

**GNSO Work Prioritization Model  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Thursday 10 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 10 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/gnso/gnso-wpmg-20091210.mp3>

On page:

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

Present for the teleconference:

Olga Cavalli  
Chuck Gomes  
Wolf Ulrich Knoben  
Stéphane van Gelder

ICANN Staff

Ken Bour  
Liz Gasster  
Rob Hoggarth  
Glen de Saint Géry  
Gisella Gruber-White

Apologies :

Rosemary Sinclair  
Jaime Wagner

Coordinator: Welcome and thank you for standing by. Today's conference is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. You may begin.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much operator. Gisella could we make a roll call so we know who's on the call?

Gisella Gruber-White: Absolutely with pleasure Olga. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening to everyone. On today's call we have Olga Cavalli, Chuck Gomes, Wolf-Ulrich Knoben. From staff we have Liz Gasster, Ken Bour, Glen Desaintgery and myself, Gisella Gruber-White. We have apologies from

(Rosemarie) and possibly from Stéphane if he's not able to join the call, he did send his apologies. Over to you Olga. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much Gisella. I want to thank especially Ken and Liz for all the great work that they have done. They have sent very useful documents and information in our e-mail list and I want to mention that especially.

Chuck Gomes: I second that Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Great. I know (unintelligible) also. I'm impressed, it's really very easy, this is a (unintelligible) easy going working group. It's not, the, like other ones that I chair that are very, very complicated. But this one is nice because you do many of the complicated things and we just say yes we like it or we make small changes. So thank you very much for all the hard work.

And firstly I would like to see if we all agree the list of active project list and other side lists that Ken prepared after our conference call on the 3rd of December and do we have any comments to it, do we want to up something, change something, do we need to say yes we like it?

I personally like it, I think it's okay. I like the way the new abbreviations are changed and I also agree with this new three categories which is, which are community inactive, monitor only and not a GNSO project. But I would like to know if we have some comments or feedback from other members of this group.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes Olga, it's Wolf speaking...

Olga Cavalli: It's Wolf?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: ...so I'm...

Olga Cavalli: Yeah. Go ahead Wolf.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Right now, so I'm sorry I cannot read the document because I have a problem here but I remember when I'm in Seoul I was also, well I was, was very satisfied, very much satisfied with the way how it's going to be, to be done there and so I'm at the time being I'm content with that.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Thank you Wolf. Also Liz sent today a detailed explanation of each of the projects, which I thought it was really very good. And my comment to her e-mail -- maybe you saw it on the list, is that perhaps we could prepare -- but this is only an idea, maybe it's very big or too complicated to read - perhaps we could a column in the right side of this chart of active project list with the description of it as perhaps a full table reference of project list, but just an idea.

And also perhaps we could add some links to it. Maybe each of us who are involved in each group or working team we can add the links to the Wiki's or something like that. So it could be like a general reference for all our documents and all our active project list and non-active or reference project list, just one...

Liz Gasster: Yeah Olga...

Olga Cavalli: ...(unintelligible) but it was very good.

Liz Gasster: Thanks. And if I could just do a quick comment on that, it's Liz.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. Go ahead.

Liz Gasster: Yeah. I think it does lend itself to being combined into the projects list and it was just sort of time and formatting that I didn't do that in. And if you notice the links are on the projects list, so we would have it everything all together, and it might end up requiring the project list to be landscaped and not portrait

and that might be less convenient, but I'm going to play around with the formatting.

The only thing I didn't do that I sort of consciously at this point was I didn't add the abbreviations that Ken ultimately came up, because they actually are different from the abbreviations that we're customarily using for those groups. And I was afraid it would be, if we used this, these descriptions like for example to send to new council members or to post to the council list without explanation, it's going to be confusing to see our new abbreviations and not the ones we had been using without explanation. So it was reluctant to make that change, but it's certainly easy to do and I'll work on the formatting over time here.

Chuck Gomes: Olga this is Chuck...

Olga Cavalli: (Unintelligible) just a suggestion.

Liz Gasster: It's a good suggestion.

Olga Cavalli: I heard many voices at the same time, I'm sorry. Who wants to talk?

Chuck Gomes: Please put Chuck in the queue.

Ken Bour: And Ken.

Olga Cavalli: And Ken. Anyone else? Okay. Go ahead Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. I'm supportive of the intent on all of this but I would be leery of any list becoming too cumbersome and complicated if we put the project descriptions right on the same list. Once people become familiar with the projects and their abbreviations they won't need to look at that anymore.

So I just suggest that when we explore ways of doing this that we not make the list really huge because it's got the, a lot of verbiage on it. It can be easily referenced below or footnoted or linked or whatever, and I don't know what way's best and Liz said she'd experiment with that.

With regard to the old abbreviations for some of these things, we probably ought to include those along with our new abbreviations that we're using so there's a, you know, easy reference point there.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Thank you very much Chuck. And first just one suggestion that I thought about. Ken, please.

Ken Bour: Yes. I just wanted to volunteer. Liz is way too busy to be working on such a project, I just wanted to say I'll take, I'll take ownership of the sort of consolidation issue mindful of Chuck's comment that we don't want it to become long and, you know, not obstreperous, but you know what I mean, difficult to work with.

Olga Cavalli: (Unintelligible) just some comments. I'm a big fan of big, big documents with all the information in one place just because I have many (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: I am too Olga, but what I'm suggesting is for example on a table you don't have to have it all in the table, you can have it referenced in the same document below, or to make it easy to find but don't make the table overly large.

Olga Cavalli: Totally agree (unintelligible).

Ken Bour: I'm sorry, what Ken's thinking about here is a, a Word document in which these are bookmarked. So you'd have the table and then the underlines would simply be bookmarked to the definitions in the same document, and that I think that gets at the idea Chuck's going after.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, it sounds good. Yeah. By the way Olga, we - it's been really good the people that have participated regularly on this group, but we have several that have regularly not been able to participate. So one suggestion in terms of process, when we finish a step that those of us that are active in the calls are concurring to that we confirm that the other members of our group don't have any objections to what we've done.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Yeah. Anyway, they are receiving the e-mails of the list, but we should ask specifically (unintelligible)...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: ...look at the list and say if they agree or want to add something, at least we have consensus among our working group. Yeah, I totally agree. Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And thanks for that because there's another group that you may, that you're probably aware of going on in the GNSO right now where people didn't actively participate and then it gets down to the wire and they say they didn't agree and it's unfortunate that people behave that way...

Olga Cavalli: Yes. I know.

Chuck Gomes: ...but they do so.

Olga Cavalli: What we could do is send an e-mail to the, to the working, to the list of our list and say if they can confirm by e-mail just saying yes or no I agree or want to change this or that. So we are sure that they, that they review, that it's not a big list of people so we may easily do that.

Chuck Gomes: Right. Good thanks.

Stéphane van Gelder: Hi everyone. Just wanted to say that I'm able to participate tonight. This is Stéphane and I'll participate as long as I can. Hi.

Olga Cavalli: How are you?

Stéphane van Gelder: I'm fine. How are you all?

Olga Cavalli: Very good.

Stéphane van Gelder: Good.

Olga Cavalli: Stéphane you just joined?

Stéphane van Gelder: Yeah, I joined about five minutes ago.

Olga Cavalli: I don't know if you heard the last comment made by Chuck and by myself.  
We just developed a new, a list...

Stéphane van Gelder: I did Olga, yes. I did.

Olga Cavalli: And abbreviations, so it would be good if you can review it, maybe you have the chance to review it and we can, you can confirm in the list that you like it or you want to make any changes or additions or deletions.

Stéphane van Gelder: Is this a different list to the one that was previously sent a couple of days ago by was it Ken I believe?

Olga Cavalli: It's split in two parts, one is...

Stéphane van Gelder: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: ...project list and the lower part is, it has three different categories for enacted community projects, monitor only and not a GNSO project. And also the abbreviations have changed slightly about what we discussed in the last, take into consideration what we discussed in the last conference call.

Chuck Gomes: But...

Olga Cavalli: But you may like it or disagree or?

((Crosstalk))

Stéphane van Gelder: Okay. I'll have a look at that.

Chuck Gomes: Stéphane it's essentially the same list of projects that we had. There's, I don't think there's any changes from when you're, from what you're talking about.

Olga Cavalli: No.

Stéphane van Gelder: Okay. Well in that case I have seen that list and I have no problems with it.

Olga Cavalli: Perhaps we can resend, Ken, could or Liz, could you help me send in the, the list with the new abbreviations and the new splitted list to the whole working team after we finish the call?

Ken Bour: I'm sorry, do you mean the same e-mail that was sent on December 4th or do you mean the consolidation?

Olga Cavalli: Well the one that you sent with the changes in the abbreviations are highlighted in red, I'm just...

Ken Bour: Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: ...looking at it. It was sent on the, yes December the 4th.

Ken Bour: You're just asking if you would resend it?

Olga Cavalli: Yeah, maybe we, we aggregate some other things after we talk now.

Ken Bour: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: So maybe we should have that in mind.

Ken Bour: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: Anything else about the active or non-active project list? Any comments, any additions so we will ask for working team confirmation about it? Great.

Chuck Gomes: And we shouldn't need, we shouldn't need confirmation from those of us on this call, just so there aren't...

Olga Cavalli: No. Of course. Of course.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: Those who are, are in the working team but are not participating in calls, I agree Chuck. Thank you. Ken, would you be so kind to give us some brief of what you said about step two about the (XY axis) and it's easier if you explain or than if I read it from your e-mail.

Ken Bour: Yeah sure, I'd be happy to. I'm going to reference the e-mail that I sent to the list on December 9, my time here is 2:08 pm, I'm not sure what it shows up on yours.

Chuck Gomes: That's what it shows on mine.

Ken Bour: Okay good. Good. And that, in that e-mail I tried to sort of summarize where I thought the team was at least on the Y axis. There had been some discussion between Chuck and (Jamie) mostly and a little bit from Olga and I think, so I guess does everybody have that e-mail?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yeah maybe it's, (unintelligible) here?

Ken Bour: Yeah. It's December 9, 2:08 pm to the list. It says team members we have a conference call scheduled for tomorrow.

Olga Cavalli: I have another one from you Ken...

Ken Bour: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: ...from the December the 4th that talks about XY and it generated some discussion in the list and so I should check the one on the...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. Your e-mail starts with we have a conference call scheduled for tomorrow, yes? Isn't it 10 December?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Ken Bour: Yeah. That's the one. Right.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Everybody won't have the 2:08 pm, it depends what your e-mail system is (unintelligible).

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: It says 8:08 pm in Europe.

Ken Bour: Okay. Anyway the definition for Y, I don't know, you want me to read it Olga or do you just want to take a minute, everybody look at it?

Olga Cavalli: No, just a brief comment, so we...

Ken Bour: Yeah. Essentially I tried to accommodate the, (Jamie)'s thoughts, restructured it a little bit to put like thoughts together and, and also accommodated Chuck's note that we shouldn't refer to ICANN the corporation but to its stakeholders.

Olga Cavalli: And the name of the YX is...

Ken Bour: Value/benefit.

Olga Cavalli: ...value/benefit. Okay. Value/benefit on the (unintelligible). Okay. Any comments? Do we like the value/benefits concept in that axis?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Well, it's Wolf speaking. Just accommodate, there was a feeling when I read through that definition, so it was a feeling okay it, it is, it seems to be or (unintelligible) to be (unintelligible) related to economic issues, you know if you read overall effectiveness, productivity and gain, okay. Then it comes, okay to what, it's related and but it should if you read these, only these three words, it, so they come from the, from the economic world, these words.

So I wonder whether we could find something just in that level, you know, already which is related to the, how to say that, more to a, to different dimensions and economic one. Do you understand what I mean...?

Olga Cavalli: Yeah. I somehow I have the same concern.

Ken Bour: I don't, this is Ken, I don't normally interpret productivity as being economic.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. But well it, okay but I know that from okay from our entity, from where we are in working on, so it's around and around. Anyway, if you look to a newspaper productivity is related to the economic, so it's here, in Germany that's the case. So...

Ken Bour: Can I ask a question, does it help, does the second sentence help at all because there we really articulate a whole range of possible things that value benefits include, including you know, growth and expansion and competitiveness and security, stability. Do any of those help Wolf?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes. It's more helpful, no, I would say you may, it's only just if you start to read then it comes to okay, we got three points, you know, related to economic things.

So as we are looking for something overarching let me say, and then (unintelligible) it comes later. So the question is right now - because you know, (unintelligible) putting it up to the, offer to people who are not in the, in the (unintelligible) who don't come from economic side let me say of this world, they are related to more social and all these, and other things you know. So that's my concern here, how to cover that.

Chuck Gomes: Well what if we were to just use the, the two key words there, what if we were to say this dimension relates to perceptions of net overall value and benefit to and then one and two and the next sentence, does that work?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes. That's more general.

Chuck Gomes: You don't usually use the same words in a definition but in this case we go on to explain what that means, so I think it's okay to do this.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Wolf, would you change the name of the, the YX? The Y axis?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Not the name of that but by these value benefit of or I understood Chuck, he proposed kind of net overall value benefit.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. That's right.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Is that?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And so the, the name value benefit still fits okay.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Did you get that Ken, so you can make the change?

Ken Bour: I can make the change. So we're going to take out effectiveness, productivity and gain and substitute value and benefit.

Olga Cavalli: Right. I'm okay with that. Any other comments? Great. Now we have X axis, and thank you for considering my comment about cost, for me it makes money, it somehow the same comment that Wolf made for, for other concepts included in the Y axis. What should be the name of X axis? Resource, time, energy consumption? Ken?

Ken Bour: I'm sorry. Yes. So the second part of my e-mail on the 9th I just, again, tried to make a suggestion for your discussion trying to remove the concept of economic actually from the X axis as we have apparently also done on the Y axis. So yeah, it's now all about sort of resources and time and energy.

Don't know if you like this definition or not or the title but I was just trying to get away from the idea of economic costs.

Stéphane van Gelder: Ken, this is Stéphane.

Olga Cavalli: Go ahead Stéphane.

Stéphane van Gelder: Thanks. Sorry. Olga, are you managing the queue?

Olga Cavalli: Yes. (Unintelligible).

Stéphane van Gelder: Okay. I do think there's some consideration of costs should be in there. It is a prime, I mean it is an important factor in any decision that we, we would take in terms of prioritizing stuff. So I do think that, I mean you may not want to, you may want to remove it from the axis label, that doesn't appear too important, but you may not just to make sure that people understand that that factor is in there.

Chuck Gomes: There may be times, for example, when the cost, literally the cost of doing a project is so high that the budget doesn't allow it. So I think Stéphane's right, but whereas that may not be the sole criterion and in some cases may not be much of a factor at all, there may be cases where cost is a factor.

Now I agree that it shouldn't be in the title, in fact I would simplify the title to just say resource consumption and then, because I think the title's too long, and we can talk about time and energy in the words that follow if we want. I think resource consumption includes time and energy, that's part of the consumption.

Stéphane van Gelder: It includes, yeah it includes every resource, I think that's a good idea.

Olga Cavalli: I like it.

Chuck Gomes: And now again, I don't have any problem talking about, I think it's helpful to talk about time and energy in the words that follow, I'm just suggesting a simpler and shorter title.

Ken Bour: Yeah. This is Ken if I might. I'm happy to do that, take time and energy out of the title and write down near the second, well at least in my case, where it says length of time needed/expected we can just say length of time/energy needed/expected. And then we've got that idea covered and maybe at the very end where it says overall resource consumption we could say overall resource consumption and costs required to develop a recommendation.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. My only comment about costs is, was that, and I think I mentioned this in the previous call, is that if a project is needed and if it's costly well it's needed anyway. So including cost as a viable may, could mean that if it's expensive we wouldn't do it and if, I think it's not the case, but just as a comment.

Chuck Gomes: That can be the case though Olga, take for example...

Olga Cavalli: Yeah maybe.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. See I'm not saying it should be in all cases but it may, for example, I think, and Liz is a good one to have on the call on this, because the WHOIS studies that we're exploring, we've asked staff to get some cost estimates and feasibility estimates. And then we're going to make a decision whether we proceed with those based on that data.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Yeah. Right. So cost is relevant, so you're right. Great. So X would be resource consumption and Ken will make the changes in the language?

Ken Bour: Yes I will.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much. Wolf, are you okay with that?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Any other comments? Great. So I think we're done with the two axis. Any other things about step two that I might be forgetting? I'm checking your, the exchange of e-mails here. Should we move forward to step three? Okay. Ken, again I will ask you to tell us about an e-mail that you sent I think today, if I'm not mistaken, suggesting next steps for our part three of our, well I cannot find it, I've opened so many e-mails at the same time that I cannot find it, so maybe if it's front of you.

Ken Bour: So that one's also dated the 9th of December at 3:47 is the time on mine. It says step 3A (proposed), that's the subject.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. Okay.

Ken Bour: Just a point of order on the last topic, step two, what I would propose to do is to make these changes to the definitions, send out an e-mail to the team and then Olga will you put a separate note on it or something that asks everybody to please confirm their understanding and agreement or do you...

Olga Cavalli: Yes. I will.

Ken Bour: ...want me to include that, you'll do that?

Olga Cavalli: I can bring forth your e-mail including that, yeah.

Ken Bour: Okay. Fair enough. Okay great. So shall we go ahead and look at step three?

Olga Cavalli: Yes please.

Ken Bour: Great. All right. So this e-mail what I tried to do is to give the team credit for having completed steps one and two, which I was correct and so we are on step three. The first thing that I talk about here are the goals of this step, now this step has to do with rating and ranking methodology, okay.

So we've got our two axis, we're going to do a two dimensional rating structure and we've got those definitions. We know the list of projects we want to work on with respect to those two definitions and now I think the next topic is how do we, how do we develop some methodologies that let us get through the rating and ranking process that end up with outputs that we can use, that council can use to make decisions.

So as I said here, the goals that seem to me in this step were to you know, make sure that whatever process we select is friendly and is clear and easy to do and that also that it generates outputs and - outputs that can be utilized by the council to actually make prioritization decisions, which is in fact the goal. Do we want to have a little discussion about the goals? Chuck added in his comment that it was not only a one time prioritization exercise, and I would be happy to include that you know, in a revision of this e-mail.

Chuck Gomes: I just think that you know, whatever we come up with needs to not only work for a one-time exercise but as an ongoing thing, and we can consider just one single new project we can plug it into the model and make a you know, a help make our decision whether to proceed at that time or not.

Ken Bour: Yeah. In fact I would even suggest making that element sub-element C of the goals.

Chuck Gomes: That would be okay with me.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Ken Bour: Anything else with respect to the goals?

Olga Cavalli: I'm reviewing them.

Ken Bour: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: So you would add C and what, what it would say?

Ken Bour: C would say, I haven't wordsmithed it but it would say something to the effect of we would ensure that the methodology is useful, not just as a one-time exercise but also would work as we add new projects in the future. Something, I have to, I'll rewrite it more flowery than that but that's the idea behind it.

Olga Cavalli: I'm okay with that. Wolf, you want to comment something?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Just say yes. Okay.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Stéphane? Stéphane you like the idea of including that comment?

Chuck Gomes: Stéphane you still with us?

Olga Cavalli: Oh, I think he was leaving earlier. Maybe he had to leave. Ken, any comments about weighting, ranking and numbers, letters?

Ken Bour: Yeah, well just sort of moving through the, my thought process in the e-mail the next comment I simply made was whatever we expect the council to do we should test, right, that's the principle. Now if everybody agrees that that's true then I think that leads us very next, next we take up the question of what should we test and so I maybe just want to pause there.

Olga Cavalli: I totally agree that we have to test and then show the, it's like a final project show that the council that the outcomes and how also we can learn from doing it if it works or not or if it's something which is ambiguous or not exactly declined.

Ken Bour: Just another, another argument in favor of testing more than one thing is that if somebody else comes along and says well, did you try this or did you try that, we would have the, the answer would be yes we did rather than oh no we didn't. And you have to go back to the drawing board and try it right so I would say the idea of testing three or four or some options like that would probably also help in just selling the fact that the team had done a thorough job in its analysis.

Chuck Gomes: Well also we will also probably learn some things that we'll tweak as a result of our testing.

Ken Bour: Right. Okay. Anything else?

Olga Cavalli: My comment is I think Chuck did this comment in the list is that we're very few and...

Ken Bour: (Unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: ...just an example and maybe if we divide amongst self, amongst more groups would we just few people that it's just a comment, you know, we can try anyway.

Ken Bour: My sense is with respect to the, we're going to get into that in a little bit as we get into the actual methodologies as to how we might actually do all four of these if we did decide to do them, so can we just take that subject up then?

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Sure. Yes. Go ahead please.

Ken Bour: Okay. Well then in, in 3A basically what I laid out is there are, so far that's come up, there are two items in the ranking or rating process, rating versus ranking and then there is the individual versus group notion. Those four concepts together could ultimately create four different tests. So let me just take them one at a time, let's look at the rating versus ranking.

So question one is should we find some kind of a scale, you know, one that was proposed high, medium, low, we could have one, two, three, four, five. We have 15 projects so you could, you could find any set of numbers like that would allow these projects to be rated.

The second is to create some sort of a ranking which is say okay, 15, 13, 11, 1, 6, 4, 2, these would be, I would put them in that order with respect to the Y axis and I would put them in different order with respect to the X axis

definition. I have tried both, like in a modeling illustrative methodology and they'll both work. There are pros and cons to everything of course.

Olga Cavalli: Any comments?

Chuck Gomes: Well just kind of reiterates one of my comments in my e-mail response and that is that if I'm going to rank these things I probably would use, something like one of the other methods to do my ranking, so why not just start with those other methods?

Ken Bour: In other words you might group them by their, by similar properties and then break them down into narrower groups ultimately producing the final ranking right?

Chuck Gomes: Yes. I mean our ultimate goal is to rank them, that is the ultimate goal. So if that's easy to do directly why are we messing with all this other stuff? I think it's not easy to do, okay, just to do ranking, otherwise we probably would have already done it. Now I may be wrong on that but that's my opinion.

Olga Cavalli: There is one comment from Ken that I didn't follow. You said that we divide into categories, is that what you meant Ken or maybe I misunderstood you?

Ken Bour: Oh, well let's say that I asked you to rank all of your, all of the foods that you eat, let's say that there's 12 different foods that you eat in a day, and I said I want you to rank them based on your preference. And you say, well you know there's cereal and there's steak and there's meat and there's chicken and all, and you might say well the first thing I'm going to do is I'm going to put all the meats in one group and then I'm going to rank them. Then I'm going to take all the fruits and put them, you know, that sort of an idea.

I think what Chuck was saying is that you got 15 projects, it would be very difficult to just say here's how I would order them, 4, 7, 13, you know, that kind of thing. He would say well, I would look for similarities among of the 15

and I might end up with some highs and then some mediums and then lows and then I would order them within those groupings, you see?

Olga Cavalli: Oh okay.

Ken Bour: And so in a sense what he's asking I think is if that's the way people would normally do the effort why not just go ahead and start that way anyway.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Ken Bour: You know why try to do, yeah, that was the idea. Sorry.

Olga Cavalli: I didn't get that before, thank you. Yeah I think it's a good approach.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: (Unintelligible) question, Wolf speaking.

Olga Cavalli: Wolf. Yes. Please go ahead Wolf.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: But just to understand, so the rating and ranking I understand is the last step, the evaluation isn't it, so ranking means okay ranking of the project or is it a ranking and rating of the criteria which are related to those projects and which we have to define as well? In other words saying, so before we come to a ranking so the question is according to which criteria are we going to.

So (the both) axis we have also defined some criteria in the axis but you have to more, to be more precisely I think after but what does it mean, you know, in terms of economic criteria, in terms of other criteria. And then the question is how do we weigh the different criteria, is that also a step incorporated in that methodology Ken?

Ken Bour: I, our, I think that our attempt in defining the axis was to do what you just said, meaning to create enough explanation of what we mean by X axis and value benefit that...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Ken Bour: ...that a counselor could look at a project like the, the PDP work team or something and say I know how to rate that on that scale, on that axis using whatever methodology we pick, whether it's rating or ranking. I know, I have enough information that I could say yep, that one's more important than this one or less important than that one in terms of value and benefit.

And then on the resource consumption side I can do the same thing. I can look at the PDP work team and I can compare that to the registration abuse working group and I can determine which one utilizes more resource or consumes more cost and resource.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So at the end there will be a, in any case an individual evaluation of each, for each counselor...

Ken Bour: That's right, this is essentially a perceptual rating and ranking scheme, meaning that there's no, if we had hard data, if we had absolute revenues and we had real expenditures and costs and all that we could probably do this without having to ask people their opinions. But in this case it's all perception and it's all opinion-based and what we're hoping is by asking all the counselors to participate in the perceptual analysis we end up with some sort of consensus that actually works.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So now even, I mean even if we had these details data available there would be an individual rate because people are you know, they think in different ways about costs and where those other criteria so that means, so somebody may deem the cost part is not as important as others are doing. Even the detailed costs are ratable, so I mean so at the end we will have to, to at the end it will be an individual evaluation, so that's what I would like to understand (unintelligible) and end of this step shall be individual ranking, is that the case?

Ken Bour: Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay.

Ken Bour: And then what we will do when we have all the individual ratings and all the individual rankings or however we finally decide it we will aggregate them all into a single chart.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes. Okay. And then, okay. Good.

Ken Bour: And we've, we prepared some spreadsheets that were attached to e-mails that...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yeah.

Ken Bour: ...back earlier in the groups existence in which those were shown, illustrated. In essence what you end up with is you get each project acronym plotted on the XY axis based on the average of all the individual ratings and rankings or ranking.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: So the, I think the question on the table right now is, is there really a difference between rating versus ranking and should we try two different approaches or just one? That's, I think that's the question that I hear in the background.

Olga Cavalli: Any comments?

Chuck Gomes: Well I already made mine. I think we go with the rating and then the, the end result is a ranking.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: Okay .

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: I would (unintelligible) the same way Chuck.

Ken Bour: Okay. If that's a consensus then what I would suggest next is we should pick what the scale, the rating scale should be. Now I proposed one that had three elements, whether they're letters or numbers is not too important because they're going to get converted to numbers anyway, but it, the idea is do we think that we should use three or five or six or two?

Olga Cavalli: (Unintelligible).

Ken Bour: I only, I picked, by the way I picked high, medium, low, that was arbitrary, there's no science or math to it, it's just that it's usually easy for people to think high, medium, low, it's in thirds, you get one in the middle you get two on the ends. Five is an also a nice number that's often used in Likert scales and other sort of things because it has a middle position and then you have two differentiators on the ends. Supremely happy, moderately happy, you know in the middle, really unhappy, that kind of thing.

So we could go to one, two, three, four, five and then define one as being I really think this is extremely low value and we could go to five which is I think this is extremely valuable, relatively to the other projects and use a five point scale.

Olga Cavalli: I like five points, I think it's not redundant and it's, I have used and it works quite well. It needs to be not, how do you say that in English, a pair number you say, how do you say it's like two, four, six, and then the other ones are five, seven, which is the name for that in English?

Ken Bour: Odd and even.

Olga Cavalli: Odds and pairs. So I, it must be a five or seven or a three...

Ken Bour: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: ...and I have used five and it's, it works quite well, it's not redundant. Ten is very, very (unintelligible) specific, very difficult to establish differences in between seven and eight, five and four, so which is usually using schools and universities for notes. But I think five is okay. It is for me.

Chuck Gomes: And so one of the things you're saying is that it needs to be an odd number...

Olga Cavalli: Yes. And odd number (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: ...and I agree, I agree with that totally. As you could tell by my comments I like a little bit more ability to differentiate, I certainly like five better than three. I probably, and I like seven better than five because when we're talking 15 or more projects the smaller number, I understand we don't want to get it to be too big a number and I'm supportive of that, but we're going to have a lot more ties. Now that probably works out in the averaging so that may not matter, but we have a lot more, the smaller number you have the more ties you will have.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: Yes, well Wolf speaking. So that brings me to, up to the idea as well, I like also the idea of having more details, say evaluation. But that means in this case we need, in any case we need to compare the projects on this level already because everybody has his or her individual feeling, you know, about you know, levels I mean from low to high.

So if the question is for me are we going to evaluate all projects in parallel or one by one? So I would say it must be go in parallel and even for looking ahead you know, for the future if you (unintelligible) the new what is coming in so we have also to compare the new projects with the existing ones on those levels. Because otherwise it's only, well it's still an individual feeling but it's, it must be related, all projects must be related to each other.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah and the, I think Wolf, that you're right. And the comparison actually I would probably use as an aid to picking my ratings, you know, it helps me, let's see would I, I think I'd rate that one a little higher than this one. So I'm probably going to go through that in my mind doing this, some sort of comparison, so I agree with what you're saying there, assuming that I understood it correctly.

Ken Bour: Are you now saying you might rank them first and then rate them?

Chuck Gomes: No, I am not. I am absolutely not saying that.

Ken Bour: I'm just teasing with you.

Chuck Gomes: Because ranking means that I've got to do them all. When I'm looking at one individual one though I'm going to compare that one and I think that's what I heard Wolf say.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: (Unintelligible).

Ken Bour: Yeah that...

Chuck Gomes: The degree of comparison in my mind to help me come up with that rating.

Ken Bour: Yes. And this is Ken, look I (unintelligible) there's no substitute, first of all I mean the principle of this entire exercise is relative, meaning no project stands in isolation, each one is relative to all the others in the mix. So I don't think there's any way you can do them one at a time, you have to see this project but in relationship to all the others in the mix.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Right.

Ken Bour: And so yeah, it may turn out that for example all the projects are, have no value, I'm making this up right, but amongst themselves they're higher or more value within the group, right, and so it's a relative system.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yeah.

Ken Bour: All right. So let's see, do I hear some consensus on we got a, is five points a good place to start here?

Olga Cavalli: I think Chuck liked seven and I'm okay if that's more detail and...

Ken Bour: The difficult we're going to have, and I'll be asking for help if we go to seven, is trying to find words that describe what one, two, three, four, five, six and seven relates to. It's, we know how to do five because we do it all the time right, in Likert scales, it'll just get, it gets a little bit harder because now we're saying well it's sort of medium value versus modest value versus no value, it'll be a little harder to do seven, that's all, it's just in the language.

Chuck Gomes: Ken don't you really just need like three descriptions, you need your low one, you need your high one and you need your middle one. There's some...

Ken Bour: Yeah we could do it that way and then just leave the mid-points non-described. Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. But it gives me some flexibility, well you know it's a little bit, you know, it just gives me a little bit of flexibility to move it in between.

Ken Bour: I'm happy to put a seven point scale together. Shall we try that for starters?

Olga Cavalli: Let's try in our, in our pilot project and see if it's too complicated then we can go to five.

Ken Bour: Okay. All right. Any other thoughts on that subject?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Well (unintelligible) seven because really Chuck one example so - I'm convinced. So if you have let me say the questionnaire about the projects available, so it's questions or the criteria I'm sure, so if we have let me say for example 20, 20 criterias (unintelligible) and (unintelligible) here for project, I am convinced if I, I personally I would make it (unintelligible) in a special order I would rate it.

So but if I take this, this paper let me say three days later, so I would really end up with a different rating in terms of not fully different but in terms of the differentiation between six or seven ratings. So surely because I forgot what I rated after three days, but if I come back and start again, so I in that case I would be, might have a different feeling that day then it would be different, so I would really, I think so, for my feeling five is easier (unintelligible) to handle afterwards (unintelligible), that's my feeling.

Olga Cavalli: I was a little bit lost. So...

Ken Bour: I think he's arguing for five.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, that's what I heard.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes because for me seven is too complicated because, yeah it is.

Olga Cavalli: I like five more, what I wanted to say before is that maybe we can try with seven as this is a trial that we are doing and see if we really becoming complicated and then we can work for five. That was my thought, and taking in consideration that, that Chuck wants perhaps more definition in this case, which is good.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, and let me, yeah let me explain that a little bit further because I understand it's easier to use five when you're first doing it but I'm thinking again to the results. There's a tendency toward the middle anyway and if you

have less differentiation my fear is that everything gets bunched to the middle even more so because you have less options.

Ken Bour: Well, this is Ken. I'd like to just insert a comment that I think in a sense here we are actually encroaching on the next subject, which is this concept of individual versus group, and let me draw a parallel to what you just said, yes I completely agree.

And in all the testing and little illustrations I've done myself playing around with these ideas individual ratings can only be aggregated like using averaging techniques or looking for means and modes or whatever they, there are different statistical methodologies.

But yes, if you ask 30 people to do ratings, even if you have a seven point or a five point or a three point scale, when you average them it's going to go all toward the center, it just will because all of the extremes start to average out. However, one way to minimize that is to use this grouping technique versus individual.

Now what you do is you bring five people together or six and you say you know what, let's talk about this and let's agree that this project is H and this one is M or this one's a four, that one's a two. Now if we have consensus among six people, and we do that with four different groups, the chances are that we won't average out to be mediocre, everything will not center down to the bottom.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Okay.

Ken Bour: So what I'm saying is that these two concepts, the rating and the grouping are kind of related in terms of the picking of the scale and how much centrality or centracism we end up with, if that's a word.

Stéphane van Gelder: But Ken are you arguing for us to go for five and have groups? Is that what you're saying?

Ken Bour: It's an alternative that I think has merit, that you would break the council up into constituencies or groups of say five or six, like you could take the registries and registrars, three and three, six. And you could take the NCSGs six and the commercial six and, or break them up into, and then everybody else could be in a separate group like ALAC and the NCAs and people like that, put them in a group and then all four groups attack this rating system together independently and then we put those four together.

Chuck Gomes: Now I'm jumping ahead a little bit but since we're talking about groups, a question that comes to mind is when you form groups do you want those groups to be homogeneous or heterogeneous.

Ken Bour: That's a great question.

Chuck Gomes: The results are very different.

Ken Bour: Yes they would and I would, I would argue that heterogeneous groups would serve the purposes better than homogeneous groups.

Chuck Gomes: It probably would but it's also much more complicated.

Ken Bour: Much more difficult, not only, not for lots of reasons, unfamiliarity with each other and differences of opinion on fundamental questions, but the results will probably be better if we could get them done.

Chuck Gomes: But what, and that's a key question, can we get it done. Because if you put people with quite different views on, let's just take an example, let's take RAA changes, so you put a registrar person with a, an ALAC person or a, you know, whatever, and they have very different views about that, are they going

to be able to reach consensus. And I assume that if you do the grouping that the goal is to reach consensus on a rating.

Stéphane van Gelder: And how would you, how would you determine the group structure? Would you just throw a dice?

Ken Bour: Could do it randomly if you did it heterogeneously, if you do it based on current groupings I think stakeholder groups is a nice easy way to do it.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. But then you're going, but that's really homogeneous.

Ken Bour: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Or are you saying one from each stakeholder group?

Ken Bour: No, I think if you to, oh I see, yeah Stéphane I think I understand. Yeah, you could take all of the counselors and give them random lots and then throw them all into groups. But the other way to do it would be try to say, we'll pick one from this stakeholder group, one from that and build the teams so that they were, but still when you pick from any group to put it in the rating group you'll still probably end up doing it kind of randomly right.

Chuck Gomes: And I have this, that gnawing fear that we're going to reach stalemates in some of those groups.

Stéphane van Gelder: Yeah I do agree.

Olga Cavalli: What was your comment Chuck I didn't hear?

Ken Bour: Well here's an idea for you to consider right, after all this is a, this is in some ways this is kind of a guinea pig group right, I mean the idea is a testing group.

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Ken Bour: So I mean one way to do this is to actually, I don't think we can break this group into really small, this gets at, back to Chuck's comment that we didn't get to earlier. I think putting two people together isn't going to simulate what the council would look like, unless we thought that they should work in groups of two, but that, you know, I'm not sure how well that would work.

But we have at least four members of this team right, and that, I don't even, I'm not even sure if staff couldn't participate. I mean I don't know anything about these projects that much and so you know, if you will permit me to function as a stand in counselor I can try to behave as though, as an uninformed new council member right.

But I think we could put together four or five people to make the test more reasonable.

Chuck Gomes: Well the problem though as you, sorry, but the problem though as you make the groups larger the difficulty of reaching consensus is compounded.

Ken Bour: It absolutely is and I would suggest to you that our group is heterogeneous right?

Stéphane van Gelder: And you bring, I mean you've just made an interesting suggestion for our group, which could be taken, pushed forward to the whole council, why not have staff on our groups, on our council groups, because staffs input would be useful when prioritizing work.

Ken Bour: Yeah, when I was talking before about the four stakeholder groups, I mean the, a fifth group could include people like NCAs or maybe staff and, or other people that are involved so that that input could be registered.

Chuck Gomes: Or you mix staff and NCAs with the stakeholders as well.

Ken Bour: Yes. You have lots of different options here. Is there anything that we can start doing in the way of moving forward that will, that will help inform what we think the best answer is. Because right now we, we're all just guessing, well if we do it heterogeneously it'll be too hard to reach consensus, if we do it homogeneously we'll end up with very different rankings and ratings between the four groups, is there a way we could test something or do a proposition that would help us make that determination easier?

Chuck Gomes: I think there are several things we can consider. One of them is it seems like an easy exercise for each of us to go through and do it individually. That's one we could just go ahead and proceed with and get that tested.

Now it seems to also that we could just treat ourselves as one group as a whole or at most two, I think one might, is one approach that might be useful, and just see if we could as a group reach consensus on ratings.

Stéphane van Gelder: How many people are there in this group Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: I don't know, what is the head count on this group?

Olga Cavalli: Well we usually have like four council members participate inactively or three and we have staff so I think Chuck approach making one group and try to reach consensus is the most realistic, because as we divide among ourselves we'd be very, very small.

Stéphane van Gelder: Yeah, I agree.

Olga Cavalli: So would one...

Chuck Gomes: Now...

Olga Cavalli: ...would be individual ranking and then as a group try to, and we are kind of heterogeneous somehow.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, so we're testing two things simultaneously, and hopefully that still doesn't eliminate the validity of the tests. Not that it's going to be all that scientific anyway, but the, now I just throw something else out, I don't think we should necessarily eliminate the idea of groups as small as two, even at the council level, but that's another issue.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah, that's okay.

Stéphane van Gelder: But for testing purposes, sorry, go ahead.

Olga Cavalli: No, I'm just thinking about, yeah, perhaps we could try with two groups among us and individually to see how the dynamic in between groups work.

Stéphane van Gelder: But I don't think it's a fair test of how that dynamic would work at council level.

Olga Cavalli: Oh no, of course, it's just...

Stéphane van Gelder: I'd prefer the single group solution because at least we get an idea of how heterogeneous group would, might the dynamic in there might work because we're all from very different backgrounds.

Chuck Gomes: Now, after doing that or maybe even simultaneous as well we could just as well test, divide ourselves up into groups of two or three and try that also.

Stéphane van Gelder: True. Very true. But how long would that take us overall, I mean?

Ken Bour: Yeah that's, I'm glad you brought that up Stéphane because I was thinking about, one of the things I wrote in my e-mail was some consideration of time and how are we going to get this, how we get through all this stuff. I can

certainly put together the sort of mechanics for individual rating or group rating quickly.

And for individual rating you all can do that at your own, at your leisure right, so that's independent exercise. So maybe between now and next week would that be enough time to do a rating of both Y axis and X axis on let's say a seven point scale for all 15 projects and then turn that in? Is that too ambitious?

Olga Cavalli: No, that's okay. For me it's okay.

Ken Bour: And then, so that would take us to next week, the following week maybe schedule a session where we do the group grope on this thing, right? Everyone's already had the experience of doing it individually and then we work together as a group and try to come up with a consensus on every, all 15 projects two scales, one through, each one being rated on a scale of one to seven.

Now, once that's done, so that would take us, maybe we would do that the week following, so two weeks out right?

Chuck Gomes: Now, is everybody in the group able to work over the holidays? That's the question because obviously next is the 17th and we have a council meeting next week.

Stéphane van Gelder: Yeah, I won't be able to.

Chuck Gomes: And then the following week is Christmas Eve and the week after that is New Years Eve, if we're using the same day and so forth. So that's the, that's something we have to keep in mind.

Stéphane van Gelder: Good point.

Chuck Gomes: I'm, I can be somewhat flexible over the holidays but I'm not sure everybody else can, nor would I expect them necessarily to.

Stéphane van Gelder: Yeah, I think that's a good point Chuck, it would be very difficult, I mean it would be difficult for me, I'm off for a couple of days anyway, and hopefully disconnected from my e-mails. So I think it might be asking a bit too much but perhaps the approach can be, the approach that Ken suggested could be used, but just stretch it out to just after the holidays.

Chuck Gomes: Well is there any reason why we couldn't do the individual ranking and the one group ranking kind of in, in parallel?

Olga Cavalli: No.

Stéphane van Gelder: No.

Ken Bour: Well it sounds like next, it sounds like next week, the 17th, either that day or that week there's a council meeting right? And so we're not going to be able to have the group, to do the one group rating we all have to be on the phone together.

Chuck Gomes: Well the council meeting would occur the two hours before this time slot.

Ken Bour: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Just to let you know.

Stéphane van Gelder: Yeah we could, sorry, are you suggesting that we meet, the question isn't do we meet is it will we have time to do it in between now and then isn't it?

Ken Bour: Let me try to summarize if I could, I think I'm getting the gist of it. Between now and the 17th each member of the work team does an individual rating of

all 15 projects on two axis and I will send out the instructions and the forms right?

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Ken Bour: And you all will turn that information into me before the 17th, on or before the 17th. On the 17th, that day that meeting we will do a collective group session to accomplish exactly what each of you did individually in the week prior.

Chuck Gomes: Now is everybody okay with having this meeting immediately following the council meeting? I can live with that, but I'm asking...

Stéphane van Gelder: Yeah, I can do that.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah I can do that.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I can do that immediately because afterwards we have a PDP working team call as well, but it's after one call later, yes. Okay. After the council it works, yes.

Ken Bour: Now the question in my mind is will one hour be sufficient to rate collectively 15 projects on two dimensions but we'll, we can just see.

Chuck Gomes: Well we can deal with that, and actually we can learn a lot maybe from just doing the exercise on some subset of the projects as far as we get.

Ken Bour: Yep.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah. We can try with (unintelligible) on the project, yeah I agree.

Chuck Gomes: Because if we try to do this thing thoroughly to test everything thoroughly we're going to drag this prioritization exercise out till February.

Ken Bour: That's true. Good point.

Stéphane van Gelder: I'm going to have to drop off the call now, I'm sorry.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks for joining.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Stéphane.

Stéphane van Gelder: But I will be here next week and you can count on me to do the individual rating during the week.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Stéphane.

Stéphane van Gelder: Thank you very much.

Ken Bour: I'll send out directions and so for the summary.

Stéphane van Gelder: Thanks guys. Bye-bye.

Ken Bour: Bye-bye.

Olga Cavalli: I think we are, seven minutes past the hour and perhaps we could wrap up and see, define next steps.

Ken Bour: This is Ken, I'd be happy to take a shot at the summary on that. So just to, I'm going to do some work on combining the lists in terms of trying to create a document that brings the definition so that when the counselors actually have to do the project rating they also have bookmark definitions they can look at and all that stuff.

I'm going to make some changes both to the Y and the X axis as discussed, simplify the titles and change the value benefit issue.

And then with respect to step three what I'm going to do is change the goals to include that item C of Chuck's and then what I'm going to do is reorient the work tasks. We're obviously going to drop from four (unintelligible) mutations to just three, or actually just two, maybe three, we'll see.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, three's still a possibility.

Ken Bour: Yeah. And so I'll rework that and I'll send that out as a clarification and I'll suggest that we try to get the individual work done between now and the 17th and then we use the meeting on the 17th to do the group rating as a test.

And then I don't think we'll, we won't be able to carry it much further than that if we have a little bit of time at the end of next week we could talk about what to do in the weeks following right, or whether we just postpone till January at that point.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. We can check next week to see if a meeting between Christmas and New Years works with people, so.

Ken Bour: Right.

Olga Cavalli: Great.

Ken Bour: That's my summary.

Chuck Gomes: Actually that time's probably going to be better for me than the first week of January because I'm going to be in Hawaii.

Olga Cavalli: Oh, that's right.

Ken Bour: We could have our group session there if you want.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: We can have a face-to-face meeting in Hawaii, I like that.

Chuck Gomes: All right. We're going to be on Maui, is Maui okay?

Olga Cavalli: Oh Maui's (unintelligible).

Liz Gasster: Let's not talk about travel funding though.

Chuck Gomes: Are you coming Liz?

Liz Gasster: Well I don't want to have to deal with the travel funding issue.

Chuck Gomes: The council, we can just bypass the council and just do it guys. That would go over well.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yeah.

Liz Gasster: And how would your family feel about us all coming along?

Chuck Gomes: Oh yeah, I'm sure they would love it.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: We really know where the priorities are?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, that's right.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay guys.

Ken Bour: Did I miss anything?

Olga Cavalli: Okay. No that's perfect Ken. Thank you...

Ken Bour: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: ...very much for all your involvement (unintelligible) work and thank you to all of you for joining us today and we have a lot to do during the week.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Olga. It was a good meeting.

Ken Bour: Great. Thank you all.

Woman: Thank you everyone. Bye-bye.

Ken Bour: Bye-bye.

END