

**GNSO Work Prioritization Model  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Tuesday 26 January 2010 at 1700 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO Work Prioritization Model meeting on Tuesday 26 January 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-20100126.mp3>

**Present for the teleconference:**

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

**ICANN Staff**

Ken Bour  
Liz Gasster  
Glen de Saint G ry

Coordinator: The call will now be recorded. Thank you.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the Work Prioritization Model Working Group or Drafting Team. And we have on the line Jaime Wagner, Olga Cavalli, Chuck Gomes, Wolf-Ulrich Knochen, and for Staff we have Glen DeSaintgery, Ken Bower and Liz Gasster.

Have I left off anybody? Thank you Olga, over to you. And please remember to - sorry, please remember to say your names when you speak for purposes of the transcription. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Glen. This is - I thank you everyone for joining and thanks Glen for the reminder today and thanks Ken for the reminder today to the Adobe Connect.

One thing before we start is something we talked about at your conference call yesterday as Chuck asked me a question and maybe we can talk about, is that when could we be ready to present our prioritization call and our outcomes to the GNSO for their feedback and revision.

And also I would like to tell you that in our agenda for the Nairobi meeting we have a face-to-face meeting on Sunday in the afternoon after lunch there. It's from 2:00 pm through 3:15 pm if I am not mistaken.

I already sent these comments in our list. So one thing that we talked about yesterday is that perhaps if the outcomes are ready to go to the GNSO before the Nairobi meeting, maybe we can share that with the Council or we can present that outcome at the face-to-face meeting we have in Nairobi.

That's something that I would like to exchange some comments with you, see how - where we are in our work and how - which are the expectations of our - dates for our work. Any comments?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, Olga this is Chuck. Let me just share a couple different options I think that are before us that they may not be the only two. But because of the Board's requirements for publication of documents well in advance of meetings, of these in-person meetings, we can't be in a situation where the Council or the GNSO in any capacity can act on documents unless we meet that document cut-off deadline.

But if - and I think that's probably at the latest 15 February. Okay, so I doubt that we're going to be in that position. But if we're able to, you know, pretty much finish our work we could use the opportunity of the in-person meeting of just, you know, giving an overview of what we are proposing and have a discussion on it without actually instituting any action. Does that make sense?

Olga Cavalli: Perhaps if we get something ready after the day that we need to send documents. Is it not possible and maybe I'm wrong and I'm mistaken with this

idea, if we share these documents before they've had a chance to review them and have them in mind and maybe some feedback and comments before the face-to-face meeting or this is against the rules and common work procedures.

Chuck Gomes: You're breaking up a lot Olga but I think if I understand you correctly, I don't think, and Liz correct me if you think I'm wrong on this, but I don't think there's any problem with us sharing a document, a plan late, okay.

But we shouldn't - there shouldn't be any action on it other than just discussion and comment in Nairobi. Does - is that right Liz?

Liz Gasster: Yes I totally agree.

Olga Cavalli: I think that takes a big group and it - depending on something that we are ready to share our procedures and our outcomes. So maybe we can have that in mind.

Chuck Gomes: It's probably - I think wouldn't everybody agree that we're not going to make a 15 February cut-off I don't think in terms of being finished. But we could be finished maybe a week or two afterwards and be prepared to at least give an overview and have initial discussions on it in Nairobi.

Liz Gasster: I mean, it's Liz. I think what would be key is to give the Council enough time to at least have a glance at it before, whatever that might be.

Chuck Gomes: That might be ideal Liz. This is Chuck again. That's ideal I think but if we got it just before and didn't expect people to have read it because we got it out last minute, it wouldn't hurt to give a presentation of what we did with the understanding that people would have an opportunity later to review it and just get some initial discussion going. Don't you think that would be okay?

Liz Gasster: Yes I think that'd be great. I might be in the same situation with WHOIS.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, exactly. And then there's going to be a whole bunch of issues that I think are in that category.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, it's Wolf speaking. May I?

Olga Cavalli: Sure Wolf, go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Now Chuck I fully agree with what you said, so you said that we on the one hand maybe we should begin - we should put ourselves a little bit under pressure so that's because I think that it's - the prioritization is a work of priority so that's my impression, the first one.

The other thing is in this respect I would agree that they would prepare very carefully this document and all of the first discussion on a Council level and that could be in Nairobi.

So we are - we can put it for, let me say for motion later on in a later stage of - that we do. But we should also have then a timeline in that document to present a timeline, what is our plan with this priority work, what work do we have in mind, when will we come up with a motion and so on.

Jaime Wagner: May I speak? This is Jaime.

Olga Cavalli: Sure Jaime, go ahead.

Jaime Wagner: I think we're - our face-to-face meeting in Nairobi should be opened for the whole Council in order to - we could present our timeline ahead and what have we achieved until then.

If it is a conclusion okay but anyway if it's an interim or partial, not yet finished work it should be also presented in Nairobi.

Olga Cavalli: Okay thank you. Other comments about our face-to-face meeting in Nairobi, and I think we have some ideas on how to move forward and try to show our work.

Okay in this case I will check again - I will turn the mike to Ken. I have been reviewing the - your last email Ken and we had some - you had proposed some actions for our call today. I'm opening this email right now and perhaps you can start working with us at what we can work on.

Ken Bower: Thank you Olga. This is Ken. Everybody can hear me all right?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Yes I can hear you.

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bower: You won't need to open up the email because I have copied all that material and I've uploaded it right here to the Adobe Room so we can follow along together. And so - go ahead.

Olga Cavalli: No, no, Chuck. I didn't notice that. Thank you for that.

Ken Bower: Okay. Yes, go ahead Jaime.

Jaime Wagner: It's just a matter - I - I'm having a problem. When Olga speaks it's very cut off.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, she's breaking up a lot.

Jaime Wagner: Yes.

Ken Bower: Glen if you're still on maybe they can...

Glen DeSaintgery: I'm getting - I'm in contact with the operator Chuck.

Jaime Wagner: Okay thank you.

Ken Bower: They'll try to work that out. In the top right of your screen there's a discussion notes area in which I just made a couple of comments. We've already dealt with the last one which has to do with the discussion about Nairobi.

The first comment just means that I uploaded the - I just uploaded the material that was sent via the list so we can look at it here on the screen. And then what I was going to suggest is that we start by going over the three elements of work that we have already discussed, and particularly there was one change that Chuck had recommended which I have made and we'll discuss.

And hopefully we can do this very quickly and then get right into the agenda items that will appear a little lower as you'll see as I scroll down. So is that okay?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Jaime Wagner: Okay.

Ken Bower: Okay super. So just to follow up then we - I believe that the team is completed now with the Y value benefit and the X resources needed dimensions and definitions, and unless there's any discussion those are now completed.

And there was no discussion on the list about the definitions there. I'll ask is that correct? Does anybody have a different point of view? Okay then we'll go to Item 2.

And here again for those of you who have already looked at this the - what prioritization model project list and the definitions, we made a lot of suggestions to that structure in our last session and I outlined here in bullet form all of the things that were done.

And we can take a minute if you want because I have uploaded that document and we can look at it. Let me just pull that up real quick. So here is the Version 4 of the project list and I'll just scroll to the top.

And I can point out some of the things that were done. First you'll notice that Item 3 here of Fast Flux is now in the list and you'll also notice that in Table 1, the prioritized projects, they're now sorted alphabetically by name, not by abbreviation but by name.

And that's the same abbreviation - that's the same sorting that I've used in the short descriptions. This was a comment that Jaime made to try to make it easier to connect the table to the descriptions.

No changes to the definitions of - well actually we did make some changes there. We made them, you know, pending, monitor, inactive and implementation.

We added the implementation category. Maybe we did that the week before. In any event in Table 2, non-prioritized projects, you'll also notice I took out the one that was the Web project because it's not quite ready to be in that table at this stage.

What else? I added the word "glossary" here at the top of the short descriptions. It was suggested by Olga. I also added a little note indicating that this glossary is organized alphabetically by title.

And then the rest of what you see is the short descriptions and they are now organized in alphabetical order, the same as what's in the tables. And so you can just sort of scroll through and find these.

I believe that was the greatest - that was the substance of most of it. Any comments about this? Any other changes that we should make? Liz had made a suggestion about whether the descriptions should be enhanced or extended and I don't know if we want to have any more discussion about that.

Liz Gasster: I think where we left that Ken was that I was supposed to add the link.

Ken Bower: Oh, the links.

Liz Gasster: So that everyone could read more if they wanted to, you know, just by looking at say the Wiki homepage, the key links for each of those which...

Ken Bower: Okay sure. And some of those links are in there like the one I'm showing now, the work team for communications, but they're probably not all there yet, like Fast Flux is missing. So okay, cool. Anything else?

Jaime Wagner: No, it's just to make sure that - this is Jaime, and to make sure that the link will be added.

Ken Bower: How about this? Liz, you have Version 4 right, and if you want to either insert the links or give them to me I'll put them in and then I'll create a V5 and that'll be our...

Liz Gasster: Okay we'll coordinate that offline.

Ken Bower: Okay sounds good. All right, I'm going to minimize this one then or delete it, move it away and go back to, let's see, so these are just all of the items that we just finished talking about.



The one thing I didn't mention when I was going through it but I made it in the notation here is I did some changing around to the project titles, right, by putting the OSC label at the end of the description instead of at the beginning so that it would sort better, and that all the OSCs and PPSCs wouldn't pile up on each other. And the - I hope that's okay with everybody.

Chuck Gomes: That's good.

Ken Bower: Okay great.

Jaime Wagner: Okay.

Ken Bower: Now the - if there's nothing else with respect to the project list, the third item that we had that we discussed last time was the definition of a prioritized project.

And we did some work on the list. Several people commented but I think the only change that I noted was down under implementation. And you'll see the blue - I hope it's blue, blue text.

This is the recommendation Chuck made on the implementation piece. While it may not be directly consuming large amounts of community resources the Council needs to understand and so forth.

Jaime Wagner: All right.

Ken Bower: And I think - does - any other concerns or questions or thoughts about the definition now of the way we've got prioritized projects set out?

Jaime Wagner: Ken, I didn't read it, okay, can you (unintelligible) in order for us to read.  
Okay.

Ken Bower: Let me know when you want me to scroll down.

Jaime Wagner: Okay. I suggest you could read it so everybody synchronizes.

Ken Bower: Okay, I'm going to start right here at the top with a prioritized project is initiated by a GNSO Council decision to commit community and Staff resources with the expectation that such efforts will impact the GNSO's overall work capacity sufficient to warrant its relative placement among all other prioritized projects.

For the purposes of GNSO work prioritization, prioritized projects do not include those whose status has been determined to be inactive, monitor, pending or implem - implementation as outlined below.

And then I've simply included those four definitions which have not changed except for the implementation one. So pending is the same as it was, monitor and inactive and you want me to read those or is that okay?

Jaime Wagner: You could read only the implementation please.

Ken Bower: Okay, so I'll scroll down to that. The implementation one now reads, the work effort has completed the recommendation phase, has been approved and is ready to begin or has already started implementation.

While it may not be directly consuming large amounts of community resources the Council needs to understand the impact on staff as it considers the adoption of new work - new project work within the GNSO.

Then the last comment was a prioritized project commences when chartered or otherwise commissioned by the GNSO Council and terminates when the working group or team's final output/recommendations have been approved by the Council.

Examples of prioritized projects include but are not limited to policy development initiatives and requests made by the Board, for example GNSO improvements and/or other supporting organizations/advisory committees.

Jaime Wagner: Yes, can I speak to Ken?

Ken Bower: Yes sure.

Jaime Wagner: This is Jaime and I - it occurred to me that we have a problem of who will be declaring the change of status of a project? Who will be able to declare the change of the status of a project?

Chuck Gomes: Well this is Chuck. In the case of an implementation phase it's defined by Council action, right, or even the one before it. Once the Council approves recommendations that will answer, you know, it for some projects.

Ken Bower: Right. We - at the very top of the definitions...

Jaime Wagner: But who will declare a pending? Who will declare that a project is pending or inactive or monitor?

Chuck Gomes: Is that not fairly evident? Maybe it's not, then it's a question I'm asking. This is Chuck. The, you know, for example Fast Flux is a good example of one that's just pending.

There's an action that was recommended by the PDP report but - and it wasn't initiate - wasn't any policy recommendation but there's still an action and we've yet to do anything with that.

So that to me is kind of obvious. Now there may be cases that are less obvious, I don't know.

Jaime Wagner: Well, but should - our documents should state that somebody or some group or - would have the ability to and the authority to declare the change of the status of a project?

Chuck Gomes: So who do you think that should be? This is Chuck.

Jaime Wagner: Well if from the - I think, well there are many - I don't think this should be required as a Council decision but I think we want the Chairman of the Council to the - to do that.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Sorry, it's Wolf speaking. So may I just comment on that? I think it's a more general item but what Jaime is raising here. So is - the question is how is the process, you know, to update the prioritization list in the future?

That means which to update, which part of it becomes prioritization and in conjunction with that, you know, what does it mean with kind of how to say that, it's what we are doing, right, the valuation of the project, in which rank - was ranking - is the ranking of the project.

So do we need to have a new ranking when new projects come to the prioritization list or not, and if that's so who is going to decide? From my point of view it must be - has to be the Council for example, but it depends. You know, I think there's some questions open in connection with that.

Olga Cavalli: Hi this is Olga. Can you hear me well?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: I think that perhaps you could have a small group of Council members that could take the approach of deciding the prioritization or not or moving them off the list and then a response by the - I think the whole GNSO should go through deciding or whether it should be on the list or no. And then the process could start by a request from the Chair.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. What I was going to suggest following up on what Olga said there is that the - there are a couple different things that are going to happen going forward once this is all ready to go.

Number one, there's going to be an initial exercise that's going to be done where we prioritize all the projects the first time. And I think that this working team has, will have or maybe already has already, you know, defined where we place things.

Now Council could disagree and it could be changed but we've done that. Going forward then we're going to have to outline or propose a process for when a new project comes into play and how that happens.

I think that's an exercise we still need to do in this drafting team and define how that would happen. And it could be - I'm not necessarily advocating this but it could be that this particular drafting team could have an ongoing role since they're so familiar with the process at least in the near term. Just some thoughts.

Jaime Wagner: Yes, can I - this is Jaime and I think we are talking about different things. First was - first we have to admit that our work is not already finished. We have - we still have a final step of making a prioritized list because - in one dimension and also we are - our team is not done - is not doing the prioritization.

It is doing the - it's proposing a method so who will do these - this work and will follow this method will be the whole Council that we will have a prioritized list at the end of this first work.

Once a new project is declared by the project of being a prioritized project this is already defined also. So who defines the new project must be prioritized is the Council and here you'll - and the Council will make also the

exercise of giving values, X values and Y values if they agree with our proposition.

And once this is made I think it will be put - the new projects will be put naturally on a sequence of this linear scale of priority so this is done by the projects or by the Council as a whole. What is not defined is who changes the - who has the authority to change or to declare the change of the status of a project?

And I was proposing that this authority could be given to the Chairman also or second by some - one or two people.

Chuck Gomes: Well Jaime this is Chuck again. You could use the Chair and Vice Chairs if you wanted to.

Ken Bower: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: This is Olga. I (unintelligible) Chuck (unintelligible) could be used so perhaps this is the same - our working team or another one maybe perhaps smaller where we are not too many, and once a Chair decides it's time to review something then the working group reviews it and proposes it to the GNSO Council.

Ken Bower: This is Ken. I noticed Liz had her hand up a while ago. Put it down. Did you want to say anything?

Liz Gasster: Actually Olga has actually said what I said which is this idea of a little group in the Vice Chairs would be great. You know, maybe it'd be an ad hoc group or a standing committee to just handle the logistics even though the ultimate decision would be the Council, so same idea.

Jaime Wagner: Well I'm not too much in favor of that. I think our groups should reach its final work and I'm not in favor of keeping groups and multiplying groups. I think the

Chairman and the Vice Chairs have the ability and the confidence that the group should do that work - to do this work.

Liz Gasster: Yes, I wasn't suggesting that it needed to be a separate group. That seems like a perfectly appropriate group.

Jaime Wagner: Okay.

Ken Bower: This is Ken. I'm not sure if we've reached a consensus. I was actually looking at this sentence trying to figure out how I might be changing it as I was listening to the dialogue.

So the current thought is maybe the Council Chair would actually declare projects to be in one or another status category.

Jaime Wagner: Second by the Vice Chair. That might help with issues - might.

Olga Cavalli: Well my supposition is different. This is Olga. I propose that we could have a small maybe reviewing team. I don't know what's the name of it and that could work, once the Chair and maybe the Vice Chairs have decided to do this work of prioritizing and including and excluding, changing the status of a project. I think it should be a special group.

Jaime Wagner: Just a word of clarification Olga. When the inclusions and the prioritizations of a project - of a new project, these are already defined to be a matter of the whole Council.

The - it's not the - who has authority to include a new project or does the Council as a whole, neither the group, neither the Chair, neither the Chair second by the Vice Chairs have this authority.

This is already defined in our paper here. What I was saying that it was - is not defined in our paper and who has the authority to declare changes in status?

And there are two and I think that we have no need to call for a whole Council assembly to decide on a change of status, that sometimes it's obvious and - but - and I could also go with the Chairman proposing and a small group - a very small group to second the changing of status.

Olga Cavalli: May I try to explain. This is Olga. This for me and maybe I'm wrong, changing the status is somehow fits in a different priority and you're right Jaime, the prioritization is done by the whole Council following this proposed procedure we're working on.

My idea is that a Chair and Vice Chair could have a small group to work with this change of status and this update. That's my proposal.

Jaime Wagner: Okay I can go with that.

Ken Bower: What shall I call that, maybe a standing committee? This is Ken again. We - does - do we now have consensus that a small group of the Council would decide or make a recommendation as to status? They would decide?

Olga Cavalli: I would say make recommendations and then reviewed by Council.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: It's Wolf speaking. I would follow Olga in this respect. Personal it's for me I think so as Chuck mentioned, so we start right now this first one of ranking of projects.

So this is the prioritization work we are doing and that's what we - what the Council is going to do as a whole I understand. So why shouldn't the Council then be in a position to do it in a follow up way as well?



And we have to find a perfect host as to procedure in which he's going - no not, maybe not for every new project but let me from - say from time to time after half a year or so to revisit the prioritization list and start any new prioritization with them, why not?

But that new procedure has to be found out but I would also see that the Council is in position to take the last decision about that.

Ken Bower: This is Ken. Oh, go ahead Jaime.

Jaime Wagner: As I understand there was no concern within the small group. It would be the whole proposition of Olga and Wolf. The end is that the whole Council will decide if it's proposed by anybody but the new change of status is proposed by anybody or by the Chairman and - but the Council will have the authority to change the status. That's as I understand the proposition of Olga. Am I right?

Ken Bower: This is Ken. Let me - oh. I was going to try and summarize.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, go ahead Ken.

Ken Bower: What I think I heard Jaime was that maybe as part of the procedure, right, so what - we haven't written it yet but the first step in a prioritization cycle would be the firming up, the confirming of the list.

And that would include two tables, one of the prioritized projects and those that are not to be prioritized. And the way that whole step would get started would be the standing committee would make a recommendation.

So just like we will do, we would go up to the Council and say, "Here's what we recommend be the prioritized projects and here's the ones we recommend not be prioritized, and here are the categories we put them in. Does everybody agree?"

And if the Council doesn't agree then some changes could be made but then that would get - that would become solidified and then the prioritization would begin on just those that were in the Table 1. That's what I think I was hearing. Is that correct?

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Jaime Wagner: Well but anyway my - the problem I raised is not - I think you didn't tackle it. I think, okay, once the list is done and the first prioritization is done so there are some projects that the Council declared, "Okay they are in such a status."

Okay but things change and so who will have the ability to put a project in another status? I think we are on something now that it will be the whole Council and - but provoked by some - by the Chair or by anybody.

Ken Bower: This is Ken again. I think what I was hearing is that maybe we have to have another discussion about how often does the prioritization cycle actually run. Is it every six months, is it every year?

Let's just take an example that we decided to recommend and the Council agreed that they should do this prioritization work twice a year, once every six months.

Then just before that would to start the standing committee would go look at the list of prioritized projects and non-prioritized projects from the last time and say, "Okay, what changes in status need to be made here?"

And they would make some recommendations and give that to the Council as the first step of the next cycle. And then the Council will go, "Okay fine. We agree with all those status changes and now we'll prioritize just the ones that are in Table 1."

And that would include by the way any new projects that materialized in the last six months that have to get added, right.

Chuck Gomes: Again this is Chuck. There's - I see one problem with that. That may still be okay but as soon as a new project is added after the prioritization exercise has happened, a decision's going to have to be made with regard to the priority of that project at that point in time, maybe even considered before a final decision is made, for example initiating a new PDP.

And if one is initiated then we're going to have to fit that in and decide what resources, you know, is it more important to devote resources to this than the other ones? Where do we fit it in the prioritization scheme that has already been approved?

Jaime Wagner: This is Jaime. I - what - the difference that Ken is viewing I think on those process I was thinking of an asynchronous one. I think, I mean, prioritizations would not run every six months or year but it would run every time that a new project would be presented.

I mean, the Council would be required to prioritize provoked by a demand of - for a new project.

Ken Bower: This is Ken if I may. That all sounds good except I'm sitting here thinking about this, at least the way we've defined the model so far. It's all relative, right.

So if a new project comes up and let's just say that it's huge, right, very large. It could actually in some ways redefine the average. I'm wondering - so when we say, "Let's prioritize this project," or let's say a new project comes up and we're in a mode where we're doing it every time, you know, we're going to place that on the chart.

Does the fact that that project comes up also make me want to reevaluate others that are already been prioritized or do we just say, "No we're only going to put a new project into the existing model until some annual cycle and we'll reevaluate them all again." I don't know.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Well it's Wolf speaking. Ken I would agree fully to that so I would let me say kind of business kind of rules. You have a yearly cycle and our work is also let me say in - it's not of the overall ICANN work and - or ICANN community work let me say so that - but it's also connected to the ICANN strategic and business plan.

So - and for that we have to encounter that. We have kind of business cycle, business means, you know, Council business cycle in a yearly way so I would see that we do it on a yearly basis to - we discuss the prioritization list.

And in case within one year new projects come they should be found a process of that finalized steering committee or whatever it is should make a proposal and it could be discussed. Our not - total list should not be rediscussed at that time. That's how I see that.

Ken Bower: This is Ken. I just have another thought. You know, we might be a - slightly ahead of ourselves in terms of this discussion because we really haven't as Jaime pointed out a few minutes ago, we really haven't figured out how to take all this data and all this analysis and develop a prioritization and we haven't also figured out what does that mean.

For example if we have, oh I don't care, 25, 30 projects and just as happened in our test no project falls into low value high cost, and let's say that for the sake of argument that's our determination for what projects not to do.

There's no project that gets stopped. If there's no management action, if there's no outcome from all of this work one would have to say, "Is it worth doing, right?"

The only reason I could think of for going through a prioritization exercise is the idea that something might stop.

Chuck Gomes: Or slow down.

Ken Bower: Or slow down. Sure. But we - what I'm suggesting is that I wonder if we need to go through that exercise in our discussion to actually determine how this could be a useful management tool.

And that might begin to help us figure out how often do we need to do it, do we do it every time a project comes up, once we understand what the conclusion is.

Jaime Wagner: Yes but, okay, but anyway this brainstorm - this is Jaime and I forgot to state my name. Anyway even if we are brainstorming here I think it's valuable because I'm getting the impression that we will have to have two - a synchronous process, I mean, the Council should be asked to do this prioritization exercise every year or so and also we will have procedures to respond.

We have our, I mean, our work should tackle both suggestions, a synchronous process and an asynchronous one when a project comes up or when some projects are - is needed to be stopped or slowed down. I mean, this I think we have to have definitions for both.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. I think that Ken your point's well taken in the sense that maybe we need to move on. We need to, you know, do a little bit more work probably before we can make some of the decisions we're talking about right now.

Jaime Wagner: Yes okay.

Ken Bower: I'm going to - yes I'm going to capture these ideas here just in my notes so I don't forget them. So we will have to revisit how projects get prioritized and sort of how often the cycle gets exercised.

Jaime Wagner: And if there is a cycle or if it is an asynchronous I think.

Ken Bower: Good, I'll - yes I'll fix that.

Jaime Wagner: Or both, the review cycle and also procedures to respond to a request.

Ken Bower: Is that better?

Jaime Wagner: I think it's not just a matter of either/or. It can be and - the process we can have both. Yes, okay thank you.

Ken Bower: Sure. Okay, all right, so we agree that the definition of a prioritized project should include how the statuses - status categories are changed. And the current thing I have written at the moment is that some committee - we might need to recommend some committee but that isn't - we haven't decided that yet.

We'll come back to all that and then we can change the definition up here and add whatever that is needed, an extra sentence to indicate how these statuses get changed. Is that fair?

Jaime Wagner: Okay.

Ken Bower: Great. Then let's see, every - is everything else in the definition for a prioritized project okay with that exception?

Jaime Wagner: For the time being I have no objections.

Ken Bower: Okay super.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Wolf speaking again. Just to come back to that, what was said before. So it doesn't - that doesn't exclude, you know, if you say standing committee. This standing committee could also consist of the Chair and the Vice Chair only.

So - because I think it could be done, right. It depends on - because it's managerial work to do here so - and that's tough for a Chair and the Vice Chair is how I understand that.

Olga Cavalli: Sorry Wolf, this is Olga. You are suggesting that the (unintelligible)?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: The standing committee is a committee which makes a proposal with regards to prioritization but this proposal is going to be - to get ratified by the Council so...

Olga Cavalli: My idea about this small committee and it's only a suggestion is that once the Chair and Vice Chair thinks that that's the time, the committee could make a proposal and then revised by the whole Council. That's only an idea.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes sure. You know, the question is only, you know, we have a lot of committees so the question is, is it valuable to have a separate committee, you know, just for the prioritization work in the future?

Olga Cavalli: It's Olga. I think it's more - it - I think it's more work for Chair and Vice Chair. I think it's somehow unfair for them and it's a different task because it's something that it may take more time and that could be proposed by this small team to the Chair or Vice Chair and GNSO. I mean, my idea. You can disagree.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Well if - well I'm open to that, you know, so - really so if that is agreed upon I don't have a problem with that so - but it was - I remember it was discussed before that.

There was also a proposal or it may be decided or maybe opposed by the Vice Chair and Chair so that's what I understood and that I'm also open to that. So - but...

Olga Cavalli: If I may, this is Olga. From my experience in GNSO in some things that have been reviewed like say for example the travel policy, we formed a small drafting team and we made many proposals to ICANN and some things were agreed.

And what happens now is that we keep but we were involved in the drafting team. We are following everything that happens with travel and that makes it easier to know what is going on.

I don't think that's the - happens usually with Chair and Vice Chairs that are looking at the whole picture and sometimes they may not be focusing on one specific issue. This is why I think a small drafting team or something - committee could be useful.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Okay. Okay.

Ken Bower: This is Ken. If we're okay with that discussion for the time being what's up on the screen now is what we had planned to do on the agenda for today. And I see there's about six or seven minutes left.

One of the items that we had identified or at least Liz and I had talked about and then we proposed it in some email summaries, is in the two dimensional model should the value and the consumption dimensions or variables be rated by different parties?

And one suggestion is that the Council take the value side and maybe the Staff or somebody else takes the cost or consumption side. And the rationale there was this - we've already discovered the cross-correlation issue between



cost and value, meaning that sometimes individual people say, "If something is very resource intensive it must be valuable."

And a different person with a different objective view might say, "No, those are two separate issues." Something could be completely valuable and take up a lot of time or not take up a lot of time but they're independent variables.

So I - we just wanted to toss that out to the group to see if there's any - what other people think about that.

Jaime Wagner: Well I think - this is Jaime and I think they are different but they have a correlation indeed so - but they are different things. The definitions are different so we can't - I cannot right now envision a project that has high value and low resource consumption but it could happen.

I mean, anything hypothetically could happen. So to be object - I don't think we should have different teams to do ratings in the two different scales. I think we could have - we could benefit from Staff input and the rating of the resource consumption.

So I - what I would suggest is that the rating and resource consumption could be open to Staff teams and leave the value rating exclusive to the Council.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. I would - I think I tend to agree with Jaime on that, but I'm not convinced that the - of the usefulness of having different groups rate different parameters.

Ken Bower: Anything else?

Jaime Wagner: Well my - rate is taking my proposition that the X value, I mean, resource could be the rating of this dimension could be done or - but and then larger groups, I mean, but the Council should do this work. It should not be left

outside of this work. I mean, the group in this instance could be enlarged by the Staff.

Ken Bower: Okay, we just wanted to get that on the table, not to belabor the point. So maybe one of the things we'll have to take into account is how to - how would Staff participate?

We clearly had Liz involved in our test, right. She did some ratings as one of whatever, six or whatever the number we had of raters. But we'll - I'll just note that as a question.

Okay great. Let me go back to my list. I just put up the - and any time anybody wants to review this and at some point we will, perhaps our next meeting, this was the final set of Delphi results and where all the projects ended up. I thought that might be useful to look at.

But the second - well let's see, does anybody want to - the second item might actually be fairly straightforward. It had to do with the rating scale of 1 to 7 and whether the team feels that that's a good scale to use.

We like 7 points versus 5 or 3 or 12 or some other number or maybe a different idea entirely.

Chuck Gomes: Chuck. I'll start it off. I'm fairly comfortable I think with 7. I don't think I would favor going lower. I might be okay with going a little higher. Overall I think 7's pretty good.

Olga Cavalli: I like it also.

Ken Bower: Okay, any other comments on that? Yes, we're just going through the big dimensions just to tick them off and say, "Yes," you know, just so we don't forget anything. We don't have to disagree on everything.

Jaime Wagner: Yes, I'm fine with 7.

Ken Bower: Okay excellent. The next one is - could potentially be a little bit more involved in the terms of our discussion. So I don't know if you want to try to tackle this one today or save it for our next session.

But it has to do with how do we really feel now about individual versus group ratings and what would we really recommend to the Council in terms of how they would go about putting these projects on the chart?

Chuck Gomes: Just - Chuck again. I like what we did where we did individual rankings first and then we did it as a group. I thought that was a good order of things. Now obviously there are other ways to do it too but I thought that worked pretty well.

Jaime Wagner: You're not talking about the small groups are you Ken?

Ken Bower: Well, that's one of the questions in here, a 3D, which is, you know, should - would - are we in a position to recommend that we think the group should be five or six, two or three?

We haven't really tried two or three yet. Is that something we want to do or - and this is - this could turn out to be a little bit of a lengthy discussion and I'm not sure - we're at one o'clock here. Olga, what do you think we should do at this point? Should we try this on the next session and...?

Olga Cavalli: Yes this is Olga. I think that perhaps we can exchange some ideas in the list. I think we should perhaps discuss more of the list to conserve some of our (unintelligible) to improve - not improve our work but I cannot find the word in English, but to move forward faster.

And yes we should follow the discussion in our next conference. Would it be okay the next? Is that a good time for you, having a conference call next week for following up?

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. If we're going to get this thing done we're going to need to meet weekly if at all possible.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Jaime Wagner: I think - this is Jaime and I think we should not sacrifice our intent of doing - we still have a last work to do either in the small groups or as a whole group, I mean, our group or to divide our small groups into model groups that we have still to do a final one dimensional decision.

So I would suggest and we didn't try the efficiency or efficacy of the small group approach. So I think we should try it in order to say if it's good or if it's not good.

And I think we can try it in this last step of our work that has still to be done, that is the - I mean, not the transformation but the taking of this to the national approach and put it in the linear scales of priorities.

Ken Bower: This is Ken. So what I think I'm hearing, one option we have is to - we could take this discussion of group and individual ratings or the approach that's all up in here in Number 3, ABCD and all that.

What we could do is suspend that temporarily and move to Step 6 which is how are we going to use - this is where I think Jaime's going, how are we going to use all this information to actually develop a prioritization which is the goal, right?

And then if we decide - figure out exactly how we're going to use all this information and what we would recommend, then we could loop back and

see if we want to do a small test of two or three individuals doing ratings and I don't know.

Olga Cavalli: I think it's a good idea.

Jaime Wagner: Let me do a proposition that's very objective. I think we have to this final step each small group I would say, each couple or two of us to get together and looking at the work that we have already done.

These small groups decide in a linear scale and then we have a get together and we see if all the smaller couples have the same list, okay, this is a consensus.

If not - if the final group dimension - it's benefit or not of the previous discussions in couples, that would be the equivalent of a smaller groups, or if it's just a waste of time and we would not propose that to the Council as a systematic of...

Chuck Gomes: Jaime, this is Chuck. I want to make sure I'm understanding what you're suggesting. You use the word linear. Are you saying that the pairs of people would just rank things linearly and not using the two-axis approach?

Jaime Wagner: Would use it as an input to the - we have - because priorities is one-dimensional list of priorities. Priorities is going to the dictionary. Priorities is time precedence.

What should be done in which order? Which - or - and so it's a linear scale so we have to - this two-dimensional approach as an exercise to a final and it was as I understood in Ken's proposition. This would be what he mentioned as a - as tactics.

Ken Bower: This is Ken. I just wanted to make a clarification. I don't think that the term priority necessarily requires that each item would be prioritized in linearly one to the end.

For example this four-quadrant model was developed so that you could have buckets, priority buckets. The A bucket is the ones that you have the most value in. The B bucket and what - maybe it's just one D bucket that doesn't - that gets stopped or it gets slowed down.

You wouldn't necessarily have to rate and rank them individually within buckets.

Chuck Gomes: And in fact the Council is capable, or the GNSO as a whole is capable of working multiple projects at the same time. So an underlying assumption that you've got to rank them totally linearly is that, you know, you're going to do them sequentially or something which we know is not going to be the case.

Jaime Wagner: No, it's not the case of doing sequentially but to have a guideline of if there is a conflict, the research conflict. How those should give orientation on how to resolve this conflict based on the thinking of what is a priority.

And this can happen in buckets or not, or between something that is in the A bucket and then all that is in the B bucket.

Ken Bower: This is - these are the questions I think that actually were part of Step 6 and we've sort of - we've morphed into it a little bit. So I - maybe the question I'm asking is should our next call be - directly surround this question?

How do we take the two-dimensional model and work it in such a way that it is useful as a prioritization mechanism to the Council and what kinds of decisions would we make?

And this is the discussion I think we really have to have and maybe it should take - maybe we should go out of sequence at this point and take it next and then loop back to the finalization of how we get the ratings done and - because I'm wondering if we might even make a decision that we throw the model away and just do a prioritization.

I mean, I suppose that's a possibility even though we've invested a lot of time in this model.

Jaime Wagner: But I think it's a valuable - it's - in order to do - even if we want to do a one dimensional prioritization the two dimensional approach is useful to - as an exercise.

And I think it should be done even, well if there's a final, I mean, just so the four-quadrant is our final output or if it's the intermediate output to a final list, a one dimensional list.

Ken Bower: Yes, in fact this morning I spent several hours just thinking about that question. You know, I promised earlier that I would do some Staff work to see if I could help the team out a little bit.

And so I've been working a bunch of different ideas about how you take the four-quadrant approach and develop a ranking using just the information that we have.

It's not easy and I have some different ideas and I could propose some of that as we move into this next discussion. But I want to spend some time thinking about it some more.

I mean, it is possible for example to develop different ratings for a cost and ratings for value and then multiplying these variables together to get a total score and then rank by the score. That's where I'm heading.

Chuck Gomes: Well my question before - this is Chuck, is whether we should move to agenda Item 6 next or something else in our next meeting. I'm fine with moving to agenda Item 6. What do other people think?

Olga Cavalli: I agree.

Jaime Wagner: Yes. And I was...

Ken Bower: Okay super. This is Ken. I will try to put some thoughts together on that subject and maybe sketch out some ideas around how we might move through that topic and we'll take Step 6 up next.

And we won't forget to come back after that to finish up Step 5 which has to do with groups and ratings and how we get all that done, and what we liked and didn't like about that process. Is that okay?

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Is a Doodle going to be done for our next meeting?

Glen DeSaintgery: Chuck, this is Glen. Is - would next week at the same time suit everybody?

Chuck Gomes: Let's take a look. Just a sec.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: It would be okay for me.

Chuck Gomes: So we're talking the 2nd?

Glen DeSaintgery: The 2nd, that's right Chuck, yes.

Chuck Gomes: I might have to leave early but we could go ahead and do it. You guys don't have to have me on the call.



Jaime Wagner: For me, well it's a holiday here but I can be because I usually do it in my cell phone so I can do that.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes I can do that.

Ken Bower: My calendar shows it's a holiday here too. It's Groundhog Day.

Glen DeSaintgery: It's what Ken?

Ken Bower: It's called Groundhog Day.

Chuck Gomes: Not a holiday we get time off for Glen.

Jaime Wagner: Well I didn't quite assimilate the joke. Groundhog, yes?

Ken Bower: Yes, it's an animal I think.

Chuck Gomes: A groundhog is watched to see if he comes out and sees his shadow it's a way of guessing whether we're going to have an early spring or a late spring.

Jaime Wagner: Okay.

Glen DeSaintgery: Chuck we've got it in for next week, the 2nd, same time.

Ken Bower: Okay I'll get a summary out like I normally do and make sure it gets to the list and I'll also give some thought to how we proceed with Step 6.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay thanks.

Ken Bower: Thanks everybody.

Glen DeSaintgery: Thanks very much everybody. Bye. Miriam?

END