

**GNSO Work Prioritization Model  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Thursday 07 January 2010 at 1700 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the GNSO Work Prioritization Model meeting on Thursday 07 January 2010 at 1700 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-20100107.mp3>

Present for the teleconference:

Olga Cavalli  
Chuck Gomes  
Jaime Wagner

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

Gisella Gruber-White: Wonderful. Olga would you like just a quick roll call?

Olga Cavalli: Yeah please.

Gisella Gruber-White: Sorry. Happy New Year to you all, to those who we haven't spoken to yet. On today's call we've got Jaime Wagner, we've got Olga Cavalli, Chuck Gomes. From staff we have Ken Bauer, Glen de Saint Géry, Liz Gasster, Rob Hoggarth, and myself, Gisella Gruber-White. And we have apologies from Adrien Kinderis. Thank you, over to you Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much Gisella, and happy New Year to all of you.

Man: I don't...

Olga Cavalli: ...can you hear me?

Man: Excuse me. Oh, okay.

((Crosstalk))

Man: I was saying that I didn't see Liz, but now she entered in the Adobe Connect.

Olga Cavalli: Oh, she is there. It's Jaime, Gisella, Chuck, Ken and Olga. Great.

Thank you Ken for your mail. Just been reviewing it this half an - this past half an hour and why don't you help us go into the agenda, as you were the one so kind to provide it, perhaps. And you have been so active in return all the documents and all our procedures, perhaps you can list the review of the agenda and we can send our comments as we go by.

Ken Bauer: I'd be happy to. Thank you.

Well alright, what I - just for the sake of simplicity - and I'm not an expert in this Adobe Connect yet, I'm still learning. I was trying to put the agenda up on a white board, but I don't have the techs fluency, I'm not sure exactly how that works. So maybe we can just refer to the email and I'll read the items off.

What I had thought we might do is use this particular call as a way to take stock of what we have done. Sort of go through and make sure that up - at least to this point that we're satisfied with what we have been doing. There - and there's a couple of open questions that we need to resolve that have to do with definitions and have to do with, you know, the Project List and some other things.

So I thought maybe we'd just go right through from the top to the bottom. And I kind of tried to lay out all the things that we have done and just ask some general questions that we can take up one at a time here.

So the first thing I thought we would do is just really quickly recall that we set out some objectives for this team in terms of what the ultimate process should do. We wanted to make sure the process that we finally select and recommend is user friendly, unambiguous and straight forward to execute, produces realistic outputs that will enable the council to make effective prioritization decisions, and is structured not only as a onetime exercise, but also considers the inclusion of new projects as they are proposed in the future.

Maybe the only question that needs to be asked here, do we still think those are good goals for us to have? Do we need to modify those at all? It may be a bit premature to answer at least the second one because we haven't really reached that step yet in terms of whether or not the process will produce good prioritization decisions; or at least leave that open.

Olga Cavalli: Ken this is Olga. I think I agree with you that the second one will be - we will know about it when the time comes, when we use the methodology. But in general I think this is what we proposed as our objective Ken.

Man: Great.

Ken Bauer: Okay, anyone else?

Man: I agree.

Ken Bauer: Okay. Any other discussion on the goals?

Liz Gasster: This is Liz. I just want to add that, you know, we do want to think about how we can kind of get this to the point where we can -- if we're going to test it with the red team -- do that. Even if it means we maybe keep working on nuances while the initial piece gets tested, that might be a way to proceed to just, you know, get it to the next step.

So be thinking - maybe we should be thinking about how to, in addition to just quickly going through these questions, how we can, you know, move this to the next step of testing.

Olga Cavalli: Sorry Liz, I didn't get you completely. You're suggesting to add a new objective?

Liz Gasster: No, not at all. I just was thinking about whether, you know, at some point we have some details here that we're still considering, but we might - if we get it to the point where, you know, where we think it can be tested by the red team even if it's imperfect and we still want to use that approach of Adrien and a, you know, a small red team, we might want to...

((Crosstalk))

Liz Gasster: ...have them begin to test it even while we're working out some details. That's my only point. So it's just a suggestion.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah, this is Olga. I think that you made a good point but it's - in my modest opinion, it's included in the second one, "producing realistic output," having a red team could be part of the realistic output.

Liz Gasster: Very good. Thanks.

Ken Bauer: This is Ken again. The - okay, if there's no other discussion on the goals then I - we'll just keep them in the back of our minds as we go through it. I suggested maybe the first thing that we might do is to confirm the Project List and the requirements, just go back over some things that we've already done and make sure we still feel the same way.

So what I've done in the Adobe Room is I've put up the current document, which happens to be KBB2, which is the, sort of consolidated 15 projects and the short descriptions. And I'll just page through here a little bit. Hopefully

you'll all remember that we created an Active Projects Table of 15 that were going to be rated. And then we created another table with projects that we took out of the total list, right?

So if we think of the GNSO as having 15 and - 21 or 22 projects, not all of them, did we think, should be part of this rating and prioritization exercise. So we put those in Table 2 so that we wouldn't forget them. And we also labeled them, categorized them, as to how - why we took them out of the list.

And I just want to review that real quick; make sure everybody's still okay with that approach. Are there other categorizations that we need to have? Are we still comfortable with that approach?

Jaime Wagner: Can I comment?

Olga Cavalli: Sure Jaime, go ahead.

Jaime Wagner: Well, during our conversations last call and our exchange of emails last week I raised the question of the Implementation Project. And I asked if there was any project that was already running. Because I think Implementation Projects will be very costly in terms of research consumption and - from staff. And I think if this is true, they should be considering (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: And I think that's covered later in the agenda, is it not?

Ken Bauer: In fact it's in this same section, Chuck. So the questions that I had posed was, "Is the format acceptable the way we've structured this document?" I mean this - because at some point we're going to, as Liz was sort of saying, at some point we're going to turn this loose and give it to people and say, "This is it," right?

And so all I thought we would do in our assessment call is to go back over the things we've done and make sure we still feel the same way we do it.

Because as we move through the process, you know, we have gone back and looked at things and said, "You know, that wasn't so good, we fixed that." And so I just - this is sort of an attempt to be exhaustive about what we've done.

In that list of things that relate to the Project List, I did also site this question about, "Should Implementation Only projects be included?" And if so, it seems like there's a bunch of other questions we need to ask like, "Does an Implementation Only project also be - should it also be evaluated on a two dimensional scale? Do the same X and Y definitions apply? Are there other considerations - are all the other modeling and rating elements that we've already decided, do they apply as well to an Implementation Only project as they do to what we've already considered?"

So we can certainly take that up now and just return to these other questions that I asked as to whether the format and the approach and the categorizations, the list. Are we satisfied that the 15 should remain exactly as it is? Do we want to take any off? When would we make that decision? Do we want to wait a few weeks and then revisit that question?

Those are some of the things that I think might apply to the list and the document that describes the list of projects.

Chuck Gomes: One simple response to that is that we will certainly have to revisit the list just before finalization because depending on when this is - this approach is finalized for recommending to the council, there could be other projects added at that time. There's one under consideration now, that's the registry registrar separation issue, where on the 28th the council will need to act on whether to initiate a PDP there.

Ken Bauer: Okay. Any other thoughts about that? What we decided prior to now is that - and I've got this flashed up on the screen. There were three - essentially three cases for something to not be on the list; one is that it's inactive with the

community; the second was that the council has only a monitoring obligation and not a real work task with it; and then the third was it's just not a GNSO project.

It hasn't either come - this perhaps is the category that Chuck's referring to. A new project may emerge and then become a project, which is not as we speak today. Are we still satisfied with those categories?

Jaime Wagner: Are you saying, Ken, that an Implementation Only project would fit in the Category 3, not a GNSO project?

Ken Bauer: That's a - no, that's a question that I don't think we've actually undertaken yet. We've had some list discussion, we had some discussion on our ratings session last time.

What I was trying to do was let's look at the Project List and ask ourselves some real simple questions first. And if we're satisfied so far, then - I think we do have to have this meaty discussion about whether or not we should add a new category of Implementation Only projects, and what that means. And I was just hoping we could take some of the easier questions first and knock them out.

Man: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: ...for the easy ones.

Ken Bauer: So how do we feel about the list, the table, the descriptions, the way we've organized it, the categorizations we've used -- at least thus far. And Chuck has already suggested that we would - just before we would go to press with whether it's a red team or whether it's the council, we would ask ourselves, "Okay, are any other projects need to be added?"

And, "Are there any that need to change categories from where they are today to Table 1, Table 2. How about all the rest of that stuff? The sort of formatting and descriptive stuff?"

Jaime Wagner: This is indeed an easy question and an easy answer. How do I feel? I feel good. I feel it's perfect for me. It's okay for me.

Ken Bauer: Anybody else?

Chuck Gomes: I agree.

Olga Cavalli: For me it's okay. I agree.

Ken Bauer: Super. Alright, then with the groups permission, I mean, this is a pretty substantial question, which is, "How do we define the boundaries on what constitutes the project?"

And this is going to relate to the definitions as well, right? Because if we say that the project starts when it gets on the list, and we have some rules about how the project gets on the list, the question is, "When does it come off the list? When is it done? What are we going to consider finished? And what's that demarcation?"

And if we're going to say the demarcation is the start - the recommendation - final recommendation to the council, from the work team/workgroup that produced it, that's the end. We can certainly put that as a stake in the ground. Or we could say, "No, it's not there." It's all the way when it's finally implemented and tested and evaluated and completely done.

Or we could say, "Well it's, you know, it's going to end - Part 1's going to end where it's - where the recommendation is produced." And then we're going to set up a whole new project and we're going to call it Implementation Only and



we'll add those. The question, if we decide to do that, "What does that really mean in terms of the whole modeling process and the rating and ranking and so forth?"

Olga Cavalli: Ken this Olga, I would suggest that once we decide or we work and finalize these stages that we are going through on this working team, we present a certain methodology to the GNSO and then we start a whole new file period with all the GNSO.

And then the team -- I'm so sorry -- could review again how the dynamic of this prioritization work is - how it is functioning. And perhaps we can review it in about, I don't know, six months, three months, I don't know.

And we can start with considering the projects that are relevant in that moment and list the categories and work with all the GNSO and see if the methodology works. But it should be also a whole new trial period, but longer and involving the whole GNSO. And then perhaps we can stabilize a certain methodology. That's my wise opinion.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. I wonder whether we really need to resolve the fundamental question that you raise, Ken, regarding whether our focus should be on, you know, the broader involvement of community resources and prioritization instead of just staff - primarily staff resources.

And I don't know if it helps us or not, but there's one very, very major implementation project going on right now, and that is the introduction of new gTLDs. It's been going on for a couple years already. And it's - it's - it's involving - it is involving the community in the sense, from a public comment point of view, and a lot of that. But it's not a project in the same sense for the community as it was when it was in the PDP process.

So I think we - we - we need to ask that question, "Okay, if it's primarily being driven by staff, we clearly have - I mean, staff resources have to be prioritized

as well, is that up to the GNSO council? Is that up to the - to staff themselves or some combination?" I don't know what the answers are, but I think that's the crux of what we're dealing with here.

Ken Bauer: Yeah, this is Ken. The - where I think this impinges on our work is when we take a project that's among the 15, and we ask a question about resource needed or resource consumption, in order - we have to provide the raters, whoever they are, some kind of demarcation, some kind of definition as to what the beginnings and ends look like, right?

So if it happened to be the gTLD - new gTLDs was on the list -- it's not, but if it were on the Project List -- you know, would we be considering all the costs until we finally implement gTLDs? And then how far past that even?

Or, would we say, "No, when the recommendation is made and the board gets it, the project is over." If we decide to take another project up later that's a different issue.

Jaime Wagner: Ken?

Ken Bauer: Yeah?

Jaime Wagner: Can I?

Ken Bauer: Sure.

Jaime Wagner: Well, when I made my management - project management course many, many years ago, one of the main things that I learned is that we should define very carefully what is the beginning and the end of a project -- what marks the beginning and the end.

So I think we, in the last call, we kind of reached a consensus that the projects that we were dealing were not implementation projects, were

recommendation projects. What - and the end of these projects was the final recommendation approved by the council.

So the - I think the concept of the end of a project, for me it's already defined. What remains, for me, is the concept of the initiation of a project; how will these recommendation projects will begin? When will they be put on the list?

Ken Bauer: This is Ken. If I may...

Jaime Wagner: And implementation project is another discussion that we have postponed. I think the implementation projects are - is a different category, a fourth category that we should appreciate as a more thorough and difficult discussion, that we - but we have to face it.

Ken Bauer: This is Ken. Thank you Jaime. Let me just - I'm going to summarize that because I wasn't aware we had reached consensus on that. And if we have, it's my fault and I apologize.

When I wrote the new definition for X, you'll see that I added a note beyond the definition. I didn't change the definition, I just added a note. I'll read it out loud. I thought I was making - I thought I was being presumptuous in writing it this way. But it sounds like you think that this is where we are.

The note says, "For projects already in progress, please estimate only those expenditures remaining from the point of rating through to completion of the final recommendation. Prior historical/sunk expenditures and future implementation services costs are not to be factored into this dimension."

Does everybody agree that - does that note, even if we wordsmith it some, does that capture where we think we are with respect to the boundaries. And also this question about implementation? At least for now?

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. And I think it does. I would change one word, but - and I think it's a comment that I submitted to our list in regard to that. I think we do need to look forward in terms of the remaining.

And instead of expenditures I would call it resources I think because some people, I think are going to, when you say expenditures, are going to immediately think dollars. Or you can plant a different word, but I don't think expenditure is the best word there. It works, I mean if you think of a broad definition of expenditures. It's just that too often people think of money when you use that term.

So yeah, I think that I'm there. And I submitted a comment in that regard.

Olga Cavalli: I also agree with...

Jaime Wagner: Yeah, and also Chuck suggested, and I agree with him, to change the name to resources needed instead of resource consumption.

Ken Bauer: Yeah, this is Ken. On the Adobe Room, in the Notes area, I've - I'm going to start capturing things that we are agreed on. So I'm going to change the X axis to - if everybody else is okay with it, we'll change it to resources needed instead of resource consumption.

Jaime Wagner: Yeah, that's good.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Ken Bauer: And we'll use the word resources versus expenditures in the note.

Jaime Wagner: But what about the beginning of a project?

Ken Bauer: Fair question. Did anybody - does anybody have any thoughts as to what instantiates a project to put it on the list?

Chuck Gomes: Well the basic question we have to answer there is this - is it - are PDPs the only projects we consider? Or are there projects that aren't PDPs? And I think the answer is it's going to be more than just PDPs, we've already illustrated that in our list of 15.

Certainly I think a - when the council initiates a PDP, that's one instantiation of a new project, okay? But it's - I don't think we can limit it to that, and all we have to do is go back to our list of projects and we could see that all of those aren't PDPs, and yet they are places where GNSO resources are needed.

Jaime Wagner: I think there are some events that instantiate the project. One of them is the PDPs within progress, but also a request from the board or request from another body of ICANN; these also - can also instantiate the project.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, that's right. So maybe what we do is just list some examples not intended to be inclusive of what can be the starting point of a project. And maybe it's council action on that event that counts...

Jaime Wagner: Yep.

Chuck Gomes: ...whether it be recommending a PDP, recommending that we form a joint group with the ccNSO, et cetera.

Jamie Wagner: Yeah, the acceptance of a request is the event; not the request itself, but the acceptance of the request by the council.

Chuck Gomes: That's good.

Olga Cavalli: Ken, this is Olga. I think it's something that involves resources from (unintelligible) which is time from counselors, or the staff, should be considered a project. It could be that it involves PDP, or not, but if resources

are involved, are needed, and of course in different proportions, then it should be in the list.

Ken Bauer: Okay, I'm just trying to capture some ideas here in the notes so I can go back and...

Liz Gasster: So one way to...

((Crosstalk))

Jaime Wagner: ...but...

Liz Gasster: ...would be to say, not just requesting a PDP or initiating a PDP, but also initiating an - a request for an issuance report.

Olga Cavalli: Also, yes.

Liz Gasster: And then...

Ken Bauer: Now...

Liz Gasster: ...there's another example of something that isn't a PDP or an Issues Report or a working group, but is at least staff labor intensive would be like the WHOIS studies that were being requested by the counsel, but at the moment is staff work.

Ken Bauer: Right and we - but we actually - this is Ken. We actually took that one and put it in the Removed Projects list, right? Yeah, so it sounds like a significant consumption of GNSO community resources is at least a, you know, starting parameter.

And some examples where that's the case is the initiation of a PDP or Issues Report, plus other activities or initiatives that are requested by the board or

other - it may be in the final analysis the council determines whether some particular effort should be prioritized. And maybe it's a judgment call.

Chuck Gomes: You have to be careful Ken, in terms of the way you worded that. At the beginning of what you just said, you said, "if," I think, "if a substantial amount of community resources are needed," that's part of the prioritization exercise, just determining whether it's substantial or not. So I don't think we can start off with, you know, that as a criterion. Did that make sense?

Ken Bauer: No not exactly.

Jaime Wagner: I agree with Chuck. I agree with Chuck. It - when Olga suggested, it was not clear for me that consumption is an event. What should mark the initiation or the instantiation of a project should be an clear event.

So I think the acceptance of a request of a - a request (unintelligible) from the staff, from the board, from...Are the decision to initiate the PDP - always the authority to initiate the project should be with the council and should be a decision by the council that we then - that instantiates the project. That's my opinion.

Ken Bauer: So council action actually initiates a project. And that can vary...

Jaime Wagner: Yes.

Ken Bauer: ...whether it be, you know, initiating a PDP, deciding to form a joint working group with a ccNSO, et cetera.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Jaime Wagner: I would not say word is council action, but council decisions to initiate the projects.

Chuck Gomes: I'm okay with that.

Olga Cavalli: I agree.

Ken Bauer: Do - this is Ken. Does the team want to have additional discussion on sort of the front end parameter or description of what instantiates a project? Sounds like where we are at the moment is, we would describe fairly loosely, that a project gets on the prioritization list by action of the council based upon an event that occurs to initiate...

Jaime Wagner: By decision though. I would...

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bauer: Okay, council decision...

Jaime Wagner: ...a word instead of action (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, and that's fine.

Ken Bauer: Yeah, I'm - it's not clear in my mind what the event is that triggers the council decision, and you know, how we're going to make that clear. The council makes a lot of decisions -- it approves minutes at the end of a meeting. That's a decision but, what differentiates that from something that would actually become prioritized?

Olga Cavalli: Ken this is Olga. There are different events that can produce action by the GNSO. Sometimes it's a request from the community, a request from the board. Sometimes it's an issue that is relevant fro the council, and then the council decides to start working in a small working team or (unintelligible) team because it's something that is worrying the council. There are several different reasons for starting - for making a decision and starting to put resources into certain projects.



Man: I...

Chuck Gomes: Chuck again. Another question that we need to ask is - okay, I mean, there are lots of times we're going to make decisions to use some council resources. As trivial as, "Okay, we need to review the minutes and approve them, to" - so, do we want to put some sort of a time constraint on it to involve community resources over a period of time of at least a month or a quarter or, I don't know. I - just another thought that - another question that came to my head.

Olga Cavalli: This is Olga. Chuck, wouldn't this be reflected in the X and Y axis value?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, you're right to an extent. What I'm trying to do is differentiate. I mean, just about everything we do, you know, when we say, "Okay, everybody, you know, send this report to your constituencies and stakeholder groups and get feedback," we're asking for the use of community resources when we do that. And I'm trying to differentiate between that type of a decision versus a decision that involves a little bit more.

So you're absolutely right Olga. And I'm not sure quite how to cover what I'm doing, while at the same time not overlapping with what the prioritization exercise does itself. And your point's well taken.

Jaime Wagner: Well, this is Jaime. I - I - I think we are proposing to the council for the first time a project driven approach. So from now on, in order to prioritize the work needed, a project will be something that would be an entity that is from now on present, and it wasn't. So decisions by the council referring to projects should be made more clear and more formally, you know. Just kind of formally referring the initiation of a project from now on.

And - but I still don't have an answer to say, "Well, what is then a project?" It's in (unintelligible) with a council decision that were from request or something, but - and this decision should be formal to the initiation of a project. But...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah this is Chuck. Let me make a suggestion. What if we were to say that it - that a project is initiated when the council makes a decision to commit GNSO and/or community resources to an effort.

So in the case of, for example, the GO Regions Working Group, we made a decision to commit a couple volunteers to work with the other groups in the community to respond to a board request on that particular issue. In the case of the, you know, in the case of a PDP, we make a decision to initiate a PDP, which means to form a working group, and so we're making a decision to commit to community resources, and GNSO resources to do the PDP, et cetera.

Does it need to be more complicated than that?

Ken Bauer: This is Ken. May I make a suggestion?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Ken Bauer: I've captured, pardon me, some of these notes. And we're going - maybe we could put this on the list. Take this issue up and continue to refine it via the email list. I'll try to phrase up some material that would go into this X definition to constrain it, both on the front end and the back end, as I've already done in making the changes that have already been recommended. And then, you know, why don't we - we can kick this around on the list some more and see if we can polish it up.

Chuck Gomes: I'm fine with that. At whatever point you think's appropriate, I'd like to come back to the broader question then of implementation projects, because

something that Jaime said a few minutes ago gave me an idea that I'd at least like to toss out.

Ken Bauer: Yeah sure. Is everybody okay with continuing the parameterization, if that's the right term, of the - the - the project, how it gets on and how it gets off, we can just continue refining that. I mean I think we generally understand that there's some kind of council decision that starts the process. And there is a final report recommendation that ends it -- at least for the projects we're considering at this stage of the game, in this WPM -- Work Process Model -- activity.

If that's okay, then you know, I'll take the responsibility for summarizing and posting something to the list that we can continue to work on.

Olga Cavalli: Ken, something that we could do - perhaps I don't know if now or in between, is we can go through our present list and review how this project started. Then we can - we have a sample of how did they become projects -- active projects.

Ken Bauer: Yeah, I see Olga. This is Ken. Just infer from the existing projects, the rule that was used to create them.

Olga Cavalli: Oh yes. It's just a sample, yeah.

Ken Bauer: Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: That was the idea.

Ken Bauer: I'll take a look at that and maybe ask Liz too for her recollection. We'll see if we can infer a rule that might have - that might pertain to all the 15 that we currently considered to see if we can make that a little bit tighter. Okay, well I'll take that responsibility then and we'll continue that discussion so we can move on to other things today.

And I - the next one that I wrote down Chuck, following your point, was I put a note here, "Implementation Only projects are postponed to some future date and are not part of this WPM activity." Now I just literally wrote what I thought I heard Jaime say, that he - that we had already decided. But why don't we - let's see if we all agree that that is in fact the case.

Chuck Gomes: Well, I don't recall that we ever agreed on that. But let me just - to - to - to jump right to my point, to a suggestion that I thought of in response to some of the things that Jaime had said.

First of all in Table 2, what we now call Removed projects, and I just thought of this just right now, I think we ought to call them Not Included projects, rather than Removed. And that'll make more sense, I think, when I make my suggestions. And it probably applies whether you accept my suggestion or not.

And with regard to Implementation projects, they're unique in a couple ways, at least a couple ways; number one, they - from a direct involvement point of view, they primarily involve staff, not community resources; number two, our prioritization scheme, it doesn't apply in the same sense for implementation projects.

First of all, the value axis is probably the same as it would have been on the recommendations project. I think that's a fairly fair assumption to make. So the two axis we have, one of them probably stays the same. If it was a high priority for recommendations, it's probably going to be a high priority for implementation. Now, costs will vary a lot.

Now, the third point I want to make there in leading up to my suggestion is that at the same time, we need to -- whenever we're doing the prioritization exercise -- keep in mind the implementation projects that are ongoing,

because they're part of the bigger picture, the whole picture. And so we don't - we need to keep those in front of us.

So my suggestion that I'm throwing out right now -- and I just thought of it during this call so it may not be very good, but let's get things started -- is that in Table 2 where we have Not Included projects, we add a new category that we, I don't know what we want to call it in terms of category because I doesn't work, but Implementation Projects as a fourth category to keep them in front of us.

And that we always, when we're looking at priorities whereas we don't necessarily include them as the list of projects in the table, the 15 that we have right now, that we always solicit staff input regarding implementation projects that are ongoing or anticipated, that will affect the availability of resources on other things that we're prioritizing. Any of that make sense?

Olga Cavalli: It does for me.

Ken Bauer: This is Ken. Jaime you have your hand up, is that from before or do you want to talk now? Oh, he's not - I think he needs to be called. Gisella are you on the phone?

Gisella Gruber-White: Yep. Ken, Jaime just dropped off, they're going after him.

Ken Bauer: Okay, super. Thank you.

Gisella Gruber-White: It's been loosely two minutes.

Ken Bauer: Okay, no problem. Email back, Jaime.

Gisella Gruber-White: He's - there, he's on - he's back again.

Jaime Wagner: Okay. Yeah, thank you.

Ken Bauer: Okay, super. Did you have a comment on - did you hear Chuck's comment?

Jaime Wagner: No.

((Crosstalk))

Jaime Wagner: Never mind. I just read the - your - the items three, and new category and one more thing. I agree, that new category.

Ken Bauer: Yes. So this is Ken. So that's - Chuck's comment essentially was, "Why don't we, maybe instead, in addition to changing the table of nomenclature, we would also add another letter. We'll have to - I'll fool around with this. Maybe I'll change community inactive to (C) our something and - we'll have - we'll figure something out there. But add essentially another category for Implementation Only projects, right, or Implementation projects.

And the idea is that they wouldn't become prioritized as part of the top list, Table 1, but they would remain in plain view.

Jaime Wagner: Yes, okay. Okay I agree with that.

Ken Bauer: That essentially what you were trying to say Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. Yeah, that's good.

Ken Bauer: Okay, so then is it true that Implementation Only projects are not ones that would become part of the prioritization exercise, now or in the future, or just for now?

Jaime Wagner: All right, thank you just for now, because we should - hold this action to the whole council.

Chuck Gomes: They are mostly.

Ken Bauer: Okay?

Gisella Gruber-White: Yes.

Ken Bauer: Is there any other discussion on that, what I've captured here essentially here is to change the table and then we'll create a new category. At the moment I'm not sure where we will get this other list of projects from, the Implementation projects. Liz is that something that you have at the top of your head, or you could identify, or Chuck or somebody.

Chuck Gomes: They're on our Action table, are they not Liz? You know the one that we update for every council meeting, and now we've got, you know, there's some that have been hanging out there for a long time. Like, for example, IRTP, A.

Liz Gasster: Yeah, that cuts that off, because - and I move - the one outstanding item. See, we haven't been doing that. We've been closing them.

Chuck Gomes: Or...

Liz Gasster: When the implementation is...

Chuck Gomes: ...we're not supposed to close them until they're done.

Liz Gasster: Right, the - when the implementation is complete...

Chuck Gomes: So it's no longer an Implementation project if it's done.

Liz Gasster: I guess a - let me think. I think we were posing them, "Well, we can do it anyway we like." I don't think we have - do we have any implementation?

Chuck Gomes: No, new gTLDs is certainly one right now. Now what we've done on that action list is we've broken that down into the subsets of the total Implementation project.

Liz Gasster: What I thought we'd done is actually just - we haven't had new - I didn't think we had new gTLDs up there, sort of permanently. I thought we had it up there when there were work projects assigned to the GNSO and the, for example, the IRT task was added. And the Special Trademark Issues task was added, but I don't think, for example, that we had a, sort of, on-going placeholder for new gTLDs separate from tasking to the council.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, I agree with you. And it won't have made sense because to the huge nature of that project.

Liz Gasster: Right.

Chuck Gomes: So that's true. But, and I'm just looking at the list now.

Liz Gasster: I am too. I don't know that we have anything else. I mean all of the...

Chuck Gomes: So did...

Liz Gasster: ...you know, the previous...

Chuck Gomes: So did IRTP get implemented finally?

Liz Gasster: It was one remaining item from it which, yes, it got them completely implemented by the Services team. There was one remaining items which was to look this for the purpose of transferring account information, but were update to WHOIS. Which - and that task got moved to the newest service requirements inventory.



So that it didn't just remain in perpetuity holding up completion of the IRTPA, which was otherwise complete. So that's how we've picked that item up. It's - there you can see them. Yeah, and those - this includes recommendations from IRTPA to consider (IRIS) for exchange of registering email addresses.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah.

Liz Gasster: But that's how we've dealt with it there.

Chuck Gomes: And we don't need to worry about that list right now. I'm just...

Liz Gasster: I understand.

Chuck Gomes: But - yeah.

Liz Gasster: I don't see anything else, I mean, in the ways, you know, there's some improvements are implementation, because the board approved the improvements package.

Man: Am I...

Chuck Gomes: We already have those listed as projects so.

Liz Gasster: But they certainly are on-going active projects by us.

Chuck Gomes: And those are really more than just what we typically call Implementation projects.

Liz Gasster: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: You know, they're quite different in that sense, but.

Liz Gasster: You know, the talk of the services is another example I guess. Where instead of approved by the council, it doesn't require board approval and there's - now staff is implementing next steps.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And there's a good example...

Liz Gasster: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: ...of a Implementation project, isn't it?

((Crosstalk))

Liz Gasster: Of course it's the only one right now.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, other than the new gTLD ones...

Liz Gasster: Right.

Chuck Gomes: ...but I've said those, yeah.

Liz Gasster: Right. The negative isn't with issue really, I suppose.

Chuck Gomes: No, but it is one we need to keep in front of use, because it is part of the bigger picture when we're doing prioritization.

Jaime Wagner: You know, can I share some thoughts, I think was having one. I was listen to you conversation with Chuck, and I thought that, you know, implementation plans will use mainly staff researchers. And staff isn't - staff work isn't something to be prioritized by the GNSO council, because the staff doesn't - many other bodies of the ICANN and so, I don't think if we should be prioritizing staff work. It's just a thought.

Chuck Gomes: No, and I agree with that. And that's what I meant when I tried to say, that the, you know, what we need really is staff input regarding their availability when we're prioritizing something. You know, if we're going to make a decision to devote resources and it involves the staff support, we need to understand how thin they are spread at the moment on other activities when we do that. So it's not us prioritizing them, but rather, it is us being aware of their availability to give the support we're going to need if we do initiate something.

Liz Gasster: And I think also do have our input on what the likely work associated with that is to the degree that we would have insights about the (measure).

Chuck Gomes: Sure.

Ken Bauer: This is Ken. It sounds like we've reached a bit of a consensus there, that we will in fact add a couple of projects to the Table 2 that will be implementation and we'll have a coding system for that. Otherwise they will not be part of this continuing prioritization exercise. Is that a fair summary?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, and I think that we may need to think more about the whole idea of how we deal with the new gTLD implementation because, on the one hand, there are the sub projects that make that up, but there is the overall PDP implementation the recommendation that the board approves. So I don't have an answer on how to deal with the broader project, but its consuming huge amounts of staff resources. And community reaction to things the staff does.

Ken Bauer: Okay.

Jaime Wagner: This is Jaime. I would like to just remember that this issue came about when we were talking about the communication it's fearing, I mean, the - making a new (wrap) page for the GNSO the - and this kind of things, this implementation of the communications theme. And this was the concern we have.

Chuck Gomes: And that's another good example actually of we need to keep - be aware, and that one's probably not too far from coming up to the council. And so it'll - so I think that will be another Implementation project that will add that, you know, the Not Included table.

Ken Bauer: Okay, I've noted that. This is Ken. Perhaps, we don't have much time, I was wondering maybe we could knock one more agenda item out, which has to do with the model and the definitions for X and Y.

I proposed in my email - we already discussed X a little bit, and decided that we going to take that up on the list, to continue and refine that. But on the Y, is everybody okay with the change I made to the Y-value definition? In essence, I just said, "This dimension relates to perceptions of overall value and benefit to the following communities," and then in order; One, the GNSO; Two, the global Internet community; and Three, ICANN stakeholders. Does that capture where we were with the intentions to make sure that the GNSO in particular, was a part of the focus of that value-benefit equation?

Man: Well.

Olga Cavalli: Ken. Hello Ken, this is Olga.

Ken Bauer: Okay, Olga first.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you. One question, what does the one, two, three would mean in his definition? Are they, the three of them, in the same level of relevance or is one the most relevant, and then the two and the three could - may influence in the first one?

Ken Bauer: Notice that it says, "And."

Olga Cavalli: No. That's...

Ken Bauer: Is that significant? I think it might be helpful if it is. It does say and. One thing we could do is get rid of the numbers, right? We could just say the following communities and just put the GNSO, semicolon, the global Internet community, semicolon, and ICANN stakeholders, if the numbering is causing interpretation. It was implied to be the hierarchy, but that was only in my mind. I don't think it's obvious by necessarily reading it.

Olga Cavalli: I would make a suggest- oh sorry, Jaime, you want to talk? Please go ahead.

Jaime Wagner: No, it's because there's a, excuse me, it's because the numbering and it will suggested by me first and that in a sense of priority, yes, more important. And it was - and I remember that I have this - had this discussion with Chuck by - through the (unintelligible), and I always - a part being less important than the whole. So the global international community for me would come first, ICANN stakeholders second, and GNSO in the third place.

Along our prioritization and rating exercise many times Chuck brought about the difficulty to the GNSO to rate overall Internet community, for instance. And so it was more easy and more objective to manage your GNSO interests. But I don't - still I'm not comfortable with the - with inversion of the priority I proposed.

Ken Bauer: So you're assuming there's order to these?

Jaime Wagner: I was assuming for - and it was not these - this order. But I don't have a - it was just a thought, that the whole comes before than the part, and it's - I - it's a philosophical thinking not thinking - not something that has an interest involved. And if I think it's easier to manage your GNSO interest, but it's not this that should justify that should put GNSO interests ahead of global Internet community interests.

Ken Bauer: This is Ken. If I might just make a - interject a comment. It - I'm just trying to recall back the discussions we had during the value - the Y axis value benefit discussions, and some of what actually happened in the discussions was that there were certain projects that had very little benefit to the GNSO. And as a result, they carried by group consensus, right, by collaborative (Delphi) discussion, they ended up carrying a lower value rating.

And I - so maybe the mistake I've made here is perhaps following Jaime's philosophic approach. We should either go big to little, or we should go little to big. In which case, we might say that the communities should go; GNSO, comma, ICANN stakeholders, comma, the global Internet community.

And in which case that helps a lot, doesn't it, with respect to looking at a project and determining its value. If it doesn't have any value to the GNSO, or ICANN stakeholders, or has limited value, it would get a lower rating. Even if it might be benefit - beneficial to the wider Internet community.

Olga Cavalli: I would suggest a text.

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bauer: I'm sorry, I missed that. This is Ken, I'm sorry.

Olga Cavalli: I would suggest a text for the - this part of the definitions. I would say over value for the GNSO considering the global Internet community and ICANN stakeholders. I think that we have to look at our work, and of course, not forgetting what is relevant for the whole community but we are doing this for our good uses.

Ken Bauer: That seems like a pretty good suggestion. Does that sound good to you Jaime?

Jaime Wagner: That's okay.

Chuck Gomes: That's okay.

Ken Bauer: This is Ken, I'll go back and listen to that again, Olga. I will - I'll try...

Olga Cavalli: I can repeat it.

Ken Bauer: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: It's the Y definition with Y value benefit. This dimension relates to the perceptions of over a value and benefit for the GNSO, and considering the global community and ICANN stakeholders.

Ken Bauer: Got it.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Ken Bauer: Thank you. What I'll do then is, polish that, circulate it along with the X, and we'll work the X and Y definitions one more time through the list. And see if we can get a consensus on a final definition. And I think that that may - we're out of time, and that might be all we can get done today, Olga. Unless you - unless people want to hang around to do more.

Olga Cavalli: No, I think it's safe, okay.

Ken Bauer: All right. So what we've done is we've finished the first three of five of the agenda items. Well, that's not entirely true. I added another item which I can certainly move. This has do with whether or not different parties should rate the X and Y dimensions, which is something I raised in notes following our last discussion.

We won't have time, I don't think, to take that up today. But perhaps in our next meeting we can start with that and continue on with the other agenda

items. In particular, this whole discussion around individual versus group ratings, and whether we want to do any more testing, and go back and try and do smaller moves. We can take all that up in our next meeting.

Chuck Gomes: And just one - throw out one question in that regard. As I read that one earlier this morning I - the question that popped into my mind, and I don't want us to talk about it now is, "How would you even do that?" Would it - it seems like it might be - it might over-complicate things, and we're trying to keep it simple. But anyway, maybe we can talk about that on the list.

Ken Bauer: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: So if you could maybe share some thoughts as to how might think that might happen on the list, that would be good preparation for when we pick this up next time.

Ken Bauer: I'll give that - get it...

Jaime Wagner: Well, I don't know if you just a little final comment. I don't know if you read my - the - my comment in the email, but I don't think we should do the ratings in the small groups again. The - we should - we could have and I think we should have the small group approach but - and the next step that would be, and I understood that it's missing in your mind map.

The steps that consolidate in one dimension - one priority, we ask that work that we've done with XY in mind. We should have one dimensional priorities, so. And this is something that I think it's not in your - steps that could be done in the small groups.

Chuck Gomes: I - I'm just, a parting comment, I'm becoming less convinced that the small groups of two or three are going to work for us, or for the council, but we can talk about that on the list.



Ken Bauer: This is Ken. I heard Jaime also making a slightly point. And that is, it is going to be covered, if not in our next meeting, in the one after that. Which is Step 6 of our original process, which is, now that we've got this XY all developed, right? And we've got all the projects plotted, I actually didn't have time to show that today, but it's - I have it here.

The question then becomes, let me just bring it up real quick, this would be the summary here. I wanted to show you - and I put it on the list - so here's the picture of the Delphi scores that came out of both X and Y. And here's where all the projects end up in their quadrants.

The question we haven't asked ourselves yet, but it on the original list. It was Step 6 of our original process is. Now that we've got these things and these buckets, what do you do next? How do you generate a prioritization list from that, or do you, and if so, how? And so, that I think is something that we are going to take up and if I didn't put it in my mapping, I will.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, good point.

Ken Bauer: Is that accurate, is that where you were coming from Jaime?

Jaime Wagner: Yeah, and I think we should not - I don't - I have my concerns, and my doubts about the feasibility of the small groups, but I think even though we should try even to reject - we should try it. But not doing what has been done already. But we could try the small group approach in the next step. And I would suggest in the 6th Step, okay.

Ken Bauer: Yeah, we can certainly take that up at the next discussion. Great, well I think that we've done pretty well. We've confirmed a few things, and I'll try to summarize that in my next email and we'll get the X and Y definitions going. And we've made some project decisions, and added a new category.

So I think that this is all - this is productive to go back and look at it again, because obviously we are making changes and we're continuing to improve it. So hopefully we can - should we try another session next week, Olga, do you think?

Olga Cavalli: Yes, no problem with me.

((Crosstalk))

Jaime Wagner: I'm on holiday.

Ken Bauer: Okay.

Jaime Wagner: No problem, I'm on - I mean holidays.

Chuck Gomes: Perhaps Gisella, we can shoot for something Tuesday, Wednesday, another (doodle) Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and see if we can come up with a time.

Gisella Gruber-White: That's perfect.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. That will be great, and anything else that we need to talk about?

Jaime Wagner: The only day I won't be available is Thursday and Thursday afternoon and Friday.

Gisella Gruber-White: I'll try for Tuesday, Wednesday. It gives us enough time to get it planned if we all respond by tomorrow evening close of day.

Woman: Great.

Ken Bauer: Great.

Jaime Wagner: Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks everybody.

Ken Bauer: I'll...

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much.

Ken Bauer: ...turn this over to Olga to close.

Gisella Gruber-White: Yeah, thank you everybody. Thank you very much Chuck and Ken. Did I hear you something?

Olga Cavalli: Sorry, I just said, "Enjoy your holiday Chuck."

Chuck Gomes: Oh thanks.

Ken Bauer: Thanks for making time for us.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you everyone, bye-bye.

Chuck Gomes: Bye.

Gisella Gruber-White: Take care everyone.

Ken Bauer: Bye.

Woman: Bye-bye.

Jaime Wagner: I will try to do the same in Hawaii.

Man:           Bye.

Woman:       Enjoy Jaime, bye-bye.

END