

**GNSO Work Prioritization Model  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Thursday 03 December 2009 at 2000 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO Work Prioritization Model meeting on Thursday 03 December 2009 at 2000 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/gns0/gns0-wpmg-20091203.mp3>

On page:

<http://gns0.icann.org/calendar/index.html#dec>

Present for the teleconference:

Olga Cavalli  
Rosemary Sinclair  
Chuck Gomes  
Wolf-Ulrich Knohen

ICANN Staff  
Denise michel  
Ken Bour  
Glen de Saint Géry

Apologies :  
Jaime Wagner  
Liz Gasster  
Rob Hoggarth

Coordinator: This call is now being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much, Operator. Help? Glen, could you be so kind to help me make a roll call to know who's in the call?

Glen de Saint Géry: Certainly, Olga. Good afternoon, good evening, everyone. On the call we have Rosemary Sinclair.

Rosemary Sinclair: Here.

Glen de Saint Géry: Olga Cavalli.

Olga Cavalli: Here.

Glen de Saint Géry: Wolf-Ulrich Knoben.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Glen de Saint Géry: Chuck Gomes. And from staff, we have Ken Bour, and myself, Glen de Saint Géry. We have apologies from Liz, who is on another call. And I don't think (Rob) will be able to make it. Thank you very much. Glad that you are all here.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Glen. And also we have apologies from (Jaime). I think he had a trip to fly to (unintelligible). He was flying at the time of this call. And thank you. First, I want to thank very much Liz and Ken for summarizing what we talked in the last call we had. It was the same day I was leaving on vacation. So since then I have been following from my BlackBerry and from my computer when I had the time, when I had connectivity. But not very frequently I could make it as the same as in my normal activity. So my apologies for that.

I think I sent some comments to Ken and Liz for summary, but I don't find them. Now I'm checking my e-mail and I don't find them. So maybe I should make them again. Thank also Chuck for your comments and Rosemary for your comments. And (Jaime) sent also some comments that were responded by Ken today. And I really appreciate Ken's comments because I personally think the same what he wrote, we have been through this exercise. And I think Jaime joined a little bit later and also made his statement about what we have been discussing.

I would like to start with -- hold on a second, please. Sorry. Ken said a very interesting summary with next steps. I would like to know what we in the call

think about it. I think it's quite good summary and it's quite good plan to move forward. But I don't know if you had the chance to review it. I have only seen comments from Chuck and from Rosemary. I don't know, Wolf, if you want to add something, if you had the chance to review the summary made by Ken and by Liz? Any comments about this?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, Olga, I got through the summary. And I do have a small comment to that, but which was commented already. So I could agree to that.

Olga Cavalli: Do you think the summary's okay, (Walt)?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: It's okay.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Ken, are you on the line?

Ken Bour: I certainly am.

Olga Cavalli: So I commend you for summary and for the steps proposed. And any comments about the list that Liz and Ken sent? I think I made some additions, but I cannot find the e-mail when I expressed what I was thinking that it was missing. Now I cannot find it among my e-mails. Maybe I should review it again.

And also, Chuck made some comments about how to make the name up, the different activities. And I think it's fine. Any comments, Rosemary, (Walt), Chuck, to the list? We didn't say activities -- which was the new projects? What was the name that we agreed?

Rosemary Sinclair: Olga, Rosemary. I worked through that trying to remember everything that was said to me in my introduction to the GNSR. And I made a couple of suggestions that I wasn't really sure about. But Chuck came back to me with explanations about those two items.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, this was today, right?

Rosemary Sinclair: That's right, Olga, just today. So I'm happy with that. So I'm happy with it as we have it now.

Ken Bour: Madame Chair, this is Ken. May I...

Olga Cavalli: Sure, Ken, go ahead.

Ken Bour: ...make a suggestion?

Olga Cavalli: Of course.

Ken Bour: The first step that we outlined that was actually discussed in our last call was to finalize the project list.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Ken Bour: And so my recommendation to the group would be, let's go through -- there's only 20 of them. Chuck has already made a comment in the list, which I can summarize or he can, as to certain of them -- one, two, three at least, if not four, five, that should actually be taken off the list. And he can provide his reasons.

But what I would suggest we do, maybe first step, is just to nail down what starting set of projects we're going to use. That would be step one if we do that. Then we could also while we're at it, we can decide on these abbreviations. And if we can make them two letters versus three, that's fine.

Chuck Gomes: And I would say, Ken, that if we need to make them four, to make them meaningful and easy to recognize, that that's a good idea. And I think a classic example is IRT. We need A, B, C, D, things like that. So between two to four I think is fine.

Olga Cavalli: Ken, one question. I didn't follow you completely. You said that from this whole list we should select some of them? I thought we were going to work with all the lists, with the whole project list?

Ken Bour: Well, I think that was modified. At least Chuck made a comment -- well, the step was -- the step that we wrote was, let's go through and make sure these are the 20 projects we want to use.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, okay.

Ken Bour: And so as I recall, I have Chuck's e-mail. He said for example, number 4, IDNF, number 15, CGR -- GCR, and 17, Who 2, and maybe even Who 1, are not projects ready for prioritization. And the same thing was true of No. 20, RRVI.

So what I would suggest we do maybe is to, let's walk right through the list from 1 to 20, and I'll make notations. If there's a consensus that we should scrap that particular one, then we can do that. But I just want to make one thing clear. If we scrap it it's not because it's a project that is untouchable or has some other characteristic. It's just that there's nothing to prioritize yet.

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary here. It strikes me that some of the ones that may be scrapped, just in quotes at the moment, are important. So one suggestion would be to have a kind of prospects list so that we don't lose sight of the fact that some very important projects may be killing up, which would in the course of time cause us to review the priorities of those that are on the list.

Ken Bour: Yeah, this is Ken again. I'll be happy to -- anything that comes off the 20, I'll be happy to tuck into a separate sort of To Be Revisited Later. And presumably when those projects reach a certain level of -- I don't know what noun to use -- but yeah, we will always keep track of those, for sure.

Olga Cavalli: Great, Ken. So our next step would be to prepare this new list with -- it would be a shortened list, and this other To Be Taken Into Consideration projects and other things that we should have in mind. Should we review the list now, one by one, among us? Do you think that that's okay, or we can make comments in the e-mail list? Or we already did?

Rosemary Sinclair: I think it's a good idea to just go through it.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. And No. 1, who that is WHO 1. I think, Chuck, you made some comments about it?

Chuck Gomes: What one? I don't have the list in front of me.

Olga Cavalli: You said I don't think the following are products for prioritization, at least not yet: IDNF, CGR, WHO 2, and I'm not sure about WHO 1, is ready for prioritization. Finally -- it's not clear. But the first one, you made a comment, WHOIS that, WHO 1, that perhaps should not be prioritized. Any other comments?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, we're not at a stage yet -- we're waiting on staff right now for the -- or not just staff; but there are a couple of RFPs out there. And once we get the RFPs back, then we'll have some estimated costs and estimated feasibility information, at which time the Council's going to have to make a decision whether to proceed. It doesn't seem to be a project that fits the model right now. It's not -- the only resources it's taking right now are staff resources. And those are important.

We have to prioritize those as well, so don't get me wrong in terms of what I'm saying. But it just doesn't seem to be at the stage where it's something we have to prioritize. Now, please, just because I suggested it, if people disagree with that, let's talk about it.

Olga Cavalli: Any comments?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I was speaking some. I'm not sure about it, because I'm not so very much familiar with the content of all these standards. But from the last meetings I heard about this. Isn't there may be a big financial implication as well to those standards? I understand they are just in the stages of studies -- which studies should be done and should be. So that means in case it is decided about (unintelligible), then it means there may be a big impact on, an economic impact in terms of my ends and staff as well in it.

I understood from our last call that in this case -- so I would say, okay, it becomes closer to a project. It doesn't -- is my understanding correct or not?

Chuck Gomes: I think you make a good point that I hadn't really thought about, Wolf. What do others think?

Olga Cavalli: Yes. Somehow I agree with Wolf. I would -- yeah, I would keep it...

Chuck Gomes: I'm okay with that. That's why -- so what's the second one that I put? I'm still having trouble finding my...

Ken Bour: This is Ken, if I can just chirp in. What I thought I heard Chuck saying is -- and we have to sort of keep in mind that the overall goal of the work prioritization effort is ultimately to get some sense of where the community's got its time invested. And I think what I heard Chuck saying is there's no current community investment in this project.

Not that it isn't important, not that it won't come up later, not that at some point there won't be community involvement. But there isn't now. And so it's going to be tough to determine difficulty, it's going to be tough to determine value when the project is not in the community's hands at this stage.

So what I was suggesting is just label it I for Inactive. I'll take it off the internal list. But I won't lose it. But at the moment, it doesn't sound like it's possible to actually even rate or rank it.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. I think we're coming to the point that we discussed at the first -- the first call. Make some big category of Inactive. Or maybe this is our first category that we're starting to define, in our whole list.

So which letter you suggested, Ken?

Ken Bour: Well, what I would suggest is we take it off the list. And I will put it under a different category called Inactive or Not Started. These are projects that are emergent, but they're not active. Otherwise, I think we're going to have difficulty with the rating, ranking and prioritization. And it's going to be hard to prioritize something that's not even active.

Olga Cavalli: Is that okay? Okay.

Ken Bour: Did I do enough to that, Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, that's fine.

Olga Cavalli: I think Chuck was the first one who proposed this kind of category. And we're going to go forward.

Number two, gTLD special trademark issues., FDI. Let's see if Chuck sent some comments.

Chuck Gomes: That one was taken off for a different reason. And that's because -- I guess there's a couple of reasons. Number one, it's a task the Board gave us with a very short deadline. We need to get it done, or it could have serious impact in introducing new gTLDs. So it seems to me that it's a no-brainer that it needs to keep going at a fast pace.

If we want to keep it and prioritize it, we can. And it probably would come out high, anyway. But that to me is one that we're going to have to keep wherever it fits in the prioritization model. So to make the exercise a little simpler, I suggested pulling those out.

Now, Ken, if I understood your comments in response to (Jaime)'s suggestion, you're suggesting that we keep them all in there. Is that right?

Ken Bour: If they're active and they involve community effort, yes. Irrespective of their momentum, irrespective of their mandate , any of that, I think it begs the question. I think what you're saying is right. If in the end something that is high value and low difficulty, it should prioritize and rank high. If it doesn't, then different management decisions can be made downstream to make an exception for other reasons.

But I would say at the start we should just close our mind's eye to the issue of whether it's a mandate or whether it's moving along well or not moving. I think we should just look only at whether or not it is important and how difficult and costly it is to do, and then let that be the basis for the determination. All the other decisions are implementation issues.

Chuck Gomes: And I'm not opposed to doing that with this one. So if the rest of the group supports that, I'm fine with it.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah, I would keep it. I would support Ken's comments.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. What's the next one? Anybody else comment on that one? So we're okay on that one? What's the third one?

Olga Cavalli: Fast Flux -- FAF.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, FAF, flux? Actually, in thinking about it, it's probably okay to leave that one there. I think it's going to come out as a low priority. It's not a project yet. It's an action item that the Council needs to take to decide what to do and whether to make it a project and so forth. But I can live with it still being on there, if that's what people want.

Olga Cavalli: Wouldn't it be an inactive one?

Chuck Gomes: It is probably inactive right now, but it's an action - the Council has the task of at some point dealing with it. So what do others think? I'm fairly flexible on that one. It is inactive right at the moment because the Council hasn't acted on the recommendations from the Fast Flux PDP Working Group.

Olga Cavalli: I think if it's inactive, it should be inactive and then we should put it inactive category when we review the list every, we should decide that, after this exercise. But then it's dynamic and we put it again when it's moving on.

Chuck Gomes: I'm okay with that. What do others think?

Rosemary Sinclair: So Chuck, what you're saying is that -- because I've just gone back to the policy priorities list, I think, pending action list from the GNA Council.

The way that reads is different from that list. That says the Fast Flux motion was adopted by the Council on the 3rd of September with seven recommendations. But you're now saying that that's where that sits for the time being?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. The GDP work group on that - first of all, they didn't recommend any policy changes. They recommended some possible action going forward. And we accepted their report and so forth, but the Council didn't specifically decide on what actions to follow and how to implement those.

So that's why it's kind of inactive now. Until the Council makes some more specific decision in terms of what to do, nothing's happening.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay. Well, I'm happy to take those comments on board. Perhaps the feedback, though, is that when things come to the Council with recommendations, that ordinarily to me suggests something going forward rather than just a report, which the report is tabled and noted but doesn't turn itself into -- it doesn't have any next steps.

Whereas, when I hear the word recommendation I immediately think, okay, we've got some actions pending, things to get on with. So I guess I'm making the comment that our work in reviewing this list is actually taking us back into why there are GNSO processes, so that we get some congruence between the work that we're actually doing and this priority list -- over time, of course. It'll take a while.

Chuck Gomes: Right. And I think it's interesting on this particular example, because I think without stating it as such, what the Council has done is to kind of put this one on a low priority, because there are so many other things that we just kind of naturally knew were more important. So I think a prioritization act has happened without calling it that.

Rosemary Sinclair: So prioritization in practice.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, yeah. That's a good way to put it.

Ken Bour: By the way, this is Ken. I'm actually happy to keep the official scorecard here. So I've gone ahead and marked that one an I.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. So we move to No. 4: IDN Fast Track Implementation Plan -- IDNF.

Chuck Gomes: Well, first of all that's not an official project, if I can call it that in a sense. The IDNG Working Group -- which I'm active on, okay -- is -- it doesn't have a

formal charter. The group is trying to decide whether to come back with some recommendations to the Council on a couple issues, and so forth.

So it's almost kind of like some voluntary group out there cooperating to produce something and then bring it to the Council for consideration. Does that make sense? And nothing has been brought forward to the Council specifically yet.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I would just make this observation. If the community's volunteers are engaged in work activities -- whether they're chartered or volunteer or ad hoc -- I think if it's substantive; meaning it's going on for N number of weeks or months or whatever, that it's probably worth noting and putting it on a list.

Chuck Gomes: The one problem -- and that may be okay -- but the one problem I have with that, Ken, is that there are groups happening all the time behind the scenes that are considering something and that may result in something being put forward to the Council for review. And if we start including all of those, I don't think it's practical.

Now, this one is a little bit different, so I'll give you this. And that is is that the Council has talked about this one, and the Council has been kept aware of what the group is doing. So it is a little bit different in that sense.

Again, I'll go with the group's wishes on this. I'm not going to push one way or the other.

Rosemary Sinclair: Can I just come in here? It's Rosemary. Being a complete newbie, it seems to me from the last - the first ICANN meeting I've ever attended that internationalized to name names, was hot topics, with impassioned speeches from the floor and people talking, indeed we're talking about fast track of the implementation plan.

So when I look at the progress in November, there is a drafting team discussing a proposed charter for a possible new working group. I'm just wondering whether the progress we're making on this and our attention to it is matching the kind of community feeling that I felt at the meeting?

Now, I may be completely on the wrong track. And being an Australian, I don't mind if someone says, you've got that absolutely wrong. We call it Ozzie Blunt, and it makes for very short conversations. But they're good conversations. But as a new one I thought I'd just say that back to everybody.

Chuck Gomes: You know, I don't think it's as simple as that you're wrong on this one. I think that you're making good points. One of the problems is that there are competing views. The group was originally formed to focus on the possibility of an IDN gTLD Fast Track so that there's not this huge gap between IDN ccTLDs and IDN gTLDs.

What has turned out, and it happened previously, too -- it's coming up again - - those who want some LDH ASCII -- in other words, gTLDs --are afraid that if there's anything like an IDN gTLD Fast Track, it'll slow down their ability to get what they want. So there are these competing elements in that regard. And so it's not a clear consensus one way or the other. So it's a little bit complicated.

Now, interestingly enough, though, what's come up recently in the list discussion on that is there's Recommendation 2 for new gTLDs probably needs some clarification. And the Group is still talking about that, whether that group should talk about it and present something to the Council or whether another group should be formed. Because the way the recommendation is right now, it says you can't have confusingly similar names.

Well, there was no intent in the formation of that Recommendation to include different IDN variations of the same TLD. And so that needs to be clarified, I

think. But where that's going to come out in that whether this group is going to deal with it or it needs to be another group, or whatever, at some point it's going to have to come back to the Council.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay. So is this one where we could say it's different in that we seem -- at any rate, I seem to think that there's quite a deal of community interest in this topic, even though we as Council for a range of very valid reasons, not even at the stage of calling it a project, which we would then prioritize. So it's different from the ones where we're saying, there wasn't really any community interest. This one just seems to me to be community interest.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, there is, yes.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yeah, so it may be one of the ones - it should be on the list. And that would then highlight to us that we've got a problem, because we're seeing it with a low priority; whereas the community might see it with a much higher priority.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, and I think what'll actually happen on this -- and then I'm okay with that -- but what'll actually happen is those who are afraid of delays in dealing with this are going to rank it low, and those on the other side are going to rank it high. So we're going to be somewhere in the middle, and maybe that's okay.

Olga Cavalli: Well, maybe that's reflecting what's going on. I also agree that it's high interest and high involvement, so I would leave it in the list.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. I'm okay with that.

Olga Cavalli: Wolf, any comment?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I'm okay with that, so thank you.

Olga Cavalli: 5, Geo Regions Review Community Wide Working Group, GNSO. Me and (Vahid), we're presenting GNSO. And the group is mainly led by staff and by ALAC. And we're reviewing the implications of Geo regions and the implications of ICANN. And now the plan is to develop a broad survey in all ICANN community to see how the regions are impacted.

I wouldn't say it's inactive, but GNSO, it's really making - we work with the group, we are always present, giving our vision from GNSO. But it's really ccNSO and especially ALAC who are the most active supporting organizations in this working group, and we are actively participating also.

So I wouldn't say it's a high priority. I don't know if we have to take it off and put it in a different category, maybe as reporting activity or something like that?

Chuck Gomes: Now, which one are you talking about, Olga?

Olga Cavalli: Geo. Geo Regions Review Community Wide Working Group, where (Vahid) and myself are representing GNSO.

Chuck Gomes: The thing of it is, it's bigger than us. As you know very well, it's bigger. It's a community-wide working group, not a GNSO working group, so it makes it somewhat different. So if we prioritize it low, are we going to take you and (Vahid) off? I doubt it. Because it is important for the community and it's an ongoing thing, so it's in a different category.

Olga Cavalli: No, I didn't mean it -- it's not important. What I meant is it doesn't bring us a lot of time in following. So it's not a high cost.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, right.

Olga Cavalli: That's my comment.

Chuck Gomes: So do you think it should just be left? Do you think it should just be left in the prior category?

Olga Cavalli: No. I think it should be a different category. I think it could be a category where we, some of us are involved and we report to the GNSO. And if something very relevant comes up, then we may change the priority but not for the moment. We may have some other project with this characteristic.

Rosemary Sinclair: So it's like a watching brief, Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Somehow, yeah.

Chuck Gomes: And I think if we were to prioritize this one, it'd come out low, but that doesn't really tell us anything. It's one we need to be involved in anyway. I mean, the bottom line, the Geo regions affects the ccTLDs tremendously. It has an impact on the GNSO, but not nearly as much as the ccTLDs.

Olga Cavalli: That's my point. But we're following; but we're participating.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. I'm okay with that, with your suggestion.

Olga Cavalli: So, Ken, this would be a new kind of letter? It's not inactive but it's not high.

Rosemary Sinclair: It's in for monitoring?

Olga Cavalli: Yeah, something like that. What do you think? Ken, are you there?

Ken Bour: I'm sorry. I was yakking away at my mute, wondering why no one was reacting.

Chuck Gomes: We like you that way, Ken.

Ken Bour: I know. So does my wife. My point of order or comment would be to try as hard as you can. I know it's hard, but don't think about prioritizing anything at the moment. That's the subject of the exercise. But we are begging the question when you say we should put this in or out because it'll come out high or low priority.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Ken Bour: That should not be a factor here. It should only be, is there substantive work going on in the community, and is it active? If it's active and there's substantive work going on, let's rate and prioritize it. Whether or not it comes out high or low is a different question. And management decisions will be made based on that but they're not our subject for today.

So I would argue - now, Chuck made an interesting observation earlier that I hadn't thought about, which is what - if there is work going on that's sort of not sanctioned - I don't want to use that term - but it's ad hoc, meaning it's de minimis and it doesn't involve a lot of people, then maybe it's not really a project. It doesn't meet the minimum threshold for being considered.

That would be it sounds to me a different way of looking at it. Meaning, it's either inactive, it's not a project, meaning it doesn't meet the minimum criteria, which we haven't established yet. Or it's active and it's substantive and it should be on the list. Now, if it comes out with a low priority in the end, it doesn't mean that it gets cancelled.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. I think that we should leave it and then see.

Ken Bour: Yeah, I would suggest that you leave it at the moment, based on what I've heard.

Olga Cavalli: My only comment was if we should add a new category to it. Not put it in a way, but as we have one which is inactive -- have one which is -- Rosemary said something interesting that I forgot.

Rosemary Sinclair: Watching brief.

Olga Cavalli: Watching...

Rosemary Sinclair: Brief.

Olga Cavalli: What do you think, Ken? This was my question.

Ken Bour: I'm not sure I fully understand what watching means. Because for example, you could have a project that has very high value to the community, has even relatively low cost, but is not progressing well, right, and as (Jaime) would say, has low momentum or something. And maybe it's in a kind of a - it's not inactive but it's not moving very fast.

I don't think that plays at all into this prioritization scheme or effort. I think what we should only ask ourselves is, is it substantive work; is the community engaged, meaning it's not inactive - it's active. And if so, we should go ahead and just prioritize and rate it. And then I think what'll happen is, after we get through this exercise, we may learn some things about minimum criteria, what kinds of projects should be on this list.

And maybe the categories that you're referring to are things like, we're just not going to prioritize work that takes less than one month and five full-time equivalent resources, whatever that turns out to be. I think we'll learn a lot more after we've been through it once.

Olga Cavalli: So you're suggesting that we leave it?

Ken Bour: I would for now, yes.

Olga Cavalli: And then not generate any category?

Ken Bour: Correct.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, are we okay with that? Any comments?

Chuck Gomes: No.

Olga Cavalli: Great. No. 6, Travel Policy, TRA. That's a working team, a drafting team really, that was made to deal with the funding of different - a new travel policy that ICANN issued like five, four months ago, and how to deal with that and how to deal with different stakeholder groups and constituencies and the funding.

That's pretty much already arranged. Although I have received some - I'm chairing the Drafting Team. And I have received some e-mails asking me how to move forward and if the different stakeholder groups and constituencies may have some flexibility. So there is some activity going on, and it has some impact on Community. So...

Chuck Gomes: So if we follow Ken's guidance, we should leave it there for now.

Olga Cavalli: We should leave it there for now.

Chuck Gomes: By the way, one minor suggestion. I would change my own abbreviation to four letters and make it TRAV, just to make it really obvious, TRAV.

Ken Bour: By the way, just for the sake, real quickly. Are we okay with STI on No. 2 and IDNF for IDN Fast Track, and GEO for Geo?

Olga Cavalli: Yeah.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Ken Bour: Okay, good. So I'll ask that question each time, make sure that the abbreviations are good as well. So I've captured TRAV.

Olga Cavalli: Great. No. 7, Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery, PED. I have no comment to that.

Chuck Gomes: It's an easy one. It should be included there. It's obviously an active group and so forth. So it's a -- it's fine I think.

Ken Bour: PED's okay as abbreviation? I know a lot of times it's called PEDNER, but...

Olga Cavalli: Maybe add an N, E-P-E-D-N, or Recovery.

Chuck Gomes: I really wanted it to be obvious, and this probably doesn't work. Some of you may not even recognize this one. I would call it RGP, because that's what it's about. And most people understand what RGP is.

But it's fine, I think, if we want to add a letter. Obviously PEDNER is five letters. I think we're getting too long when we get up to five.

Olga Cavalli: What RGP means?

Chuck Gomes: Redemption Grace Period. The redemption grace period policy is one that has needed to be reviewed for a long time. And that's what's happening there.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Ken Bour: Would it be better to go with PE?

Chuck Gomes: Or even EXP, Expire for expire. I don't know. People have finally -- it took me about three or four months to get used to the acronym, but I think most people now are used to calling it PEDNER. So PED probably works. But I don't have strong feelings on the abbreviation on this one.

Ken Bour: We'll just leave it as PED for now.

Olga Cavalli: Leave it PED, yeah. Great. No. 8, Registration Abuse Policy Working Group, RAP WG. Any comments?

Chuck Gomes: Now, we could call it ABUS to make it more obvious...

Olga Cavalli: ABUS.

Chuck Gomes: ABUS. But I just throw that out for people to react to. RAP doesn't probably ring a lot of bells in our head.

Olga Cavalli: I think ABUS may be more explicit.

Chuck Gomes: I think I like that better, but I'm flexible.

Olga Cavalli: Any comments?

Ken Bour: What was the consensus there?

Olga Cavalli: Well, we're just asking. We're saying that ABUS, Chuck, or ABU?

Chuck Gomes: Can I just suggest that maybe ABUS might be a more intuitive abbreviation for this group?

Ken Bour: I've captured it.

Chuck Gomes: I guess nobody objects to that.

Olga Cavalli: No, no. And it's on the list. It's active. Okay. 9, Joint ccNSO IDM Working Group, DIG JIG. JIG, did I say it right?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, and that's an abbreviation that's been widely used for a while.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, it has been used.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. It's another community-wide group, or at least ccNSO and GNSO.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: One second. Isn't that connected to No. 4, Fast Track Implementation Plan?

Chuck Gomes: No. The JIG is actually looking at some IDN issues related to implementing new IDN TLDCs and Gs, like variance and how they're handled at the root and single character, two-character names. It's really to try and refine a few things that still need a little bit more work with regard to IDN TLDs. Did that make sense?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: And it is an official joint group. It has a charter that's been approved by both the ccNSO and the GNSO.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: No. 10, PP.SE PDP Work Team, PDP.

Chuck Gomes: It's fine. That's a really important one for Council to talk about priorities -- I'm sorry.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. No. 11, PP.SE working group, working team, both -- WGT.

Chuck Gomes: I'm okay with that abbreviation. We can even shorten it and make it WG, for working group.

Ken Bour: Yeah, I like that.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, I guess it's as a working group.

Ken Bour: I'm going to take the T off -- got it.

Olga Cavalli: No. 12, OSC GNSO Operations Team -- GCO.

Chuck Gomes: An acronym that's been used there for a while is GCOT.

Olga Cavalli: GCOT, yes.

Chuck Gomes: So we could change it to GCOT. And I'm okay with that.

Ken Bour: I just took the T off Working Group Team.

Chuck Gomes: I understand it's more a historical thing, Ken, in that it has been referred to quite a bit as GCOT.

Ken Bour: You're right. I'll put the T on there.

Chuck Gomes: Are we being inconsistent?

Ken Bour: Consistently so.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, good. I'm glad we're consistent about something. And the key thing on my opinion on these things is to make them as intuitive as possible so that

people can look at them and -- without having to go back to a legend, you still need to have the legend -- but it makes the tool a lot easier to use.

Ken Bour: Yes, okay.

Olga Cavalli: So it's GCOT. 13, OSC Constituency and Stakeholder Operations Team, CSG. We have been using CSG for his working team. So I think it's fine.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So you really did? I was thinking it was CLT, isn't it?

Olga Cavalli: It was at the beginning.

Chuck Gomes: Well, yeah. The problem, Wolf, was the confusion with the GCOT.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yeah, okay.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah, at the beginning we had a different acronym, but then we started to use CSG. And we have been using that for a while. So I would say that should remain.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: 14, OSC Communications and Coordination Work Team -- CCT.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, it's another acronym that at least in the last month or so has been used fairly widely. And of course, the Council has an action item -- excuse me -- the OSC's been dealing with the CCT. It hasn't come to the Council yet but probably will shortly.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. No. 15, GNSO Constituency Reconfirmations -- GCR.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, this one isn't a GNSO project, as I understand projects. This is like I said, Rosemary, and my response to your suggestions today, it's along the

same line. It's something going on between constituencies and ICANN staff and the Board. And it's mainly a keep the Council informed of what's going on.

Ken Bour: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: And this is a good one for staff to respond to. Isn't that an accurate characterization of this?

Ken Bour: Yes, I believe it is. And I'm mulling it over in my head as I think about it. It's an activity that is going to consume community resources. I suppose that it is in some sense or other - it's work that doesn't necessarily have to exist. The question is, I'm thinking to myself, when you're looking at active work that's taking up peoples' time and you prioritize it...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I don't - the Council is really, is pretty much involved in that. So Chuck, really I agree to you. It's something between the constituencies and the Board what's been going on. Now, it's time-limited, all these things, I understand, supposedly going on. Isn't that let me say a similar activity like let me say, new constituency approval, or confirmation of new constituency?

So I understand, it's a separate task because it comes from the BGC review. But on the process, the Council is not very much involved here.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I think you could make the same argument for the five work teams. They came from the BGC review as well, right?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: But those, Ken, are GNSO projects. The Board tasked us with doing those things. And it is a GNSO project. This is not a GNSO project.

Ken Bour: Okay, all right. So the criteria that we're starting -- this is part of what I was saying about the learning exercise, right. You go through this for a while and then you start to develop some criteria or some mechanisms for making decisions.

And we're starting to hone on one of them, which is, it has to be a GNSO project. And if it relates to just a constituency or stakeholder group, that doesn't make it a GNSO project. And so it doesn't qualify for being rated and ranked. Is that right?

Chuck Gomes: I think so.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Ken Bour: So I'm going to mark those with X -- meaning they're not projects, not qualified.

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary Sinclair here. Only thing that I would say, a criteria where, is there work going on and is the community engaged? It's important to just understand with this non-commercial stakeholder group transition that there's quite a lot of work going on, which means people in that stakeholder group are pressured with that work and may not be able to participate in other GNSO work.

So I think it's important for GNSO just to be aware that that project is going on, albeit that it's not a GNSO-wide project but a single stakeholder group project.

Chuck Gomes: And you're absolutely right there. And that's why there's an ongoing reporting of the activity there.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: (Rob) keeps us informed of what's going on there. And maybe we want to come up with other ways to keep that visible. There are going to be tons of activities that are going on that are involving community resources and peoples' time and so forth. So if we included every one of those as GNSO projects that we have to prioritize, this exercise I think will become terribly cumbersome.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes - no, no. I'm agreeing with you completely, Chuck. I'm just perhaps - I'm musing about whether we need another category somewhere that says, projects that are of interest to us but now where responsibility is resting with the GNSO.

Chuck Gomes: And your term wasn't bad. Maybe it's a monitoring category that the GNSO has. They're not GNSO projects per se, but they're things that we have to keep our eyes on and be aware that they're taking resources, like you said.

Rosemary Sinclair: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: So it's marked with an X and it's not on the list?

Ken Bour: Right - again, Ken. I'm going to make sure that I'll actually put them in a separate list. I'll mark them with these codes and I'll put a legend in it so we'll know what we've done. And if we revisit we can or if we have to explain it to anybody, we can.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Let me ask you something. We're reaching one hour and we have one, two, three, four five projects to review. Should we finish, or stop here?

Chuck Gomes: Let's finish. I think we can finish quickly. Let's finish.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. 16, IRTP, Part B PDP.

Chuck Gomes: That's Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: IRTP.

Chuck Gomes: And remember, there's a C, D and E coming.

Olga Cavalli: Challenging for my spelling.

Chuck Gomes: This was one of the ones that forced me to go to four characters.

Olga Cavalli: So is that an active project?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: That's an easy one.

Olga Cavalli: 17, Synthesis of WHOIS Service Requirements, WHO 2. You made some comments about WHO 2, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, and it's too bad Liz isn't on the call because she could jump in on this. But she can't be here today. Right now, that's in staff's court. Eventually, though, there will be a work product that comes out of that and the Council may decide some action as a result of that, which would turn into a project.

It's a staff project right now, and again, that's taking staff resources, which is important in this whole exercise. What do we want to do with that?

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I would suggest that we've already been through that with the other WHOIS. I would mark it I. It's inactive.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Ken Bour: And I would, even though I appreciate the comment about the staff resources, I know from talking to (Denise) and Liz and others that what we were really hoping to do with this effort was to really look at community resources. I mean, the staff has the ability to engage consultants and all that.

I mean, there isn't an unlimited supply of staff resources, but there is apparently a limited supply of community volunteers. At least there has been, and that was really the main focus of this exercise.

Chuck Gomes: But I think it would be good when we call something like this inactive, to put a parenthetical or footnote or whatever way we want to do it, indicating that at the present time it's staff only activity.

Ken Bour: Yes. I'll do that.

Chuck Gomes: So it's inactive from a GNSO perspective.

Ken Bour: Right. Got it.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. That's WHO 2. So WHO 2 goes to inactive?

Ken Bour: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: No. 18, Register Accreditation Agreement, RAA.

Chuck Gomes: That's an easy one.

Olga Cavalli: We keep it.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And RAA is an acronym that's been used for ten years.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah. 19, Internalized Registration Data Working Group -- IRD.

Chuck Gomes: This is another, for all practical purposes, another WHOIS one. But it is a live group. This is a joint one with SX. And I don't know if anybody can come up with another acronym, but it certainly needs to stay.

Olga Cavalli: IRD, it's okay?

Chuck Gomes: Okay with me.

Olga Cavalli: No. 20, Registry/Registrar Vertical Integration, RRVI.

Chuck Gomes: Before we talk about the abbreviation, this is another one I commented on. To my knowledge, this really isn't a GNSO project yet.

Olga Cavalli: I agree.

Chuck Gomes: Now, Math could turn it into a GNSO project. And in fact, we're going to vote - it looks like it's not going to be until January -- we're going to vote in terms of whether or not to initiate a PDP on this. So it could become a project in January. It's not yet, I don't think.

Olga Cavalli: No, I totally agree with you.

Ken Bour: But let me ask this question if I might. Do you think, Chuck, that it will be -- by the time we get to this stage - this team, the Work Prioritization Team, that we will be asking people to rate and rank and prioritize -- will it have materialized? And maybe if it has we can simply add it, right?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, we can do that. But your point's well taken. It could be. If the PDP is voted down and isn't initiated, it probably doesn't. But I would predict that at the latest, January 28 a decision will be made on that.

Ken Bour: And this team was hoping to be done in December, now that I remember some earlier e-mail conversations on that. Why we don't I just go ahead and mark it X, not a project.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Ken Bour: And when Liz asks, I'll explain.

Chuck Gomes: That's good.

Ken Bour: Nice job, guys.

Olga Cavalli: So this is the end of our list. I have only one comment -- two comments. One, what we do with liaison for example, ccNSO liaison? Do we include it in the list or -- because it's a reporting issue.

Chuck Gomes: Well, it's in that reporting category that we stay on top of, but it's not a project, right?

Olga Cavalli: Okay. And there is one other group. It is IDM PDP. It's a working group that Admin and myself are participating. Unfortunately I couldn't make because the calls are usually very, very early in the morning, like 2:00 a.m. for me. So Admin has been following, and there is not much activity. Should we include it in the list or no?

Chuck Gomes: We're probably going to have liaisons and lots of other groups.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, so we don't include it. Okay. So we make the revision of our list. Ken, would you be so kind as to send the updated and corrected acronyms and all that to our addressing team?

Ken Bour: I would be delighted.

Olga Cavalli: And what is our next step?

Ken Bour: This is Ken again. The next step is to solidify the definitions -- well, I guess we should say, yes, we still want to go ahead with a two-dimensional rating scheme that bases value against cost or benefit versus difficulty, that sort of thing. And if we still like that approach, the step that I've identified is to nail down the definitions of those axes. Because eventually we and the rest of the Council, are going to have to use those as the guideline for how to figure out what number or what evaluation to put on that for each project. So that's the next step.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Could you be so kind to summarize this in an e-mail to the people who didn't participate in the call so they can follow up?

Ken Bour: Yes. And in fact, the next step after that will be once we have the definitions nailed down then I think we want to proceed to the rating and ranking methodology...

Olga Cavalli: Exactly.

Ken Bour: Which was in Step 3, and we had a Step 4 or 5. So I would suggest that we keep all those steps the same. And on the next call we deal with Step 2.

Chuck Gomes: And hopefully on the list between now and then.

Ken Bour: That's even better. And (Jaime) did make some suggestions to the definition on one or both of them. I didn't see any additional commentary about what he had done.

Olga Cavalli: I have one comment about the word cost. I think for me it's confusing. It brings only the -- I would change it, but I don't know which other word could be good. It brings to me the issue of value and money and all that. But I don't think that's the point. I think the point is different.

Ken Bour: Madame Chair, in the interest of time, I think you wanted to wrap up. Maybe we can take that on the list.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, I will. I'm sorry.

Ken Bour: What I'll do is I'll summarize what happened with Step 1. We're done with Step 1. And we'll move to Step 2 and maybe we can get some work done on the list before the next call. And so I'll target that area for the next step of discussions.

Olga Cavalli: Right, thank you, Ken.

Ken Bour: And that will be a good idea. I think we should just do them one at a time rather than try to take them all at once, right?

Chuck Gomes: And we should do a doodle on the next meeting. We should have another meeting next week, right?

Olga Cavalli: Yes. I have no problem next week. So I'm available next Tuesday. Okay, thank you very much.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you all. Thanks for taking your vacation time.

Ken Bour: While you're on vacation, practice up those acronym sounds.

Chuck Gomes: We'll give you a test next time.

Olga Cavalli: Bye-bye.

END