

**GNSO Work Prioritization Model
TRANSCRIPTION
Tuesday 12 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 Tuesday 12 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-wpm-20100112.mp3>

On page:
<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/index.html#jan>

Present for the teleconference:
Olga Cavalli
Chuck Gomes
Jaime Wagner
Wolf-Ulrich Knoben

ICANN Staff
Liz Gasster
Ken Bour
Glen de Saint G ry

Apologies :
St phane van Gelder

Coordinator: This call is now being recorded.

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

Glen de Saint Gery: Yes certainly, Olga. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. On the call today for the GNSO Work Prioritization Module we have Jaime Wagner, Olga Cavalli, Chuck Gomes, Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, and for staff we have Liz Gasster, Ken Bour and Glen de Saint Gery myself. Thank you. Olga over to you.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much. Thank you and thank you everyone. I would like to ask a question first. In the reminder I saw that the call would last two hours. Are we doing a two hour call or one hour that's the question? My question I mean.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: I think it should be one hour, for me it could be fine one hour because then if not I would have to leave that's just a clarification.

Ken Bour: Olga this is Ken. In the last note from Gisella it said further to the Doodle poll this call was 12 January at 17:00 this meeting will run for 60 minutes.

Man: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Oh maybe I saw a different reminder I'm so sorry just wanted that clarified so I could organize my time. Thank you. Thank you Ken. I have been trying to find maybe it was my fault I didn't prepare next steps email which is what I usually do when I chair some drafting team.

But I am so accustomed that Ken is leading this and writing so beautiful summaries and with links and beautiful graphs. I didn't do that. And I couldn't find one after our call on January 7. Did I miss some email or some document maybe I don't have it or it went to some binder?

The last thing I found about our conversation and our document is an email from Ken that we have been reviewing the text from five days ago from January 7. Is this okay Ken? Or I'm missing something.

Ken Bour: That is the latest one yes.

Olga Cavalli: And we were reviewing text about X and Y definitions right.

Ken Bour: Right we are in our last call on the 6th I believe it was our last call we made considerable progress which I tried to note in this email. And then I sort of indicated where we had the items that were left that we didn't finish in the agenda.

Olga Cavalli: Okay would you be so kind to help me find where to start and I give the floor to you so you guide us because I cannot - I can't really recall where we finished and what we have to do.

Wolf Ullrich: Ken it would be also for speaking for me because I didn't have a chance to participate last time and either I could what I wanted I could hear the MP3 record. So if you give short update just from the last meeting it would be very nice.

Ken Bour: I'm actually...

Liz Gasster: Ken we got halfway through the agenda that you had sent out prior to the January 7 meeting which was when we last met. And there were five agenda items and we got through about two and a half of them.

I think we were roughly halfway through number three. We reviewed the objectives. We went through the project list and the short descriptions, talked about what we would include in the projects.

And a little bit about this issue of implementation only projects and whether they should be included. Ken probably has more exact notes on this than I do. And I think we were really left today with number three and then four and five.

Ken Bour: Yes the reason that I'm stammering here a little bit - this is Ken. I thought I had written up something after the last meeting and sent it to the list. And...

Liz Gasster: I think you thought you did.

Ken Bour: Yes.

Liz Gasster: Maybe you did and it didn't get received because we don't have it.

Ken Bour: I understand.

Liz Gasster: Yes.

Ken Bour: But what is this meeting - I have a message that I put out on the 7th.

Liz Gasster: That was to answer the call Ken that was a resend.

Olga Cavalli: If this helps what I remember is this text going through this text that it's in an email that you sent on January 7. And we made some suggestions and some changes.

What I cannot recall is where we finished and if we have a clean version with all the changes that we agreed and suggested. I am confused with that because I cannot find it. Maybe you sent it and I don't have it.

Ken Bour: And I remember writing it. Okay I apologize and...

Jaime Wagner: This is Jaime. I think Liz summarized it well we were in Item 3 and we were almost finishing Item 3. And we began discussing about Item 5. We passed - we began some discussion on Item 5 and (unintelligible).

And I think this is the main goal of our conversation today is to talk about this small group approach that if we should try it and how we should try it and the next steps.

Ken Bour: I found the note everybody. I'm sending it to - I made the same error as last time. I sent it from the wrong email account which doesn't go but I did write it so I'm shooting it out to everybody right now that's why I'm sorry for playing puzzled.

But I knew I wrote it. And I knew exactly where to find it so we can work from that yes. Gosh darn it I operated my Outlook to a new version and I'm still getting used to it. Anyway it's on its way to the list. It'll take a second to get there.

Jaime Wagner: I'm scared because I just - it just arrived a new computer for me and it's - I was confused now I'm double confused. The darn thing...

Ken Bour: Yes you will get - you will shortly get an email and I'm going to go ahead and continue right because there's some material here that's common. The first item in it by the way it's dated today the 12th although it was sent on the 7th.

And it says we agreed to work on the Y and X definition and so what we're looking at for the value benefit is - I changed the language to read this dimension relates to perceptions of overall value and benefit primarily for the GNSO.

But also considering ICANN stakeholders and the global internet community. That was the only change made to the value benefit and I basically picked up Olga's language that she put in the last call.

Olga Cavalli: Yes I remember that.

Ken Bour: Is that - does that sound like it captures what we discussed?

Man: Yes it did to me.

Liz Gasster: Yes.

Ken Bour: And you all will see this momentarily as soon as that email gets through ICANN and gets to the list. It'll be there and you should have it in a minute or two I would hope.

Liz Gasster: I have it.

Ken Bour: Okay great. Okay super then it's on the list then everybody will have it. And so if you would just look at the Y value axis and you'll see in red the changes that I made.

Liz Gasster: Yes I remember that.

Ken Bour: Good I think I captured what we discussed. Any other comments?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I still have your message from 7 January. Is that what you are referring to?

Ken Bour: No there's a new one. It's dated...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay I'm still waiting for that.

Ken Bour: Okay it'll be there momentarily.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Ken Bour: The - I apologize for that. The X axis definition I did not change the definition itself but I added a parenthetical note which I'll read at the end of it. Note for projects already in progress estimates include only those resources remaining from the point of assessment through to completion of the final recommendation.

Prior historical/sunk resources are not factored into this dimension. The changes essentially there were to get the word expenditures out and put resources in. And I think that was Chuck's comment and I just did a little wordsmithing just to clean it up.

The thought we wanted to get on the resources was and I also changed the title to resources needed was that when the projects already activated. It's not something brand new than the estimate should only look at the resources from the time we do the estimation to the end. And we're now seeing that the end is completion of the final recommendation not implementation as I found.

Chuck Gomes: Works for me.

Ken Bour: Okay good. Item 2 in my email - go ahead.

Jaime Wagner: Ken, this is Jaime. Just another thing we had discussed is that we would include a new configury to put to the council that would be implementation only project.

Ken Bour: I'm coming to that in a second. That's item - we're coming to that in Item Number 2. So Item Number 2 in the email that I summarized attached another version of the projects and short descriptions Word document. And what I did there was I incorporated the changes we discussed.

There mostly all on Page 2 of that document if you want to open that. I altered the title for Table 1 from active projects to prioritized projects. And then I changed the title on Table 2 from removed projects to non-prioritized projects.

You might recall that we discussed a slightly different label for those but I thought this might be more appropriate. So what we're going to end up with prioritized projects and then non-prioritized projects.

Chuck Gomes: Yes I like what you did there. I think I commented on the fact that a change might be helpful in terms of the title that works for me. Sounds like Jaime has something.

Jaime Wagner: No it's okay. I just (unintelligible) I agree.

Ken Bour: Okay you'll also notice that in the table instead of just using one single letter like I or X or whatever I actually made a short little word like pending, inactive, inplem so it would be real clear. You don't have to look at a legend to determine what these things mean.

Chuck Gomes: Very good move in my opinion I was thinking about that last week. And I was just kind of hesitated a little bit. But I think that makes it immediately clear which is more important than brevity for a one word issue.

Ken Bour: Yes especially since I didn't really have to change the column width or anything like that. It still fit pretty well. Now I noted that we should probably add short descriptions for - okay I also put in placeholders for implementation projects that we discussed last time.

So this gets right to Jaime's point. In Table 2 I now created another category called Inplem, I-n-p-l-e-m and I actually put in two or three placeholders there. I opened up the document myself and take a look.

Jaime Wagner: Okay.

Ken Bour: Does everybody see that?

Chuck Gomes: Yes. Now in the case of the Web site development that actually hasn't happened yet but it may be okay to leave it there. I think it will happen in the next few weeks.

Ken Bour: Yes this is Ken. I'm aware that the activity is under way right now to develop some specifications and to actually get some competitive, not competitive bids but some private estimates and things of that type.

So it's moving along. But any event again these were placeholders. I went ahead and I put places for short descriptions in the back but I don't have any content there yet. So we can fill those in.

Jaime Wagner: The only thing I would suggest and this is Jaime to your Word document would be to put in the short descriptions to put the abbreviation we've used in the table, Table 1 okay.

Liz Gasster: It's a good idea yes.

Ken Bour: If everybody's okay with that I certainly can do that.

Chuck Gomes: Could you repeat that Jaime?

Jaime Wagner: It's a little bit contrary, but in the short descriptions to use also the abbreviation we used in Table 1 and 2. We would put the FDI and IDNF to put before the - for instance there is a (taskless) policy development process and the abbreviation we use is -- I couldn't find it -- oh, (FF). And also I would suggest to put the - to group the short descriptions by groups prioritized and non-prioritized, because they are mixed. You understand.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I do understand. I had hoped that just by creating the link you could just go to the link by clicking on it and it would take you. I randomized the short description section so it's all bookmarked so you don't have to follow it in order.

Chuck Gomes: Well I think Jaime makes an interesting point though and by the way I like having the link like that. But somebody may also just want to look at the short descriptions.

So couldn't we do them in alphabetical order and have the link? That way the descriptions themselves could be easily referenced by in alphabetical order or if somebody was working from the table they could link to it very easily.

Ken Bour: We can do either but I thought I had Jaime ask to have them put in the same order that they exist in the tables.

Jaime Wagner: Yes that I think this would be more to receive this structure that is in the table to repeat in the short description just to make I think it remains more readable. And we don't need to be referring to the first page always, you know, you can read a page at a time.

Chuck Gomes: Yes I guess I lean the other way and I think there's some value. And we don't have to belabor this, because I can go either way. To me the short descriptions if they could be used independently having them in order by the way they occur in the table creates a dependence on the table.

What I was suggesting is you've got the links that create that in order. If you - if somebody wanted to just look at the short descriptions real well they'd be easier to find if they were in order that's independent of the table. But I can go either way. We don't need to...

Jaime Wagner: Just because when you refer to the short descriptions you don't know by the description I mean for a newcomer to (unintelligible). If you go directly to the short description you don't know if it is what kind of project, what kind of group it is unless you go to the first page and use the link.

So I think it would be more straightforward to repeat the structure. And if you are on Page 2 or Page 3 reading the description you would know this is the group that is prioritized or outstanding or implementation only project.

Chuck Gomes: So should we add this in the short descriptions another bit of information for each one to show that? That's it's a prioritized project, non-prioritized project maybe in parenthesis after the title or some other way that logistically makes it easy and clear.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I just would say that we're making the administration of the table much more difficult by doing it this way. I think alphabetically works because it's pretty easy to sort the list alphabetically. But to keep it - here's the problem I'm struggling with.

I'm looking at this very long set of short descriptions. If I put a title at the top that said prioritized and then put them in that order by the time you get to Page 2 you don't know what section you're in anyway. You wouldn't be able to tell right.

So I don't - I'm not - I don't know that the short descriptions need to contain all the information that's included in the index. The index is how you get to the short description. I suppose we could put them in alphabetical order or so I'm just trying to be - I'm trying to think about what this will look like when we're finished and how useful it will be.

Olga Cavalli: Ken this is Olga. I would see this short description as a glossary. And I think alphabetic order for me its fine because it's easy to browse. What we could add is the few letters that describe each of them maybe just by the title. That's my suggestion.

Ken Bour: Jaime would you be okay if we tried for just to see how it looks? I can certainly try putting the short descriptions in alphabetical order. The links will all be the same. And I'll also include the abbreviations as we discussed. Is that - would that work for you?

Jaime Wagner: Yes I was trying to because if you read the document and you go directly to the short descriptions you to clarify you need to come back to the first page. It's just to know what kind of project it is.

I would also - so if it is in alphabetical order I would contest to add some information what kind a little thing what configury it is, if it isn't prioritized or non-prioritized and what kind of project.

Ken Bour: Yes it's just that those - the thing is those who keep the descriptions up to date what goes into a prioritized or non-prioritized project can change with some degree of frequency right.

I mean we could and we will constantly be updating the short descriptions to indicate whether it's prioritized or not. But the purpose of the short descriptions is only to tell you what it is not what its status is just what it is.

Olga Cavalli: Ken this is Olga. This is why I mention it works for me, could work for me as a glossary where I check the definition so and this is why I find it okay if its alphabetic order because I know how to scroll it.

Chuck Gomes: And I think Ken the point is well taken that the descriptions can be relatively constant. You're not constantly having to update elements of these short descriptions the glossary as Olga says. And that makes it easier to maintain as soon as we add dimensions that are going to change periodically. We have a new challenge in terms of keeping it up to date.

Jaime Wagner: But the configury will be changing.

Chuck Gomes: Sure for example some of the things that we haven't - let's just take one example. Let's take the registry/registrar separation issue that's one right now that is not a prioritized item because - but it could become a prioritized item if the council decides to initiate a PDP.

Jaime Wagner: Okay.

Ken Bour: May I interpret that okay Jaime? Let me restate what I'll do and then we can take another look at it and see how we like it. I will add the abbreviations to the short descriptions right because they're semi-permanent, right. They're not going to change.

And I will change the title of the short description to add the word glossary. I think that's kind of a nice addition. And then we will put those in alphabetical order.

Jaime Wagner: Yes.

Ken Bour: Does that work for everybody?

Liz Gasster: Yes.

Jaime Wagner: Yes.

Ken Bour: Okay super. Great let's see the - in the email that I sent out I also - I added this new category called implementation and maybe we could just take a look at what I wrote to see if that is an acceptable definition if you will.

Chuck Gomes: Where are you at Ken?

Ken Bour: So this would be in the email in Section 2, Paragraph 2 where I wrote the following projects were removed from the original list by the drafting team for one of the reasons but will maintain and so forth.

Then I have community pending which I called pending in which case it says the work effort has been put on hold status and is waiting on or pending another action or decision. That's pretty close what we had before.

The second group category was monitor only. The work effort is not fundamentally prioritized by the council but it does maintain an interest from an informational perspective that's the same. And Number 3 was not a project which I'm calling now inactive. The work effort is not or not yet a GNSO initiative and not properly evaluated and prioritized.

And then four was implementation. The work effort has completed the recommendation phase, has been approved and is ready to begin or has already started implementation.

While such projects are not consuming large amounts of community resources the council needs to understand the impact on staff as it's consider the adoption of new project work within the GNSO.

Olga Cavalli: So these four categories are for those projects which are not in the main desk.

Ken Bour: That's right.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: That looks good to me.

Olga Cavalli: Yes for me too.

Jaime Wagner: Some projects - a project cannot be already started implementation but has not been approved because I don't know if for instance the implementation of the lab sites has been formally approved.

Chuck Gomes: It has not and I think that would still be a community pending one technically speaking would it not?

Ken Bour: Yes as a matter of fact I think - yes I think I jumped the gun there a little bit. Chuck's I think 100% right technically. The OS - the Communications Team a final report has been drafted and it's still with the team.

But it's going to be shortly sent to the OSC and then it goes. I think I was just presuming that all of that would go through and then it would be approved.

And then we would have an implementation. But at the moment right today I don't think it is.

Chuck Gomes: See the problem here is Ken's got inside information.

Jaime Wagner: The point is this project already demanding some resources.

Chuck Gomes: It's actually Jaime a part of the GNSO improvements project on communications coordination work team. So it's really still in that park. Once that element of their work is approved it'll be pulled out as a separate little implementation project.

Jaime Wagner: It's not really running no.

Chuck Gomes: Not by itself that's correct yes.

Ken Bour: What I was referring to is there is some preliminary background work being done by staff in preparation for a eventual approval which we anticipate that's the more accurate way to say it I think. If the council hasn't approved this project by the time we go to press with this list we should change the category from Inplem to...

Chuck Gomes: Well we may not even list it as a separate project.

Ken Bour: Yes that's right we just leave it off.

Chuck Gomes: If it still falling to the operations and I mean communications the OSC communications coordination work team effort.

Ken Bour: Yes I completely agree. I was just trying to be a little bit - I was trying to help with the implementation piece that we discussed by putting some examples in.

And I thought that one was one we discussed but you're right. It's probably premature. Okay anything else on the - on that Section 2 and the four categories and their definitions?

Jaime Wagner: No.

Ken Bour: Great then let's go to Paragraph 3 which is all right we discussed creating parameters around what it means to be a quote prioritized project now that we've changed that title and definition. So I suggested some language here and perhaps we could take a minute.

I could read it out loud if that helps everybody you can follow along. That would probably be the easiest way to do it. For the purposes of GNSO work prioritization a prioritized project is defined to be one that is initiated by a GNSO council decision.

To commit GNSO resources with the expectation that such efforts will impact the community's overall work capacity sufficient to warrant its relative placement among all other GNSO prioritized projects. Let me pause there. Should I go on?

Chuck Gomes: Sure.

Ken Bour: Examples of projects that would be included under this definition include but are not limited to policy development initiatives and requests made by the board for example GNSO improvements and/or other SO/AC.

For these purposes a prioritized project commences when chartered or otherwise commissioned by the GNSO council and terminates when the resulting working group or team delivers its final output/recommendations.

(Liz Gasster): Okay.

Jaime Wagner: It's Jaime. I would say that it's not when it's in delivery it's final output but when the output recommendations are approved (unintelligible) formerly we see them approved by the council.

Chuck Gomes: That's a good point because it's possible that the council for example could send the recommendations back to the work group for a little more work.

Jaime Wagner: Yes.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I capture that. That's a great suggestion, good change I appreciate that. So what we'd say let me just try. When the resulting working group or teams final outputs and recommendations are approved by the council that's the idea right.

Jaime Wagner: Yes.

Ken Bour: Or accepted and approved or in other words yes the result...

Chuck Gomes: You probably don't need and approved just...

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bour: All right good approved is enough good. All right yes I've captured that one. Anything else?

Jaime Wagner: Well (unintelligible) so I am just after myself you know I understand the prioritized project and the ones before Number 1 through 4 from community pending to implementation. These are should be the enter a bunch of projects.

That's my understanding isn't it so the question is so how - why we are - let me say it that way. So we just defined the other projects from one to four.

And the results, the negative result of that is it means all the other projects should be prioritized project. Is that the understanding?

Chuck Gomes: Not exactly because there will be new projects created that aren't in the prioritized category or the non-prioritized category at a given point in time.

Jaime Wagner: I see.

Chuck Gomes: The GNSO Web site improvements is an example of that. It's not anywhere right now because it's part of the work that's coming out of the communications coordination work team which is a project okay. Did that make sense?

Jaime Wagner: Yes.

Ken Bour: In some ways I think we're maybe asking what does it mean to be a project. If it's not in List A - if it's not in Table 1 or Table 2 then it's not a project.

Jaime Wagner: Yes this is the case with our implementation. It's not yet a project. It's a project to be.

Chuck Gomes: Yes that's right. Good question.

Jaime Wagner: The unborn - well that was speaking so for me the other question is, you know, if you look to the (unintelligible) to the definition of prioritized project so couldn't that be a case?

If you look at other projects also be covered under this definition? You know, a prioritized project is defined to be one that is initiated by the GNSO council that's the others also defined this way.

So commit GNSO resources okay the others will commit - we'll need commitment of resources as well. So I'm just talking about really to

differentiate between this what we defined already in the formal list and what we are now doing.

Ken Bour: I think I understand the question he's asking.

Chuck Gomes: I'm not sure I do so help me out.

Ken Bour: Yes let me try. Let me see if I can help there. I think he might be asking should the definition of what a prioritized project is also say what it's not. So in other words I think he might be suggesting that an implementation project or a inactive or one's that's monitor only or pending all those meet the definition as stated. And therefore why aren't they prioritized?

Jaime Wagner: What I interpret both as saying the definition should be enough to not include to preclude the inclusion of non-prioritized projects and the thing is if here with the definition as it is now. It won't - it wouldn't also include some project that we left in the non-prioritized project.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Jaime you are right. So for example let me give some example. I cannot understand for example if you look to the (unintelligible) studies why doesn't it fall under the prioritized project as we define it right now. What is the difference here?

Chuck Gomes: Well the council has taken action to ask staff to, you know, get - to gather information regarding estimated costs and feasibility for who studies. So the key there is it is a, you know, the council did make a decision to do that. Does that make sense?

Ken Bour: This is Ken.

Jaime Wagner: Just to clarify if the council has decided and so it would be - it would meet the definition of prioritized project and it's not one.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. Let me try an idea here. So we take the first sentence which says what a prioritized project is defined to be right and so far we've - there are only two things that one is it has to be a council decision and two it has to commit resources.

Well everything does that right. So what we might - what if we added in addition a prioritized project is active. I'll want to pick all the opposites. It is not in the pending status. It is not implementation only. In other words I would add another set of - another sentence that puts exclusions in that accommodates the four items that we have put up there. Or I could say a non-prioritized project...

Jaime Wagner: Ken.

Ken Bour: I'm sorry.

Jaime Wagner: I think just saying that it is active is enough because everything that is standing or implementation only is something well except for implementation projects that are active.

Chuck Gomes: And I think that's okay we just have to be careful in one sense. For example I think I appreciate the example of the who is studies because I mean it's still active but it's active in a sense that staff is doing some stuff that we asked staff to do.

Once that's done the rest of the GNSO will get more active again so there will be lulls of activity for some of us during a longer project like that. And as long as we understand that active doesn't mean that it's full community activity all the time. And I think that's okay. I'm just clarifying that for our own sake.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. Another option here would be immediately after this definition to add another definition for what it means to be a non-prioritized project and put our four definitions in. So now you have a definition for what it means to be a

prioritized and what it means to be non-prioritized. And they together constitute the entire list.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Well it's worth speaking so I think what Chuck said it makes it very clear so, you know, if we could just more precisely be more precisely in that sense that it means, you know, projects which are for example more on staff side yes at the time being so called project.

These are at the time being for example not prioritized projects yes. Because like studies it's a pending one. It may come back but it's not yet. And the criterion as I understand because it's - it has been decided but it's on staff level for time being. So could you make that a little bit clearer in the definition?

Chuck Gomes: Now that's an interesting point that Wolf raises there. Because I was kind of considering the who is studies as a prioritized project. It's just one that's in a kind of a hold period for until we get the data back that the council needs to take the next step.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: And I wasn't considering it a pending project. We had already, you know, made a decision but it's a decision that leads to another decision later on depending on the information we get back.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I'm a little bit confused at the moment as to what the will of the group is as to how to fix the definition.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: So it was speaking for me it's just whatever. I'm just in line with you but I would like to have it really clear not, you know, I see in the Table 2 as being OE studies as pending.

So wherever it comes from this is to place it here so that means as I understand its non-prioritized project here because Number 2 non-prioritized. So from the definition we just have for prioritized projects if we just look at this definition one could ask okay but I understand a study would fall under prioritized projects.

Ken Bour: I don't mean to interrupt but I understand that. What I'm asking is how do we fix the definition so that conflict that you're pointing out doesn't occur?

Jaime Wagner: All this discussion - this is Jaime and all this discussion makes me figure out a question. Shouldn't we prioritize also the pending projects? Because if it standing when it's a matter of process so it's (unintelligible).

Liz Gasster: This is Liz. And I kind of agree with Jaime. I've been holding back on this who is thing because it's such an anomaly I don't want to get bogged down in, you know, a sort of anomalous situation.

But the fact is we have probably close to one full time staff person roughly working almost exclusively on this even though it's behind the scenes half of my time and half of someone else's time.

So if we weren't doing this in theory we could be doing something else that might be very staff intensive or providing more staff support to other groups hypothetically. I mean I know this is a priority and, you know, but hypothetically it seems to me if you're looking across all the resources.

Chuck Gomes: At the same time Liz it's hard to prioritize who is studies until we get the data that we're waiting for.

Liz Gasster: Yes it's like who is studies has work associated with it now that you're not seeing but that in a way I think still should be prioritized by the council looking across all the resources.

Or at least giving staff direction which you have, you know, in a sense priority saying it's a, you know, it has been a high priority. We haven't lost that. When it comes back to the council it'll be a different task.

Chuck Gomes: Yes right.

Liz Gasster: But it's still a task so today it's a time consuming task just mostly a staff task. Tomorrow it could be, you know, a time consuming task or something in between for members of the council.

And it's slow like I actually envision as a practical matter coming to the council with the first half of the information shortly and then coming to the council with the second half of the information, you know, perhaps in two or three months.

Chuck Gomes: So maybe we need to be more precise in terms of the name of the project in this case and say the project we're talking about right now is who is study, cost and feasibility estimates.

Liz Gasster: Right.

Jaime Wagner: Yes.

Liz Gasster: And the next month it might be who is study, you know, council assessment or.

Chuck Gomes: Yes right.

Jaime Wagner: But I was not discussing particularly the case of who is study. What I like example how you to work from but I was kind of doing deductive thinking. Thinking in principle I think that a standing project just changes its status and I think this is a dynamic situation.

One day it can be pending and the other day it goes back to active. But in principle a project independent of its status it should be prioritized I know. It should be pending for some information on something.

But it's still is - has a priority still has - we can still - it has its importance. And we can still figure out which will be the results ahead. So what I was asking if in principle shouldn't we be prioritizing pending projects also independent of who is study.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I would like to say something. I think it might be controversial here but it's burning and I got to get it out. This work prioritization task I believe it came initially from a concern about community resources in the GNSO.

And the participation of work teams it sort of had its origin there. Now that's sort of point one. Secondly there are a lot of things, a lot of projects that the staff, the policy team is working on. The community doesn't know in any sort of formal way.

Let me give you an example. I spent and withheld from Margie and others we worked for months on bylaw changes for the GNSO restructure that was never a project on the GNSO list right because it was all staff work. Now if that - if we're going to say that all staff work has to be prioritized when it's staff only or staff primarily.

Then what we're going to have to do is take all of the work in Denise Michel's organization and maybe others I don't know and put it all on the table and say everything needs to go out here on the list even stuff that is being done only by the staff.

Liz Gasster: But Ken it was on the GNSO project list. It may not have been, you know, as transparent as all the little facets of what we needed to do associated with that. But it was in fact on the projects list the action item was to include in the

bylaws changes. What's not there is an assessment of the volume of staff work that's not clear to the group.

It's the same thing with who is. It's not clear to the group how much time we're spending unlike maybe a working group where, you know, in a particular working group that say Marika's supporting. Her actual efforts are quite discernible to the group. They're more apparent so.

Chuck Gomes: Isn't this very similar to what we talked about last time about implementation projects that were primarily staff involvement? We need to keep them in front of them - in front of us. They're part of the bigger picture but I thought on implementation projects we decided not to include them in the prioritization exercise.

To me this is very similar. We need to keep them in front of us. We need to have an idea and staff needs to communicate to us with regard to availability of resources and resource commitments and so forth. But to me it's perfectly analogous to the conclusion I thought we came to with regard to implementation projects last week.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I think that's what I was trying to say also. And we originally we created this classification of pending and inactive precisely to put things of the list right that were pending that we're waiting on staff input. Our definition even reflected that so we are sort of retrogressing back to the question whether our original decision was right or wrong.

Jaime Wagner: Yes I'm doing exactly that. And I think we should always look back what we have decided. And I'm doing precisely that. I'm retrogressing. And I don't know what I was thinking about the question I put.

I think you didn't respond Ken. Because I felt generically and not about (unintelligible). And I - we talk about resurface here. We are not referring staff

research. We are referring resources that are in the GNSO resources which implies some staff effort but not all staff work and not all staff resources.

So we could I think we should rephrase to include only GNSO resources. And but what I ask if a project that concerns GNSO resources it can be in a pending status. And it will consume GNSO resources it can be in a pending status. And I ask why not to prioritize it? Hello.

Chuck Gomes: We're still here.

Olga Cavalli: Yes me too. I'm here.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: I must say I'm a little bit lost at this time of the conversation. I'm not sure what we're discussing.

Liz Gasster: Well it's Liz. I think one thing is that, you know, and I think I'm possibly a cause of it a little. We're struggling with GNSO resources versus community resources versus staff resources.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Liz Gasster: And it occurs to me that maybe even though I wasn't thinking about this initially that Jaime's idea of limiting the assessment, ex-assessment to GNSO resources is appropriate with the caveat that we the staff provide you with assessment of how we view the staff resources.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Liz Gasster: So too with any of these projects so that and I'm not sure how to blend the two ultimately. It seems like the council needs to also have an appreciation for staff resources that are being detailed to different projects or that might be

needed in a finite, you know, where resources are limited. But maybe it's a different assessment of process of consideration.

Chuck Gomes: Now, you know, Jaime's basically just asking should we - if I can rephrase it Jaime? You're basically just saying should the things we're showing as pending projects actually be in the other table in Table 1.

Liz Gasster: I thought he was asking whether...

Jaime Wagner: Yes.

Liz Gasster: Speak clearer about the GNSO which resources we're assessing.

Jaime Wagner: Yes I think also it's not clear from our definition what precisely is meant by GNSO resources because it includes some staff resources. If it's not only community resources but I think we lack these definition of what is GNSO. We can't always assume that everybody will understand what kind of resources we are referring.

But some times it can be confusing to some people because it's not all the staff resources. It's not only community resources. So I think we should the message deserves some more thinking or some more work on the definition.

Olga Cavalli: Ken this is Olga.

Ken Bour: Hey yes.

Olga Cavalli: I would like to add something to what Jaime said. I think it's a good point and I think that we could add somewhere I don't know where some how a level of involvement of staff and of the council.

For example there are some projects that have very low participation from staff just because are needed for other support in organization. Say for

example the geographic region group that two of us are participating there but we need staff involvement not from our side the GNSO side but mainly a (unintelligible) GNSO for example.

And there are others like who is which the involvement of our staff is really very important. And perhaps 100% staff for the moment maybe we can add some how like not go into numbers because it would be very difficult but low, high, and medium involvement of council members and/of staff and to so it could be clear if someone looks at list.

Jaime Wagner: Let me give use the example of who is. Can we estimate future involvement of future resources consumption of who is (unintelligible) or not?

Chuck Gomes: Not until we get the cost estimates and feasibility estimates back which is the part of the project that is going on right now. That's why the council made the decision they did.

We were basically saying hey, you know, these studies might be good but we need to evaluate that in the context of the cost effectiveness of doing it. You know, the value that you know them may not warrant the cost it would take to get it or vice versa.

Jaime Wagner: I understand we could estimate the value but we could not if we tried now we would be able to estimate the value but not the costs of future costs.

Chuck Gomes: Well and there's some limitations in estimating value too because if the studies as proposed are not very feasible in other words doable then they may not be very valuable either.

So you have on the value side you have the feasibility estimate. And on the other side the cost side, you know, what would it cost to really do a study if it is feasible. So it is kind of in a pending state until we get that data back.

Jaime Wagner: Yes okay. That (unintelligible) why a project that is pending should not be prioritized because we cannot prioritize it because (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Jaime Wagner: Because it's pending some information is missing some information to that would be necessary to do the prioritization.

Chuck Gomes: Now to use another example fast flux maybe we could possibly prioritize that. It's a little bit - we're not really waiting additional information it's just how important is it to us? So maybe staff giving projects could be prioritized and some can't.

Jaime Wagner: But it's...

Chuck Gomes: And as since the council has given fast flux a low priority without formally so you'd understand.

Jaime Wagner: This is - so there are two kinds of pending. One is pending information and the other is kind of low priority already decided by the council.

Chuck Gomes: Yes so maybe it's not really a pending project. It's just a low priority project and should really be bumped into the other that's a good distinction. Does that make sense to others?

Liz Gasster: Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: How about to you Ken?

Ken Bour: Yes it does. With that description it sounds to me like fast flux was put in a pending state when perhaps it shouldn't have been. But we can move it up.

Chuck Gomes: Yes right exactly.

Ken Bour: And then if it gets say low value on benefit and potentially a high cost on it might land in Quadrant 4 right. But my understanding originally was that we were waiting on a council decision to go. But I didn't maybe I didn't understand it fully.

Chuck Gomes: You know.

Liz Gasster: I think we are waiting for council action I mean.

Chuck Gomes: But council, you know, it's a low priority for council so we, you know, we keep putting it off.

Liz Gasster: Right.

Jaime Wagner: For me it as a newcomer it was just a way for the council to postpone some decision.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. With respect to the definition of prioritized project I'm willing to scratch my head some more on this and maybe talk to Liz and work on it. I think I understand that we need the definition needs to say what prioritized projects are.

And it needs to imply what they're not. Otherwise everything looks like it should be included when we clearly have classes or categories whether we move any individual project from one class to the other.

You know, can be continued to discussed but maybe I can take a shot at trying to amend the definition so that it's more complete and tighter. And then circulate that back to the group rather than try to figure it out in this session.

Jaime Wagner: Okay.

Ken Bour: If that's acceptable I'll try to do that and I'll send it to the list.

Olga Cavalli: Yes and also those changes as we talk about in the Word document in the glossary.

Ken Bour: That's correct. I'll make the changes to the project list and short descriptions and send that out as well.

Olga Cavalli: Great.

Ken Bour: And so what we've managed is that we're a few minutes over so I think maybe we should sort of summarize and then wind it up. We've - I think we have solidified our X and Y definitions. We have agreed what to do with the project list and short descriptions.

And we made a down payment on the definition for what a prioritized project is and more work to be done on that via the list. We did not get to any of these other items in the agenda so I'll summarize and leave those there. And we can take those up at the next session continue along that is.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Jaime Wagner: Okay Ken thanks.

Olga Cavalli: Ken when or group when are we having our next call? Next week.

Liz Gasster: So this week is tough for the staff.

Olga Cavalli: Oh you right. You're right maybe early the other week.

Liz Gasster: That'd be great.

Jaime Wagner: You mean the week from the 25th to 29th.

Liz Gasster: Right.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Jaime Wagner: Well I have a problem on the 27th okay but depending on the timing I will be available.

Liz Gasster: Jaime which day is bad for you? Could you - Jaime could you say again which day is bad for you?

Jaime Wagner: The 25th and the morning here in Brazil and the 27th. And almost all night I have - I will be giving a course.

Olga Cavalli: Maybe Tuesday is fine for you, Tuesday the 26th.

Jaime Wagner: So in the afternoon I can always be participate and the 26th that can be also. It depends on the timing. It will be - but anyway I'm not essential to this.

Chuck Gomes: I don't know you add a lot of good stuff.

Olga Cavalli: Yes I would say that.

Chuck Gomes: In fact I compliment everybody on this group, you know, it's a good group.

Olga Cavalli: It is and...

Jaime Wagner: Well Ken accused me of retrogressing the...

Chuck Gomes: That's okay.

Jaime Wagner: Okay so.

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bour: In fact this is Ken. This whole assessment that we're doing is all about going back and revisiting all the things that we said before. So I probably misspoke there.

Jaime Wagner: I'm joking.

Ken Bour: Okay.

Jaime Wagner: I understood perfectly.

Ken Bour: Is Glen or Gisella still on? This is Ken. I'll send a note.

Glen de Saint Gery: Hi.

Ken Bour: Oh hi Glen. We were hoping maybe we could do a doodle for the week of the 25th through the 29th. My sense is that maybe 26th and 28th were days that worked best.

Glen de Saint Gery: Okay.

Ken Bour: Twenty-sixth, why don't we try 26th, 27th, 28th and...

Glen de Saint Gery: Well isn't 27th a day Jaime said didn't work for him?

Ken Bour: Okay let's - he did.

Jaime Wagner: My best day would be 26th, 28th and 29th.

Ken Bour: Super.

Glen de Saint Gery: Twenty-five, that's 26th.

Jaime Wagner: Twenty-five, 27th - 25 is difficult for me.

Glen de Saint Gery: It's difficult okay so 26th.

Chuck Gomes: Twenty-eighth, 29th.

Glen de Saint Gery: Twenty-eight, 29 Jaime.

Jaime Wagner: Yes 29 is fine day for me.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Twenty-eight is council isn't it?

Glen de Saint Gery: Twenty-eight is council yes so let's take that out. So we've got 26 and 29.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Glen de Saint Gery: That works for me.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Glen de Saint Gery: Okay so I'll get a due lock for that.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much Glen.

Glen de Saint Gery: Pleasure.

Olga Cavalli: Ken so you're sending this summary and next steps for the next call and the part of the agenda that we haven't been able to review yet.

Ken Bour: Yes and may I ask my teammates here if you don't see anything in one day's time please let me know. That thing sat in my inbox ever since last Wednesday and I didn't even know it so. But any how I'll try to be more conscious of that.

Olga Cavalli: Yes and I just realized that today and then my apologies for being chairing this group and didn't realize before. But I've been very busy and I just checked today and I realized that. I will do that before I promise.

Ken Bour: I appreciate the help. Okay I think I've captured all the notes and then so I'll get something out right away this afternoon or tomorrow morning. And then we'll I guess we'll see how the doodle goes.

Olga Cavalli: Okay great. Thank you. Thank you very much Ken.

Ken Bour: Thank you all.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you staff. Thank you friends and have a good week.

Ken Bour: Okay thanks. Bye everybody.

Jaime Wagner: Thank you bye.

END