

**GNSO Work Prioritization Model  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Monday 28 December 2009 at 1500 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO Work Prioritization Model meeting on Monday 28 December 2009 at 1500 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/gns0/20091228-wpm.mp3>

on page:

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

**Present for the teleconference:**

Olga Cavalli  
Chuck Gomes  
Wolf Ulrich Knoben  
Jaime Wagner

**ICANN Staff**

Ken Bour  
Liz Gasster  
Glen de Saint G ry

Coordinator: Sorry for the interruption. This is the conference coordinator. I would like to inform all participants that today's conference is being recorded. If anyone has any objections you may disconnect at this time. You may continue.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you.

Coordinator: You're welcome.

Olga Cavalli: What you was saying, Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: My question is, is in the status area -- the upper left of the Adobe Connect window -- when a hand goes up, if it's not - if the name of the person raising their hand is not displayed, you have to scroll down to see it, or to those moved to the top so you don't have to constantly being - scrolling in the window to see if somebody raised the hand?

Ken Bauer: I was just going to try to test that to see if I could scroll the window up past Wolf, but it won't let me go any higher than...

Chuck Gomes: Yes. Okay.

Ken Bauer: So...

Chuck Gomes: You kind of have to move it around periodically.

Olga Cavalli: Can you move the chat window down? Can you change the size of the chat window? Maybe that helped in - with the other...

Ken Bauer: Well what I'm seeing is all the names are listed in the attendee list. Are you guys not seeing all the names?

Liz Gasster: Yes we do Ken, but...

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Liz Gasster: ...like if it's - if this were a really large call and you had a bunch of people there, there might be too many people than would appear in that window, no matter how large the window is. It's sort of...

Ken Bauer: Right. I agree with that. But I don't think in my recollection I've ever seen any names slide around. I think the hands go up, but I - yes I'm not sure. Yes.

Liz Gasster: Yes, so one thing Ken though is that you could give us control over our screen so that we could also like move up and down on the...

Ken Bauer: Yes.

Liz Gasster: ...main screen.

Glen DeSaintgery:Liz, before you go any further, shall I do a roll call?

Olga Cavalli: Yes, please...

Liz Gasster: We got off on Adobe. It's - sorry. Go ahead.

((Crosstalk))

Glen DeSaintgery:Good morning, good afternoon, everybody. On the call today we have Olga Cavalli, Chuck Gomes, Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, Jaime Wagner, and for staff we have Ken Bauer, Liz Gasster, and Glen DeSaintgery. Over to you Olga?

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much Glen. Good morning good evening everyone. First I want to thank Ken for his great work with all the information that we have been handling in the last conference call. I'm really impressed of how detailed and how easy to read are your emails and all the information you have gathered for us.

What we are going to do today is to work on -- please correct me if I'm wrong -- we work on the X axis ratings, and there is an idea sent to Adrian. Unfortunately he is not with us in this call today, but he suggested to be kind of a red team member or doing that. He has been following our activity in the list and in the call, and perhaps we could say something about it, exchange some ideas.

We also have some comments about how we define the axis about X and Y - if we have a broader definition regarding the community or we go to a - maybe a narrower view in relation with GNSO. Perhaps we should talk about that before starting with the ratings and about the red team or we just go to the ratings. What do you think? Any comments?

Jaime Wagner: I think we should - it's Jaime. If I may?

Olga Cavalli: Yes, of course. Go ahead.

Jaime Wagner: Well I think we could first finish our scheduled work. And I mean go to the axis first. And then if we have the time we could discuss because I think we have good discussion on the red team already. And we could put first the X rating then the discussion on the Y value benefits meaning. And then if we have the time to go to the red team, because I think the red team is already established by the discussions we have in the list.

Olga Cavalli: Right. Any other comments? So we should go to the X axis ratings. So I will - if we agree, I will give the floor to Ken so we go through a similar procedure that we did in the last call. Ken the floor is yours.

Ken Bauer: Okay, thank you very much Olga. What I have displayed just quickly is just to show you that I have updated the document that was pre-loaded that we can use to go through these numbers. And you'll notice that the sequence numbers are now gone and the acronyms are there. And for the least all the Y values -- the value benefit -- the - okay Liz got back in.

I have also put in - the black numbers are the group consensus or group Delphi ratings that we did last time. Okay good. So with that in mind I will click back up to Page 2. Sorry. There we go. All right, so here are our - this is what our task is for today. And we can start with - we'll notice that STI, which is the first one, does not have an X value.

And so I also wanted to make a - call your attention o the fall right bottom. In this little note area I have put the definitions for both the X and the Y axis so we don't have too much trouble to go find those now. And so the X values, just to refresh our memory, has to do with perceptions of total resource consumption, including things like complexity, and intricacy, difficulty, and all of the sort of cost factors that associate with trying to get a project like this done.

Okay good. So with that we're going to do STI. And let's see if I can get this pointer up there. There we go. The starting values -- 751627 -- quite a bit of dissimilarity there. And I don't - who wants to start? Anyone?

Chuck Gomes: Well what's STI again? I'm blank.

Liz Gasster: It's the trademark - special trademark issues.

Chuck Gomes: Oh that's that one. Okay. I - okay good. It's early for me, as you know Liz.

Liz Gasster: It is. That one was only tattooed on my brain, or I wouldn't have remembered it myself.

Chuck Gomes: Yes I guess - let me ask a question. I'm curious as to why others rated that so high in terms of resource consumption. And it may relate to the - my question probably is based on the way I did it. The, you know, that's not going to require very many resources going forward, and I was rating these things going forward from this point in time not in total resource consumption, because resources that have already been used I don't think we need to worry about.

Olga Cavalli: I had made this exactly the same rating with that idea -- that it's done. So priority is not that high so their resources are not that needed. That was my idea. But maybe it's - some people said Jaime that said six or Wolf said five? Perhaps we're mistaking.

Wolf Knoben: Yes, Wolf speaking here. Well I was of the opinion - (unintelligible) I'm not especially (unintelligible) the STI work, but it seemed to me that from the status we have today, which is the STI work and a lot of noisy proposals or reports to that work that ere might come up in the future additional discussion about that. So - which makes it necessary to deal with it again.

So that was my feeling just for that. So - and when we are looked at this, what was - what did it mean, you know, right now. The STI working group, which I summarized as being a group from - under (a counter), let me say like that. So I would say okay that is my imagination - my feeling that there might come up more work. That was my - just a feeling.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck again. I think it's...

Man: Well...

Chuck Gomes: ...true that there may be some more discussion of it. Obviously there's a comment period going on right now. And once that's done there will be analysis and staff will come back with some proposals based on the STI recommendations and the public comments.

So I think there will be, but it seems to me that relative to other projects that are ongoing, it's going to require fewer - much fewer resources than most others.

Liz Gasster: So it's Liz. Can I jump in?

Olga Cavalli: Sure Liz. Go ahead.

Liz Gasster: Actually I did a totally different thing and it's so useful I guess to have these tests because we just come at these with if perspectives.

I assumed that it - because it was a test and it was just a snapshot in time that we were looking at STI as though it were an ongoing work effort. And at the time that we did STI, it was incredibly labor intensive for those few weeks. So I strictly did it as though that were the level of work, you know, at the time. And as we in fact did, we had to push other work to the side and cancel other calls that was (so) total resource intensive.

So I really just use it - viewed it as a test example of, you know, and I wouldn't even recommend probably that we have this on the list when we - when you all voted at council.

Chuck Gomes: And Liz yes and I understand that and totally agree with the amount of resources that were used.

Liz Gasster: Yes that's all it was.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Liz Gasster: It was really just...

Chuck Gomes: To...

Liz Gasster: ...a snapshot in time. So if I were rating it today, I would rate it a one.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, yes. And that's what I did, because I think we want our tests to simulate as closely as possible what the council will be doing, and it's - rating it as of today I think is more useful in terms of using the results to prioritize our work.

Liz Gasster: Yes. So I'll change my vote a one.

Ken Bauer: It's Ken, and I will make this is a process observation or whatever. That definition needs to - and I made a note to myself at the bottom here on the note section that it's - it seems to me this is a fairly important issue as to whether or not the definition includes the total resource consumption of the project over its history or whether it's only from this date forward. Everything that has already been done is (sunk) and not - and that - we didn't make that clear in any of our definitions.

Liz Gasster: And it's logical. It's totally logical. It's just...

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Liz Gasster: You know.

Ken Bauer: Okay good. So let's - any other comments?

Jaime Wagner: Yes, can I - yes I...

Olga Cavalli: Sure Jaime.

Jaime Wagner: ...(unintelligible) something. My observation was a momentous one, because at that moment STI was a thing that was popping up in the list and it was very time consuming at the time.

And also I agree with Wolf that there are - I think there are still minority positions in that this could be - could add some work in the future. But as a general rule, I - I'm not very aware of the kind of research consumption that any of these projects has. So I would endorse anything that Liz or Chuck put.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Jaime Wagner: That's my (tendency).

Ken Bauer: My suggestion is that we should take a poll. I'm going to try this time not broadcasting the results. Let's see what happens, okay? We - I wrote that in my last email. I'm going to open the poll now. I got to remember how many we have voting. Is it just four today? Liz, Jaime, Chuck, Wolf, Olga. We still have five...

Chuck Gomes: Five. Five, right?

Ken Bauer: Yes, okay. Now you don't see the results, right?

Chuck Gomes: Correct.

Ken Bauer: All right. Now I'm going to broadcast them. So I'll wait 'til after everybody's voted and then I'll show them. So we have two twos - I'm sorry, yes two ones, two twos and a three. So following the pattern we've been doing in the past, we would pick the median, which would be a two, unless anyone suggests that we go through another round.

Chuck Gomes: Looks good.

Ken Bauer: Okay, with everybody?

Jaime Wagner: Okay for me.

Man: All right.

Man: Okay.

Ken Bauer: 2.0. I'm going to post it. Okay good. I'll close the poll, clear the results. And I'll get this out of the way. I'll just bring it in each time. Okay good. The next - so (IBNS) already had a Delphi score so we'll skip that. We'll do (GIO). We started out with a 3, 2, 1, 4, 1, 2 on resource consumption. Not that big a spread.

Maybe Jaime you could talk a little bit about the four since it's the higher of the highest number.

Jaime Wagner: Well I think this would take some effort, but I don't - because I don't have - very foundation for my weighting, but I just thought that if it were implied working on (GCNSO) in other, it would have many discussions and preparations, that's fine with me.

Ken Bauer: Chuck or Olga, how about all the ones?

Olga Cavalli: Yes. Sorry if I may say something, Zahid Jamil, and myself, we are representing GNSO in this working group. The working group is not required a lot of resources because it's not that active as other working group. It's not that we're not doing anything but it's taking more time. At the moment we have developed an interim report and now we are working on a survey, and a survey document that will be distributed.

So the contribution and activity from the GNSO perspective is not very high although we follow the list and we follow the conference calls. For you to have an idea, the last activity of the group was a face to face meeting in Seoul. And since then we were not able to find a date and time for having a teleconference, and we're waiting for that. So it's active but not that high consuming for us. But it's again a GNSO perspective.

Chuck Gomes: And let me - this is Chuck. Let me jump in on a side comment, because I'm realizing as we're looking t this, last week when we were doing the Y values we talked about should we be focusing on the GNSO or the community as a whole and so forth.

With regard to resource consumption, it seems to me that our primary focus needs to be on GNSO resources and also on staff resources, because that is where the impact is the greatest. But I throw that out for discussion, because it's, you know, some projects like this one in particular probably are going to - it's going to require more resources on the country code side than it will on the GNSO side as Olga kind of already described.

And I think it's appropriate -- and I'm curious what others think -- for us in this value -- the X value -- to focus primarily, not necessarily exclusively -- on GNSO and staff resources that are needed that - because those are the resources we have to prioritize use of.

Ken Bauer: Okay. Jaime has a hand up.

Jaime Wagner: Yes, I completely agree with Chuck. And I think - and it's clear for me that when it comes to the X value we are rating only based on the GNSO council with certain staff not - but I put (unintelligible) that, because I thought wrongly. I had (unintelligible) - I'm well inclined to put a one since Olga based on the (unintelligible). (That's all).

Ken Bauer: All right, shall we go ahead and try another poll then? Looks like we're about ready. Let me go ahead and open it. Okay we have five scores and we have three ones and two twos. The median result would be a one. Everybody okay with that?

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Ken Bauer: Okay.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Okay.

Ken Bauer: Okay good. I will close the poll clear the results. Get that out of the way. Okay great. Very nicely done. The next one up is travel. We started out with a 4, 2, 2, 4, 1, 1. Again Jaime do you mind starting out with a four?

Jaime Wagner: Well I would like to - I don't know what kind of involvement would - that - but it seems to me that there will be a discussion and budget preparation and this kind of thing that I thought would be time consuming for the staff. Just my reasoning.

Ken Bauer: Okay.

Jaime Wagner: Budget revision and - I don't know if this is done regularly, but budget review during the fiscal year.

Ken Bauer: Olga or Liz?

Olga Cavalli: Ken if I may?

Ken Bauer: Yes sure. Yes.

Olga Cavalli: The - we had a very intense discussion about this during last year, especially when the new travel rules were issued. And we - really we - we made a major achievement for the GNSO because all of the council members are founded now by ICANN, because we - our argument was that the GNSO implies a lot of work and effort and this was the reason. And ICANN really hurt our - what we said, and even we - but it was - that was almost done.

What we have to do now is follow up. So the intense work is - was done months ago. And so I would say I don't know what do others think, but I would say that it requires some attention, some effort, but not that high now. That may change in the future, but for the moment it's like that.

Chuck Gomes: And Ken this is Chuck. Just - the reason I rated this a two instead of a one, I agree with Olga that it's lower resource consumption. I guess it's because there's - as illustrated in the last council meeting, there's still some controversy in terms of whether there should be travel funding for...

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...certain individuals or not. So I just bump it up a little bit because of that ongoing controversy.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: And I agree with Chuck also that it may be a little bit higher than one. Yes you're right Chuck.

Ken Bauer: Any other comments?

Wolf Knoben: Yes Wolf speaking. So I have also - as you know I would like to give him a one because it's not a basic work for the GNSO -- not at all. But I fear it needs - it should consume more time in the future. So coming - so from my experience I had already (unintelligible). So that's was the reason I gave them less also a two.

Ken Bauer: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bauer: Anybody else?

Jaime Wagner: Yes. No just something about Adobe here. Can you put the central screen more to the right so we can see the whole picture of the acronyms of the - I - yes, that's - okay thank you.

Ken Bauer: Okay. Okay, let's see, this would be - should we go ahead and try a poll now on (TRAD) travel?

Jaime Wagner: Yes.

Ken Bauer: Okay here we go. I will open the poll now. Okay I can close the pool and broadcast the results. We have four twos and on one. Everybody okay with a two?

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Man: Yes.

Ken Bauer: Okay great. And let me slide this back over. All right we already had a Delphi results for PED for 4-1/2 and we had one for ABUS on the cost side. We didn't have one on the Y side. And the next...

Chuck Gomes: Ken before you...

Ken Bauer: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...go on, this is just something you may want to put down as a note.

When this exercise is done with the council or with small groups or whatever, whoever's leading it should not just refer to the acronyms that we've chosen, but they - the leader should refer to the - I mean read them out. You know, like for example the - ABUS stands for the (Abusee) of Registrations working group, PED stands for the Post Expiration Domain name recovery, you know, that kind of thing.

So I - this just a logistical thing for the future -- kind of instructions for whoever referral service controlling the Adobe Connect.

Ken Bauer: That's good advice. And I'm going to have to go and open up a document that's got those, because I don't have them all memorized.

Chuck Gomes: Yes I don't care whether you do it - don't worry about it today.

Ken Bauer: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: I just happened to - and I think all of us should do that. As we think of things that will facilitate the process when we actually implement it at the council level, I think it's helpful for us to mention those so that, you know, the clearer everything can be when the process is ongoing as we - so whatever we learn or think of as we're going through this, I think we should capture it.

Jaime Wagner: Ken I have the - Liz's document that she prepared (open with) - and I can read for everybody each time if you want.

Ken Bauer: That'd be great. Thanks. We'll - and back to - we're on to JIG. And that's a good one, because I don't remember that one off the top of my head. So we'll use that one.

Jaime Wagner: Okay I'll read it. This is group is charged with identifying IDN issues of common interest both the ccTLD and the gTLD communities and proposed methodology to both councils to resolve them. Issues of common interest may include that aspects of volume management for the root zone submission and publication of IDN tables and the activating of IDN guidelines related to both ccTLD and gTLD implementation processes.

Ken Bauer: May I make a suggestion? I wasn't sure if Chuck meant to read the definition -- just to use the full name versus the letters. And so maybe we could do it this way.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...IDN group.

Ken Bauer: Yes, just...

Chuck Gomes: IDN working group.

Ken Bauer: Yes just give us the title, and then if anybody wants that description read then they can ask for it, right?

Chuck Gomes: Well another logistical thing...

Ken Bauer: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: ...we could recommend in the actual process at the council level would be to make sure everybody has a copy of the definitions that they can refer to themselves.

Ken Bauer: Yes that's true.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...be on the live screens. As long as everybody has that handy like Jaime does right now, it's very helpful. So...

Ken Bauer: Yes, and I have them too except that I've got to keep this one screen kind of open in order to control what's going on. If I start opening up other Windows I'll be in trouble. Okay anyway we're on this particular one. Yes I'll put the arrow there. And we started out with a 6, 4, 2, 5, 3, 3. And Stéphane had the high score there but he's not available, so how about Wolf. Would you give us a perspective on this one?

Wolf Knoben: You talked about the joint IDN? (Joint)?

Man: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Ken Bauer: Correct.

Wolf Knoben: Yes. Well that is - yes, yes. That is just (unintelligible) okay, To rate it relatively high is because I was rating the IDN at all as being of high priority and was also opinion that it will use - according to that, it will use relatively high capacity from the council or the working group. Okay that's the reason.

Ken Bauer: Great. Chuck you had the low score. You want to give your perspective?

Chuck Gomes: Sure. By the way totally agree on the priority but we're not rating priority right now.

Wolf Knoben: Yes, I see Chuck really...

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Wolf Knoben: ...but I was talking accordingly.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. No, no, no understand. Sometimes high priority things do require a lot of resources so I understand that. But let me tell you why I was lower on this. First of all it requires mostly fairly technical people to do this, okay that understand the issues pretty well. There are two primary issues being dealt with. The issue of variance and how that's handled at the root...

Wolf Knoben: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...and the issues of the number of characters that allows for IDN TLDs.

Wolf Knoben: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: The - with respect to the number of characters, that one has been dealt with pretty effectively by a totally different group of people within IDN that - a report that was published just in the last few weeks. And I think that that group's recommendations are probably going to be fairly well adopted. And I've tested that idea with Edmond Chong, who is heading this - the - he's the co-chair with someone who's selected from the ccNSO.

And so I think - a lot of good work has already happened on this. It needs to be completed, but I don't think it's - there are few people that are going to need to continue to focus on this and work together. There - it's not controversial type work, but it - they need to come up with some solutions. And part of those are already - have already been proposed that are probably

going to be amenable to the broader community. So that's why I was a little bit lower on this one.

Wolf Knoben: Yes.

Jaime Wagner: Okay - well I was not aware of this work done. My - the reason I put high value on (unintelligible) (resources) is I thought the staff would - I thought is as very technical matter in - it would require some staff technical approach. I didn't know it was from outside the staff. So...

Chuck Gomes: It's...

Jaime Wagner: ...that was me...

Chuck Gomes: ...both actually Jaime. It's both staff and some technical people in the community. And the report that - and the group that (Tina Damm) worked with -- and I'm blank; maybe Liz you can help me on that -- the report that came out and that talked about some of the issues that this group is working with was just published. And they did a pretty nice job I thought.

So staff and some other technical people in the community have already come forward with some of the recommendations that deal with this group, but with what this joint group is working on.

Jaime Wagner: Okay.

Ken Bauer: Any other comments? Shall we try a poll? See how we do here on this one. I'm going to open it now. This is JIG joint GNSO ccNO IDN working group. We have three ratings, four. One more. Got it. Okay close poll, broadcast results. We have three threes and two twos. Everybody okay with a three?

Chuck Gomes: Fine.

Man: Yes.

Ken Bauer: Excellent.

Incidentally -- just a question here -- during one of the emails, I don't know if I proposed it or just mentioned it, one of the things we'll need to consider if we go this route -- and we use this kind of a methodology with the council -- is you'll notice in this case our range is equal to one, meaning that a three minus a two - the ratings are never more than one apart from each other.

In my mind that's actually a pretty interesting thing to think about consensus or Delphi here. If we ended up having let's say a one, a couple of twos, and a couple of threes, we would have a range of two right? We're spreading two levels. And maybe in that situation we go one more round to try to get it down to one. It's just a thought. Does anybody have any comments about that?

Chuck Gomes: Interesting idea. Yes I think it's worth considering as we move forward.

Ken Bauer: Okay, anybody else?

Jaime Wagner: I think sometimes in the first rating in a matter that is somehow controversial, I think a second round - my experience is here doing with complexity - project complexities here is that in the second round there is a - closer to the center of (being converse).

Ken Bauer: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: You really gain much though from doing that second round unless you have additional discussion.

Ken Bauer: That's right. I think you do - yes, it strikes me that if you have - if the range stands two digits -- two numbers -- then, you know, you might have a second

round. And the goal is to get it down to the point where everybody's either on the same number or they're next to each other -- the range is only one apart.

But, you know, we've done pretty well so far. The next one I'll just point out is the policy development process working group, but that one got a very nice Delphi score it looks like. So why don't we go ahead and take care of the next one, which is the working group team as part of the PPSC policy process steering committee's work.

And so we started the working group analysis with 5, 2, 3, 5, 4, 5. Again there's a fair amount of commonality there, but we ended up with a range of five minus or two or three. So the idea is see if we can get it down a little bit. Liz or Jaime want to take a shot at the five assessment?

Jaime Wagner: I (unintelligible) back to Liz.

Liz Gasster: So I think this one -- and really some of the others too -- I'm looking at staff resources. We have quite a bit of staff resource on this group, because it's a high priority to the board that we complete this work, and we haven't had good working group participation. We haven't even had good working group (care) participation.

So the staff has really had to craft -- take the lead essentially -- on crafting the guidelines for working groups and for chartering working groups. That's it really. And so we have, you know, Ken and Marika and the - and often Glen on almost all the calls.

Ken Bauer: Okay thank you. Wolf you had a two there. You want to give your perspective?

Wolf Knoben: Yes maybe. I had a lack of information about but, you know, I was - I had the impression the working group team was relatively advanced at the time being. So, you know, if I include - exclude the resource consumption of the

past that was my impression okay they were relatively advanced so they would not need a lot of more consumption - a lot of consumption for the future. That was my impression. Maybe...

Liz Gasster: It's Liz. That's true. They are pretty far along, which is another thing that I'm looking more in the (past) in a sense of how much the staff in particular has done work on this to get it to the place it is. So thank you for that. That's true and another reason why we should make clear in the X that we're talking about future work, you know, which I would probably rate (lower) one of the resource...

Jaime Wagner: But Liz...

Liz Gasster: ...requirements would be lower.

Ken Bauer: Chuck had a...

Jaime Wagner: Liz, Liz...

Ken Bauer: Go ahead.

Jaime Wagner: (Unintelligible).

Ken Bauer: Let me recognize Chuck. He had his hand up. Go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Sure. Liz actually answered the question that I had, and Wolf's statement was very similar to my thinking. Everything I'm hearing on this one is they're very far along. So I didn't - based on that I rated it a little lower.

Now once the recommendations of the working team move up to the council level, I'm sure there will be, you know, additional discussion and input. I don't see it being really hard, because I think we've learned great lessons on the working group model over the last few years. So I don't think it'll be very

controversial. But there will be some more work for all of us to do as we finalize it.

Ken Bauer: Okay. Thanks Chuck. And then Jaime had his hand up.

Jaime Wagner: Yes, I would like just help - a comment - an additional comment from Liz. And probably from Chuck too to compare the work to be done on - because I think the PDP and the working group team - the ones that are dealing with the most important thing. So there will be much more discussion and I thought both PDP and working group teams were at the same level of work done.

Chuck Gomes: If I can respond to that a little bit. Based on what I'm seeing from my position is, is that I - based on the recent controversy we had with the PDP working group with regard to whether there should be a face to face meeting and so forth, I got the impression that there was a little - a few more challenges on the PDP one than on the working group team. But Liz maybe can comment on that and see if she agreed or maybe someone else - Wolf maybe on those too can comment.

Liz Gasster: Wolf, do you want to comment first?

Wolf Knoben: Yes. Well from the PDP team, so it's (really) - and that was the reason why (really) talked about this is face to face meeting is, because though we of the opinion that we were in a - as we say in a kind of - not dead end, but so we need some (unintelligible) really. So - and so my impression for the - when I looked to the working group (unintelligible) was not a member of, but that I was really impressed about their progress. So I think there is a very big difference.

Ken Bauer: Liz you want to...

Liz Gasster: Yes I agree that there is a difference in progress. I think (there are) reasons for the difference in progress - so it's not a question totally of fault, because

lack of participation is that - a very serious problem in both. But in working group - we've been using working group for a - quite a while now.

We've -the group has been able to kind of memorialize as guidelines a lot of what we're doing now. So I think in a way they had an easier lift, and that, you know, staff has been able to kind of memorialize what we've been doing in ways that the -when the group does meet they can respond to tweaks or concur with.

And what we're really trying to do with the PDP are some significant changes that are going to boil down to real bylaws changes. There are a lot of different steps to consider and details within those steps to consider.

And because of the lack of participation and the fact that we really have to make decisions about how we're going to - I mean we can - we all can recognize the places that need to be changed, but not necessarily are at the point on any of these calls where we can reach consensus about what the actual change ought to be or ought to say. It's much slower.

You know, we're trying to built in a lot of flexibility where there isn't flexibility today, but actually defining the language for that is harder.

Man: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Can you move the screen over a little bit so that full table shows or is that just me?

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Other way. There we go.

Ken Bauer: Yes it's funny because it was all the way to the left on mine, but evidently it must slide on yours and not - I've got it on sync so it's supposed to synchronize. Okay. Sorry.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks.

Ken Bauer: Yes, any time that happens, just let me know. Okay any other thoughts on the working group? Want to take a poll? All right let's try it. Let me open it. Here it goes. One more. There we go. Broadcast results. We have two threes, two fours, and a five.

Now just a - to ask the question again. So in this case we have a range of two, and one question might be should we have a little more discussion to see whether the five one...

Liz Gasster: I'm the five, and I'll change mine to a four.

Chuck Gomes: Well, you know, thinking about what you suggested there Ken, the results really weren't too bad on this.

Ken Bauer: No they weren't. I was...

Chuck Gomes: You know, I think if we had a range of three, it would be more important to have a little more discussion and do another rating. I'm not sure two is a big enough range because I look at the results. It's not bad that...

Ken Bauer: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...pretty good results.

Man: Yes.

Ken Bauer: And that was - you...

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bauer: ...(and trust me), that was my question. Should we work for a range of two, or we make the decision that no, as long as the range is two or one, we accept the median result. If the range is three we have more discussion and go to Round 2. That - I think you're - that's where the discussion's leaning right now.

Jaime Wagner: This kind of - I think it wouldn't need another round of discussion. Very promptly the - I think what happened with Liz here very promptly would happen there. And we - if we stood with the two - with the average as a four, it wouldn't make a difference.

Ken Bauer: Okay. Very good. Let me clear that and get this out of the way. Put this back. For some reason as soon as I get the poll it always wants to scroll to the right. Then next one then is the GNSO council operations work team or GCOT as we've been calling it. We started out with ratings of 5, 2, 3, 5, 3, 5, and we have a range of 3 -- 5 minus 2. And so Wolf would you mind talking about your number?

Wolf Knoben: Yes. As I'm a member of this team, so my rating was, you know, I was thinking, okay we'll not expect to have more people, more members in the future than we had in the past. So that's my expectation. So I would like - I would love if you had more, but I don't expect. So that's the one thing. So that means three to four people.

So comparing to other groups like the PDP or the working team - group maybe that's - that it's lower let me say a consumption of the sort that respect. On the other hand, I expect it's a continuing job for some time right now but not - so if I compare to PDP and a working group team so I would rate it to that level. So that's - in comparison (done) to the other groups, yes?

Ken Bauer: Okay thank you. Liz you had the - one of the high scores there. Do you want to give your comments?

Liz Gasster: Yes, again. You know, I recognize that I'm coming very much from a staff resource perspective, and that's a theme that I see all the way all the way through my ratings on the X axis. And so here we continually have - we have multiple staff people assigned. We're trying to redraft rules of procedure, which I think we're doing, you know, changing - making a second set of changes now and there may actually at some point be a third set of procedural changes.

We're looking - we're involving the legal staff as well as - ICANN's legal staff as well as our policy staff and several people in the policy staff group. So I view this as resource intensive from a staff perspective, possibly in the future too.

Ken Bauer: Okay. Chuck had his hand up.

Chuck Gomes: Yes I guess when I put my hand up, the screen scrolls.

Ken Bauer: Oh.

Chuck Gomes: So that's probably what happened. So anyway, you know, the - this group is functioning very well so my compliments to Wolf and (Ray) and the rest of the team on this one. I've been very impressed with the - with what - how they function. That to me tells me that, you know, even though they may have a small group functioning, they're - if the - it'd be fine if we get more people at it, but it's not necessary to add a lot of resources and I understand that staff has a lot to do in this. And it's working very well.

Now they do have some tough issues to handle, so, you know, that - they're dealing with this - how do you count abstentions in terms of figuring out the voting thresholds and some things like that. So they've got some really

important work that all of us will have to get involved in going forward, so that's why I'm a little bit higher than Wolf.

And I wouldn't even be opposed to a four on this one just because of the - so I'm between a three and a four, because it is really important. But it is functioning really well, and so it's not as if I don't think we have to pour a lot more resources into it because they seem to be able to progressing on a steady basis.

Ken Bauer: Any other comments on this one?

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bauer: Yes.

Jaime Wagner: I would like to comment something. I think all these teams that are working, they are very important. And I - in the - when it comes to the Y axis, I mean in the value, I would rate all of them at the same level. When it comes to the X value, I think the kind of work they do is quite the same, is a team of people that gets together and has meetings and conference calls all that - but - and a group that has less participation, I think that what they had in terms of discussion at the council level is more intensive than the group that has had all the discussions inside the team when it has more participation.

So when I see what Wolf said -- that there was less participation, even though they did a great job, I think there will be still lot of discussion at the council level.

Ken Bauer: This is Ken. I just wanted to make an observation. One of the things that we put in the definition -- I think I probably crafted this language -- but lack of cohesion for example many competing interests.

I have it highlighted down there in the definition. In other words one of the issues I wonder about in terms of whether something is gobbling up a lot of resource - remember we used to call this axis difficulty because we changed it to resource consumption. At, you know, how challenging is it? How many different points of view are there? How hard is it going to be to reconcile competing interests and competing ideas?

So, you know, if somebody says, you know, "I think we have conflicts of interest in the council," and somebody says, "I don't think there are conflicts of interest," there could be a - quite a bit of wrestling over whether that's true or false and what it means and how to resolve it and what do about it.

So I just - I toss that out as a - maybe it's a question for the group is the extent to which a team or a project has to wrestle with difficult subjects, does that also increase the resources consumption dimension of this exercise.

Chuck Gomes: And this Chuck. And I think it does. And in fact I think that'll become real - even more obvious as Olga will attest on the next one.

Ken Bauer: Shall we...

Liz Gasster: ...difficult issues but difficult people.

Ken Bauer: Well that, you know, that's an interesting point too, right? As to whether that plays a role in the...

Chuck Gomes: We'd better be careful about communicating it that way.

Liz Gasster: Right.

Ken Bauer: Okay how about we take a poll. Any other comments before - all right, let's go ahead and do it. I'll open it up. This is the GNSO council operations team. All

right, good. I'll broadcast the results. We have four fours and a three.  
Excellent job. That puts a four on that one.

Man: Okay.

Ken Bauer: And I will clear that and remove it from the list here. Next one up is the constituency and stakeholder work team as part of the operations steering committee. I believe I got that right.

Chuck Gomes: You did.

Ken Bauer: And let's see. We started off with a five, a three, a four, a five, a five, and a seven. Once again except for the seven we have a pretty good range there. Liz you want to take a first stab at it?

Liz Gasster: Again it's very much a staff-driven...

Ken Bauer: Yes.

Liz Gasster: ...vision of resource to address the differentiating views. And there are multiple groups of subteams within this - or subtasks within this group. So managing the outcomes in the wiki and the work puts them a little higher than the other teams and they continue to be 'til it's done. But that's, you know, very much a staff centric view.

Ken Bauer: Okay

Olga Cavalli: This is Olga. If I would weight it from my own time consuming I would say 10 or 11. I can't put - but I - this - my five it's an average of time consuming for staff and for the group. They have - we have a lot of discussions amongst ourselves and it has been difficult to find consensus. We are still trying to find consensus in some documents that we're preparing.

So would - could be higher than five from my perspective, but I tried to be not so biased by my own experience.

Ken Bauer: Chuck had his hand - thank you Olga. Chuck had his hand up.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. And this one really is - and Olga's had quite a challenge, just to let people know, on this particular one, because there are some strong differences of opinion on some constituencies and stakeholder groups but recommendations. And I think it's going to be challenging to reach consensus within the work team or that there's going to be a lot of minority opinions. Let me - a lot. There will be several strong minority opinions just like we had in the one task that we've already completed the toolkit of services.

And so I think it's going to take more resources. I think it'll get easier when we get to the council level than it actually is at the work team level, because I think the - at the council level there will be more common agreement on some of these points than what we've had on the working team level. And consequently I'm seeing myself bumping my rating up one, just because of that.

Ken Bauer: Wolf do you have anything to add? You had the lowest rating there.

Wolf Knoben: Yes. It began, you know, it's - you have to look at these ratings in the context of all ratings for all improvement work, you know, for the other group. So if I compare that, that was my opinion okay. That is different. It's slightly more work to be done compared to the conservations team. That was my impression and compared to the other - the working group team. So that's why I rate it in that way.

Ken Bauer: Okay. Any other comments or we can go ahead and try a poll.

Man: Yes.

Ken Bauer: All right let's try a poll. I'm going to open it now. One more.

Chuck Gomes: Are you still waiting for one? Because my...

Ken Bauer: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...when I clicked it, looked like a vote was submitted but that it didn't stay. So let me do it again.

Ken Bauer: There we go. Okay. Here we go. Super. All right, so we have three fives, one four, and one six. A range is two. And if we accept that, the answer would be a five. Okay?

Wolf Knoben: Okay.

Ken Bauer: Five it is. All right, let's clear that. And the next one is the communications and coordinations work team also part of the operations steering committee. Started out with ratings of five, three, two, six, three, four, and so our range is four here -- six to a two. Chuck you want to start with the - with your sense of the...

Chuck Gomes: Sure. This group here is just a - is basically done. They've just got to submit it to the OSC with the recommendations on the Web site, which was a really big one and a really important one for us. So I expect in the next few weeks that that will go through the OSC very quickly and up to the council level, and I don't think there's going to be any controversy. The recommendations on the Web site are great, okay, and desperately needed.

So what we've done though at the OSC is we sent it back to them on the other recommendations because they need more work. They spent so much time on the Web site, which was very well spent, that they need to cover some things. And the OSC has made some recommendations in that regard. So I don't see that as real complicated or controversial work; just more time.

And so that's why I don't think the resources needed for this going forward are going to be terribly challenging. It's just going to take some time.

Ken Bauer: Okay. Anybody else want to comment?

Jaime Wagner: Yes...

Ken Bauer: Yes, Jaime?

Jaime Wagner: ...if I may. Just - I don't know -- please correct me -- for the Web site, the - this won't have - consume staff resources?

Chuck Gomes: You know, Jaime it's a very good question. It will take a lot of resources to implement the recommendations. But this may be another point of classification in our definition and that is, is I don't think we're well let's - we need to talk about that.

Are we rating the referral service consumption with respect to implementation or with the policy development work coming up with the implementation recommendations? That's a real critical question because it will take a lot of resources to implement...

Jaime Wagner: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...the Web site recommendations.

Jaime Wagner: Yes. I - this particular group I thought - I don't know if I did the thing right. I understood that implementation was part of the work of the - that the group at least would oversee the implementation. But also it would have staff resources just to the overseeing of the implementation process.

Chuck Gomes: Well it's Chuck again. And I don't think the charters of the work teams are to actually be involved in the implementation process. The charters in each case

of the five work teams for GNSO improvement are to develop recommendations for implementation, and then it'll be up to staff to implement those, you know, as budget and resources are available.

The - now that does not mean that staff couldn't use the work team as they're going through the implementation process, but I don't think that's specifically envisioned in the charters.

Jaime Wagner: Well but still when we are talking about this group, we are talking about the use of staff resources. And this work and the implementation process would require - would consume staff resources. That's my confusion. And I think we would need to clarify this with respect to this group,

Ken Bauer: This is Ken. I wonder if I might just pop in here a quick comment. Would it make a difference if we closed down the CCT work team, right? We said, "Okay thank you very much team. You've done what we asked you to do. You've developed a set of recommendations. Now staff's going to go off and implement it. Your work is now done. That project is closed."

If that were the case, would that influence the way that you rated it? And that might - that comment I just made might help to draw a distinction between what is a policy recommendation and what is clearly an implementation, and whether or not this resource consumption analysis or evaluation should have anything to do really with downstream implementation.

Chuck Gomes: And I personally don't think that it does. Certainly the charters don't say that they're - that they view it more the way you're talking about I think Ken. But it's very important - and Jaime's raising an issue that we need to make clear in our instructions and our definition, because this is a great example of if there are going to be a lot of resources needed to improve the Website.

And in actuality staff is all right working on that. So - but I think we're going to have to make clear to those participating in this process of that distinction. So Jaime's question is a great one.

Ken Bauer: All right, so Liz had her hand up first. Liz?

Liz Gasster: My thought would be basically what you said Ken about kind of closing the work. Like when a report is turned over to the - or approved by the council that is the output of this group and if all the reports are complete, seems like we should close the group and move - and distinguish implementation work.

I don't think - for the purpose of GNSO improvements I don't think we want to refer to it as policy work, because that's really not what the GNSO improvement five teams are. They are improvements work that relates to enhancing the policy process broadly defined, so I don't think we want to use that as the yardstick, but I do think it makes sense to think in terms of completed projects that were chartered for those teams to do.

And I think probably the gating factor needs to be council approval because if it weren't, they could send more work back to the team to do on that particular measure like what happened with the CCT. So that's be my suggestion. Not gating it as far as policy and versus implementation but gating it as far as - at least for those five teams, completion of the cap to find in the charter.

Ken Bauer: Okay thank you. Jaime your hand is up.

Jaime Wagner: Yes. Because I think then we are missing one process. I understand so that the CCT project end with and closes with the report - the group report recommendation, but then we will have to have another project that deals with the implementation. And I think that this is so important that we should be rating this project from now and the project that deals with the implementation of the communication policies.

So (that's one view). And another one is that I think that these groups or these teams - I understand the - there is a different process. The implementation process is a different one. But I think that these teams that work on the policy development process for - they should oversee the work of the implementation team, you know, of the implementation team that is responsible for implementation.

Ken Bauer: Okay, thank you. Chuck...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Yes I would say that that's true of every one of these projects. Every one of these projects is going to have an implementation phase. And so if we go down that path, I think it may overcomplicate our task here.

Jaime Wagner: Yes. And no one of these groups is already - I mean no one of this implementation projects or implementation (unintelligible) is already taken place, because if it is being - if it's taking place it is consuming staff resources and maybe even council resources.

Ken Bauer: This is Ken. I just ask another clarifying question. If it turned out that for this particular effort -- the clarification and the Web site project -- if staff took funded dollars and went and hired and outsourced it completely to an outside firm, would that have any bearing on the sense of the rating?

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: Well it's still resources, whether...

Jaime Wagner: I didn't understand...

Chuck Gomes: ...it's outsourced or not.

Ken Bauer: I was just trying to see if there's a clarification there as to whether or not - yes, whether it's the resources that we have that are in limited supply, which is the existing staff and the community, that is really the fundamental issue. Is it - or is it actually money? I mean one of the things we thought we tried to stay away from when we looked at the X definition was real cost -- hard dollar real costs. In fact, I think that was one of Olga's contributions to that definition, right?

We eventually softened it up and added economic factors based on Stéphane's comments, but that's the reason I drew that attention to that. If we had - if the money goes somewhere else and we're not using our existing resources then does that change the evaluation?

Jaime Wagner: Well anyway I'm - I think we should clarify the definition of this particular project or venue or role of the teams, that the - they are dealing only with the policy development. And they will close and then we will have to have other implementation projects. But this is a clarification that must be made that - from the (top).

Chuck Gomes: Yes totally agree with that statement by Jaime. This is Chuck again. And I think that becomes a budget - more of a budget issue, at least in some respects, than a GNSO issue although we have input into the budget too.

Ken Bauer: I'm just curious how we might move forward. I think we've got three more to do in about 15 minutes, so should we try a poll on this one or, do we...

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Ken Bauer: ...need to spend more time clarifying?

Chuck Gomes: No, just...

Jaime Wagner: No, it's okay.

Chuck Gomes: ...accept (Jaime)'s recommendation that our definition of what we're rating here needs to be clarified in this regard.

Ken Bauer: Okay. But until we've clarified it, I'm not sure we'll get - well let's try a poll. All right, let's see. I'm going to open it up now. I have three ratings, four, five. Okay. Okay we have one two, two threes, and two fours. If we follow our approach, we would take that as a three. Okay?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Jaime Wagner: Three and a half.

Ken Bauer: Okay, clear that out. And the next one is the IRTB. I did open up that document. This would be...

Liz Gasster: Inter-registrar transfers Part B.

Ken Bauer: Okay. Thank you. And we started out with a five, a four, a two, a four, a three, and a five. So five minus two gave us a range of three. Chuck you want to start?

Chuck Gomes: Sure. The reason I rated that one as a two is because the working group for the most part has stayed in tact for inter-registrar transfer policy, from the very first one we did, the Part A to Part B. And so far the participants have been relatively willing to continue working through the - all of them, including hopefully right up to PDP. (B) I think is the last one.

And it's very specialized. It really needs lots of registrar input and lots of - and some registry input, because registries are the dispute resolution providers for transfers and so forth. So if - it's important that we have the continuity of

the group, but that seems to be there, so I don't see it as a real big drain on resources as long as we have the right ones there.

Ken Bauer: Liz, any thoughts on yours?

Liz Gasster: You know, again I do have a bit of a staff bent here. So we've got some compliance resources working on this work team as well as policy resources and some contentious issues that are adding to the complexity of resolution speed of progress. So that was my thinking.

Ken Bauer: Any other comments? Want to try a poll?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Ken Bauer: Okay. Interest of time it's open. One more. Okay broadcast the results. We have two threes, two fours and a five.

Liz Gasster: I needed Stéphane to be on the call.

Ken Bauer: All right, and should we accept the four? Hearing no objection, all right I will clear that. And on to the next one, which is - no this is the amendment.

Liz Gasster: This is the RAA amendment...

Ken Bauer: Yes...

Liz Gasster: ...amendments to the RAA and there's two subgroups, one working on the registrant rights charter and the other working on - which will also identify potential amendments and then a group solely working on amendments. And this is a joint ALAC GNSO project or working group.

Ken Bauer: Okay. Started out with ratings of 6, 5, 3, 6, 4, 7. Let's see, Liz you want to start out with the high there?

Liz Gasster: Well one is the staff perspective. We've got ALAC resources and quite a few GNSO staff resources tied up in this - these two efforts, and a lot of staff work to do already -- what we've done on the registrant rights work, but also what's going to come from that with only the legal staff. There's a lot of staff resource on this. And then some of the complexity and controversy, which I think will be extremely acute when we get into the details of the work.

Chuck Gomes: Yes I've got to jump off right now, but I seriously underrated (one). So I will participate in the poll but I've got to take this call, okay?

Ken Bauer: Okay.

Liz Gasster: Hopefully that's his advice about inoculation so that we could all benefit from that.

Ken Bauer: All right, fair enough. Anybody want to comment, because I think Chuck can actually do the poll even though he's not listening at the moment.

Jaime Wagner: I would like to add something. I think this is very important and I think it's time consuming because of the legal aspect involved. The - and there are many controversies, and I don't - and I see also that on some things that are not already counted in the RAA.

And I raised an issue about some requirements - technical requirements from the registrar to present in this - that this should be added to the RAA, and I didn't see any of this discussion that I think it's very important and it's very difficult have taken place yet.

So I see a very much work - very much - many discussions (are had). I would love if this could come to an end very rapid, but I'm not sure that it will happen.

Ken Bauer: Olga do you have anything you want to add here?

Olga Cavalli: Sorry, my - not that much. Have been - I have not participated in this working team, but I've been following and I think it's - I put an average because I think it requires some effort from staff and some time, but not - I cannot say if it's too much. But I see the movement in the list, so this is why I (put a three).

Ken Bauer: Okay let's go ahead and try a poll. I'm going to open it right now. One more. That might be Chuck. Yes he looks...

Jaime Wagner: Chuck isn't...

Ken Bauer: Yes if he looks up at his screen - yes I'm going to - well, we still have quite a bit of variance here. I'll broadcast what we have so far. We have a four, a five, a six, and a seven. So we will have some - this might be good opportunity to try another round of discussion and see if we can bring it a little closer.

((Crosstalk))

Jaime Wagner: So I suggest the four and the seven to (excuse) themselves.

Liz Gasster: I'm the seven. So, you know, I'm really focused again on in particular the staff resourcing and the controversial aspect, and some of the complexity of doing things jointly with two different supporting organizations that have, you know, different perspectives, different processes for working.

Jaime Wagner: So the four?

Olga Cavalli: This is Olga. I'm a four but I could - maybe it's because of my ignorance and could be a five.

Liz Gasster: And of course I'm willing to be a six.

Ken Bauer: All right, so let's - or I cleared the results. Let's try this poll again. It's opened. And again I don't think Chuck might not have his eyes on his screen at the moment and might not be seeing it. So I've got four answers here so I'll broadcast these. We have two fives and two sixes.

Liz Gasster: So we all listened to Jaime.

Ken Bauer: So unfortunately without that fifth number we don't have a clear - we - the median in this case would be 5-1/2 actually.

Jaime Wagner: Yes, because we are...

((Crosstalk))

Liz Gasster: Well maybe we should talk briefly - given the time that's left maybe we could talk briefly about the second - the next one that's on the list, and then when Chuck gets back we can...

Ken Bauer: All right, I'm going to post the 5-1/2 and then we'll see - if Chuck says he's going to be a six then we would move it up another half. How's that?

Jaime Wagner: It's okay.

Ken Bauer: Okay good. All right I'll clear that and close the poll. And last one is the...

Liz Gasster: This is the internationalized registration data working group. This is a technical working group - joint working group between the SSAC and the GNSO that was requested by the board to look at internationalized registration data -- meaning non-ASCII contact information in the WHOIS -- and to look at technical possibilities for creating a standard for the display of registration data.

Ken Bauer: Okay this is an interesting one. We started out with a two, four threes, and a six. And so the reason this didn't get a Delphi is because of the range of a six minus a two, which is four, but we actually had a very clear mode. There were four people who gave it a three. So I guess we should have some discussion. Maybe - well I - Stéphane isn't here so he can't talk about the two. Do you want to start us with - Liz as to why - I think staff perspective maybe?

Liz Gasster: I am like a broken record. Sorry.

Ken Bauer: That's okay.

Liz Gasster: But also, you know, this is a joint working group. The SSAC typically doesn't work in a working group mode. This is kind of a new thing for them. And, we're going to end - I think staff in particular's going to end up writing a report, but I think there's some real questions about how they proceed, whether they actually try to develop a technical standard, what the role - or whether they define whether that should be done and by whom.

You know, should it be actually the (IEPS) or some other forum, or should it be this technical working group that proposes something, and what would be the recommendations that come out of that. So it has some significant technical resource tied up in it as well as policy resource.

Ken Bauer: Do any of the threes want to comment?

Jaime Wagner: I would like to comment another thing.

Ken Bauer: Okay.

Jaime Wagner: It's just that I think even - yes, we should - even though there was - the one that you had a previous Delphi, I think we should discuss them, because I think (severe) discussion - the ratings - my ratings are lowered - were lower.

So I think I could lower my ratings. Also in the ones that (IDNF) and (CD) and ABUS and PDP, you know?

Ken Bauer: Okay, so you - I think what I hear you saying is that you would actually like to go back to the ones that were previously - where there was a - already consensus and...

Chuck Gomes: I'm back on by the way.

Ken Bauer: ...rediscuss it.

Chuck Gomes: I just jumped back on.

Ken Bauer: Okay. We're on IRD. We'll come back to the RAA to find out what your vote would've been there.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Ken Bauer: I'll summarize what happened. Jaime just raised another question as to whether or not we should go back to the ones that had Delphi on the basis that there's been some discussion that may have changed some concepts around what the resource consumption would've been, or, you know, that - I would just submit to you we don't have time today to do it.

And the other question I would ask is, does it do anything to our process? In other words would we learn anything more about the process by doing it? We might improve or change the...

Man: Oh okay.

Ken Bauer: ...ratings, but the question is would it - would we learn anything about our process in terms of our recommendations to the council?

Jaime Wagner: I do not think that - well if we don't do it in the whole group, I think we should do that in the process - in the - to add that to the process.

Ken Bauer: Yes okay. Fair enough. So let's do a quick poll on the IRD since we're running out of time and I know folks probably want to go. So I'm going to open up the poll for RAA. I'm sorry IRD. This is the last one -- SSAC IRD. And I need one more. Got it okay.

We have two threes, two fours, a five. That makes it a four average. And let me now - is that okay with everybody? Good. Let me review what happened on the former one -- the RAA, Chuck. We ended up with two fours - I'm sorry two fives and two sixes, and we didn't actually have your vote at that point.

And so as a result I - we picked 5-1/2. But if you'll tell us your vote -- five, or six, or seven or four -- whatever it is --that might - that will change what we have as the median result. Is that clear? Hello?

Jaime Wagner: Chuck?

Ken Bauer: Uh oh.

Chuck Gomes: I'm sorry. I had muted myself and I forget. It would've been a five.

Ken Bauer: Okay then that would make our - that would drop it a half.

Chuck Gomes: And I'm okay with 5-1/2 too. I - like I said, I severely underrated that one.

Jaime Wagner: And also I would like to add that Chuck, this - it was one first experience of rerating. And after - at first round were the - we had four different scores. We had a second opinion and then it come to two fives and two fours.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, good.

Jaime Wagner: Two six.

Ken Bauer: Two sixes, right. Okay good.

Chuck Gomes: So that had a range of three of higher, huh?

Ken Bauer: We finally did, right. We had right...

Chuck Gomes: Okay good.

Ken Bauer: ...four to seven, right that we...

Chuck Gomes: That's good. That's a good...

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bauer: Exactly. I think so too. Okay great. I think we're just about out of time. We have accomplished a mission everyone. We have completed all the Xs and all the Ys. Now the next thing I'm going to do is I'm going to generate a new chart, which is going to be the Delphi chart. Let's see if I can - I'm not sure which of these it is. Okay so it will look something like this, right? This will be the - it'll be the Delphi scores.

I - now that I have the rest of the Xs I'll plot those, and then I'll move these around to where the new - the points are. And I'll send that out in the email so everyone will be able to see what our Delphi chart was and how it compared to the other two charts that we already did on means and medians.

And with that I think - I'm not sure how we're going to resolve the question of the X definitions, but, you know, what I'll try to do is try to summarize the issues in the email and then we can hammer away at them on the list if that's okay. So I'm going to turn it over to Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much Ken. Which should be our next steps? Should we work in small groups? How are we going to handle this? Should we (bow) to this new step of doing it in small groups? Comments, ideas?

Chuck Gomes: I think we need to try to test that.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, I do agree with that.

Ken Bauer: What I...

Olga Cavalli: The only concern I have...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: ...is that we have very few. I don't know how many groups can we build. I have...

Ken Bauer: Well one of the...

Olga Cavalli: I don't know.

Ken Bauer: One of the things I might suggest that we do is at the next meeting, if we're going to have it in the first week of January, is to actually do some analysis evaluation pros and constituencies of what we've done. The outcome of that could be let's do another test.

In other words we've confirmed after our discussion an analysis that we do want to test in small groups and then decide whether it's twos or threes or whatever and how many we have to do to make it work. That's just another way to go about it.

Olga Cavalli: So the purpose of the next call would be to review our work and our methodology.

Ken Bauer: That's - that would be my suggestion.

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bauer: That's at least an approach. And out of that meeting could come - we want to do X and we want to do - I don't want to use those. We want to do A, B, and C as additional things and then we'll have, you know, another round of those and then we'll do a final analysis and recommendation and be done.

Olga Cavalli: Any other comments?

Chuck Gomes: Just that I think...

Jaime Wagner: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...we might be able to, on the list, resolve the issue of refining the definition to deal with the things we talked about today.

Ken Bauer: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: Someone else wanted to talk?

Ken Bauer: Jaime's got his hand up.

Jaime Wagner: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Go ahead Jaime.

Jaime Wagner: No is that - I think one thing we haven't had and we could do this in a meeting with all - with - like this with a group of five or seven people, is to put - because we will end up with one set of priorities. I mean even though we are

spread in two dimensions now we will have to have one dimensional prioritization.

I think this - all this work is to give an idea of resource conception. And - but now what we should try I think is to do this in small groups because the - we - this is a final step of I think - we didn't do this final step, and we have to do it. And we could do this in small groups and then a final whole group, or we could try to go directly to the - to our - I mean our whole group is the small group. I don't know if I was clear.

Chuck Gomes: Well haven't we just finished doing it as a total group?

Ken Bauer: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: So that would be next call.

Ken Bauer: I believe we have finished that.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. We did finish it...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: ...as a group individually ratings. The idea was to - if we go to small groups - my - I like the small groups idea because I think it will be the way that GNSO council will work with this. I see more small groups ratings than individual. But maybe I'm wrong.

Chuck Gomes: By the way Olga in that regard...

Jaime Wagner: But...

Chuck Gomes: ...we - because of how small our group is, what we just did could serve as a kind of a bigger small group type approach...

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...but I still agree with you that it would be helpful to try maybe even smaller to see if (that it) works.

Ken Bauer: Now this is Ken. So maybe I can try then in the - to fashion up some ideas and shoot them out on the list. For example I have conducted the whole group for our total group using Adobe Connect, but - oh and I see Jaime says he was dropped off.

The - if we're going to do it - I think you have to decide do you want to do it in groups of two, do you want to do it in groups of three. Obviously we just did one with five, right? We've done two of them with five.

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Ken Bauer: Or do we want to do four? Is there a significant difference between five and four or should we (think of) two or three. And then the question is like what criteria do you put on those small groups? One experienced person, one inexperienced? And when I say experienced I'm talking about sort of knowledgeable with some history and background in the GNSO or those kinds of criteria. Should they be from different constituency groups or stakeholder groups, that sort of thing?

Olga Cavalli: Okay Ken so you're summarizing and proposing this to the list, and...

Ken Bauer: Well what I can do is can throw some ideas out and see if - because between - if we're going to do the small groups, I would - I guess they - we would try to do them next week, the first week in January?

Olga Cavalli: I'm okay...

Ken Bauer: In other words instead of having a group session and an evaluation meeting we would just go on and do individual small group ratings just like we'd been doing them. But then the question is do you ant me to facilitate those, or do you want to just do them privately by having little telephone calls amongst yourselves or that kind of thing?

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: You know, the more I think about it the more I'm wondering about how well it will work on the small groups because of what we've already done.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, I'm thinking...

Chuck Gomes: You know?

Olga Cavalli: ...about that. So...

Chuck Gomes: Yes. It's going to be...

Olga Cavalli: ...and I...

Chuck Gomes: ...very hard to get a fresh test because of what we've done. I kind of like your idea that we use our next call to kind of analyze and look at where we're at and talk about - you know, one of the things we could do is talk about the council doing this thing as a whole or in groups about the size of what we just did.

You know, maybe breaking the council up into three groups or four groups or something like that. And then if we did that, how would you combine the results? So I'm wondering whether we can do an honest test of the small groups because of what we've just done.

Olga Cavalli: Yes I agree.

Man: (Yes).

Olga Cavalli: How long would be the next call be? It took one hour and a half? It's two hours, it's one hour call?

Ken Bauer: I think we could use a full 90 minutes, but I think the common practice is to set up conference calls for one hour...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Ken Bauer: ...unless there's a very strong reason to do it for longer, which we had in this case, right? And by the way it worked out exactly the way we thought it would. It took an hour and a half and we got 11 of them done, so...

Olga Cavalli: Yes, and Chuck is next week okay for you?

Chuck Gomes: Well it's possible I won't be able to make the call, okay? I'll do my best.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. So let's do the call to wrap up what we have done now, and exchange some ideas on how to move forward for one hour next week and see what happens.

Ken Bauer: Okay. I'll try to summarize and set that up. And thank you all. Very good.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Ken.

Liz Gasster: Thank you very much again.

Glen DeSaintgery: When do you want the call next week?

Olga Cavalli: Yes the idea would be next week and see. Perhaps you can prepare (Doodle) and see if the people that was not in the call today may say they want - they can make it. Perhaps Stéphane or Adrian. And...

Chuck Gomes: Well so I don't know that we want Adrian on the call.

Olga Cavalli: Oh no, I know.

Chuck Gomes: If you really want him to be...

Olga Cavalli: He want - we want him...

Chuck Gomes: ...a red team leader...

Olga Cavalli: ...okay.

Ken Bauer: Yes this is Ken. May I...

Man: Yes.

Ken Bauer: ...suggest either the 5th, 6th, or 7th for (Doodle)?

Olga Cavalli: That's okay with me.

Glen DeSaintgery: Let's check off the 7th because it's a council call and there's already...

Olga Cavalli: Oh.

Glen DeSaintgery: ...another call on (unintelligible) Ken.

Ken Bauer: Okay thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bauer: All right how about just five and six then?

Glen DeSaintgery: Okay five and six?

Ken Bauer: All right, and we'll see if we can find a time that would enable Chuck to participate, but, you know, that'll just depend on his schedule.

Chuck Gomes: Yes but go ahead even if I can't. You - everybody's doing a great job contributing here. You don't have to have me on there to make progress.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Ken Bauer: Okay. Great everybody.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you.

Jaime Wagner: I just...

Ken Bauer: Go ahead.

Olga Cavalli: Jaime you want to say something?

Jaime Wagner: Yes. But it's just that I was dropped off and I don't know. We will have - I think we should try two small groups - two groups and in this rating - in this final rating because we need to test. Although I think this would delay a little bit work, I think we should try this to see how it works when it comes - well these two groups when they come together what - how things would work.

I think we should try that. We - and I think this next call of the next week won't be to work. I mean we won't prioritize. We will just discuss what to do, yes?  
Am I right?

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bauer: Yes this is Ken. I believe that's the recommendation yes.

Jaime Wagner: Okay thank you very much. Sorry.

Olga Cavalli: That's okay. Happy New Year to all.

Ken Bauer: Thank you everybody.

Man: Okay.

Ken Bauer: Thank you. Good work.

Man: Thank you.

Woman: Thank you.

Ken Bauer: All right, bye.

Chuck Gomes: Bye.

Ken Bauer: Bye everybody.

Woman: Bye.

Man: Bye.

Man: Adieu.

END