing the importance of it. I know we can deal with it if and when it happens but is this so critical that we should be spending half of our call on this one issue?

Jaime Wagner: No. Okay. But I think Ken is reducing the scope of our work. For me maintaining the scope of our work is - this can be left for other work or other discussion that will happen after the further implementation.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Ken Bour: Okay then.

Jaime Wagner: Okay.

Ken Bour: Okay? All right. That sounds good. This is Ken. I notice that we're at the hour point. We still have - I had kind of hoped we would get through this entire document and we still have a ways to go. Let's - Olga, any suggestions?

Olga Cavalli: I can stay for maybe half an hour more but I don't know if you guys are able to. Or maybe we can work some here and work with the list with the rest of the document and revise it and (then move in some changes).

Chuck Gomes: We have had some discussion on list. Are there any other issues that need to be discussed on the call? Or is there pretty good concurrence on the rest of the edits that are shown?

Olga Cavalli: There are some comments. This is Olga. There are some comments in the next paragraph. But not - I don't think that they are major ones.

                   Perhaps Ken, if you could - you drafted the comments in the right part and do you find very big issues about final text? Maybe you can take those comments out and present in the first draft of the whole document and maybe we can read it and agree on it. I think that would be very good.

Chuck Gomes: I thought that has already been done.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah. Me too but I'm just talking about going through the comments again.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I find myself ill equipped to determine whether something that is major or minor because as we just discovered 30 minutes we spent on a topic that I didn't - I think that's just the nature of the group work.

Any one of these comments could take an entire hour-long discussion if we decide that it merits it. I'm not sure I can do much more. I put comments in. Other people have comments but we don't have any consensus and we haven't discussed whether one idea is better than another.

They don't all agree. I mean I definitely can take a staff point of view and say this is what I recommend and write it up that way and then you guys can look at it.

Chuck Gomes: Well, which of the remaining ones, the changes that have occurred, still have alternative views?

Ken Bour: Well, let's take a look.

Olga Cavalli: That was my question. I was checking the text. Are there major things to decide? Maybe we can address some of them now quickly or just comment.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. Go ahead.

Olga Cavalli: Jaime, go ahead.

Jaime Wagner: I have no problem (staying on the call).

Chuck Gomes: I can do it but I can't do it longer than a half hour. I have got way too much to do.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. Let me then in the next 30 minutes - this is Ken. Let's see if we can in fact really just skip through it. In 6.3.1 I had suggested we could take the goals out. Does anybody have a problem with that?

Chuck Gomes: And why did you want to take them out?

Ken Bour: Well, it was basically Liz basically said we've got to keep this document as short as possible and look for ways and things we can take out. And when I was going through it I said well, I'm not sure we have to say what our team goals were in producing the methodology.

We have developed a methodology that in fact is user friendly and does produce but we don't have to say what all those goals were. We can do that in - okay?

Chuck Gomes: That's fine.

Jaime Wagner: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Okay.

Ken Bour: Okay. Now sliding on down, that was just a small one. I added some steps in 6.3.3. First step before prioritization, confirm the list. Two and three were the same and then four, publish the rankings. That seems pretty minor. Is that okay?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Ken Bour: Now 6.3.4 has to do with frequency. So we said a formal prioritization rating would be conducted once per fiscal year to be approved at the meeting and it can be conducted more frequently if recommended by the chair and approved by the council.

We have some comments there and Chuck said it should suffice to simply use the default voting threshold. If that's not achieved then prioritizations would not be conducted more frequently. So is everybody okay with taking a vote? Do we have to say it that way?

Jaime Wagner: I would like Chuck to explain because I'm not sure I understood your comment.

Chuck Gomes: Let me look back at what I was commenting on and make sure I was commenting on the right thing in the right place.

Ken Bour: While he's thinking, this is Ken. I have some language in there about putting in rough consensus and I think I changed it to I took all that out after Chuck put his comment in.

Chuck Gomes: That's why I'm missing it. Yeah. I definitely did not think we should be talking about rough consensus, which has no definition and so forth. We should use existing voting thresholds. So you have actually fixed the problem that I was concerned about.

Ken Bour: I attempted to, that's right. This is Ken. But I remember that in Nairobi there was a lot of discussion. I think it was Wolf that said that we shouldn't use voting. And we should only use consensus and the group should just talk about it so that's why I wrote it that way.

Chuck Gomes: Well, than you've got to define consensus and rough consensus.

Olga Cavalli: Rough consensus.

Chuck Gomes: And they're not defined.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I'm okay with it the way it is now. I guess the question is is the team okay and do we think we have done justice to Wolf's issue if we leave it this way?

Jaime Wagner: Yes. I think we put this voting without referring to voting thresholds. I mean...

Ken Bour: This is Ken. The voting threshold is already defined for anything in the - this would fall under the default voting threshold of the council.

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Jaime Wagner: Yes. Okay.

Olga Cavalli: I'm okay with that. Yes.

Ken Bour: Okay. Then I think we're done with 6.3.4. 6.3.5 A - okay, right. Now this is I have a comment in here. When we talk about the procedures during one of our earlier meetings we defined a bunch of questions that would be asked when a new project comes up.

               And these questions strike me as being operational questions that are as part of the council's management responsibility but not specifically related to the prioritization exercise unless somebody has got a different view.

Jaime Wagner: You have already heard that from me, it's kind of difficult to make the separation if it's not very clear between prioritization and management. I mean (unintelligible).

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I quite agree that it is but I see it as a different step. You can prioritize and then not manage and you can manage and not prioritize. But what we decided is we should prioritize and use that information in the management, right?

               And so I'm just wondering - I'll tell you what. Why don't I just delete my comment for now and I'm the only one who had any comment on it.

Olga Cavalli: Ken, this is Olga. Apart from your comment what is your proposal with this part of the text?

Ken Bour: Move it to a new section that hasn't been written yet. In other words we would build another section that says now that the prioritization is done here is what the council should do with the data and here are some questions that should be asked like for example when new projects come up.

And here are questions that should be asked as categories change, here is how categories change and here are the implications of those. And then there is the whole other set of materials around tools. I mean how will the council know how much resources have been put on Project A versus Project B and how many resources are assigned there and all of that kind of stuff?

So if you think about what a project manager needs to do a job, that would be the whole area of what the council is going to need to actually do anything once the priorities are set.

Olga Cavalli: This is Olga. Are we having time to do this other part of the document with the time constraints that we have to present this document to the council?

Ken Bour: Yeah. This is Ken. I think we have got.

Chuck Gomes: I have a totally different question on this. I'm not sure it can be moved because the more we go through this exercise of trying to work on priorities and we have a real live example in front of us right now with the VI PDP working group.

Regardless of what - we can do all we want on prioritization and I think that's important but when it comes down to it the questions you're asking in A are really important before we make a decision on a PDP regardless of how it might have come out in a prioritization exercise.

What types of resources do we need, are they available? Are there sufficient staff and community resources? That's what it really comes down to. And if we would have just done our prioritization exercise before we made a

decision on a PDP for VI we would have probably said, hey, we don't have the bandwidth.

Now look what has happened. We have 50-60 people willing to work. Staff has assigned some resources to it. So if it came out low on the prioritization list would we have put it aside? So somewhere along the line we have to look at present reality and evaluate the availability of resources before we make any final decisions. And that is not going to come out of a prioritization exercise.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I completely agree with everything that you just said. The issue of the question in the comment relates to the structure of the document and where things belong, right?

So we're going to do a prioritization. You're asking valid questions and these questions here in this section are all about the management aspects of it, not the prioritization.

Chuck Gomes: And I'm disagreeing with you.

Ken Bour: All right.

Chuck Gomes: I'm saying that they have everything to do with prioritization because if first of all they have to do with whether or not we need to prioritize because if we have got enough resources then why do we need to prioritize?

And in this particular case, the VI PDP, it appears that there are enough resources. That doesn't even come into question. In fact, we have more than we know how to handle.

Ken Bour: In the interest of time - this is Ken. I'm perfectly happy to delete my comment so I would suggest for the time being we table that. I'll delete my comment

out of the document and I would propose to move to the next comment, the next issue.

Rob Hoggarth: With one exception - this is Rob, if I can just interject real quick. There are plenty of resources now for the VI but that means something will fall off the list. And I guess the issue then becomes do you formalize that process?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. No, it's a valid point and that's been one of my concerns in watching this thing go on - okay, a lot of these people are on multiple groups that are doing this and how is that going to affect everything else?

Rob Hoggarth: Let's grab victory while we can. Ken is backing off on this.

Ken Bour: I definitely am.

Jaime Wagner: Excuse me, this is Jaime. I was kind of liking Ken's line of reasoning that one thing's prioritization and another thing is management. And I declare that I have problems with making this distinction.

If I understand you were suggesting to remove this section from this document maybe for another work that would be done after our prioritization, is that, Ken?

Ken Bour: That was the original thrust of my comment but I think in the interest of time it's probably not necessary. And as this whole prioritization effort evolves and matures there will be time to go back and attempt to do that later.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And it seems to me that these questions maybe need to be asked before we even do a prioritization exercise when we're looking at a specific project and a new project in particular.

Olga Cavalli: So this is Olga. We are keeping the text in this part of the document?

Ken Bour: This is Ken. Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. I'm okay with that.

Jaime Wagner: Ken had suggested to maintain. Well, Ken, the problem is that you have convinced me of something and then you (back down).

Ken Bour: I'm sorry but I'm sensing the time, I know how much we have to get done. We have got a deadline coming up and as Rob Hoggarth recently reminded me we don't want perfection to be the enemy of the good. That's an old expression.

Jaime Wagner: Well, you know that I'm a guy that is not constrained by pressure. I think we should do what we think is better to be done and to give some thought to the questions here.

                 You convinced me that management and prioritization are two things apart. And well, I think removing this to another is something that should be considered. Well, Chuck, as I understand your disagreement with this consideration shall be taken from the first prioritization?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. I think they're almost questions that need to be asked - don't need to be managed afterwards. Maybe they need to be managed afterward also but need to be looked at up front.

Jaime Wagner: Okay. But the questions could be moved to another part of the document and I think what Ken was suggesting, now he has removed his suggestion, is to leave out consideration of new projects to another document as well. This doesn't mean that these questions are good questions and can be put in prioritization in another part of this document here. And this is something that...

Chuck Gomes: Well, what I thought I understood being suggested that it would be moved to something like a project management document rather than as part of the prioritization project.

And it seems to me that these are all critical questions to be asked in the prioritization effort.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I'm going to try to take a middle position here without exactly - because this section is titled new projects we are basically maybe borrowing a little bit from the management world just for the sake of the prioritization.

So what I'm trying - I think maybe what we're saying here is this and if I look at A and B together this is the tie in. A basically says before you start work prioritization you have to look at the new projects that come up. And the first thing you have got to do is you've got to categorize them and you've got to classify them and here are some questions that would be useful to ask in that process.

Now D says depending on the outcome of that analysis, if the project is approved and then it gets put in the prioritized list then you go ahead and do a prioritization. If it's not you don't.

And so maybe what I'm doing is I think we can make an argument here that this new project methodology stuff, the management stuff, is pertaining to the prioritization effort and not to general management, which we could leave for a later section and a different time. How is that?

Chuck Gomes: Right. Yeah. I appear to be missing some numbering in the document as I'm looking on the Adobe Connect thing. I go from - there it is. This is Section 3. Never mind. I found it. It was just in a different place. I'm okay.

Ken Bour: Section 3.5.

Chuck Gomes: 6.3.5 is new projects. Okay.

Jaime Wagner: Yeah. And well...

Chuck Gomes: By the way, my question in the third bullet there, I don't understand that
second question under A.

Ken Bour: And I tried to write an answer to that in the comment right below it in blue. Do
you see it? I'd be happy to read it.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, go ahead. That's really - I'm trying to keep comments and text on the
same screen and it's really small to do that.

Ken Bour: Yeah. What I wrote, Chuck, was - let me just read the question. Originally it
read so the full question is should this new project have a deadline imposed
thus establishing urgency, if it is determined to be urgent can any real
consequences be identified that will cause the date to be perceived and
treated as critical?

And Chuck said I'm not sure I understood what that was all about. And so the
answer I wrote was this question derived from some discussion that Jaime
and I had regarding what causes urgency to be perceived as real. If there are
no consequences associated with missing a deadline then it is often treated
as not urgent.

Assigning a date deadline by itself is frequently insufficient to propel teams to
accomplish their tasks within a specific timeline.

Chuck Gomes: What are real consequences? I mean is a board deadline sufficient to be real
consequences if we miss it?

Ken Bour: I don't know. The question asks if we could find any. It doesn't try to say what
they are.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. I at least understand the question so that's okay. We don't need to belabor that.

Jaime Wagner: Yes. One more clarification - a board deadline would not suffice but a board decision would be a real consequence.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. We can go on beyond that.

Ken Bour: Okay. I'm just making a note to that effect so I don't forget. All right. So the next one was just fixing the nouns. We already discussed and then we go to we're down to the last one.

                 Okay. In that Section Bii, the last sentences says that if the chair determines that a specific rating is deemed necessary to proceed with the council's management responsibilities then the chair will call for the new project to be formally rated per 6.3.3. And the comment was 6.3.3 covers the full prioritization exercises. Is that what was intended here?

                 And I wrote an answer that said I did intend that the council would undertake the normal prioritization process but perhaps it could be streamlined for a new project. For example, we could have staff to recommend a provisional rating and then ask the council to approve it pending the next official prioritization effort. Anybody else have any other thoughts?

Jaime Wagner: Well, I'm still dealing with your bigger question that it can be very good. You convinced me as to the removing of a project and so the inclusion I think would be much more a case of management than the removal of a project, the inclusion of a project. That's more a case in the prioritizing. I mean it will be included anyway. I mean how is it included? It would be the formal prioritization session? It would not require...

Chuck Gomes: Where are you at, Jaime?

Jaime Wagner: I'm in the old 6.3.5. I'm referring to the new projects.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. I got it.

Jaime Wagner: I mean I would read following Ken's reasoning that he convinced me in this call that management is different than prioritization. And then I would say that the inclusion of a new project in the prioritization session, we should treat this as something that will be supposed to be included.

It will have - it will be - it works like we have in the 6.2.3 - I think it's 6.2.3. Yeah. (Process for staff recommending for modifying the classification) (unintelligible) - well, if a project is included it will be on the list. So okay.

And these questions should be treated as (factors). I think they are mixed with new (factors) here. And they are already in the (factors), important and difficult. Sorry for being such a - but I cannot just for the sake of hurry pass by my feelings that I want to share with you.

Chuck Gomes: So where would these questions show up in our document?

Ken Bour: This is Ken. Go ahead.

Jaime Wagner: I believe they should (feature as factors) that should be considered when doing a prioritization.

Chuck Gomes: But they are not there now.

Jaime Wagner: Well, they can be. They are pertaining to difficulty except for that line that pertains to importance.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. I'm not sure they are captured well under difficulty.

Olga Cavalli: This is Olga. Jaime, I'm not sure that I followed you completely. What is it that you are proposing?

Jaime Wagner: Well, I'm following Ken's proposal of removing the section and a new (one).

Olga Cavalli: The questions.

Jaime Wagner: Not only the questions - all the constraints upon new projects from this document and we have - and I want these questions if they are - it seems to me that Chuck is thinking that they are very useful and very necessary to be considered. And I would move them to enlarge the factors. But I'm sorry to be complicating things.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I want to see if I can suggest a simplification that might work for everybody. Do we all agree that before a formal prioritization occurs, which is the substance of the document we're writing that we should take into consideration anything that might affect the prioritization?

And if we agree that that's true then maybe all this material shouldn't be under a new project session, it should be under a factors affecting the prioritization effort. And new projects is only one of them. Changes to classifications is another and we have already talked about that.

What I was proposing to do is to harmonize all of the things that might influence a prioritization and put them under step one of the methodology. Now if you look above in 6.3.3 general procedure, the first step is to confirm the prioritized project list. That could have sub-steps to it.

And Sub-step A could be to take into account any changes that have occurred to the project that might affect its position in Category A or Category B or its classification. A second step would be are there any new projects that need to be added or not?

In that section we say now, before you decide whether to add a new project here are some questions you should ask yourselves and that's where we would put those. So maybe what I'm suggesting is moving the new project section and incorporating it into the methodology where it belongs as part of confirmation of the project list. Now it belongs under the prioritization section.

Jaime Wagner: Okay. But this leads us to the same problem. Okay. I agree with it.

Chuck Gomes: As long as they are captured somewhere I'm okay with that. I think they're critical things to consider.

Olga Cavalli: All right. This is Olga. I agree that it should go first.

Jaime Wagner: Yes. I agree also.

Ken Bour: I'm sorry - this is Ken. Olga, I'm sorry I didn't hear your comment.

Olga Cavalli: That I agree with you.

Ken Bour: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: That's a good one.

Ken Bour: I was going to suggest let me take the material in new projects, all that material, and reconstitute it as part of the methodology and not its own like category because it doesn't flow properly and it's out of context.

And what I would try to do is put it in context as part of the prioritization effort so that it makes sense. And we won't spend a lot of time dwelling on the managerial aspects of it. We're only talking about the factors that affect the prioritization itself.

Jaime Wagner: And the prioritized project list.

Ken Bour: Yes sir.

Jaime Wagner: Yes. Okay.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Ken Bour: And so I will submit a new draft with that in mind.

Olga Cavalli: This is Olga. Did we solve the last comment? I'm not sure that we agreed in it. The last one - Section EE in 6.6. - the very last one. Did we talk about it?

Jaime Wagner: This was the one that I would ask Ken that you consider also in this step the removal of not the procedure but the removal of projects because of the new classifications. There will be a list of projects to be removed and that should be expressed.

Chuck Gomes: And that should be a relatively big step in most cases.

Jaime Wagner: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. This is Olga. It's half an hour more than our time and I personally have to leave and I know that you all are also very busy. So Ken, I would suggest the following.

                 Send us the new draft with all these discussions and suggestions that we have made/have had and it could be good if we agree with it in the list or just make suggestions of our changes and deletions in the list and work on this document and have it finished for our next call and we move forward. That would be very good if we are able to.

Ken Bour: Yeah. I just want to call your attention to the fact that we have two more Monday meetings before the 13th.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Ken Bour: And so we have to nail this one down and the annex between now and two weeks from now if we are going to meet that deadline so we can turn the document over to the council on the 13th, eight days before their meeting.

Chuck Gomes: Good.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Ken Bour: Great. I'll summarize all that and put it in an email and I'll get a new draft out directly.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks everybody.

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bour: Jaime, yeah, I'm sorry. It'll be on the 29th. Are you there? No. I guess not.

Gisella Gruber-White: Twenty-ninth of (April did you say)?

Ken Bour: Yeah. I think it's the 29th, Gisella.

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bour: Yeah. I don't think Olga is going to be able to join us.

Olga Cavalli: No. I won't join on Monday but I'll follow up with what you are doing after the call and I'll join in the next call.

Ken Bour: Terrific.

Chuck Gomes: All right. Talk to you later.

Ken Bour: Okay. By everybody.

Olga Cavalli: Bye. Thank you Ken. Bye.

Ken Bour: Bye-bye.

                        END