GNSO Work Prioritization Model
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 09 February 2010at 1700 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO Work Prioritization Model meeting on Tuesday 09 February 2010 at 1700 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:
http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-wpmg-20100209.mp3

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

ICANN Staff
Ken Bour
Rob Hoggarth
Glen de Saint Géry
Gisella Gruber-White

Apologies:
Stephane van Gelder
Wolf-Ulrich Knoben - ISP

Operator: Please go ahead the recordings have been started.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, thank you very much. Good afternoon, good evening everyone.

                 Thank you for joining. Gisella or Glen, would you help me please making roll

                 call to see who is on the call.

Gisella Gruber-White: Yes, with pleasure Olga. Good morning, good afternoon to everyone. On

                 today's call we have Olga Cavalli, Jaime Wagner, Chuck Gomes. From staff

                 we have Ken Bower, Glen DeSaintgery, Rob Hoggarth and myself, Gisella

                 Gruber-White. We have apologies from Stephane Van Gelder and if I could

                 just remind everyone, please, to state their names when speaking, thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, thank you very much. Okay, thank you again for the interesting email. I must confess that your email has put my English in a very high top challenging situation which I love.

And I read it, thank you Jaime also for your contribution and my apologies for having no time for translation, but finally the translation was made by Jaime. I really had a lot of things to do this week and I found it difficult for translating it. But I thought it was a very interesting document and I commend you for writing that.

I would like Ken and Jaime perhaps talk about the email and summarize what you are proposing, Ken. I would I pass the mic to you. And so you maybe tell us what's your suggestion for next steps.

Ken Bower: Okay, thank you Olga. Well, the essence of the email was an attempt for me to sort of walk through my own thinking based on the discussions that we've had after the interaction with Jaime on the topic of urgency and how it might relate to this model.

And so I sort of - my goal was to walk through my own thinking logically and try to lead to a set of possible recommendations and conclusions. And maybe rather than try to walk back through the logic, maybe I could just start with where I - my current thinking is. And of course, it's not my team, I'm just trying to help.

So I - after talking and conversing back and forth via email with Jaime, it just didn't seem to me and this is just a hypothetical, I'm tossing this out to the group, that urgency is probably not a useful concept for us to introduce into this model, although it was very interesting to think about it. Maybe I'll just sort of stop there and see if there's consensus on that point of view.

Jaime Wagner: Can I add some...

Olga Cavalli: Sure.

Jaime Wagner: ...thoughts of mine.

Ken Bower: Absolutely.

Jaime Wagner: I just - Ken and I had exchanged some emails and in the end I think Ken summarize it very well in the - in this email that is in - well not to take longer, I agree with his suggestion that the team would be a waste of time to think much more or to try to introduce the urgency for in our models.

Ken Bower: Okay, thank you, Jaime. Anybody else have any thoughts about that? And if not we can put that one aside and then I'll go to my second recommendation.

Olga Cavalli: This is Olga. I think it's important to have urgency in mind. Personally, I think it's very difficult to use it as a dimension for different reasons, for especially because of the subjectivity of the issue for some members would be highly urgent and for some other (unintelligible) different so I find it difficult in having an objective measurement of urgency.

Ken Bower: Yes, that's essentially where I came out on it also, is that it would be very, very difficult for us to introduce it in a way that would have authenticity and would work. You know, it would just, I think it would just make things even more fuzzy than they already are.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Ken Bower: And I owe that to Jaime's excellent article in which he really points out the subjective nature of the term and how it gets used by people. And then so you say well let's don't make it subjective, let's make it objective. But then you run into the problem of well how would we do that?

I mean especially in ICANN. You know in a corporation, in a business dates are set. Dates are usually mean something, but in a public world that we're in, dates are almost always self-imposed and they're frequently missed and there are no consequences.

So it's going to be very difficult for us to turn that variable into something useful. And then the other point that I made and I am, I'm sorry for this extra commentary, but the other point is that I actually think urgency, deadlines and dates might be a proper output or outcome of GNSO councils deliberations.

Meaning once they have a set of projects that are already prioritized on some dimension that we'll agree to, like value or importance, figuring out then what the dates should be and what the urgency of these projects should be is probably a decision that the management of the council should make as a manager of the policy process.

So rather than being an input, I was thinking of it as more of an output. Any way I'll stop there, hearing no other comments. And does that mean that we're okay on that then? We'll just drop urgency at this point?

Olga Cavalli: I think so but it's Olga. It's me is what I think.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. I think it, you know, I am okay with dropping it in terms of a prioritization, you know, category or putting it on the any sort of a chart or anything. But, obviously and I think you were just saying this Ken the council will have to decide in any given instance of evaluating a task whether the urgency warrants, you know, expediting it or visa versa.

Jaime Wagner: Yes. Can I - what I think is that urgency is it will be in the end be considered when we consider value benefit. And then the way people think of urgency is and they value the possible loss of something and this is the feeling of urgency that is the sense of urgency that appeals to when there's deadline or when there is some possible event that will impact the value of something.

Then people consider it variable when - and I think it will be considered when the council rates a project on the basis of value because this perceived sense of urgency relates (unintelligible) indirectly to values through the sense of (loss) of that value.

Ken Bower: That's an excellent lead in to my second recommendation, which is that I think we should now also drop resources needed from the model. And in that process simplify it to a one-dimension, which is exactly what Jaime was talking about which is value, benefit.

And I think he's right that urgency will factor in to the assessment of value and importance and therefore it will already be accommodated without having to make it a separate variable.

So my second recommendation then again would be to get rid of the four-quadrant model and drop to a single prioritization of value and benefit. And maybe we could extend the definition a little bit to incorporate the concept of criticality or urgency. I'll stop there.

Jaime Wagner: Well, I don't know if you received another email. I think you didn't, that I sent. There is another rating model for tasks that is based on gravity, urgency and tendency. It is a good model.

But it doesn't add much to our work so I'm just mentioning it as a tool. What I would like to add is that I think the exercise of rating the resources needed it would be interesting to remain, to preserve, this exercise to the council to do it. Because I think, it is, although the rating of value and benefit is a most important one.

And the one that should relate to priority at the end, I think that the resources needed rating is (useful) to make this (splendorous) tight, I mean, two products with the same value, or almost the same, the exercise of resources

needed is it would be useful to put one ahead of the other in our priority scales.

So I would not drop your suggestion to drop completely the, we can drop the four-quadrant model, but I would not drop the rating exercise on resources needed.

Ken Bower: Any other comments?

Jaime Wagner: Hello?

Chuck Gomes: Well, this is Chuck. You know, I guess I made, in an email response yesterday, made a very brief response in that regard. What I said was I don't think we can strictly just focus on staff resources.

Ultimately, we have to ask ourselves in the GNSO whether or not, you know, the SGs and other community groups think they can provide resources to support a PDP for example.

And if there's the general consensus that at this time we can't do it, even if there are staff resources available, we might have to defer something. Now that may be quite a different point than what Jaime is making.

Ken Bower: Yes, this is Ken. I do think it's a different point, but I think they are related in a way and the way that I would connect them is this way. I have been recently thinking more about resources needed again as an outcome or an output of the council's management role than an input.

When we think about resources needed, at least up until now in the model, what we've been doing really is a relative measure. It's not a measure of resources needed, it's an assessment of, compared to some mythical average, does this project need more resources than the average, or less resources than the average.

It isn't going to be helpful at all in terms of deciding how many resources are really needed to do any project. Now, once a prioritization of projects is done based on value, the council, just as Chuck said, one of the actions that it would take is it would say, okay, this is the highest priority project in terms of value and benefit to the community at large and to the GNSO.

How many resources do we need on this? And then you go out and see if they're available and if they are you assign them. Then you go to the next one in priority list and do the same thing, or something similar to that.

In other words, to me, resources is a management technique that one uses based on a priority rather than an input that tells you whether it's a high priority or a low priority task that you want to take on. So that's how I see the two related, but I'll stop there. This is Ken.

Chuck Gomes: I agree with that.

Jaime Wagner: Well I think resources needed is much (having) difficulty head and the real meat of the (axis). And so it can be helpful and I think we - and they are not, I don't think the perceived difficulty and the value of a (unintelligible) the more difficult a thing is, the higher value we can, it is usually related but not necessarily related.

So I can figure something that is easier to do and has the same value or a higher value than another thing. So what I'm saying is that this exercise of perceived difficulty or resources needed could add some insight as to the relative priority of similar value projects.

Ken Bower: This is Ken are you…

Jaime Wagner: That's the only point.

Ken Bower: This Ken, are you thinking then of rating that dimension, but not for the purposes of trying to put it against value in a model, but just as a tiebreaker?

Jaime Wagner: Yes, that's it.

Chuck Gomes: Well wouldn't that happen...

Jaime Wagner: Or…

Chuck Gomes: Wouldn't that happen kind of as a natural part of the process when the council considers available resources. It seems to me that that would be part of what would happen is, is if there were two projects that were closely rated and, you know, if resources are more available for one than the other we would, you know, probably hold off on one and do the other.

                  So I'm not sure we're saying different things.

Jaime Wagner: But still, Chuck, (unintelligible) to rate (unintelligible) that are the same perceived difficulty for everybody in the council because this can be also differently rated for a different person. And I think the council should be, well I agree that we should propose one dimension of value benefit first. And then if necessary a second tie breaking exercise of perceived difficulty.

Chuck Gomes: Now, so Jaime, this is Chuck again. So are you suggesting that if needed, we do a ranking of resources needed? Is that what I'm hearing?

Jaime Wagner: Yes. First the proposal would be first and as the main task the value, benefit, ranking I think the seven grade scale is okay and then if there are many ties as arose from our work, the (unintelligible) of course, then a second exercise of rating resources needed are as I'm stating now perceived difficulty from would be a second tiebreaker.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, I'm, Chuck again. I'm struggling with the process of ranking resources and let me hopefully describe where my concern is.

So if a particular project is being considered and we need to rank resources there are going to be four SGs and in a couple of cases, multiple constituencies and the ALAC and maybe others that need to consider, okay, do our groups have the resources necessary to support this.

And then staff has to really totally independently of those groups decide, you know, where they're at. Are they spread too thin to take on a new project. It seems to me it's very hard to use a process to rank those.

It comes down to more fairly straightforward questions that unfortunately are going to be somewhat subjective because like Ken pointed out in his document, you know, we can always find new people.

So does the, do the registries think they can get some new people even though all their currently involved people are stretched too thin? Those kind of things are really hard to put a value on and it's going to vary by group an awful lot.

But I think it is something that we could talk about as a council and say, okay, you know, let's look at this. What about resources? It's kind of hard for me to rank it in terms of availability but it's pretty easy to talk about. Yes, the registries think they can come up with some people that would work on this.

Jaime Wagner: But...

Chuck Gomes: And staff says, yes. We have someone we could assign to that or we don't. But I don't - I'm not sure ranking them gets the answers to those questions and those are really the questions that we need to answer.

Jaime Wagner: Well, Chuck, this is Jaime again. I'm just bringing the need to rate resources needed and it's straightforward. If one project has the same value that's (unintelligible) here (unintelligible) here.

One project has the same value as another and the ones - the Project A needs few resources. I'm not - I don't know anything about availability or not of these resources. One needs less resources than another one and they have the same value, the same perceived value too.

It would be natural to put - well we can throw both of them together, okay. But it would be natural to say that the one that needs few resources can come - (came out) first. It will naturally do so and it would be sensible to do so and to give this priority to the one that has less, consumes less resources despite the fact that they are available or not.

Chuck Gomes: I agree with that by the way. And I guess maybe what I thought you were suggesting is that we, after we rate value, you know, that we rank, prioritize the value parameter that we, then if we need to, rank all the…

Jaime Wagner: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: …projects in terms of resources needed. And what I just heard you say is if there are two that are kind of tied in terms of value and we have limited resources, then we just compare those two and, in terms of resources needed and make a decision based on that, that I'm okay with.

Jaime Wagner: Yes, I would say that it's not needed to rank all the projects in terms of resources needed.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, all right. Then maybe we're on the…

Jaime Wagner: I think it would be a…

Chuck Gomes: Yes. I think maybe we're on the same page.

Jaime Wagner: It could be a tiebreaker.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. I think…

Jaime Wagner: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: …maybe we're on the same page.

Jaime Wagner: Okay.

Ken Bower: This is Ken. So I just tried to capture that up on the note page. So the step one would be to rate all projects one to seven on value benefit as we've already done and we understand. The second step, if needed, rank any otherwise tied projects on resources needed as a tiebreaker.

Jaime Wagner: Yes. If needed.

Woman: Yes.

Ken Bower: Yes, okay.

Jaime Wagner: And only (one), (you only one needed), not to rank all of the projects in relation to resources needed or I would like to add another thing too, (perceived) difficulty as a consideration (too), to change the - yes. Okay, thank you.

Ken Bower: We - I'd have to go back and look at our definition on X. I have it available. I think we did capture in our list of things difficulty as part of that.

Jaime Wagner: Yes.

Ken Bower: But I'll go back and double-check that.

Olga Cavalli: This is exactly what I was thinking if we should revise the definitions (on there) of the (unintelligible) that we're using.

Ken Bower: Okay, I'll capture that as an action item for - maybe in between our this time and our next meeting. Just take another look at our definitions.

So this is Ken again. Well if we've reached agreement that we should drop back to a single dimension, then what I have displayed up on the screen now is just for talking purposes. This would be our value benefit ratings that we did as a group, not counting the other dimension X now for the time being.

And as you can see, we start with (STI) and we end with (TRAV) and geo as tied for 14th and 15th position. One of the questions that this whole step six deals with, I think, is what does the council do now that it's got a prioritized ranking?

And the reason we can ask that question now is because we're staring at one, right. Before, when we had four quadrants and we had little dots on top of a chart, it was almost impossible to think about which is the most important, which is the least important, because you have the quadrant two and three problem and, you know, so we didn't have anything in quadrant four.

But now that we've simplified it to just a single list, the question I think that I would - that causes me to - well - it's - interesting question next is what would we do with this list? What would the council do and what would this team recommend to the council to do?

Chuck Gomes: Can I take a stab at that? Okay. This is Chuck again. Okay so we're looking at that - and I kind of talked a little bit about this on my brief email responses yesterday.

But okay so we look at this. First of all, I don't think it means that if we, automatically that if we are finding we have a, we can't do everything that we automatically eliminate those at the bottom. And I talked about that on the list yesterday.

For example, you know, if you take IRDB, you know, that's a requirement that we have to fulfill and that we're way behind in doing. So as long as we have some resources and it seems to be proceeding (and) we don't have to expedite it but it would seem to me that it makes sense to keep working on that. And I'm just looking at, I'm looking at the total picture.

If you look at the geo group, we know - I think that's taking two bodies right now from the GNSO and, Olga, how much time do you, are you having to spend on that?

Olga Cavalli: Well really it's a group that is going very, very slow. It's nothing compared with our (unintelligible) work.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: It (unintelligible)

Chuck Gomes: So it's not a terrible - it's not a big strain.

Olga Cavalli: No.

Chuck Gomes: Is that correct?

Olga Cavalli: No because we never find the time for having the conference call and now (maybe)…

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: So you (two) have an idea. We never had a conference call since the (unintelligible). We just never managed to find the time and not because I didn't respond to the (unintelligible). But we may have a day to meet if - in person in Nairobi, I hope.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: So it - but that's the dynamics of this group. It's not always the same.

Chuck Gomes: And there's another factor that comes into play with one like that. That's a community-wide group, not a…

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: …GNSO group.

Olga Cavalli: Exactly.

Chuck Gomes: And so there's some PR issues. We want to be cooperative and work with others and so I don't think we would eliminate that one based on factors like that. And all of these there are a variety of different factors that come into play.

                 But pursuing it a little bit further now we have a new project, okay we have a PDP that was just initiated or the charter's being drafted right now for vertical integration.

                 Now we have to ask as a council, okay, do we have enough resources to do this? And will it impact these other projects? So one of the questions we might ask, okay, where would we fit the vertical integration PDP into this ranking right here?

Now, I guess the next questions up, comes up and I don't have an answer on this is, do we then, you know, how do we fit it in there? Do we just ask people to, you know, fit it relative to what's there right now?

That's kind of what I'm thinking initially but I haven't given it a lot of thought. Because how do you independently assign values to a new project without going through the whole exercise including all of them?

Now I do agree, Ken that, you know, maybe quarterly or semi-annually or something we probably should go through the whole ranking exercise. And then in between we would just kind of look at these and say, okay, well I, you know, how many - where would people fit this relative to this ranking?

And notice that we have groups. And I think that's okay. We have the one group, we have the five group, we have the ten group and then we have the ones at the bottom. So which of those groups do we think this would fit in? And we could ask the various stakeholder groups and the other council members to evaluate that and where they would put them.

And then this really only needs to be done if we think we're at a resource limit. If we think we can go ahead and do this PDP and there's plenty of staff resources and there's plenty of community resources and it's not overly difficult or complex that, you know, maybe it's not even realistic to produce a reasonable outcome, then we may be able to just go ahead and approve the project.

But this gives us a view and sorry to be so long winded. This gives us - what we have in front of us right now in Adobe it gives - sorry, Rob. It gives us the view that we can kind of at least rationalize and consider various factors to make a decision. Now did, does that make sense at all?

Jaime Wagner: Well but - this is Jaime. I think there is a common saying that says that, there is no lack of resources and no lack of time. What exists is lack of (a) priority.

So well give - I think the outcome of this exercise as it's done by the council is to give an orientation to everybody, a political orientation how to, how the council as a whole envisages the work and how it should receive (this) (unintelligible).

Well if something is of high value and it and the teams that are responsible for it are not finding time, well they should find time. And if there are not real resources for something that is ranked in high value, well the resources should be found to do that work.

I think the outcome of this exercise is not only to serve as a decision-making (unintelligible) (managerial one) but also it's (political) in the sense of it's high, of a higher rank.

Chuck Gomes: Yes but, Jaime, on this let's use the vertical integration PDP as an example. And you and I are probably on the same side of that issue based on our votes last week. But we have pretty much a split in the two, you know, with regard to whether or not that's going to be considered a high priority or not in the council. So it's probably going to come out in the middle somewhere.

Jaime Wagner: (Unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Now a specific step as we're thinking about this is the, in terms of ranking, we could ask every member of the council to - with this chart in front of us of the established rankings, to assign a numerical value from 1 to 15 for the vertical integration PDP.

And then we could average that to come up with a composite ranking that (we'd) place. Now whether that's useful or not, I don't know. I'm just thinking out loud.

Ken Bower: This is Ken. For the moment - well first of all, Chuck, you answered the question that I had proposed which is what would you do with this ranking now that you're looking at it? And you answered it. And then we got onto what would happen if we had a new project, which I think is an extremely useful discussion.

But before we get there, I just want to make a comment that I wrote in my last paper and say it again out loud. To me, the purpose of a prioritization is to decide what to do and what not to do, right.

When we - the reason we might prioritize tasks that we have just as individuals is because we have, we don't have the time or the resource or the ability or whatever to take them all and so we prioritize them for the purpose of doing this and not that.

Now I would just, you know, I'm begging the question here is that if we end up with a - we spend some time and we develop a prioritization like the one on the screen and the net result is nothing ever stops, nothing is ever postponed, resources are never moved from one place to another, we just always go get more or existing people just double and triple and quadruple up, then I would wonder if we're, if the exercise has any value?

Chuck Gomes: Well let me give you an example where it might have value. And I understand your point. And by the way, if we keep finding the resources to do it, then maybe that's okay, okay. In other words, we keep growing.

Ken Bower: No, it is…

Chuck Gomes: I'm not sure that's a bad result.

Ken Bower: It is okay. Don't get me wrong. I think it is that's what we've been doing. I'm wondering though whether then the prioritization exercise has any value? In

other words because if let's assume we didn't prioritize the projects and vertical integration comes up. What do we do?

Chuck Gomes: Well…

Ken Bower: We ask if there are resources available and then we staff it and it goes on, right. It doesn't need to be fixated or placed in a relative rank order in order for it to be started.

The reason we might create the rank order is because it won't fit in. We don't have the resources. There is a constraint on capacity and we therefore have to make tough prioritization calls and that's why our ranking helps us. But that's where I'm at. I'm trying to tease out whether this is actually even worth doing.

Chuck Gomes: Well and here's the example I was going to give. So let's say we have a new project that - and it really needs to happen when the council is deciding whether to initiate the project or not, okay.

The - and so we go through the exercise as I described it, okay. And this project comes out, you know, somewhere in the middle say. Maybe it's a seven or something like that and so it's kind of in the middle of priority across the council.

Now, we also decide and this goes back to, you know, step number two that you've got up there, that there is a - it's going to be a very difficult project. It's not totally clear that it'll result in any significant value add.

I think then we start saying, well, you know, it's not a super high priority. The chances of it producing something useful is low and the difficult and it's very difficult, it's going to be resource intensive. I tend to think then that it causes me to, you know, want to delay or not consider that project. Now, could that all be done without this in front of us? Maybe, I don't know.

Ken Bower: Thank you. This is Ken. Thanks, Chuck. That's exactly I think the question is that - is do we need the prioritization in order to make the managerial call? And if we don't, then maybe it's not time to do this exercise.

But if we do - and this goes right back - this, it's like what's the benefit of this process? We've spent weeks and weeks and weeks tugging at it and I kind of wish we'd asked this question up front but maybe we weren't prepared to answer it until now.

Is really what is this - what does the prioritization buy us and what do we do with it? What does the management of the council do with it? Because you look at the bottom, for me, since I don't really know these projects very well, I would say, Fine. If we're resource constrained, cut the last two.

That's what the prioritization was intended to do. It was to create a rank order. We have a rank order. The bottom two were cut or postponed or stopped and we devote those resources somewhere else. But the answer comes down well we can't do that. And this is (unintelligible). And so in the end it's like well then what did we just spend all that time doing and how is it valuable?

Olga Cavalli: If I may…

Jaime Wagner: This is Jaime.

Olga Cavalli: Oh, Jaime. Go ahead.

Jaime Wagner: I would like to - in the end Ken, I think you are right and if the prioritization exercise doesn't - it will in the end serves to point out what should not be done.

But I don't think this can be stated as that I mean now in another sense of difficulty it's not - it doesn't seem well to be I think the council will never say that travel (projects) for instance should not be taken but it will serve as every decision every managerial decision that should be in accordance with the priority list that is done by the council as a whole.

So if not this should - the disrespect to the prioritization list and then it would, I would agree with you. What's the point of doing that? But if there is a list of priorities set by the council, every manager from the chairman of the GNSO to the staff and also to the chairs of the working groups should take this into account and when deciding where to put resources, where to put time and effort.

And so - but the end result of that is that the one the projects that are left they will remain that priority is what comes first and things that are left for after they can be left for never it's the kind of political way of doing things.

Ken Bower: This is Ken. I just want to, along the same lines of the sort of political consequences or factors that might attend to a list like this I wonder if because you said earlier and I think you're right, you know, if you have a prioritization list then everybody from the chairman all the way down should respond in kind to that prioritization.

But I'm also wondering if there's a downside to that. So the people who are working on geo and travel and maybe IRDB or some of the ones down at the bottom how do they feel about the work on a project that the GNSO considers bottom rank?

Does it have, do we now have, do we, have we now created a problem which we didn't have before by telling people in essence the work they're doing isn't important? Or isn't a high priority?

Olga Cavalli: Ken if I may.

Ken Bower: …this is. Yes, I'll stop there. Okay. Sure Olga.

Olga Cavalli: This is Olga. Somehow, you're right but I - in reality it just wouldn't happen because the lower in the list doesn't mean that they are not important but they're having less attention in relation with resources or not with value exactly for the GNSO but it's not a high priority. I don't think that nobody will complain when their projects are down in the list.

                  I think that the problems that we may have is for those that are top at the list and how to manage two or three projects that were different stakeholder groups are having a completely different priority and this is where I find the usefulness of this tool to handle those different visions of urgency from how I see, want to see it like that.

Chuck Gomes: So one of the questions that comes up here is that okay should we really first of all be focusing on what questions should be answered when a new project is considered and we've talked about a lot of those okay and we've captured some of them in our work so far and we probably mentioned some new ones today.

                  And provide a map a process for the council to use when a new project is considered whether it be a PDP or something else. And then those questions help guide the decisions that's made whether to pursue it now, whether to delay it, whether to consider, whether it's needed to adjust other priorities as a result of this et cetera.

                  And we have this tool of a method of prioritization if it's needed. I don't know I'm just throwing that out.

Olga Cavalli: This is Olga. Somehow you're right Chuck but I think that we should use the tool like on a permanent basis not spending that much time but as a

reference because sometimes a different, the same project may have a different urgency, or view or a feeling some difference from all the groups.

And so I think it helps the dynamics of the GNSO having so many things to do and using having using our time in an efficient way so I would say that we have it as a basis for general reference.

Chuck Gomes: I'm okay with that as long as we're clear up front that we don't say that the tools are a magic bullet that will solve our prioritization issues you know what I mean?

Olga Cavalli: Yes totally and I agree. It's a reference tool to order our own tool to start a discussion.

Chuck Gomes: And what about my suggested approach of considering a new project by if we're going to use this tool of having every counselor, you know, rank the new project in a score from one to however many projects we have on the table right now. Using this tool and then taking the average as just a point of reference.

Olga Cavalli: That's fine. That sounds okay.

Jaime Wagner: So we would - this is Jaime, Chuck. Are you suggesting for us to abandon the seven range and to turn to a 15 or 16 or…

Chuck Gomes: No.

Jaime Wagner: …range the number of projects we have.

Chuck Gomes: No. I'm agreeing. I'm saying I'm okay with what Olga suggested that we use the tool the way we've done it using the one to seven rankings okay. And we would redo do that whatever periodic rate we want to do it every six months, every quarter or whatever. We can decide on that what we think is best.

But all I'm saying Jaime is okay so now we've done this exercise, we have a new project, you know, a new PDP the vertical integrations an example. So now we go through a little brief exercise asking all counselors to assign a rank of from one to fifteen, I think that's how many projects it's whatever number of projects you have at a given time right.

And they can refer to this ranking that's already been done and just assign a ranking we take the average of that just for a point of reference and say okay overall across the council this came out to a seven.

Ken Bower: This is Ken. May I react to that?

Chuck Gomes: Yes please.

Ken Bower: I would suggest a different approach. I think that ranking is always going to be troublesome.

We discussed that early in our team that, you know, if you ask, you know, even if I have to just place that between the 1 and the 15th one - another way to think about this is all right everybody on the council and we haven't discussed a methodology yet as to whether it's individual or in groups.

But let's assume for the moment that the council has already gone through an exercise using the one to seven scale and they've already created this group that we're looking at right on the chart right let's assume that was done by the council in four or five small groups using Delphi Approach and this is the collective of priority that has resulted.

Now they've all been through it and let's say that history gets repeated formally as a complete list once a quarter, so within the last three months then everybody has been through that exercise. So I already know in my

own mind what I did with STI in a group and I know why it got there and so forth and so on so here comes vertical integration.

I take the seven point scale, I form the small groups and I say okay guys we need to, group wise, we need to slot this particular project one to seven and we need to get a Delphi score from three groups and then we'll average or take the median of those just like we did right.

And then it will just get slotted with a number four and a half, three, six, seven, one and then it will automatically take its place in the ranking.

Jaime Wagner: Yes

Ken Bower: That's probably okay.

Jaime Wagner: This is Jaime. I am more sympathetic to Ken's suggestion because Chuck's proposition would amount to give to the new project a different scale then to the other projects that were rated together so I think the way that Ken is suggesting would be more equal to, would not treat a new project in an unequal basis.

Chuck Gomes: I'm, like I said, I'm okay with that.

Ken Bower: I'll try to write that up for, you know, our documentation records. All right so we've discussed that, we've discussed several things today. We have made some big decisions I think if I might try to summarize, I think it's coming across to 1 o clock.

We have decided not to introduce urgency in a separate model variable way but maybe to incorporate that into a revised definition of why. So I'll try to take our why definition just that one alone and I'll try to work through that…

Jaime Wagner: I think, Ken sorry but I think that Olga suggested that revision of the
                  definitions would be in our next (attendance).

Olga Cavalli: Yes, I agree.

Ken Bower: I missed - maybe I'm not understanding. Would you prefer that I don't
                  attempt to revise it in an email and let you guys look at it?

Olga Cavalli: Oh, yes.

Jaime Wagner: No, no, yes you can you can suggest but we could we would - that would be
                  a first item in our next meeting to once you suggest you - I think we could
                  suggest in the list the definitions but to define, to come to a final decision and
                  approval in our next meeting. The discussion should roll on the list.

Ken Bower: Yes. That was what that was what I was trying to say. If I didn't say it
                  properly, I apologize. So what I will do between now and the next session is
                  to sort of document what we have discussed today.

                  And just to confirm that we're, you know, that we dropped the urgency, we
                  are dropping resources needed from the model but it will be now considered
                  as an as needed step and I'll try to document that we will take another look
                  and the Y definition I'll give some thoughts on that, put it on the list for you
                  guys to talk about in between and then we'll print, make that an agenda next
                  time.

                  With respect to the adding a new project, we just went through some
                  discussion there I'll try to put some thoughts around on how that might be
                  structured.

                  And I think that, I don't think that gives answers to all the questions because
                  we have to come back I think maybe next time and talk now about the
                  methodology again all right and how we're going to go through it. Are we

going to recommend groups? And how will the groups be structured so there's a - I'll try to pull out the questions that we haven't addressed and try to format those for our next discussion but we made, certainly made some momentous decisions today.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Jaime Wagner: This is Jaime. Can I add something? I think that we also raised and you raised a question that we should answer which is the real outcome of our priority list like that? What will it serve for which will be it used by the council by everything. I think we should add some consideration to that as a first step to the council to consider.

Ken Bower: Yes, this is Ken. I would think that the other council members and maybe this will be something that our red team will ask of us like okay tell me again why I'm doing all of this and yes we should have some good answers for that so okay I just added that to my notes. I'll try to reflect that in our summary as well.

Olga Cavalli: Okay we reached one hour.

Ken Bower: We sure have.

Olga Cavalli: What's the plan for the future?

Chuck Gomes: Does next week at this timework for everybody?

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: It's 2 a.m. in the morning but that's okay.

Chuck Gomes: Two a.m. for who?

Olga Cavalli: For me I'm in Japan.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, you're in Japan. So you're in Japan next week. That's a tough time well I mean we don't have to do it at the same time I don't think.

Olga Cavalli: Well I don't know because…

Jaime Wagner: For me it's not…

Olga Cavalli: …so maybe I'm awake…

Jaime Wagner: It's good we'll be in a Carnival in Brazil, you know.

Olga Cavalli: Oh great.

Jaime Wagner: But I will not be in (the avenue) so…

Olga Cavalli: (Unintelligible). Don't change the plans for me I'll manage.

Ken Bower: I think Glen and Gisella if there still on the call will be very happy because the calendar is getting quite crowded and it's hard to find spots to move and we've got a good one so if we can keep it I'm sure they'll be thrilled.

Olga Cavalli: No, no problem I'll manage.

Chuck Gomes: And that's a resource issue isn't it just the calendar?

Olga Cavalli: Yes

Chuck Gomes: In time zones.

Ken Bower: Yes. There is one element in my notes that we didn't talk about that I'm going to pull out and summarize again. It was item three just before the

rating I mean which I talk about the management tools that I think could really help this GNSO world that even I can't at large.

And I have been talking about this also with my staff colleagues and I think this team could really, would really help if this team could make that kind or recommendation to the GNSO council and that gosh we really just don't have the tools and the tools are available so I'll stop there and I'll say more about that between now and the…

Chuck Gomes: Sounds like an easy recommendation to make if we're not required to recommend specifically which tools.

Ken Bower: I don't think we are no. Okay super. Thank you all and thanks to Olga.

Olga Cavalli: So you're sending us the, our next items in as we keep working on the list and we meet again next Tuesday?

Ken Bower: Yes. I won't be as late this time because I really struggled with the…

Olga Cavalli: I was worried.

Ken Bower: …last time. I spent the entire week out of just mulling these things over and trying to understand and so anyway, I apologize.

Chuck Gomes: I can't imagine why Ken. We just almost totally reversed course.

Ken Bower: Yes, I know. This one will be much easier to do and I'll get it done faster.

Chuck Gomes: But just one final comment and we'll probably have to explain this to the council why did it take us so long for this simple solution but I think what we went through even though we ended up dumping something we spent a lot of time on it's a lot easier for us to do that than having put the whole council through that and any (unintelligible) we did.

Olga Cavalli: Sure.

Ken Bower: Yes, there's an old saying they also serve who serve as bad examples.

Jaime Wagner: Well sorry…

Ken Bower: Okay thanks everybody take care

Jaime Wagner: …if I gave you…

Olga Cavalli: Bye

Jaime Wagner: …a hard time during the week and reading my paper.

Ken Bower: Oh no, no, no, quite the contrary. It was very thought provoking and - but, you know, I think there are times Jaime where you have to go back and ask sort of fundamental questions and it's easy to just get carried away and we just go through the model and then through the exercises and then you drop back and go okay now what right. Whoa, but it was hard.

Jaime Wagner: For instance, we save the small group a lot of discussion by having this between us in the middle okay.

Ken Bower: Yes we did.

Jaime Wagner: Bye, bye now everybody.

Olga Cavalli: Bye

Ken Bower: Bye buddy. Enjoy your carnival.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks guys. Enjoy the snow Ken.

END