

**GNSO Work Prioritization Model  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Tuesday 29 March 2010 at 1900 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO Work Prioritization Model meeting on Tuesday 29 March 2010 at 1900 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Coordinator: Excuse me, this is the operator. This is to inform all parties that this call is being recorded. If you have any objections please disconnect at this time.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much. Hello. Good evening, good morning everyone. Gisella please help me do a roll call.

Gisella Gruber-White: Absolutely. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening on the, on today's Work Prioritization Model Group call on Monday the 29th of March. We have Olga Cavalli, Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen, Chuck Gomes, Jaime Wagner we are trying to get a hold of him.

From staff we have Glen Desaintgery, Rob Hoggarth, Ken Bour and myself Gisella Gruber-White. If I can also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking and we have apologies from Rosemary Sinclair. Thank you. Over to you Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you. Thank you very much Gisella and thank you everyone for joining. Ken was so kind to send us a new version of the document. I personally checked it and made a few comments (in the disk), some others did. I am okay with Chuck's suggestions. I think Wolf also made some comments.

So I would like Ken if you can, now we have the document in our screen if you can go through the document and see if we have some comments or additions or we want to change something, maybe you can explain us a structure that you finally use for the document.

Ken Bour: Sure. Thank you Olga. Let's see, it would be great if today we could get all the way through Section 6 and what I would like to do is to take notes here, indicating that we have accepted each section that's in red or, and get rid of all the comments and then I can send out a clean version, we could take one more look at it in between this and the next session, does that sound reasonable.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck, it does to me except that I would hope we don't have to go item by item because I think, it sounds like all of us have, have reviewed this and made some comments on the list like we planned so...

Ken Bour: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: ...hope that we can do it more quickly more on a broad scale basis than an item by item basis.

Ken Bour: Yeah. Well yeah, how about, this is Ken how about if, yeah, let me try to direct, I'll be try to be the traffic cop through this and then if I get too bogged down somebody please pull me back up.

On 6.1.1 I think the only comment was Wolf and he wanted to change the footnote which reads procedures relating to the council's project management role will be developed subsequently and he suggested we change will to may and I guess we should just see if that's, if that's a good change or not.

Chuck Gomes: That's fine with Chuck.

Olga Cavalli: That's all right to take from me.

Ken Bour: This is Ken, the only comment I would have is that, when we use the term may are we suggesting that there is, we may also not, that the council may

actually take no action or there would be no future action with respect to the management role of the prioritization?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: It's Wolf speaking, that's (not) my intention Ken, so I tried to explain that in my e-mail because I think this is a, something which has to be discussed really whether we you know, what we do understand under for project management.

It seems to me right now so that we are, that's also my thinking you know, if I think about project management so I am working with a company and I know about what the company is doing, but it may be in a, done in a different way because we are very diverse group on council (unintelligible) and have different views on that, so I tried well to find out how to (unintelligible) not just to put a certain direction on that.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. Would it help if we said procedures relating to the project management will be discussed subsequently? So we keep the emphasis on will but we don't say developed we say they'll be discussed subsequently. That leaves all the room open for you know, redefining the terms and making sure everybody's clear on what they mean and all of that.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: If that is (unintelligible) as well by the others this way, Chuck you have heard my intentions though I am, I would go along that in the discussion council level as well.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck, I would too, that would I think that covers Wolf's concern and it seems to be okay.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yeah.

Ken Bour: Okay. Super. I'll note that, change footnote to will be discussed. All right. I in 6.1.2 let's just see, yeah I guess I want to, is Jaime able to join yet? Are you on the call?

Jaime Wagner: Yes I am.

Ken Bour: Oh super.

Jaime Wagner: Hello.

Ken Bour: Jaime you had originally suggested that the last sentence be listed as a goal and what I did is I left the three goals A, B and C and then I added this sentence that says to achieve the above purposes this section describes the methodologies in 6.3 for reaching council agreement on project priorities.

If we do it that way have we captured what you had hoped to get in your thoughts?

Jaime Wagner: Okay. Okay. It's an implied role but I think it fills a goal but anyway if, if you, I think the, the agreement on project priorities (unintelligible) the goal of the, of the (work) itself. If there is no agreement on project priority then we'll have, would be the point of doing this work.

Ken Bour: Does anybody else have any comments?

Jaime Wagner: I'm, I'm okay with leaving this as a, it's an implied goal but and if it, if it's difficult for, for the group to (unintelligible) I would leave it, I'm okay with leaving it in the implied role in (unintelligible).

Ken Bour: Any other, does anyone else they want to comment on the structure of 6.1.2? Okay. Hearing none we'll pat, we'll move on. I'll accept all of the changes and remove the comments there. On 6.2, okay so this, this is the first time the subject that eligible versus qualified or some other language comes up and I believe that on the list, those who commented said eligible and not eligible worked fine, and so this would be the time to ask.

Does anybody have any strong objection or any objection to using eligible in place of prioritize and non-eligible in place of non-prioritize?

Jaime Wagner: No problem.

Ken Bour: Okay. Pushing ahead then to 6.2.1 I don't think there's anything there, 6.2. So let me just makes notes here, 6.2.1 okay, 6.2., how about on 6.2.2? I did try to make the category versus classification clean in every case. Jaime I didn't, as I said in one of my notes, I didn't actually create definitions because I was having trouble figuring that out, but I think I've used the terms consistently throughout the document and hopefully it's relatively clear in each case what we're talking about?

Jaime Wagner: Yeah. And I, I understood the classification implies categorization.

Ken Bour: Yes. It does that's right, they're related. Okay 6.2.2 I'm going to mark that one as okay. 6.2.3? I'm going to mark that as okay. And let's go down, I'm sliding mine down, hopefully you guys are scrolling as well because I'm not controlling it for you. In 6.2.4 I take it that's okay. Let me just pause here.

Olga, you raised a question that I didn't fully understand and, on the e-mail list about where the project lists live, and 6.2.4 actually answers that question. The GNSO Web site is listed there and I actually have the, the link embedded there in blue, it should show up that way.

Olga Cavalli: This is Olga. Yes, that was my question. Sometimes GNSO Web page may be confusing so I think the link was, but it's included so sorry for that.

Ken Bour: That's okay. And I wasn't sure what you meant by a glossary exactly?

Olga Cavalli: No, I wondered if we should explain a little bit what that list does but don't worry just (unintelligible).

Ken Bour: Yeah. I did put some material in there. The, we are going to have of course where that list gets published it will have all the same information that it has now in our Word document, and we'll take another look at that I'm sure as we move along.

Okay. Pressing on to 6.3.1, there were really no changes there, you know what I'm going to, I'm just going to stop putting okay in it just, I'll just (unintelligible) changes (unintelligible).

Jaime Wagner: I have only a minor observation, is this a paragraph?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah I was thinking the same thing Jaime, it's probably just section?

Jaime Wagner: Yeah. 6.3 has this paragraph outlined, is it a paragraph or is this an entire item (unintelligible)?

Chuck Gomes: Section probably makes more sense Ken.

Jaime Wagner: (Unintelligible).

Ken Bour: Oh, I understand. I was having trouble figuring out what you guys were talking about. In 6.3 this, this section versus paragraph.

Chuck Gomes: Paragraph.

Ken Bour: Yeah thank you. I got it and you were correct on that. One of the things I had been confused about in the whole way we talk about the GNSO operating procedures, and I'm finally landing on, at the 6.3 level that, that's like a, that's a section and 6.0 is a chapter and then each thing that's smaller than that would be a paragraph, let's try that on for size.

Okay. So 6.3.1 is okay I take it? Let's go on to 6.3.2 frequency? We're okay on that. 6.3.3 the general procedure, I've now listed four steps there,

confirmed the list, individuals do ratings and the group reaches consensus on each one then we publish the results, that okay?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Jaime Wagner: What we won't mention in 6.3.2 that it will be during ICANN meetings or not?

Ken Bour: Yeah. What I was thinking was just based on what happened in (unintelligible), what I was thinking is that, and the way I wrote it is we time the prioritization so that it can be approved at the ICANN meeting but it doesn't happen at the ICANN meeting, it happens in advance of it.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, we should be as flexible as we can there because one annual meeting it might be better to do it before we ever arrive, another one it might be better to do it on the weekend, so why don't we just leave it open enough so that we can design as best fits the needs at the case in point?

Jaime Wagner: Yeah I think this is (unintelligible) your concern Chuck. If it can be at the meeting or before it, I understand that this, the wording of this paragraph (unintelligible).

Ken Bour: Yes. This is Ken, thank you Jaime I just re-read it and said yeah, you know what we would be okay, right. It's just that...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Ken Bour: ...yeah it has to be timed and it can be done either in advance or at the session as long as...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Ken Bour: ...it's approved at the session so I think we're probably okay there, yeah.

Chuck Gomes: I agree.

Ken Bour: Okay. Super.

Chuck Gomes: Chuck.

Ken Bour: So. Go ahead?

Jaime Wagner: Oh (unintelligible) next item.

Ken Bour: 6.3.3.

Rob Hoggarth: Well Ken before you move on to that, and I know this is something that we had only discussed briefly, do, are you guys comfortable that the language allows you to reconsider priorities more often? So you're doing it at least by the annual meeting but that you can also considerate it at other times? Are you comfortable that the language provides for that?

Ken Bour: Well Rob...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. The second sentence.

Ken Bour: ...the second sentence says the prioritization session may be conducted more frequently if recommended by the chair and approved by the council.

Rob Hoggarth: Great. Thank you. I don't, I'm not on Acrobat, I'm mobile so thank you.

Ken Bour: Oh okay, so you can't see it, right. Okay. Good enough. Thanks.

Rob Hoggarth: Right. Thank you.

Ken Bour: All right. So how about 6.3.3? Anything there?



Man: Nope.

Ken Bour: Oh, that's outstanding. So that's all I show for, because what we, we sort of decided to do was to put all the real mechanics and logistics and other details in the annex and so if that's it then Olga I would suggest that we declare, six, Chapter 6 completed and I'll clean it up and put out another version and unless there's any other thing that comes up in subsequent discussions that piece is done.

Olga Cavalli: This is Olga, I agree. I agree.

Man: Cheers.

Ken Bour: Cheers is right. All right. I'm going to minimize this everyone and I'm going to bring up the annex okay? And the annex is this one, and again you should have a control over the adjustment of size. Okay. Should we...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Not yet.

Ken Bour: I'm sorry?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I don't have control.

Ken Bour: All right. So you don't see the slider?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: No.

Ken Bour: All right. Hang on.

Chuck Gomes: There we go.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Ken Bour: Yeah you know what, there's a little button on my screen and it's, the gray in and out is very, very faint and I can't always tell when it's on or off so, it looks like it always puts it in sync mode and I have to un-sync it so you guys can control it. Okay. Let me just make a note here, annex next and I guess we'll start with Step 1. Okay. Step 1 is to update the project listings and you see the changes I made to 1.1, I guess we should start with that. Everybody okay with 1.1?

Chuck Gomes: I'm okay with it all except for the, the two places where there were questions, or no one place it wasn't a question the length of time that a councilor can speak to an issue, that was the one change I recommended and then the other issue was whether somebody who misses the ten day...

Ken Bour: Yeah we'll come to those real fast.

Chuck Gomes: What I was suggesting is does anybody have any other issues besides those?

Jaime Wagner: Let's move step by step I think it's okay. So I'm okay with 1.1, 1.1.

Ken Bour: In 1.2 this is where I took all the material we had before under new project (unintelligible) and now I just embedded it as part of what steps would be done to clean up the project list. I did leave the questions in there so we have an A and a B section now, but I did a little re-writing to that 1.1.

Okay so 1.2 just covers the new projects. Everybody okay with 1.2?

Jaime Wagner: (Unintelligible).

Ken Bour: Okay. So in essence what we'll do is the first thing that the chair will do is to say okay, let's look at all the existing projects, make sure they're all classified categorized properly then let's go to the new projects, if there are any, that

are pending that hasn't been done and determine if they're non-eligible or eligible. And if they're eligible then they'll go into the work prioritization list.

So we've got, so we start out Step 1 with a complete list of projects that need to be prioritized. Then Step 2 is each individual council member does their own individual rating, and so 2.1 didn't really have any changes, 2.2 again very...

Jaime Wagner: I think those, something is (unintelligible) let's see (2., 1.2) is that if, well depending upon the outcome of the (unintelligible) analysis and the project is approved the chair will ask for a recommendation from staff, and the chair will announce that recommendation. And if it is announced as a (non-eligible) and, and a councilor disagrees with that, is any procedure (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Where are you at Jaime?

Jaime Wagner: It's 1, 1.2.

Chuck Gomes: Oh we, you're back in 1.2, okay. All right.

Jaime Wagner: Yes.

Ken Bour: I think 1.2B, letter B.

Chuck Gomes: Oh okay.

Jaime Wagner: Letter B yes, letter B, indicates that the chair announces the staff recommendations as a new project to be considered as (non-eligible) and if there is disagreement with this recommendation there is no, there is not a procedure to resolve this.

Ken Bour: Okay. Yeah what is says is the chair will announce staff's recommendation and ask for council approve, but if it doesn't get project, if it doesn't get council approval then...

Jaime Wagner: Yes.

Ken Bour: ...we don't, what happens right?

Chuck Gomes: Well we could take a simple vote on the council for which category and just use the, the vault loading threshold that's pretty easy.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yeah. It's Wolf speaking. So I think we have only two advantage, eligible or non, certain case the staff's recommendation is rejected by the council it would mean the contrary, the other.

Chuck Gomes: That's true. That's pretty straight forward.

Jaime Wagner: But what is the rejection? It's a simple vote, a majority, one vote, what is the rejection is not (unintelligible), how, how?

Ken Bour: This is Ken, and I checked, and correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe that as the way that the GNSO procedures and the bylaws are written anything that is not a specified threshold for voting is considered a default, which is 50% of each house. We...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Simple majority of each house.

Ken Bour: Correct. So what we could say here is the chair will announce staff's recommendation and ask for council approval by vote if necessary.

Jaime Wagner: That's what I would try to avoid is that a formal voting to be necessary. I think only a vote, a formal vote should be taken if there is disagreement of a one councilor, with one councilor, then a formal vote will be called but otherwise

there will be no voting. This I would like to be, to have it stated to avoid future confusion if one councilor, okay?

Chuck Gomes: And that's typical, this is Chuck, that's typical of the way we approach it too, we just, you know are there any objections to this, if there's none we move on. If there are then we would, we would, we could you know, poll the (unintelligible) to see.

Jaime Wagner: You think this would, you Chuck, you think this would be the case for a formal council meeting to, or it could be printed on the, on the our list?

Chuck Gomes: Well it depends, we try to, unfortunately some people just don't participate very well on the list so you know, I've often used the technique myself where I'll say well if nobody objects to this in 48 hours we're going to assume it's approved, it's about the only way to make it happen on the list sometimes.

So and keep in mind that a formal vote doesn't really necessarily mean all that much formality, you know so don't be too afraid of a formal vote, it doesn't need, it may not need a pre-written motion and second and you know, we can easily do things like this fairly quickly and still be consistent with the, with our operating procedures.

At the same time I think you raise a good point, we probably ought to add a sentence or something or just modify this sentence so that it's, it's clear what happens if, if there's no, if somebody does object.

Ken Bour: This is Ken, I started to just jot some notes over on the right side of the Adobe room. What I've written is something that might go like this, I can tweak it, the chair will announce staff's recommendations and ask for council approval by voice acclamation if any objections are raised a formal vote will be taken.

Chuck Gomes: The only problem that I have with by voice acclimation, if we do for example the, if we're able to resolve it on the list that doesn't work. So...

Man: Yes.

Man: Oh.

Chuck Gomes: ...you might want to just modify it again I think allowing enough flexibility, keeping this as flexible as possible so that we're not locked into necessarily doing it in a formal meeting.

Jaime Wagner: Yeah. That's what I, I was referring. I would like if there is any objections from a councilor, and this leaves open to being in, in the list or in a formal meeting, but if there is any objection from (unintelligible) a formal vote will be taken.  
Yeah, it's okay.

Ken Bour: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: And would it be okay to say if there's any objection, counselors will be polled?

And the - what I'm getting at here again when you say a formal vote, that implies some - a fairly specific procedure either in an in-person meeting or on the list. And it might very well be possible just to poll how many, you know, people support this approach, how many don't, something like that. Again I'm a little bit bothered by having formal vote there.

Ken Bour: Okay.

Jaime Wagner: Yeah but anyway, anyway I think the threshold of 50% of each (House).

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Jaime Wagner: Might - should be maintained.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. And that automatically - agree. And we have that in the - that's actually in the bylaws so we're okay there.

Jaime Wagner: Okay.

Ken Bour: Can I say if determined by the Chair, a vote will be taken? So what I'm...

Chuck Gomes: What's wrong with saying counselors will be polled to determine support.

Ken Bour: Okay. Does that work?

Jaime Wagner: Yep, okay.

Ken Bour: Okay. I will do that. Okay, I've noted that.

Jaime Wagner: I'm taking for granted that this implies that the normal thresholds will be - will apply here. Is it correct?

Chuck Gomes: That's my...

Jaime Wagner: Assumption.

Chuck Gomes: ...assumption Jaime. So I think it is. Does anybody disagree with that?

Jaime Wagner: No. I would like...

Chuck Gomes: Anytime we make a decision the voting thresholds come into play and those are defined in the bylaws so.

Jaime Wagner: Yeah...

Chuck Gomes: What I was trying to (imply) by not saying formal vote is, you know, formal vote implies very specific procedures whether it be on the list or in a meeting whereas polling, whether - even - in my opinion polling has the same threshold as a formal vote. Does anybody disagree with that?

Jaime Wagner: I only - I would like for Ken to get assured of this. I don't think we can...

Chuck Gomes: Well we can cover it without having to do anymore work. We can just say determine support based on approved voting threshold.

Jaime Wagner: Yeah, okay. That's okay.

Ken Bour: Yeah, this is Ken. I'm pretty sure that this procedure will also get reviewed by Legal as it seems like all GNSO operating procedure drafts are submitted.

And we'll get some indication from them as to whether that kind of language is sufficient. I suspect that someone might say, well you could poll but then what if you don't determine support, then what happens?

I'm not sure we address (that).

Chuck Gomes: Well then either the project doesn't get added to the list or, you know, I mean what are the options? The options are, is eligible, it's ineligible or not even considered.

Jaime Wagner: Yeah.

Ken Bour: It may be that Wolf is right that, you know, if staff makes a recommendation and says non-eligible and the council, there isn't support for that position. Then it'll go to the other one.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.



Ken Bour: So that may just turn out to be the right answer.

Okay, any other discussion on that point? I'll try to redraft that consistent with our discussion.

Okay, moving onto Step 2, I think we're okay on 2.1. There weren't any changes there.

Also 2.2, I also - very, very just small words made changes there.

How about 2.3?

This is where we've decided to give them, I think Jaime's recommendation was ten days to finish the individual ratings and then submit them. And that's now in part of 2.3.

Okay, hearing nothing. 2.3.1, I - that was another suggestion by Jaime to actually highlight the statistical definition as a separate subparagraph and I did that.

And I also...

Man: Okay.

Ken Bour: ...changed consensus everywhere to agreement per our earlier meeting.

Step 3 is group discussion and agreement. Now at this point we - there was - Chuck I think responded to this issue. I put a comment in and to this extent.

If a counselor doesn't submit their individual ratings then would he or she still be permitted to participate in a group discussion? Chuck's response to that was yes. I think that's fine.

My only comment would be might counselors just skip the individual rating in order to just participate in the group thing.

Chuck Gomes: Well we're not allowing them to express their opinion, excuse me, they're not going to be kept - their rating is not going to be in the group ratings that we're using. All I'm saying is that if they have a comment they should be able to share it.

Jaime Wagner: Yeah. But they will be able to vote or not?

Chuck Gomes: No. Not if they missed the ten day window. By vote we mean, you know, expressing their rating.

Jaime Wagner: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: My concern is if we allow them to do it late, then it's going to greatly impact the time because we've now got to take their rating and add it to the mix in a live process.

And if you have three or four people doing that, all of a sudden our two hours isn't going to work even for the first one.

Jaime Wagner: Yeah.

Ken Bour: So yeah. Chuck your explanation was deeper than what I read in the email. I see now. I think I can fix that in the paragraph.

So we probably just need to say exactly that. If a counselor does not submit an individual rating he or she will be able to participate in the discussion but not in the voting as per 3.2., whatever it is, 3.

Chuck Gomes: Well what do you mean by not in the voting? I mean...

Ken Bour: Well that was what Jaime just asked and you said. I thought you said yes. He said could they vote? And you said no, they wouldn't be able.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Well it depends what time you're talking about. I mean if we have to go to another rating, okay, in the live meeting they could participate then.

Ken Bour: Oh.

Chuck Gomes: But in the initial ratings that have already been tabulated, we don't...

Jaime Wagner: No, no, no.

Chuck Gomes: ...want to come back in on that.

Ken Bour: Oh I see.

Jaime Wagner: I was explaining. I was asking if they would be able to participate in the new session. If a new session is required, range is higher than two than they will be able to rank, yes?

Chuck Gomes: Yes. I think that's fine because that doesn't cause any delays.

Jaime Wagner: Yeah. And I think otherwise we will - we would take a stronger position. So I think this is the rating will not be considered. Well the ratings will not be considered in the first.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Jaime Wagner: I think it's not. Yeah, okay. But they may express and both in the next ratings.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Jaime Wagner: If yeah, okay. You created a new concept. Agreement bound.

Ken Bour: Well I reserve the right to change the language when I actually write this. But I wanted to get the idea that I think I follow, all right.

Jaime Wagner: Yes, okay.

Ken Bour: So yes. The initial individual ratings are not going to be revisited but as soon as - if a project - so if a project reaches the point where it has established agreement as a result of the individual ratings and therefore is not discussed, it stays in that category. It doesn't get revisited because somebody says well I would have voted a six versus a two.

But if it does end up in the group discussion process then any counselor who's participating in that session can contribute, discuss and also poll in the polling vote, right.

Jaime Wagner: Yeah, that's it.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Ken Bour: Okay. I will capture that in some new language to reflect that in Step 3.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Ken Bour: And then send that to everybody. And I'll leave that redlined. I'm going to clear up all the existing redline and all the existing comment and just show what's new so you'll be able to identify it. Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Good you did that.

Ken Bour: You bet. It's getting a little unwieldy. So let's go to 3.1.1, this has to do now with limits and time.

Jaime Wagner: I would only say that it's not necessary a teleconference session, and 3.1.1 conference or (presidential) meeting.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, in other words it doesn't have to be a teleconference.

Jaime Wagner: Yep.

Ken Bour: Change teleconference to or just remove it?

Chuck Gomes: You can probably just remove it, I think, you know what I'm saying, you know.

Ken Bour: So (delete those)?

Jaime Wagner: Yeah, (from that section).

Ken Bour: Okay. I got that.

Chuck Gomes: I fully support as you can tell by my other comments, not being so specific that we tie our hands to particular things.

Jaime Wagner: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: And that's consistent with that.

Ken Bour: Okay, good. And the footnote, it was my attempt to address. It might have been - I can't remember now if it was Wolf or Jaime. But the idea was that as sessions progress and as experience is gained we might have two hours, we might have less. And I tried - I just took it out of there, out of the - and stuck it in a footnote.

Are we okay on all that or?

Chuck Gomes: Fine.

Man: Okay.

Man: Okay.

Ken Bour: Okay, super.

Jaime Wagner: (See that) footnote. Okay. It's okay. I'm okay with that.

Ken Bour: All right. 3.1.2, did not have any changes made.

3.2.1 in the procedure section, just changed eligible there.

3.2.2, okay. Is this where the time limit, the one or two minutes is raised?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah it is. It says the two minute time limit.

Ken Bour: Okay, so maybe we should have some discussion here because I think Chuck had thought in his comment that we might go down to one minute.

Chuck Gomes: That is correct.

Olga Cavalli: Ken this is Olga. Two minute, one minute, I understand.

But are we going to measure the time? I mean it sounds a little bit not realistic.

I would say the shorter or somehow expressing that it should be six but I don't think it makes sense, one or two minutes expressing...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Well if you don't, keep in mind, whether we measure it or not, what you do is you measure it if you have to.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: If people are talking too long you measure it.

So if everything is moving along you don't necessarily have to turn a clock on.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: That same thing happens in ICANN Meetings, you know, they don't do it until they get to a situation where they have to.

But the problem of it is, keep in mind we're dealing with a group of over 20 and 20 people. And granted we're going to have the people at the extremes talk first and so forth. But even if you have three or four of those and each one talks two minutes, you know, with four you're already up to eight minutes of your time and we have a whole bunch of projects, you know, to go through.

So I mean if you've got a point that's new, you should be able to express it in a minute.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: And I don't think anybody's going to be so rigid that if somebody goes over a little bit. The point is we want to clearly communicate. Let's be efficient about this. Let's make your comments concise. Have them prepared so that you can make your point.

And then if people - if somebody has a question about your point they can ask it and you get to speak again.

Ken Bour: Okay, and Chuck would you also make that one one minute or less?

Chuck Gomes: I think that the one minute is a good guideline. I haven't even thought about that Ken so the point is...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...we need people to be brief and to the point otherwise we're going to need a lot more than two hours.

Olga Cavalli: Ken this is Olga.

Jaime Wagner: I think...

Olga Cavalli: And I agree with Chuck. In (unintelligible) IGS we had in the last session, that we present several documents, we had a limit of three minutes with a clock going backwards.

And three minutes was just to read maybe one or two pages. It depends on your speed.

But so one minute would be enough.

Ken Bour: Okay. I'm hearing that the team has reached the consensus on one minute for both the initial expression of rationale and in the Q&A period we should - everyone should - and I use the term honor, right, that everyone is going to honor that.

And hopefully as Chuck points out, it's not required to pull a clock out. But if everybody honors it then, you know, it'll go reasonably quickly.



Are we okay...?

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bour: Go ahead.

Jaime Wagner: No. No. I think we have written here two minutes. You are reducing just to one minute.

Chuck Gomes: Correct.

Jaime Wagner: Each counselor gets one - two minutes, time limit in providing explanation.

Would - you think you should reduce it to one minute. I would preserve the two minute and the ten minutes per item, the two thresholds. And to be used in case - just in case, you know, we have to have this procedure very well. Define it.

But the (longevity) will not be (done), but if needed by and I think that the Chair will manage this.

Chuck Gomes: No, no Jaime. It doesn't - this is Chuck again. This is not rigid at all the way it's worded. It says each counselor is asked to honor a one minute...

Jaime Wagner: Yeah, okay.

Chuck Gomes: ...on changing it, a one minute time limit. There's nothing to prevent this from allowing a little more time if it's needed.

But we're asking - we're setting an expectation that people will work toward. If you set it too high it'll just go longer.

And I think we need to set the expectation at a low amount and if we need more we can add more. This doesn't prevent that.

Jaime Wagner: Okay. I'm just saying that the one minute time limit, well it can be considered too small. It's okay. You know I will give you an example. Here, now just to because I'm not a good - a very good English speaker, it took me exactly 30 seconds now since I began talking. And, you know, almost one minute. And I said nothing.

Chuck Gomes: Can we put a footnote that Jaime can have two?

It's a valid point. But I don't see us, you know, in cases where English is not the native language, I can't imagine any of us being too rigid on that.

But if you have a lot of other people that are native English speakers that are, you know, taking much more than that then this thing is just going to take a lot longer. Keep in mind, we - how many projects do we have?

How many people on the council? We're not talking about a group our size right now. We're talking about a group that's, you know, 20 plus.

Ken Bour: This is Ken.

Jaime Wagner: Well if you...

Ken Bour: Would it help at all if we said to honor a one to two minute time limit in providing an explanation?

Jaime Wagner: Okay. It's okay. Just okay, it's not rigid. But (what - rigid) is brought about because it could be - it can make some people refrain to give sometimes well insightful participation. That's what I have in mind.

And Chuck by the way it took you 28 seconds and you're a very good English speaker.

Chuck Gomes: And so I give you my other 32 seconds Jaime.

Jaime Wagner: Yeah, definitely.

Chuck Gomes: I'm okay if we put one to two. I prefer one but I can live with that.

Jaime Wagner: All right.

Ken Bour: Yeah, I'm only suggesting it, not advocating it.

Chuck Gomes: I understand. Go ahead and put one to two unless somebody else doesn't want to do that. That's fine. I'm okay with that. I at least want that target of one minute in there so that because it is very brief but we - people - we don't need people repeating things and you say that (elsewhere Ken) in this, that have already been said. We want them to focus on very specific points that add to the understanding.

Jaime Wagner: And I think this will give a weapon to the Chair to different - if to refrain somebody that is repeating an argument. I think...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Jaime Wagner: ...with this wording we have the weapons for a good Chair like Chuck to conduct a good discussion, an objective one.

Ken Bour: Yes. Okay. This is Ken, any other discussion on that point? If not, we've got a consensus on one to two minutes.

And I'll - I guess the second one probably should be left as alone. Should be constrained to - I could say can be - should also be constrained to one to two minutes or less. We could do it the same way in both, all right?

Jaime Wagner: Well I think, well okay.

Ken Bour: Go ahead.

Jaime Wagner: No. I think a future round could have a tighter time limit. I mean here I would be okay with one minute. With I think the second discussion should be I think an overall time limit of five minutes.

Ken Bour: Right. Well we're coming up on that in a second. Maybe we can see if we can figure out how to get that done.

So moving on then to 3.2.3 there weren't any comments there. That just deals with the voting.

3.2.4 is - okay, and I do in 3.2.4 is say we're just going to follow the Q&A period similar to the first round without putting specific time constraints on it. In fact I even said under the same time limits.

Chuck Gomes: Yep.

Ken Bour: Does that work for everybody?

And again I think what I hear Chuck saying is if it's going well and things are moving along, I mean even in our six - when we did with five or six people, there were a couple of projects that took longer to discuss. And then a few others we went through very quickly.

And so there might be some of this well I'm going to borrow some time from the first three that were easy in order to spend more time on four which takes

longer. As long as we get it all done in an hour and a half or whatever, it probably doesn't matter.

Jaime Wagner: But anyway, you know, since in the second round there is a tendency to repeat arguments. So I would make the time limit tighter. And I would reduce how - I would have one minute and five minutes overall because second round tends to maintain the argument. And if there is not a convergence there will be repetition and what - and (this) repetition does not have to take more than one minute.

Ken Bour: Okay, any other comments?

Okay then do we all - we agree that we should - I should rewrite 3.2.4 to impose actually specific time limits and use one and five.

Does everybody agree on that?

Chuck Gomes: Sounds pretty good.

Ken Bour: Okay. So let me just make a note here. Rewrite to impose one minute and five total in second round, okay. I'll put something together on that.

Jaime Wagner: Just for the second round. Second and third, it's for second round.

Ken Bour: And - okay.

Jaime Wagner: Yeah. Okay.

Ken Bour: All right, anything in 3.2.5?

If not we are nearing the end, Step 4 results. Then that just takes us to this final question in the yellow, the note.

You'll notice that there's no place in the procedures, in the annex, where we talked about using difficulty as a tiebreaker. We did mention it in Section Six that it could become something that got used. But there's no specific procedure for it yet.

And what I comment here is that I'm not sure it fits anywhere in here because it's not something that is a prioritization activity per se. It only comes up in the management of the project workload when you have to make a decision and you look at your priority list and you say okay, the bottom, let's say I'm just making this up, Projects 13, 14 and 15, we don't have enough resources to do them all. They're the bottom three but they're tied. We can't differentiate between 13, 14 and 15 based on the original prioritization rankings.

Then we resort to difficulty, and we would go through a similar process that we just went through for overall value, which would bring up the whole polling and rating, and all the same steps. It's just that we would only do it for three projects in this case -- 13, 14 and 15 -- to break the tie. Thoughts?

Olga Cavalli: Ken, this is...so are you proposing a whole new section for planning that? Why don't we just add a paragraph and explain that what you have just said, very quickly.

Jaime Wagner: No, no...

Olga Cavalli: Very clearly.

Jaime Wagner: This is Jaime. As I understand, we have two ways of moving. One way is simply removing difficulty as a secondary factor, and finishing on that (unintelligible), and we admit the Web site.

The other way to move is we maintain difficulty there in the item. I don't know which in the other. And we would have to have a Step 4 that would be a tie-breaker session. And then the publication of results would move to Step 5.

Either we remove difficulty from our factors and it's not a factor, and our work finishes with the prioritization of values done, and we admit sites.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I have something, a third option in my mind, which is we keep - what we said, and I have it up on the screen now. We had it in 6.3.1(b). In the event that two or more projects have the same value rating, but must be prioritized individually for any reason that would not come up during prioritization, but it might come up for some other time, the following factor will be separately rated in difficulty. And then we say what it is.

Now what I have in mind is that this project management stuff that I've been referring to, I do think we're going to ultimately end up with a new section -- either a bigger section in the GNSO procedures, which swallows prioritization; or a separate section that deals with the managerial aspects of using prioritization in the council.

And in that section, which has yet to be written, which was implied in the footnote we discussed earlier, that's where we would put that procedure. That's where that paragraph, Olga, would be written. Because under the normal circumstances of managing the workload, and the council has to make a decision, and there's a tie in the ratings, what do you do? That's where that paragraph would live.

So what I'm seeing in this team is, this team was asked to develop a prioritization methodology. It is nearing the process of completing that work, and it has done it. But the entire managerial job of the council isn't done just with prioritization.

And so we're going to need either another team, this team, somebody to take this work now, and move it to the next step, which is okay, now how do we act on this data? What other information does the council need? Like milestone tracking, resource capacity, utilization and other typical data that

people use when they're managing work. The prioritization itself is just one factor of that.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, this is Chuck. I can see it both ways. I can see, for example, the difficulty being included in the prioritization exercise, and I can see it in the management. In either/or. And I don't know that I have strong feelings either way, but it could also be part of the prioritization. If you have three projects that are considered to have comparable value, do the one that's easiest first and so on. Like that. That's a prioritization exercise.

Olga Cavalli: This is Olga. I think it should be included in this exercise. Perhaps, in my view, more simplified. But referring to the other process, which is same. But, just my thoughts.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. When I say we, the team, define the difficulty as not part of the prioritization process. We specifically had it in, and we said now we're going to take it out and we're only going to use it as a tie-breaker if it's ever needed. It may never be needed, right?

So but if we change our minds, and we want to go back now and say, "Okay, the first step of the prioritization is to go through and do all the value ratings, and then everywhere there's a tie, we go back through the same process and do difficulty, so that there are no ties when we're done," we can certainly do that. But that's not what the team decided earlier on.

Chuck Gomes: Well, I guess I understood what we decided a little bit differently than you did. But I don't think that you have to break all ties. If you've got enough resources to complete the work, you don't have to break a tie. It's only in cases where you don't have enough resources.

Ken Bour: Right, but to me - isn't that a management question? Wouldn't that come up during a management dialogue around - I'm trying to envision how it would come up in a prioritization context.



Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: (Unintelligible). Wolf speaking. So I fully agree to Chuck's. It may come up later on, you know, and that, you know, it depends on the resources available, really. And that's what we cannot see at the time we are doing the prioritization, exactly, you know. That means it may come up, but if not, (unintelligible), let's do it in parallel, and not breaking the tie.

So that's how I see it, you know. We are not urged to break any tie under any condition. It depends on the other conditions we have with regards to the available resources.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. Let me just try a different question. This has to do with time.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: No, just one comment. We are five minutes past the (unintelligible).

Ken Bour: Oh, I lost track of time. I'm sorry.

Olga Cavalli: We should perhaps decide if we can stay longer, or we can discuss it later at our next conference call and decide our next step. So first I would suggest that you send us all the documents with the agreed changes. And how do we want to proceed with this discussion about including or not the tie-breaker?

Jaime Wagner: Can we extend for 15 minutes? Does anybody have a problem with that?

Olga Cavalli: I can do it, but we should agree.

Chuck Gomes: I can do it.

Wolf Ulrich-Knoben: I can do it.

Ken Bour: Me, too.

Jaime Wagner: Okay, this is Jaime. And I would like to bring some thinking, because when we began the work, I thought prioritization was a managerial tool. And my thoughts were in the sense that we were kind of doing a project management, to bring in project management to the council, to GNSO.

Along the work, Ken brought the differentiation between prioritization and management. And I could understand that, and I think this is a good way for us to finish our work as focusing in prioritization. And leaving the other managerial tools to (unintelligible) prioritization work.

And I think tie-breaking, if a managerial tool, I agree with Ken that this is a managerial tool. My only point is that we should remove this factor -- difficulty -- from the prioritization work. And we could final in another document that managerial work will be necessary, and that one way to proceed would be with tie-breaking and difficulty.

But I would vote for us to consider our work done. And no to include difficulty or tie-breaking in the prioritization pass work. This would make our work finished and focused objective.

Ken Bour: Jaime, this is Ken. Just a question, if I may. We currently do not have difficulty defined as part - I'm sorry. We do not have difficulty incorporated into the methodology itself. All we have done as a team is said that there are two factors. And we're only going to prioritize on one. And the second one will be reserved if ever needed, and we don't say how. We just mention that. Would you also take that reference out?

Jaime Wagner: Yes, I would because this is advancing a work that we intentionally left out of our scope. Our scope was to come to the council with a prioritization method, and while there is something that we thought perhaps of our scope, and I think it's okay. Once the work is committed to a team, and it can be this team or not, then we could add our thoughts that difficulty would be a good tie-

breaker. But they can come up with others. So I would say that this is not in the scope of our work.

Chuck Gomes: Now, this is Chuck. I have a question. Were we not, after we finish what we're just about done on now, going to then talk about what happens with these priorities?

Ken Bour: Yeah, this is Ken. I thought that we had decided, or that we were not going to go that far, that that would become the work of...

Chuck Gomes: Okay, then that would be consistent with the argument right now of deferring the difficulty issue to a management decision. If in fact we're going to talk about, okay, what does the council do with the priorities, what happens next, that then is in the management arena? So if we were going to do that, it would make sense to do this as well. That's my line of reasoning here.

Ken Bour: Yeah, I think Jaime makes a powerful argument for taking difficulty sort of out of the entire process, and leaving it for the next group to figure out.

Jaime Wagner: I have one consideration that I would like to add. When we began, I thought prioritization was part of a managerial effort, or a managerial tool. And I think most of the council that are not participating in this team have this express expectation also. So I think we can be very objective. We will have our work done, okay, but it will be kind of disappointing to the council. We will say some (unintelligible).

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I agree with that and have always agreed with that. With the group's indulgence, I would like to read a short paragraph. I started - I told you I was going to write a draft letter to the council, from the team, right? From Olga. This is a draft, and I'm just putting this language together.

I started working on it today. I'd like to read one paragraph out of that, and see if this starts to capture where we are on this particular issue. This isn't the whole letter, but this is one paragraph out of it. May I read that?

Olga Cavalli: Sure.

Ken Bour: Okay. Although outside its direct scope, the drafting team has spent considerable time considering - I'm sorry, has spent time considering how the council can make effective use of the work prioritization, once it is completed. Although prioritization is an important first step, the DT, the drafting team, believes that it will be important that the council have access to appropriate project information, data and tools to assist with its active management of the workload.

To facilitate these managerial responsibilities, the drafting team recommends that that all GNSO projects be documented and tracked on an ongoing basis using a feature-rich - I said Web-based - application that will assign staff and community resources to projects and tasks complete with time tracking and collaborative tool sets including integrated blogs, wikis, calendar, document repositories, et cetera, that enable work to be performed efficiently, effectively and transparently.

Information from such an application suite, properly summarized and analyzed by staff, will enable the council to make better-informed decisions by understanding and evaluating more clearly the resource constraints impacting existing projects, as well as the effects of new work that must be integrated into the total portfolio. End.

Jaime Wagner: The only point is - I'm okay with this paragraph. But also we should emphasize that a process of - because a tool is part of the project management work, and it's a medium. And it does not, of course, project management does not, of course, there is not a process that involves periodical evaluation by the - and I would say here if the council will manage

and we would have to have decision as to who. Where are the managerial responsibilities? They lie with the chair, the vice-chair, and with the group chair? Or with the whole council?

We would have to have managerial responsibilities defined in the process of, anyway, of planning the project. To have a project management, we have to have a management and evaluation periodically.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. Jaime, the board governance committee actually assigned that managerial responsibility for the policy process to the GNSO council. And that particular element, that managerial responsibility, was actually tasked and assigned to the GCOT, the work team that's handling the GNSO operations.

I don't think they've done any work on it, though. But there was a team assigned specifically to do that work. And since then, this team got started to put the prioritization together.

Chuck Gomes: You're talking about the council operations work team?

Ken Bour: That's correct.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, okay. By the way, I want to point out something, a very practical need. And that is, is that, you know, I personally fully support the need for some tools to assist the council in its management responsibilities. But we're coming up on a deadline here very shortly where the budget for fiscal year 2011 is going to need to have that kind of input. And we're a little bit behind in the power curve on that.

So my question then is, Ken, is it unreasonable, even though it's kind of vague right now, to come up with some sort of an estimate with regards to how much funds might be needed to put these tools into place?

Ken Bour: It wouldn't necessarily be that difficult. In fact, one of the things that I have had in mind -- I've been thinking about this for some time -- is the use of open-source tool sets, which don't even require license fees. And there's some very good ones that are out there. Now you have implementation costs, and training costs, and things of that type. And we don't have to start with everything at once. You can always start small.

We're going to take a couple of projects and put them in, and start working on milestones and tracking, and have resources put their time in, community and staff. So that we can begin to develop the kinds of information that ultimately you need to take advantage of the prioritization, right? So I think this was a much bigger project than we initially thought.

And whenever I think about just looking at a prioritized list, it leaves me cold. It leave me with - I don't know what to do, unless I also know how much time I have available, how many people there are, and all that information is really not available to the council. It's not available to the staff, either. The only thing that's tracked in the GNSO right now is attendance records.

Chuck Gomes: Well and tools won't necessarily make that information available, either.

Ken Bour: Only if they're - well, they would if they're tended to regularly, right? I mean tools don't do anything if people don't use them right.

Chuck Gomes: And the bottom line, with the (PI) project as an example, who knew that there would be 60-plus available people resources work on that project? And I don't think a tool would have helped us figure that out.

Ken Bour: That's true.

Jaime Wagner: What I'm bringing, Ken, is that tools are important and I'm not saying that they're not important. But I think the most important thing is to have a process

to keep track, with the tools available. If there is not a process, a regular process of appraising projects, then the tool will be not used.

Ken Bour: Yeah. Jaime, this is Ken. I 100% endorse that. And after I heard you say it, I thought, "Oh, I know how I can fix that paragraph." Because you're right. I should have emphasized the processes, not just the tools. And I'll fix that in the next draft of that letter.

Jaime Wagner: And I would say that we recognize that our work is a first step in this direction, and that we recommend not only the tools, but also that some consequence to this work will be to devise some sort of process of appraising and using tools, and which kind of ways we should manage the end of the project.

Ken Bour: This is Ken.

Jaime Wagner: I'm okay with your paragraph, with this addition.

Ken Bour: Sure, and I'm agreeing that that addition - I'll make that addition. That's an extremely valuable point, and I don't know how I missed it the first time around. Just maybe I'll take a shot at summarizing here. If we agree that the team's job was to create a prioritization, and the team is savvy enough to recognize that that is the first step of a larger managerial process, right? You still have to have priorities, but by itself, that's not enough.

And the team is going to recommend to the council that it develop, discuss, agree, define terms and pick this piece up and, you know, do more work in that area. Then maybe what Jaime suggests is right. We don't need to put difficulty into this version right now. We can hold it back and give this to whoever gets that job, to define and develop the management aspects that the council's going to need to do, including the processes and the tools.

Chuck Gomes: And I'm okay with that, and here's why. Because really, when it really comes down to it and at any given instance, difficulty is just going to be one factor of

probably multiple other factors that we might need to take into consideration at the time.

Jaime Wagner: I fully support (unintelligible).

Ken Bour: How about Olga? Wolf? Any other comments.

Olga Cavalli: I'm okay with your summary explanation.

Ken Bour: Okay, then I'm going to go...

Olga Cavalli: Just one more comment. I think we have to focus on finishing this methodology, and maybe we can set it as a first step of a broader bunch of tools. I also agree with Chuck that the tools won't give you the information of those variables that you don't know.

Chuck Gomes: So, Wolf, are you okay with removing the reference to difficulty in the document?

Wolf Ulrich-Knoben: Yes, yes. Yeah, I'm okay with that.

Ken Bour: Okay, then, this is Ken. I think we may be at the point where I can clean up six. I'll clean up the annex. We'll make all the changes we discussed. I'll give you two new versions that will only have red lines where we added new material for you to look at, and we'll take another look at these two.

This time I'm going to put them together, right? Six and annex in one document, so that - would that make sense? I think that's how we would present it to the council, right? As opposed to two documents. Because they do go hand in hand.



Then we can take the week to go through and clean those up for sure. That leaves us two meetings before the deadline. We're ahead of the game, I think.

Chuck Gomes: We could possibly wrap it all up in one more meeting.

Olga Cavalli: That would be great.

Ken Bour: Yeah, I think so, too. And by the way, this letter that I'm writing, I will send that to the list also, so you guys can have a chance to look at that. Because I think we should have a transmittal document that goes to the council with this particular document. And then so we can spend a little bit of time next week on that.

Then maybe next week we could spend some time talking about if there's anything else we need to do in preparation for releasing this information. You know, do we have to think about training at all? Or when might we recommend for it to be implemented? Should it wait until the management procedures come out? Or should we actually go ahead and recommend that the council actually do a work prioritization in advance? That kind of things.

Jaime Wagner: Unfortunately I am complete out of time, now, and I will be the whole week. But I think we should have an objective to go to finish our work in our next session.

Chuck Gomes: I second that.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Ken Bour: Speaking as your staff support, I believe that's doable.

Jaime Wagner: Okay. So, let's adjourn.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, I think we're done, Ken. Thank you very much, and let's - we'll be waiting for your clean documents with the new text included. And let's suggest some ideas, and we'll talk again next week.

Ken Bour: Yep. Congratulations, everybody. Good job.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Ken, for all your help.

Ken Bour: All right, guys. We'll talk to you soon.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Thank you, (Catherine).

Coordinator: Thank you. Have a good day.

END