

**GNSO Work Prioritization Model  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Monday 23 November 2009 at 1900 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO Work Prioritization Model meeting on Monday 23 November 2009 at 1900 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-prioritization-20091123.mp3>

On page:

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/index.html#nov> <<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/index.html#nov>>

**Present for the teleconference:**

Olga Cavalli  
Chuck Gomes  
Wolf-Ulrich Knoben

**ICANN Staff**

Denise michel  
Liz Gasster  
Rob Hoggarth  
Ken Bour  
Glen de Saint G ry

**Apologies :**

Rosemary Sinclair  
Adrian Kinderis  
St phane van Gelder

Coordinator: Excuse me, I'd like to inform participants today's call is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. Thank you. You may begin.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much. Gisella would you help me please doing the role call and so we know who's on the call?

Glen de Saint Gery: I'll do that for you Olga, it's Glen. On the call we have yourself, Olga Cavalli, Wolf Ulrich Knoben, Chuck Gomes. And from staff we have Denise Michel, Liz Gasster, Rob Hoggarth, Ken Bour and Glen de Saint Gery.

Olga Cavalli: Sorry Glen, I didn't recognize your voice. Must be a different land line.

Glen de Saint Gery: Sorry.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much.

Glen de Saint Gery: Pleasure.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. First I would like to know if you want me to chair this call, if you're okay with this because I volunteered in the face-to-face wrap up meeting we had in Seoul, but we were few at that time and I'm not sure if you want me to lead this.

And also my apologies because I have been traveling and with a lot of access problems to the Internet and that complicated things to organize this call last week, so I just would like to ask you how do you want to proceed?

Chuck Gomes: Works for me. Go ahead.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: (Unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Great. I have been just re-reading all the comments that we had in our list. Chuck, thank you for your comments. I think they are very, very good and somehow adds to mine and I don't know Wolf if you had the chance to review them?

Wolf Ulrich Knoben: Yeah. Thank you Olga. So I have received all the final, the comments about that so and well, if you're asking for my opinion, well I could really agree to all of this. And one item I would like to discuss or to put into discussion is we should be aware about you know, what is the project that

that means for me that we are talking about (unintelligible) we are talking about action items and these things and so on.

So I think we maybe are going well to put priorities in, we should be aware what is the project, what - do we talk about sizes of projects which are (fairly) able to be put on that list and which (unintelligible) should be discussed.

Olga Cavalli: This is a very interesting comment. Let me give you my idea what we have to prioritize. Aren't we in the need of putting priorities to all the things that we have to do in the GNSO, all the action items? By the way there is a new updated list on by Glen very recently. Isn't that the idea that we have or maybe I'm mistaken and we are just putting some prioritization in some of the, in the (several) group of this action item? Maybe Chuck you can help me understand...

Chuck Gomes: Well...

Olga Cavalli: (Unintelligible) each of the categories, I mean (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: You're correct Olga. Now, we could decide though that some of them are pretty obvious so we pull them out of the queue with the agreement that those are going to go ahead regardless of how we prioritize things and then it makes it the exercise a little bit simpler, which is an idea that I've been advocating.

But you're right, yeah, we're, and I think Wolf's question is a very good one. We probably should, if we're going to use the term project we should define what we mean by that, and I don't think that's very hard. Basically you said it Olga, I think any project is something that's going to take resources in the GNSO including volunteers and/or staff, usually it's going to be both, and therefore we need to make decisions as to, as to where we can put resources.

Wolf Ulrich Knobon: Oh, I supposed we can talk, while asking that you know, coming so from a company they are also doing some priorities on (unintelligible) every time be talking about, then we talk about (unintelligible) something which is related to, to budget and also other resources is, resources these things. And so we set a minimum limit let me say, for those kind of projects which you put on the list.

So if we don't do let me say, put action items or such things on the list because that is daily work and it may depend so that's - that the - that my understanding of action items may be different of that what is going on on the council. So if you're talking about all these things which consume budget of a, let me say a minimum budget, and a minimum kind of resource, which is to be defined (unintelligible) minimum, then I am with you.

Chuck Gomes: You know your point's very good Wolf and I think that it will be helpful if we're precise in that. I think we've been using the term action item in the action items list there for a long time and that's not, we don't mean by that you know like Glen had some action items out of the council meeting today.

And we certainly don't mean things like that, so your point's well taken, we, I think the term project is okay or tasks and I think it's tasks, another point that I think comes out of what you're suggesting is that we're really talking about tasks that are going to consume time and resources over some length of time.

We're not talking about something that can be done in a day or even a week probably but rather tasks that are typically going to be involve a working team or a working group or a committee and that will involve you know, volunteers in staff and will take you know, some whatever we define as a minimum period of time. Is that correct? Does everybody agree with that?

Wolf Ulrich Knobon: Yes.

Liz Gasster: It's Liz. I'd like to add one thing which is, well actually two things, one is that you could have a situation like the WHOIS studies where right now, and for the last many months and for several months more, we're just talking about staff resources and potentially consultant resources and not council resources.

So I see where there could be an added complexity there, maybe WHOIS just gets removed from the calculus too for other reasons, but I just want to raise that because it's a bit of an anomaly where we're talking about staff and consultant resources not so much council resources for some time, period of time.

And then the second thing I'll just add is that you could conceivably have a situation where the council or the, a working group wants to incur incremental resource, we haven't had this occur but I foresee it with the new PDP in a sense, like if we wanted to retain an expert for some purpose or incur some incremental significant costs where we want to have some assessment of the utility or value of that and a decision to do that.

I don't want to add unnecessary complexity at this point because I think we're just you know, we want to get kind of sort of baby steps here but I just would add that as a, you know, now that I think about Wolf Ulrich's excellent question you know, some of the layers of complexity there.

Chuck Gomes: Well you know you raised something that is, is important for us to consider too. Even though the WHOIS studies are right now only involving staff resources, you know, staff resources have a limit as well and so we may have a situation where need to prioritize the use of staff resources, maybe separately, than when it's combined resources, I don't know, I throw that out. All this is producing some really good points that we should deal with.

Olga Cavalli: One question to Wolf. Wolf you mean that we may have action items or tasks and projects at different categories, is that what you tried to say before, or maybe I misunderstood you?

Wolf Ulrich Knoben: So Olga I couldn't hear you because it's very, very (unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: Now what I said is are you suggesting that perhaps projects are different than tasks or action items, it could be a first to type of the categories that we could define?

Wolf Ulrich Knoben: No. I think though I fully agree, so if we are referring to items or projects which means, okay, consumption of budget and other resources, personal staff resources and these things yeah. So which has to be (online) but okay, that's what I mean so that's fully okay.

And I don't think that we have, I mean only would like to avoid that if we are dealing with smaller items here and trying now to figure out you know, which kind of part of the (quadrant) smaller things should be placed in these things so.

Olga Cavalli: Okay thank you.

Chuck Gomes: And Olga to help on that I think it probably, just it probably does make a little bit of sense to use a term like project or task rather than action item. Because action items oftentimes are just hey, you need to get this done you know, tomorrow or something and they can be larger but it probably avoids any implication that we're talking about short term tasks.

Wolf Ulrich Knoben: Yeah.

Liz Gasster: So I'm going to take that as just a separate task or action item to change the title of the action item list, which I think started you know, as an action item list but has morphed into more of a project list, so.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, that's right. That's right. Good.

Wolf Ulrich Knoben: Yep.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Great. So it's project.

Chuck Gomes: It's project.

Olga Cavalli: Project. Great. So no more action item. This brings me to some discussions we had in our, in our list about categories. And Liz made a very interesting point that for example, the study (unintelligible), which I think is a very important issue.

But it's like going with no much involvement of the council in this moment but it's, it's moving forward and it's totally different like other issues that are being reviewed but some working teams right now with a deadline and a lot of involvement from the GNSO. Would this be our first category perhaps?

Chuck Gomes: Our first category?

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: You mean staff, staff only projects?

Olga Cavalli: No, I would say, think that, and I think you already suggested this Chuck, think about moving by themselves because they are already established and...

Chuck Gomes: Oh yes. Yes.

Olga Cavalli: ...and (unintelligible) studies or the reports from the liaison, the GNSO liaison or this things going on with a certain amount of times from the council or from

the staff or both, but don't really need a specific amount of, they don't have a due date really.

I think due date is the thing that makes things different in the project or tasks. If they don't have a certain due date then the effort into, I don't know the value but the effort put in, in achieving something is totally different. It's things that are going on with specific, without a specific due date then perhaps could be one category and the other one, the ones that have to be finished by a certain date. Any comments?

Liz Gasster: You know, it's Liz, go ahead I didn't mean to...

Chuck Gomes: No, go ahead Liz.

Liz Gasster: I was just going to say I think WHOIS is really an anomaly, it's not typical of what the council's been doing at least in the two years that I've been with ICANN. It's a very important significant amount of work, it also has deadlines they're just as emphasized maybe, but I definitely am operating under you know, at least self-imposed deadlines if nothing else.

So I think it might be better for this call not to dwell on WHOIS. I can't think of another project that exactly falls into that category where it's just really on, in staff's lap. You know maybe an issues report for a specific duration would be another example of something where staff holds the token for a set period of time and then just in the case of WHOIS it's a much longer period of time. And for that reason maybe it gets pulled out of the mix for right now, it wouldn't, well that would be my suggestion.

Chuck Gomes: Now I don't think, Olga, that having a due date is necessarily a determining factor, and the reason I say that, look at the new GTLD PDP. Obviously that's done now, but we, you know, of course we have the due date in the bylaws, which was ridiculous, you know, it took us over a year and a half and of course the bylaws PDP didn't allow for that.

But it's something that required you know, over a year and a half to get done but the fact that it didn't have a specific due date didn't make it less of a priority or something that we shouldn't prioritize. You follow me?

Olga Cavalli: Totally yes. Totally right. Yeah. Okay. Chuck, would you be so kind to remind us, especially for Wolf, the first categories that we discussed among us in previous to the list, having the e-mail list, you have three, I think you set up three different categories.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Let me, let me see if I can get those in front of me so that I can speak from the, on the prioritization issues, bear with me a second while I find that e-mail. Well, let me just try and talk to it off my head here.

First of all, I think it, the category I came up with is those things that we know we're going to continue and proceed with regardless of where they fit in the priorities. And that probably means they're a high priority, but regardless I don't think we need to go through the prioritization exercise.

And my, I think one of the prime examples of that right now is the (STI) group. We know that's, you know, and this is where the, a clear deadline from the board fits into Olga's comment a little bit ago, you know, we've got a short deadline on that, it's a gating factor in introducing new GTLDs, which is a big priority we know.

So that kind of thing, assuming that the council agrees, which what things fit in the category, we can pull out of the prioritization exercise, because we're kind of agreeing, yeah, we're going to do these things regardless of how the priorities come out, so let's pull them out of the exercise to make the exercise a little bit simpler. So that was my first category.

My second category, and somebody may be able to help me out here, what was my, I'm thinking of my third and not my second. My third category was...

Olga Cavalli: The important one, I remember, it was the, the things that we have to categorize.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. The third one is the ones we really need to prioritize. Oh, I know what the second one was, the second was things that have really good momentum right now, we have volunteers for them, they've been ongoing for awhile, so it'd be kind of silly, unless we just were forced into it, to stop that momentum and change them.

So for example, the GNSO improvements working team, those are in my view are proceeding really well, we have good momentum, they're heading to closure. So to, in my personal opinion -- and again this needs to be made by the whole council, this decision -- I would say I think we want to just keep those going like they are. And so assigning priorities to them doesn't add any value if we make that decision.

And then the third category is everything else where we do want to do the prioritization exercise. Did that make sense?

Olga Cavalli: Totally. Yeah. Now I understand you better because in the e-mails it was not so clear.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. That's the way e-mails are.

Olga Cavalli: Talking, at least for me sometimes (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: We all do.

Olga Cavalli: Wolf, any comments to these three different categories that Chuck has expressed?

Wolf Ulrich Knobon: No, yeah but Chuck did you put these categories as a comment to Liz's e-mail or?

Chuck Gomes: No it was earlier and I'm trying to find it right now. I haven't found it yet. It was in the early discussions about a week and a half ago or two weeks ago when those of us that initially volunteered for this exercise were talking about, I don't know if those comments got transferred over to our, to our list. Did they?

Wolf Ulrich Knobon: I'll check. What I'm asking though, I have received from you a also a matrix you know, with GNSO work priorities (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Oh yeah, so it was, I think it was around that same time that I sent those. And my matrix is if, in fact I think the matrix that Olga and (Jamie) were working on and the one that Stéphane proposed and the one that Ken and Liz have proposed they're all very similar...

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...in terms of approach, which was kind of neat to see, you know, we were all kind of going down the same path. But the categories was a separate comment and basically what I was trying to do if we can sort out the projects in front of us and narrow it down to a smaller group, it's still probably quite a few that need to go through the exercise, I think that makes the exercise more doable.

Wolf Ulrich Knobon: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: I'll try and find that and send it again Wolf, while we're talking here.

Wolf Ulrich Knobon: Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: Chuck, one question, in between Category 1 and two the project that have its own momentum like GNSO improvement and the ones that are going to happen anyway, like the (STI), is that somehow the same?

Chuck Gomes: They could be lumped into one category, which is I think what you're suggesting, yeah, and that would be fine.

Olga Cavalli: So yeah because I, really I don't see the difference. They both have momentum, they both have the inertia to be finished by its own agenda. And so...

Chuck Gomes: And we're going to handle them the same, we're not going to put them into the mix.

Olga Cavalli: Exactly. So we just say it's two categories that the ones that we need to prioritize, the project that we need to prioritize and the ones that have their own, their own momentum and are proceeding well. Because I don't see a lot of difference in between one and two (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. It's a good point, a very good point. Thanks.

Olga Cavalli: So we have no, not three but (to continue).

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Liz Gasster: It's Liz. I have a thought.

Olga Cavalli: Yes?

Liz Gasster: It strikes me that, if it's okay, that having momentum is qualitatively different from heading towards closure. And because I actually see quite a few groups that you could probably say have momentum, you know, the transfers group, the, there's a lot of resource and a lot of activity in the post expiration domain.

A lot of participation, a lot of debate, registration abuse same thing, but I would not put those anywhere close to heading towards closure I don't think.

Chuck Gomes: Well I was talking about some guidelines with regard to these categories that aren't, each guideline in and of itself isn't a determining factor. In one case we may put something in Category 1 because it has such great momentum and the volunteers and everything else, and another case we may do it because the board's given us a directive to do it.

Liz Gasster: What saying is though that it would be part of the process for the council to decide sort of as a preliminary matter which things get put into it...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Liz Gasster: ...like step one is decide which things belong in Category 1.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Right.

Liz Gasster: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: And there could be different factors that we use on one, one project than we use on another to put there.

Liz Gasster: So when we're providing guidelines...

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Liz Gasster: ...we should try to capture these elements as possible criteria not...

Chuck Gomes: And the criteria don't have to all be met...

Liz Gasster: That's right.

Chuck Gomes: ...on each project. Yeah. Right.

Liz Gasster: Thanks.

Ken Bour: This is Ken Bour. I might just interject with a note here. It might make sense to put everything on the map, everything that is substantive enough that it uses community resource volunteers and is you know, sort of not a week long minor exercise, you know. And the reason is that if this project or this prioritization idea goes forward and then you want to add another new project and place it on the map, do you want to have a whole group that are not even represented because they've been grandfathered so to speak.

And it just seems to me that as you go forward and looking at new things to be added, not having the whole work load mapped might create some problems in terms of deciding whether we can take on the next one.

Chuck Gomes: Well that's an interesting point Ken and you know, this may be where we identify some of the projects on the map, on the matrix a little bit differently. Maybe we put them in bold or we circle them or something if they're projects that we have identified as those that should proceed regardless of where they fit.

Ken Bour: Yeah. I like that a whole lot better and I was thinking almost exactly the same way, they would be asterisks or they would be in red or in some other way coded so that you knew that these were sort of grandfather or pre-approved or for whatever reason they were continuing without being prioritized out of the list.

Chuck Gomes: Now the one difficulty with that, and I'm curious what your thinking is, is how do we, I mean do we, we don't really need to prioritize those kind of tasks. We can but it makes the exercise more complicated. How could we show those so that the total work picture is visible and obvious without having to complicate the prioritization exercises by including those?

Ken Bour: Let me take a shot at that, I think I understand. The picture, the map, the graph, the chart, however we want to call it is really not the prioritization. It is just the map. So you could have something for example, if we stayed with this two-dimensional value versus cost idea you could have something in the bottom, what I called Quadrant 4, meaning it has high cost and low value, but it could be prioritized high.

You might ask like why or how would we do it, but that would bring in these criteria you're talking about -- it was directed by the board or it has some other facet to it. And so once you have the map all that tells you is relative to value and cost where these various projects or groups where they land.

The next thing that has to be done from the chart is to actually create the prioritization and if you follow along with the logic that says the ones we prioritized the highest are the ones that have high value and low cost. Well then you know, those would obviously get moved up onto a priority list, but that seems to me that's a second step.

Chuck Gomes: That makes sense.

Olga Cavalli: Ken, are you saying that we didn't have this for categories that we were talking about?

Ken Bour: I think you do but I wouldn't make, I wouldn't take any project out of the mapping.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Ken Bour: I would put everything in the list for several reasons, not only is it useful I think to have in one picture every substantive project, right. We don't want to have to consult two pictures in order to see what the total work load is.

Chuck Gomes: So are then you suggesting that we prioritize everything?

Ken Bour: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Well that was my point at the beginning.

Chuck Gomes: It was, you're right.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah. Which it somehow makes sense but it could be complicated I mean on the just two axis graphs could be difficult to read but then we maybe find some areas and see what fits in there in which quadrant for example that the graphs that (unintelligible) can prepare and then we, we prioritize. And somehow I think it's this we're talking about the same but how to write it in (unintelligible).

Liz Gasster: You know, it's Liz, it strikes me that we have two separate tasks in a sense that we're trying to accomplish actually, one being a prioritization task and the other being an, managing an overall inventory of work understandings of the aggregate cost of - so once we take on, if we identify N number of projects as being in Category 1, the must do.

Then you know in a different construct there would only be a limited number of other things we could do and we would be managing the work based on some calculus of the remaining headroom that's left in the community and staff after those Category 1 things are taken off the table.

And so the prioritization exercise would be the process of determining how you would do the, or which of the remaining things you would do. But in a separate optimal construct we'd also have a way of saying, and this is how much time, energy, resources required for each incremental project, which I think we will actually get to through a second exercise that we're beginning to look at in terms of you know, it's bottom up versus top down, how much resource overall, how much capacity can the GNSO handle.

Because that's where it seems to me the benefit of retaining the top list of projects that we're continuing to work on is important is assessing what the balance is of work capacity that the council and the working groups and staff can handle. That might be Phase Two of implementing a prioritization process, the first step being accomplishing a way to look at the incremental time that's remaining and Phase Two being able to quantify more what the aggregate time available is. Does that make sense at all?

Wolf Ulrich Knobon: Well it's Wolf speaking...

Olga Cavalli: (Unintelligible) so which would be our fairest, so this second phase that you mention, which is the first one?

Liz Gasster: The first one would be going, using this prioritization process or one like it that we're putting into place now to assess of the things that aren't on the primary list, the Category 1 list, what the prioritization for those are, just as we've been talking about. But with the ability perhaps or the idea perhaps in the future where we might begin to assess what the overall capacity of the community is and looking at projects that way and the ability to take on new projects.

I don't mean to complicate things, I just thought you guys were trying to separate it so that we didn't get bogged down by the fact that there are going to be a significant amount of work that falls into that must view category and how to visualize that on the chart, that's all I was trying to do.

Chuck Gomes: So maybe we need to ask the question okay, if we go the approach we're going -- and I may be backing up a little bit Olga, forgive me if that's a problem -- but maybe what we need to, one of our first tasks, we don't need to do it on this call, is to identify all the projects regardless of where they're going to be prioritized. So we need a full list of projects. Now the action item

list probably does that for us, we'll have to check and make sure it's complete.

Ken Bour: Yeah I counted, there was, there's 21 rows including WHOIS in that matrix or table.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. So we have our list of projects, right...

Olga Cavalli: And perhaps we could with this list we, of projects we could first check if it's totally complete and then, I interrupted you, sorry Chuck, you were going to...

Chuck Gomes: No. Keep going, you're on a good track.

Olga Cavalli: And no, I was saying that perhaps we could add some columns like two or three maybe adding this, which is something that you already did Chuck in your first matrix, add some values and determine, previous determined (unintelligible) cost or difficulty or relevance or whatever, we may have two, we may have three it depends. And then we have our first picture.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And it's not so much I don't think for us to come up with the picture as a small group as whether we're coming up with the methodology that the council will apply. But we, I think we, it will really help in terms of facilitating consistency of ratings, and you can only succeed to a degree there, but if we provide some guidelines in terms of how to rate on either axis, you know.

What are factors that will be considered with regard to level of difficulty and cost? What are factors with regard to value and benefits? And I did start that a little bit in one of my messages that I sent.

Olga Cavalli: I have a comment about costs, I think I really, I already turned it in the list. What if a project is costly but it's important? Would a high cost mean that we could lower its, I don't know, rating in one of the two axis or which I think it's relevant and we still keep it up?

Chuck Gomes: I don't think, I think you're, if I'm understanding you correctly I think you're onto something very important and that is a high cost doesn't necessarily mean we won't put it as a high priority.

Olga Cavalli: Exactly. And so having an axis with cost -- which is fine, I mean I'm not saying we don't consider that -- could perhaps if the cost is high could diminish the relevance. And how, how the cost issue is difficult for me to imagine in this exercise including priority, because it's something that a high priority, well sometimes it's costly and that's fine and you do it.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. In fact to use Ken's and Liz's matrix, it's quite possible that we would have items in Quadrant 2 that would be prioritized higher than those in Quadrant 1, although Quadrant 1 are naturals like Ken pointed out, the new GTLD PDP is a big example of that.

Liz Gasster: So in a sense you would want to rate or weigh difficulty lower in an overall importance and value.

Chuck Gomes: It depends on the exercise.

Liz Gasster: Right.

Ken Bour: Yeah, this is Ken. You know at the risk of just turning it back, I'm going to follow your approach there Chuck and then just ratchet the notch back one level. We don't have to, the council doesn't have to go into a two-dimensional rating, that system of evaluating cost and difficulty against value benefit is designed to make the prioritization easier assuming that value and cost are the most important dimensions in a prioritization scheme, which we took a, which we took a guess at.

There's another simpler way to do this and that is simply to prioritize them. Just take 20 projects that are listed in the matrix and rank them from 1 to 20

in terms of how much, how important they are to the council. That's it, that's one dimension, there's just one table and they get, each one gets the prioritization.

And so the question that becomes is, is there a way to simply create the priority in some consensus or ranking methodology without having to go to two dimensions and three dimensions of cost and time and difficult and value and benefit.

Olga Cavalli: Well if it's a one dimension that that number about prioritization could come with a previous analysis of cost and value benefit something, you know, etc., that brings us to a certain number that puts the project in a certain place in the list.

Chuck Gomes: Now Ken though, I thought I heard you say earlier and I kind of liked it that this two-dimensional exercise actually is helpful in doing the one-dimensional exercise.

Ken Bour: That's right I did, but if you could, if you could simplify it right, if you could just create a prioritization list without having to go through this preliminary ranking process on two dimensions that would be simpler to do. Yeah, if you can't, if you need the, the one is a tool for the other.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Ken Bour: That's all I was trying to say and for example let's say you have five people on the call and we decided to have a discussion, out of the 20 list that's in Glen's matrix what's the number one GNSO priority? You know would we have some agreement on that right off the bat without having hardly any discussion about costs, value, benefits or anything else?

And if the answer is yes we would, we could pick the top. Maybe even if you didn't say I need to rank them one to 20 I need to rank them in three or four

groups, meaning these are must do, these are next must do, these are you know, that process could produce a prioritization that might put one project in number 20 slot or at the bottom and others at the top.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, that's easier than just one through 20.

Ken Bour: Well yeah, and so, and so...

Chuck Gomes: (Unintelligible) yeah, etc., yeah.

Ken Bour: Right because what I was hearing in the discussion, and the reason I stepped back to ask that question is if people find a rating cost and difficulty and value benefit, even if they find that relatively straight forward to do, what you don't want to end up with is having something in project in Quadrant 4, which is high cost, low value, but it gets a number one priority. Because now your tool isn't informing your decision making. Your decision-making's already there, your tool is just wasted time.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Wolf Ulrich Knoben: Wow. It's Wolf speaking so I think you are (unintelligible) two-dimensional approach is (unintelligible) it shows you the, the consequences of that what you are going to decide upon with regard to prioritization.

So if, for me it's only a tool you know, to see okay, so look at in case if I, if the council has to go to decide upon what to do in future, which is the next, the first, the second one we have to do, then it shows you some of the consequences with regards to parameters which the council has to decide upon at first, you know, is value benefit and difficult cost are those parameters.

So I would say yes, so and it's something we chose you really one of the hard parameters related to the project and that it gives you a basis for the

decision, it's not position itself. You know but it could be placed in any part of the quadrant. It shows you some consequence if you do even if you do something - if you are of the opinion to do something which is in Quadrant 4 it shows you what does it mean, and you can before you decide to do that go into more details and just discuss what does it mean really difficulty in cost in this case.

If you are of the opinion it could be of high priority then you have to discuss it more in detail.

Olga Cavalli: I agree with Wolf that could I mention brings more (facial) value to, as a tool. And what we can do also is to follow with in time how the project evolves, it could be desirable perhaps that it starts in one quadrant. And if it's well done and the prioritization was good that it goes to other quadrant which should be the one for finishing or put it in a certain (unintelligible) we may follow how they evolve in the graph.

But the one that I mention is (unintelligible). One question, do we want to have this call for one hour?

Chuck Gomes: I have to get off at the end of an hour so you, but I don't have any problem if you continue without me.

Olga Cavalli: All right. I think that for me could be good also one hour, and perhaps we have in this last 15 minutes we can decide which our next steps are, or play around one list or play around with the two-dimension chart or with all the projects together or with (unintelligible) maybe we can discuss that now.

Chuck Gomes: Well it seems to me that we've got okay, we need a list of all the projects, and I think we could combine that with coming up with an abbreviated identifier along the line. I like the three capital letters or at most four, so that we can, and then turn them into meaningful letters, you know, I showed some

examples in one of my posts, you know, IRT-A, IRT-B, IRT-C that'll come in the future. The PED is one for the (pedner), you got FF for Fast Flux.

Just so that people don't have to look back a legend, and since we only have probably less than 25 that shouldn't be too hard to do and then they become meaningful and you can look at the, at the four quadrants and know what each one is without you know, referring back to another legend.

Olga Cavalli: And...

Chuck Gomes: And so the first...

Olga Cavalli: ...what project are there?

Chuck Gomes: So the first exercise is to create the list of projects and their abbreviation, their identifier.

Man: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: And then isn't the second step, and again this is something we would, we'd put in front of the council, we wouldn't need to do the exercise, we could do the exercise if we wanted to test it out, but I don't know that that's necessary.

The next step then would be to use the, the two axis approach, the four quadrants as a tool to go to a third step which is to actually come up with the prioritizations. And Ken I liked your second approach rather than just listing them one through 22 or whatever, the must do's, the whatever we want to call them you had good terms for them I though. Dividing it into four or five groups makes that exercise a little more meaningful.

And then I think you still have to go back then and make your decisions as to where we're going to end up with our priorities.

Wolf Ulrich Knoben: Yeah, Chuck, Wolf speaking so but we have to have consensus about the parameters against which (unintelligible) going to list it or to prioritize it. So well, I found it very useful to have (unintelligible) parameters here which are listed as difficulty, cost, value benefits or maybe difficulty we have to more detail that but what does it mean, but so the in principle so I would go along that way.

Chuck Gomes: I totally agree and that's what I was getting at and I think the post that was ultimately sent out on Friday I actually wrote it on my trip from Frankfurt to San Francisco. But you know, we need to provide some guidelines for what difficulty/cost means and we need to provide some guidelines with regard to value and benefit. I think for value and benefit I put well, you know, how many, how much of the community does it benefit, there's a variety of things. Does it just benefit one stake, one interest group or some things like that that we can come up with, I suggested a few ideas in my message.

But I absolutely Wolf agree with you that we need to provide some guidelines for those, those two axis metrics so that it guides people in their thinking.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. Did you see the X and Y definitions that we proposed?

Chuck Gomes: I did.

Ken Bour: Oh okay.

Chuck Gomes: You did a very good job. Yeah. I commented on those as I went down on my post as I recall.

Ken Bour: Okay.

Wolf Ulrich Knoben: Oh yes, I see. Okay.

Chuck Gomes: That's the kind of thing we're talking about right now and Liz and Ken did a good job on that. And we should try and expand on that so we give as much guidance as possible.

Wolf Ulrich Knoben: Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: So I think our next step would be to define or to polish our list of projects, and be sure that we're including all of them. And try to place them in the, in the two, in the four quadrants, graphs then I think it looks very good. With this two dimensions difficulty, cost and value benefits could we try to exercise this for in between us? Could it be (unintelligible) or do you think that's too complicated or?

Ken Bour: This is Ken.

Chuck Gomes: Well if it's too complicated for us the whole council's not going to be able to do it.

Ken Bour: Right. This is Ken, I...

Chuck Gomes: The question is whether we want to go through that exercise ourselves or not.

Olga Cavalli: Perhaps we could present one, one outcome as a group, I mean as a working team and see what the reaction. Of course being, having worked on (unintelligible) with having reviewed among ourselves, but (unintelligible) are without (unintelligible) so much (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: But before we do that we should come to a reasonable agreement on the definitions of the XY dimensions.

Olga Cavalli: Yes of course. Yes. First steps, yeah I agree.

Ken Bour: This is Ken, how would you propose doing that?

Chuck Gomes: Well you've made a start, I added some comments, maybe we, other people can add some things. Maybe Ken could you kind of pull together, you've already got your draft definitions, you've started there, I think I added some comments and if you could distribute that to the people working on this, including those that aren't on the call, and we can all add to it that would be a way.

Ken Bour: Excellent.

Wolf Ulrich Knoben: I just found it Chuck, so I also would like to add some comment on it and distribute it to you?

Chuck Gomes: Yes. Yeah.

Wolf Ulrich Knoben: And Ken could then collect all the comments, yeah.

Ken Bour: Yes, I'd be happy to coalesce all of the suggestions to the definitions for the two axis here.

Wolf Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: But wait, do we want to just have everybody just provide comments, that's fine, I provided some already and Ken has provided some here. If everybody else could, now we need to ask Adrian and Stéphane and (Rosemarie) to do it as well.

Olga Cavalli: I think yes we should, I did comment, maybe Wolf can comment and Adrian and Stéphane and with that information perhaps Ken and Liz can draft something.

Chuck Gomes: Now it'd probably be good to call to the attention, especially those not on the call, what's been done already in this regard and ask them to add to it. I think

we all understand what we're asking, it's not going to be probably as quickly obvious to them.

Olga Cavalli: Liz can you help me sending this e-mail to the list, maybe today?

Liz Gasster: Yeah. Sure.

Olga Cavalli: And then once we have all the comments to add to the list perhaps we can, Ken can work on that input and produce some outcomes. Okay?

Chuck Gomes: So before we close could we agree on the tasks that need to be done before our next call? And I do think it would be helpful to have another call like this and try and get one where hopefully everybody can participate, early next week.

Ken Bour: This is Ken I was going to make, try to make that summary, and what I heard so far is we want to first nail down the list of projects as we're using the term so that would be all the things that need to get ranked and put on the chart, so that's step one.

Step two is to nail down the axis definitions. So it's sounds like we've agreed on a, essentially a two axis chart style for trying to get the 20 or whatever that number of projects is scoped out and placed on this diagram.

And then step three which we didn't talk too much about, but Olga suggested do you guys want to take a shot at using the methodology that we've developed associated with this as a way to try to actually plot real projects on a real graph using your temporary data points?

Olga Cavalli: Yes. That's (unintelligible).

Ken Bour: So then with that, I'll tell you what I think that would do for you. Number one, I think it does help then to sort of prove out the methodology. You've been

through it and having done it you can recommend it to others to do, that's step, that's one.

Number two is we will actually end up with a chart with real projects on a real dimension, and I think a fair question for this group would be okay, now that we have that, even though it's not formal and it's not approved and it's not official what would we do with that. And if a council member said, okay team, now that you've got these things all up there what are you going to do with all this data?

I think that's a fair question and that was, we put that at the end of our e-mail is it's really the most important question to say what will I do with these results now that I have them.

Chuck Gomes: And we as a small group are going to have to answer that question before we send this to the council.

Ken Bour: I agree.

Chuck Gomes: As well as a couple of, the other question and I think I added one to the list as well.

Ken Bour: So what I do, what Liz and I can do is we can get the list of projects, help with the definitions and coalesce your ideas around those. And even if we don't have them perfect we can start with a methodology, send it to all of you on the team, ask you to complete it, build the results into a real matrix, don't publish it, and then ask ourselves the question do we like what we've done, did it work out okay, and what would we recommend to the council having now gone through that exercise.

Wolf Ulrich Knoben: Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah. I agree it's a very good exercise so we will prove it with doable, usable and we think the outcome is good.

Chuck Gomes: Now it sounds like we should have somebody do a doodle for I don't know, next week I would think earlier in the week is better but it depends on people's availability, so.

Liz Gasster: Yeah, and I know we, this time wasn't convenient for everyone, which is (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: See now we have, we have Pacific Coast U.S., East Coast U.S., we have...

Liz Gasster: Australia.

Chuck Gomes: ...Australia, we have Europe, we pretty much have the whole spectrum.

Olga Cavalli: Right. I will be Europe so my time is different next week.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: But I can, I can answer the doodle and find out what times that's okay. It's not Latin America.

Chuck Gomes: So who's going to, who has the task on the doodle?

Liz Gasster: Glen. Glen, is that okay?

Chuck Gomes: That's fine.

Liz Gasster: Okay.

Ken Bour: Is she still on the call?

Liz Gasster: I'll make sure she gets this.

Ken Bour: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Good.

Olga Cavalli: Great. So Liz and Ken are you going to send this first draft to move forward and then we'll send a doodle so we have things to do to comment and to give some input to your e-mail once we receive them and hopefully we will get some more comments from, on the, our working team.

Ken Bour: Yeah this is Ken, I will take a shot at summarizing what we've just discussed, laying out the plan and soliciting the team's feedback on all of the dimensions or elements of it.

Man/Woman: Okay. Great.

Olga Cavalli: Comments?

Chuck Gomes: I think we're going in a good direction.

Wolf Ulrich Knobon: Great.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Thank you very much. I think it was a very good call. Thank you. So we keep in touch through the list and we will talk to you next week.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks everybody.

Wolf Ulrich Knobon: Okay. Thank you.

Ken Bour: Thanks.

Liz Gasster: Thanks Olga.

Wolf Ulrich Knoben: Yeah. Bye-bye.

END