

**GNSO Work Prioritization Model  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Tuesday 16 February 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 16 February 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-20100216.mp3>

Present for the teleconference:

Olga Cavalli - NCA Chair  
Jaime Wagner - ISP  
Chuck Gomes - Ry SG  
Wolf-Ulrich Knoben - ISP

ICANN Staff  
Ken Bour  
Glen de Saint Géry  
Gisella Gruber-White

Apologies:  
Rob Hoggarth

Coordinator: This call will now be recorded.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much. Gisella, would you be so kind to help me doing the roll call?

Gisella Gruber-White: Absolutely. Good morning, good afternoon to everyone. On today's Work Prioritization Model Group we have on Tuesday the 16th of February, sorry, we have Jaime Wagner, Olga Cavalli, Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, Chuck Gomes.

From staff we have Ken Bower, Glen DeSaintgery and myself, Gisella Gruber-White. And I do not have any apologies. Over to you, Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much, Gisella and thank you Ken for sending over the next steps and summarize our conversation in our last call.

Before we start I would like to exchange some thoughts with you about the comments sent by Stefan and Adrian. I was a little bit surprised, but the comments are variably directed to, I guess me and Ken, because it's to the Chair.

And I've been chairing, I think...

Chuck Gomes: I don't know, Olga that might be directed at the Chair of the Council too.

Olga Cavalli: Well, that's something I also thought, because it's not clear if it's to Chuck, to me, to me and Chuck and also to Ken who has been helping us in this. And I would like to know if you think that we may have changed the way we have been working or something that we should think about before moving forward.

Chuck Gomes: Well, without over-personalizing this thing -- and this is Chuck -- the, you know, they're right that we need to get some closure on this process fairly quickly. Because it's taken a lot longer than any of us anticipated

So without worrying about all the details and the criticisms, I suggest that we do try to do our best to reach some closure so this can be moved onto the Council as quickly as possible.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Any other comments?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Wolf speaking, Olga. So I would say, you know, this kind of conversation is, for me, is typical, you know, when we don't have a chance immediately to elect a language by speaking to each other, you know. Then it might have been, you know, no problem to talk about this.

Because for me what the issue was okay, we have really to think about, you know, how to speak that. Because for me also the overall item is prioritization.

I talk about piratization, but the first thing what I have to do to prioritize anything, so I have to come to a result with regard to that. What my feeling as well, but then, you know, writing these things down so it comes up with - it will end up with this many misunderstandings, and I am afraid this happens this way.

So I'm also - I have for both sides, let me say, I have some good feelings. Because I see okay, we have to hurry up and we have to find a final solution or a final proposal to the Council as soon as possible.

And on the other hand I understand also that we have a different approach than anywhere. Than somewhere else, you know, in other - in entities or so.

And that's all that I have to say.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Wolf. Any other comments?

Jaime Wagner: Yes, please, I would like to comment. This is Jaime.

Olga Cavalli: Jaime, go ahead.

Jaime Wagner: I think - well, I already - I've already sent to the list my thoughts. And I think we are very close to a closing.

And these kind of position or - that Adrian manifested doesn't add anything besides impatience. And I think we will be able to - we should continue with our work and finish it as soon as possible.

And I think we will do that in any one or two meetings ahead. And so I don't see the point made by mainly Adrian besides a sheer criticism from somebody that is detached enough to do candid observations.

That's my point of view.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much, Jaime. Any other comments?

I would like to do mine. I think we have been - we are closing - we're close to the finishing our work.

I think we have to do it. But I also think that we have gone through conversations that otherwise would have been taken to the Council.

So we have been saving time for the Council. That's the feeling I have.

We have been going through a process among ourselves in order to find a model or a prioritization team that will be helpful for the Council. So this is why I think we have to spend some more time perhaps than our original idea.

So any other comments about this? Okay, great. So let's move forward and try to finish our (show).

Ken, you have sent some summary of our next steps. Can we start reviewing them?

I think there have been some comments from Chuck and Wolf, I think. And not myself because I really had no time to make comment.

But perhaps we can review the text with the comments. What do you think about?

Ken Bower: Sure, that would be fine. I would just like to ask you, Olga if you have an Internet connection, do you want to join the...

Olga Cavalli: Yes, I'm - I did join.

Ken Bower: I haven't...

Olga Cavalli: I don't know, what did I open. I open a link. I'm seeing everyone connected. Is this what I have to open?

I'm in Meeting View.

Ken Bower: It should be the GNSO Work Prioritization, the Adobe Connect session.

Chuck Gomes: No, you don't want - Meeting View is fine, that just shows you who's on. You want to get into Adobe Connect.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, yes, I got confused. Sorry.

Ken Bower: That's okay. And the second comment I wanted to make is that Rob Hoggarth is tied up on another call, but he will join us as soon as he can.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, great.

Chuck Gomes: And while we're waiting for Olga to connect, I have a suggestion and if it doesn't work, that's fine. But rather than reading through all of your notes, Ken, we've had them for a few days.

I wonder if we can -- like for example on action item number one, if people have any points they want to discuss to identify them rather than reading through the whole thing. One way we might be able to be a little more efficient in the use of our time.

I for one thought that your suggestions in number one were fine.

Jaime Wagner: For me also.

Olga Cavalli: That's okay.

Ken Bower: Okay, that's great. Then we are good to go, we changed the - we made the language changes and changed the title from Resources Needed to Difficulty and everything's cool.

So we go on to Step 2. Here's Olga. Okay, I'm going to say accept, and there you go.

Let me call it action item one. All right, and with respect to number two, our Step 6 analysis.

Do you - how do you want to go through these?

Chuck Gomes: We probably have to go through these because these require some decisions.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Ken Bower: Okay. So the first one is...

Olga Cavalli: Ken, I'm sorry, it is so small that I cannot read. It's...

Ken Bower: I have it at 145%. Do - can you expand your...

Olga Cavalli: Yes, I can. I'm sorry. No, I thought it was - okay.

Ken Bower: That better?

Olga Cavalli: No. But I'll go through the text. Don't worry.

Ken Bower: Okay. So the first question is should the prioritization result in an unambiguous ranking, meaning sort of individual, each one has a separate spot without any ties. I had just made a note that I thought we might have

answered that in our prior question or session, but I just wanted to make sure everybody agrees.

That we - we're going to allow a prioritization for there to be ties in raw number, right. So there'd be three at Level 4 and whatever.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Ken Bower: Anybody else disagree?

Jaime Wagner: I just - we would recommend that in the event of a tie we should proceed to difficulty or...

Ken Bower: Yes, that's correct.

Chuck Gomes: Rank it.

Ken Bower: Well, that - but I think that that was only going to be true if the Council needed to break the tie for some reason. If it didn't need to break the tie then the tie would just remain.

Chuck Gomes: I agree with that, yes.

Jaime Wagner: Okay.

Ken Bower: So what had happened -- let me just say it clearly. What would happen is we would go through the prioritization based on value, the new definition.

And we would end up with 15 or 12, whatever the number of projects is. And let's say that in positions two, three and four they were all ranked two because they all had the same value.

So you have one, two, two, two and then you go to number five. We wouldn't break that tie unless the Council said, oh, we have to stop a project, you know, that high up in the prioritization for some reason and we've got to pick between those three.

Then they would go to resources - I mean difficulty.

Jaime Wagner: Okay, it's okay for me.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Ken Bower: Okay. Ties are okay.

The next question was what frequency should the process be exercised? I had proposed quarterly in my last e-mail.

I don't think we actually nailed it down. Does anybody want to try to nail it down?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: No - it's Wolf speaking. I wouldn't try to nail it down.

But I think just for me quarterly seems to be too frequent. So that is - so just think about it, every three months to do an update of the prioritization?

I don't think if I look to a project where I was involved so far, I don't think that the - so often make too much progress, you know, within three months. That we can think about a reprioritization of this project.

So...

Jaime Wagner: Ken? Can I -- this is Jaime -- can I give a suggestion? To include the prioritization exercises, an item of the agenda for the face to face meetings in - ICANN meetings, they would be three meetings annually.

Hello?

Olga Cavalli: I have a question. What happens when we have a new project?

Should we do again a categorization exercise? Or we wait until the next time?

Jaime Wagner: This is the third point.

Ken Bower: Yes. We're actually going to come right up to that in a second, Olga. And maybe we could take that question first.

But that - they do relate to each other a little bit because if you - let's say you do the prioritization once a year. And a new project comes up, you know, fitting it in will be a little bit more difficult if the last time you did a prioritization was 11 months ago, the worst case, right.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Ken Bower: The quarterly, I can see how that might be a little too frequent. The - what about (Jamie's) suggestion, the three times at the annual ICANN meetings?

Olga Cavalli: That sounds fine, because it also goes through the rhythm of the meetings.

Jaime Wagner: Yes, yes. That's okay.

Ken Bower: Any objections?

Olga Cavalli: No.

Chuck Gomes: I think that's a pretty good idea. One of the things the in person meetings would provide -- and this is something that could be done on the weekend working sessions...

Ken Bower: Yes?

Chuck Gomes: ...is that it would allow for the group type rating if we decide to go that way. And that would really facilitate that probably.

So that might be a good thing to try. I definitely think quarterly's too often.

Ken Bower: Yes. Okay, excellent. So to Olga, we're on - so the next question was in fact, how should new projects be added to the list and incorporated into the process in terms of both your - the ranking?

And I noted here that we discussed an approach, and do we just need to confirm it? And so I'll just highlight it.

I didn't actually lay it out here, did I? But I did in another e-mail that I sent earlier.

But anyway, what we basically discussed was that - so if you've done it in the last four months, right -- so three times a year, perhaps the Council members would have a general recollection of what they had done. And so a new project would just be handled exactly the same way as any of the original 15.

The new project comes up, it's number 16, we use the same exact rating approach if we break into small groups for Delphi purposes, they go through the same exercise and they just rate that project. Keeping in mind the 15 that they had just done a few months ago.

And so as long as that kind of works, then we can get a group rating from the teams and take the median value of those, and then that becomes how that project slots right in. That's what we discussed last time.

And I thought we had pretty much consensus on that. Does that work?

Chuck Gomes: It does for me.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Jaime Wagner: Well, I understood that there would be a process of group evaluation. Is that our consensus?

Ken Bower: May I suggest that we take that up momentarily? That's on the list today as well...

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Ken Bower: But we - I don't think we've actually ever said we've done our analysis on whether it's individual or group. We've talked around it, but we haven't actually done it.

But that's coming up in a minute. I think the key point for new projects here is whatever process we recommend for the group of the 15 or 16 would be applied to an individual project that comes up new, provided that it cannot wait until the next ICANN meeting.

Right, so let's say a new project was identified like now, this vertical integration. And we're literally a week or two away from an ICANN meeting.

We would just prioritize, I would guess, at that session, right. Do them all.

And then if it's in between an ICANN meeting and we have to get a rating or a prioritization then we would use the same process that we normally use, but just do that one.

Jaime Wagner: Okay. I think the process that we will use - that the Council will use in this first prioritization effort will be different than the effort that will be done by - at the periodical evaluation. Because it will be only a confirmation of something that we've already done.

And this one will be a first time. And I think the prioritization of a new project follows much more in the lines of these first exercise we will do with the Council, then the periodical re-evaluation process.

Ken Bower: This is Ken. I think I understand what you're saying, but I'm not sure I - I'm not getting the difference between - let me draw this out carefully.

So let's say we have 15 projects and let's say for the very first time we were going to do them in Nairobi with the full Council. And we do that same exercise with the Delphi, we've broken into groups and we've got our - and we finished it.

Now the next ICANN meeting comes up which is, I don't know when that is -- in Latin America or something. Are you saying that that process would be different than the first one?

Jaime Wagner: Yes.

Ken Bower: And could you say how? Because I'm not understanding - the second time around I would think you'd take all 15 projects and you'd just put aside the fact that we had grouped or rated them before and you'd do them all over again.

The - and the reason is mostly because of something you brought up awhile ago, which is that because the dynamics of this changes frequently that you have to kind of go back to all the projects and look at them over again and give them new ratings.

So let's say that STI was number one in Nairobi and in Latin America it might be four. If it's done over again using the same process.

Jaime Wagner: I'm just saying that we will not be able to forget what we have done before.

Ken Bower: And that's probably not a bad thing, right, because the more knowledge that Council members have about the projects, what their status is and all that will just make everybody - make the final prioritization that much more rich and valuable, right?

Jaime Wagner: Okay. Okay. Well, the process will be the same but okay.

Ken Bower: Okay. That's all I wanted to make sure. Okay. So the process will always be the same, and except for a new project we would just do the one.

But we would still use exactly the same techniques.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Just (trying to) -- Wolf speaking, so Ken, that it means - using the same techniques means at the next ICANN meeting. So I understand the following so right now, so in case we (it's important this upcoming) -- (this) priority let's just say.

So immediately, it has to be prioritized immediately so there is no need of any prioritization. Because it's of priority and the Council has to do or has to decide to do that.

So in case there is some - there may be this project doesn't need immediate action, so that means it can wait for the next prioritization which is to be done the next meeting, ICANN meeting. Is that the case?

Ken Bower: Yes. This is Ken. That's what I had said, and if everybody agrees that that's okay.

I think just summarizing, if a new project comes up and it cannot wait until the next ICANN meeting where we would do a full prioritization, then it gets prioritized using the same techniques.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. But the full prioritization is up to the next ICANN meeting.

Ken Bower: Right.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: And full prioritization means taking into consideration all existing projects.

Ken Bower: Right.

Olga Cavalli: Ken, this is Olga. What's the difference in between a project that can wait to be prioritized or that must be? How can we handle that?

Ken Bower: Just - I don't know if there's a rule that we could use, but it - for example vertical integration, I'll just ask. If we knew we were going to be doing a full Council member prioritization of all 16 projects -- let's say that's how many we have -- and including vertical integration, would we have to ask the Council to do it now, or just wait a couple of weeks until the next meeting?

Chuck Gomes: I - my response? It depends.

Ken Bower: Right. And what would your answer be for this particular project, Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Well, probably on that one the Council would not have supported waiting because of the fact that there were people really concerned about the timeframe and still are. So in other cases I think it might be perfectly legitimate to delay the exercise and make a decision after you do the exercise.

Ken Bower: So the answer is it depends.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, I know you'd love it.

Ken Bower: I do like it. And I think it's - there are cases when that's the right answer.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Ken Bower: Because the circumstances cannot be predicted in advance by rule.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Ken Bower: So it's going to have to do with whether it has to start right away, whether there's a sense of urgency to it, whether, you know, there's already people ready to get started, all kinds of things like that.

Chuck Gomes: In fact, Ken, a related question that comes up is, you know, as far as, you know, let's say we have to do it right now and fit the new project in. There could be cases it seems to me where we don't even need to go through the prioritization exercise for the specific decision.

We know it's urgent and we know it's got to be started now. Let's see if we can find the resources for it without impacting other projects and just go ahead.

And then when we come to the regular prioritization exercise it would be fitted in then. Does that make sense to people?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I think so, yes. Wolf speaking. So but for me it's still not very clear.

For example, the practicability of it, it means if we have - at each ICANN meeting we'll have a prioritization meeting let me say. Because the question for me is how much time we spend on prioritization at each ICANN meeting.

So it may take an hour or one and a half hour or even more. So are we really prepared well to take such time to - for every meeting for prioritization?

Is that too much? So that's one question for me.

And the other one is if a new project comes in, we should have all of the flexibility of it just to look at the existing lists of projects. And if we think, if the Council thinks okay, that's okay and we could just rank a new project or fit it into any number of priority of that, and we could agree on that then that should be enough.

And there is no must for reprioritize the whole list. Was I clear enough?

Chuck Gomes: Now, Wolf are you suggesting then that we don't go through the full exercise each time?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, it depends. You know, I don't have an estimate how much time it takes. If it takes two hours for example, I would say that is too much.

For every ICANN meeting to devote two hours for a prioritization, I think that's too much. Because we don't talk about content, so we have to talk more about contents rather than prioritization.

Olga Cavalli: This is Olga, if I make a comment. I think that if we are going to make something face to face during the ICANN meetings less than an hour, it's not possible.

And perhaps the work should be done first and then the final list of priorities could be finished in a face to face meeting in an open discussion. But we may need some time before the meeting.

Ken Bower: This is Ken...

Jaime Wagner: This is Jaime. Can I add something?

Ken Bower: Please.

Jaime Wagner: I think such a meeting would need some preparation and planning before, so in the meeting it could be very objective and we could do this exercise in one hour, I think.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. That's my - exactly my point, yes.

Jaime Wagner: But I have another thing to add, is we - along the lines of what Chuck said is that we live the - without the prioritization work and team or process until now. And I think projects can be added along the way and wait for a full exercise.

And we should not impact the whole Council with another burden of doing a single project prioritization. I think as a rule -- I know it depends, but as a rule it could be - the project could be undertaken without a priority assigned to it and then have the prioritization at the next ICANN meeting.

Ken Bower: This is Ken. I believe that is exactly what Chuck said earlier. I captured that in my notes up here, and so I'll reflect that in our next.

So the only time you would ever prioritize a new project individually is if it absolutely was necessary in order to manage it effectively.

Jaime Wagner: Yes.

Ken Bower: If you could manage it effectively without going through the prioritization exercise then you would.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, I think that's correct.

Ken Bower: Yes. That's what I've tried to capture.

Chuck Gomes: So one of the first questions we have to ask is can we manage it - in other words are there sufficient resources available without negatively impacting other projects? And if so, then we don't need to spin our wheels prioritizing something that we know we can do anyway.

Ken Bower: Yes. And in fact picking up on a suggestion you made, Chuck about a set of questions we might ask, that's one of the four coming up in just a second here that we could take a look at.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, yes. And then in fact it's probably - I was just looking at the order of those, and I think it's one of the first - it may be the first one we need to ask.

Ken Bower: Maybe so. Yes. I'm happy to reorient them.

Chuck Gomes: No (unintelligible) I understand.

Ken Bower: I do think - Ken again. I do think that Wolf's comment about the timing -- and everybody else has chimed in on that -- I do think that's an issue.

You know, I'm remembering back when we did our conference where we did the - maybe it was X or Y first and then we did X secondly. It took two full hour sessions just to do those ratings.

And I realize that it was our first time, and maybe the first time it will be - take longer to do. Still at all, I wonder if that's something with - because you have a discussion, right?

Well, I think it's this and I think it's that. You start with a test rating and then everybody's all over the map.

And we only had three or four people doing it. What if you had 15 and you've got people everywhere from a number one to a number five?

Then you have to have all these discussions and - so I think we - I'll capture that and we'll have to have some more thought about whether it really can be done at a face to face ICANN meeting, or maybe somewhere in preparation offline. Because - or - yes, because I think to just do it at the ICANN meeting would take more than an hour for sure.

Jaime Wagner: For the first time, I think so.

Ken Bower: Yes, yes, okay. All right, I think we can move ahead.

We've talked about how new projects started to be incorporated and we've also talked about the periodicity and how that might work. Chuck had suggested the last time that we develop some questions that the Council might ask itself when a new project surfaces.

And I tried to write a few of them down here. Do you guys want to talk about those next or move on?

Jaime Wagner: Ken, can I add something? Just about the - and Chuck's answer to your question, the answer that is always right is it depends.

But I - the question that arises is it depends on what? And I think it depends on the decision of the Chairman if it is needed or not to go to a prioritization before the next meeting.

So I think we should leave this written. It will depend and I suggest it will depend on the decision of the Chairman of the Council.

Ken Bower: I've captured that in my notes up here on the right. Does anybody object to that?

Chuck Gomes: Well, it's possible that some members of the Council might because we're less of an authoritarian organization and more of a bottom up organization. I suspect that any Chair that is doing the job appropriately would probably respect the wishes, you know, the input from the Council in that regard.

Some of it's going to be driven by the board. For example, you know, we were given this task of the AOC review teams with just a short deadline.

You know, that kind of thing is hey, we have to get this done, we have a short window, we did it. I mean, it was no question that we had to go ahead and proceed.

In other cases it's going to be more volitional in the sense like for example, even the vertical integration PDP, so.

Jaime Wagner: Well, the Chair - I'm saying that the Chair has the prerogative to do this recommendation to the Council, but...

Chuck Gomes: Yes, right.

Jaime Wagner: But I'm not thinking he will be authoritarian.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Yes, so we're on the same page.

Jaime Wagner: Yes. I'm not Adrian.

Ken Bower: What I - this is Ken. What I wrote is suggest that the Chair - so the team would suggest in its recommendations that the Chair be allowed to make a recommendation to the Council as to it depends.

And then I guess if everybody said, well, that makes sense, then that would be fine, right. So let's say that Chuck in this particular case as the Chair said, I don't think we have to actually prioritize vertical integration. We can catch it at the next prioritization session.

And everybody around said, okay, that's fine, that's fine, that's fine, that's fine. Then that would be it, right.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Ken Bower: Does that work?

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Ken Bower: Okay. Anything else - do you guys want to take a look at these four questions or do it off - on the list?

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Well, I have a - Wolf speaking. I have a more general question to this.

It's how is it prioritization related to, let me say the ICANN's priority list? ICANN's stuff? The main overall program?

So how is interrelation between them? Is it sure that there is an interrelation? And how?

Should there be - is that also a point we should discuss here? Or because, you know, I understand the following: so staff or ICANN shall have a priority list from their point of view as well.

So right now - so we are talking about implementation of new projects and getting them - and giving the old - the total staff - the total number of projects, giving new priorities maybe every ICANN meeting. So is that realistic if it's regards to the overall ICANN program?

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: I don't know that the ICANN in the broader sense of the word, has a list of priorities that could be mapped to what we're doing. What are you referring to?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: The main - for example, the budget plan, ICANN budget plan, you know, all these things. So they are talking about 2011 budget plan.

So behind that budget plan there must be a kind of program, what to do in that year. And also kind of let me say timeline how to turn out those projects.

So that's what I understand from...

Chuck Gomes: So the operations plan that...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, operations plan.

Chuck Gomes: The budget, yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. Operations plan.

Ken Bower: This is Ken. My sense -- I wish Rob were on, we can ask him when he joins -- but my understanding is that ICANN takes its prioritization from the community.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Sure. It should be.

Ken Bower: In which case we may be chasing our proverbial tail. The - ICANN probably in the absence of a prioritization list, they put an operating plan together.

But if the Council actually developed one, that would probably dominate. In which case ICANN would dovetail to the Council's priority list rather than the other way around.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Yes, okay. But, you know, it should be then ensured that ICANN can follow our - we are taking - each ICANN meeting - that may be a different question then. Okay, fine. Thank you.

Ken Bower: I'll just capture this as a question and we'll come back to it.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Thanks.

Ken Bower: So the - I just wrote up four or so questions that occurred to me that a Council might ask itself when a new project comes up. So we've done a full prioritization, we're in the middle between ICANN meetings.

It's a Council meeting, a vertical integration pops up. The questions are, first - and again the order here could be - I tried to put them in the order I think of them, but maybe not.

First was should this new project have resources assigned to it? And if so, what type skills and quantities are needed?

So that question's asking, should we actually work on this project first. And then the second question was, are there sufficient resources -- staff and community available to undertake this project assuming that we've said yes to the first question -- without causing adverse impacts to other project work?

The third question I came up with is, to undertake this new project, should any other project work be stopped or postponed? And then the last one is, should this new project have a date or a deadline imposed, thus establishing its urgency?

And if it is determined to be urgent, can we find some consequences that would help that date to be perceived and treated as though it really were critical? Those are just ones that came to my mind.

Maybe you guys have some others or...

Chuck Gomes: Yes, this is Chuck. I think there - it's a pretty good list of questions.

And actually the more I look at it, I like the order pretty well too. It doesn't need - mean it has to be rigid, but it looks pretty good to me.

Jaime Wagner: Well, there is a first question that I would - should this project be undertaken at all?

Ken Bower: Yes. That's what I was trying to get at with the first one. Should this - should we assign any people to do it at all?

Jaime Wagner: Yes, okay.

Ken Bower: Should it be undertaken? But I could reword that one, Jaime. I like your...

Jaime Wagner: Yes, no, it's - okay. It's okay. I understood that.

It seems to me that once the project comes to the list, it is already a project - or the Council should have the (unintelligible) that it will determine if the new proposal will be a project or not. I think at this stage when it's not already a - it is already a project or not, this is my question.

When it comes to the prioritization, it will - can already with the status of an ongoing project?

Ken Bower: This is Ken. I don't know the answer. Anybody else, Chuck?

For example, vertical integration, the question I think he's asking is when it comes up -- like it comes to the Council -- is it already determined to be a project? Does the Council say - could the Council say, sorry but we're not going to work on that.

We're not going to - it's not going to be undertaken.

Chuck Gomes: Well, we do have - I mean, that's what happened with the vertical integration PDP. The issues report was prepared, it came to the Council and a vote was taken to initiate a PDP that was basically to initiate the project.

If that vote had failed, it would have been decided not to make that a project.

Ken Bower: Okay, so that's neat because in a way we can tie that sort of first question really to - well, that would only apply to PDPs. But I think that is a, should it be undertaken?

And the Council actually takes a vote in a PDP case, and depending on whether it gets the right number of votes it is initiated or it's not.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. And anything that's going to require resources like that, we're going to have to make some sort of decision even if it's not a PDP whether to, you know, devote resources to it.

Ken Bower: Yes.

Jaime Wagner: Okay.

Ken Bower: So I'll - what I'll - I'll do a little wordsmithing on that first one just to get the idea of should it be undertaken, which means in essence should the project have resources assigned, right?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Jaime Wagner: Yes. In the end I think your question resolves the problem. Because I think I was creating a problem that does not exist.

Ken Bower: Okay, that's fine. Thank you for that.

The next bullet point then if we're finished with those is -- this is probably okay to pass here -- since the rating process is (rel) is it possible to slot a new project without re-evaluating all the others? And I think we've talked our way through that already, right?

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Ken Bower: So I would say we can skip that one.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Ken Bower: The next one is, how are changes to project status identified, recommended, approved and incorporated? And I think we've addressed that one.

That came from an earlier comment Jaime made about the sort of dynamic nature of all this and that it's going to change every three, four months. And if we do it three times a year, that should enable us to capture the status of

changes and different circumstances in the environment that would cause the prioritization to change.

Is that fair?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Jaime Wagner: So let me understand and put this formally. A project status would only change in the - during the formal re-evaluation of priorities? Is that right?

Chuck Gomes: I don't think that's totally correct, Jaime. This is Chuck again.

Because if a decision is made to start a new project that impacts resources on other projects, its status could change somewhat when that happens. Isn't that correct?

Ken Bower: This is Ken. You know, it's interesting because the project's status changes maybe every day, it may be every hour.

But I think what we're saying is we would only recognize those changes at a couple of different points. We would capture them in formal prioritization sessions or in the evaluation of a new project.

That would be the only time they would actually be captured.

Jaime Wagner: Or formalized.

Ken Bower: Formalized, yes. Otherwise I think we would be prioritizing all the time.

And so the trick I think here, the challenge is to find a frequency of prioritization that's not too fast and not too long so that too many changes

can't happen that you don't get formally recognized. And what we've settled on so far is three times a year.

Jaime Wagner: Let me ask Chuck, we have previously -- and I had suggested that the Chairman could propose a change of status of a project in between these regular prioritization exercises. And I think this is the case that you mentioned. Is that Chuck - is that right, Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, I think so.

Jaime Wagner: Okay. We suggest before that the Chair - knowing you're recognizing a need to change a status would recommend that. And if - would recommend that through the list, I think so.

Ken Bower: This is Ken. I think I've captured that.

So project status changes essentially occur formally three times a year, informally when new projects are undertaken and at any other time as recommended by the Chair.

Jaime Wagner: I think it is formally in all three situations.

Ken Bower: Let me just say what I meant by formally, and I can - I'm happy to change the word. What I meant formally, it was the exercise of the prioritization rating process.

To me a formal recognition is the one in which we use the process to capture and put it into form and structure and listing, rank order, that sort of thing. Informal is we discuss what changes have occurred, we recognize things that might - but we don't formally capture them and try to remake our list.

That's what I meant.

Jaime Wagner: Well, I - sincerely I didn't like the phrasing, because I think once a decision is recommended by a Chair and is recognized by the - all the Council members through the list, this is formal enough to me. It's written and it's documented.

Ken Bower: This is Ken. Okay, I'll find a way to take the word formally out and substitute it with something else.

Okay, I've got - thank you. I've got enough notes to fix that.

So that - what I'll basically try to indicate here is, when project statuses are going to change all the time. The rank ordering will capture them officially so to speak three times a year.

But when new projects are undertaken, clearly project status will have to be discussed to the extent that any other project is impacted. And then if the Chair at any other time says, you know, we've got to redo - we've got to think ourselves around the projects and the prioritization, then he can make a recommendation anytime.

Got it?

Jaime Wagner: Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Ken Bower: Okay. All right. Now to a question that we have not dealt with directly in a long time, but it's time, maybe.

This has to do with the individual versus the group ratings. Jaime brought this up a little earlier, I think, that, you know, have we really - are we clear now that what we would recommend to the Council is group ratings, individual.

There's a series of questions here. I'll just try to summarize them.

You know, if we settle on group sessions, how - should the Councilors do them individually first? Then, you know, what sizes and configurations would we recommend?

We had talked at one point about trying another test with our group into the little smaller groups, even, like two or three versus four or five. And there were some considerations that I had written awhile ago on that.

And then the sort of last idea is if we decide to do group ratings, should we also recommend to the Council that they be facilitated using Adobe Connect with the voting and polling feature.

Okay, so this is - so that's just a summary of some of the issues. What do you guys think?

Jaime Wagner: Well, in the - I think - I'm thinking if it will be done in a face to face meeting, if it makes sense to do a small group experience.

Olga Cavalli: I think it should be done previously in smaller groups. And then the face to face meeting like finishing the work.

Chuck Gomes: Well, we have one logistical issue. We're - this thing isn't going to be ready for action in Nairobi.

And it's not going to be a very good face to face meeting to do it there anyway. For other reasons.

But so the first time around I don't think we want to wait for the exercise until Brussels, so that's one issue. But secondly with regard to how we do this whether it be individually or in groups or whatever, I kind of like the group process but it's much more complicated and time consuming to do.

So I just throw that out for us to think about, because the harder the process is to do and the more time consuming it is, the more challenging our success is going to be. So that's two different points that I throw out.

Olga Cavalli: I think that facing the Nairobi meeting and taking into consideration that some people will not be there and we may have an exception of process before Brussels and the review again and do a presentation again in Brussels as the second time, I agree with Chuck that it's time consuming having groups. But I think the outcome will be better.

Ken Bower: This is Ken. I just want to back up that comment with data.

We can prove just in our small group that the variance around the answers that you get using individuals is considerably higher obviously than you get when you do it in the groups. And one of the things we discovered in the Delphi approach with the polling feature is that I think in only one case did it take more than one iteration to reach a tight enough consensus where the answer that we picked was only one away from the other ones that we had.

I'm not saying that very elegantly, but I think you know what I mean. It is definitely a longer process though, and that's the downside to it.

So the thing to - here's the nut. If you have 15, 20 Councilors let's say and you give them all the ranking sheet with the definition of value and the list of the 15 projects, and individually and independently they go through and they do their ratings, my prediction is that what will happen is that by the time you average all those results most projects will be rated four - between four and six.

And so we'll have a huge bunch up in the center where projects are rated four, five or six. Well, I'm sorry, it would be around the four area.

It'll be three to five is what I really wanted to say. And we won't have any twos, there won't be any sixes, there won't be any ones.

We didn't get any ones or sevens ourselves even after the Delphi process.

Olga Cavalli: Well, that's my concern somehow. You said it more correctly, but...

Jaime Wagner: Well, but that is a problem, this is a problem. I think this is a no problem.

Because once we have - the problem is with size. Once we have a way to remove away the ties, it's okay.

We have a process that works. And I would recommend that - to do the way we have done it, we did it.

At first everybody has its own ranking in a group section. Then we will have a discussion of - with the Adobe Connect feature or polling feature.

And we would do as we've done the last time we rank them together with blind - with not knowing who was voting, but only the amount - the number of votes. And then it would flash and the - if there were the very different weights, the extremes would justify and then if needed it would - we would have another round.

And I think this could work in one hour. Because we are now with only one access.

Ken Bower: That's a very good observation. Jaime, I think you were - okay, so I think we understand your recommendation is essentially a twofold step.

Councilors do an individual rating, then they bring them to a small group session at which we use the polling and voting feature. And I think - that

process I don't think has the disadvantages that I was just speaking about a minute ago.

I was addressing myself to just doing individual ratings all by themselves without the group session. And that I think tends to produce averages that will all cluster around the center.

It's just the nature of what happens when you take a two and a six and you average it together. You know, you get something in the middle.

So...

Chuck Gomes: Let me make sure I...

Ken Bower: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Let me make sure I understand. So are we talking about - okay, by the way I do support the - just like we did in our group is, everybody individually ranks and then we go to a group.

If we go to a - are we talking about going to a total one group session to do it, or multiple small groups? I think either one could be considered.

Jaime Wagner: My recommendation - what I was thinking is to go to a whole group session.

Chuck Gomes: I think that's simpler and probably more time efficient. What do others think?

Olga Cavalli: Yes. I agree.

Ken Bower: This is Ken. I'm not sure it would be more time efficient.

And my reasoning is that now you have to - if there are 15 opinions or 20 opinions, you have to give each one a chance to speak. If there's only four or five in a small group, you know, you only go through four opinions at a time.

So it could take a much longer period of time for each project to get through the polling rating system. The - and just to finish that thought, if you have let's say a Council of 20 members and you break it up into four groups of five or five groups of four, those four -- once they're finished with their Delphi scores -- we get them.

We take the four or five group scores and then we find the median between those. That would be the - so that you don't have - once you do a group of four or a group of five, you don't then have to go and do a much larger group. You're done.

But I tell you that I think I - the thing that I like about this group idea, the whole Council all together is, it will take much longer to do 15 projects as a total group but then everybody - you have a consensus now of the whole Council instead of four different groups. The only question in my mind is how difficult will it be to arrive at consensus when you have 20 people involved?

Jaime Wagner: Ken, this is Jaime. I have the experience of doing this kind of rating with a group of 10, around 10 people. And 12, 10, 12 people - and we rank a much larger amount of projects than we are dealing with -- it's much more than 15.

And in our case it takes four hours of each meeting, in - 20 days apart. But what I would like to add is that only the extreme weights will have to speak.

We - you don't need to give the word to everybody. Only the extremes should defend their opinion.

Ken Bower: This is Ken. So we could establish maybe some, I don't want to call them rules, but some procedures that say how we could get through this in an efficient way.

For example, another thing that one could do is to say each person who gets to speak, you know, you only have four minutes or two minutes or something like that. Because we - if you just do the math, in an hour, right, if you have 15 projects to do in 60 minutes you have four minutes apiece.

You've got 20 people. Even if you have extreme positions on either side -- and you almost always will on every project; we had them and we had a much smaller group -- you're going to have people who are going to want to talk about why they think it should not be high value or it should be low value.

And then you do the poll, then you compare again. And if you still have gaps between where the median is and, you know, we had a rule that said the answers couldn't be more than - they could not beat by more than three contiguous slots.

So you could have a two, three, four or a three, four, five but you couldn't have a one, three, four, five. You'd have to make the one move somewhere closer.

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bower: Go ahead.

Jaime Wagner: Ken.

Ken Bower: Yes.

Jaime Wagner: I think we won't be able in this first exercise -- should it be done in Nairobi or Brussels, I don't know where -- we won't be able to do it one hour. The first

one will - it will be - we will need at least two hours to go through this process for the first time.

Ken Bower: So this is a question. How's everybody feeling about the idea that has now been proposed that the group session -- everybody does it individually, I think you've all said that already -- then the group is everybody at one session, the whole Council.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: Yes. It's Wolf speaking. So I'm in favor of this idea as well.

But I'm thinking about whether the, in preparing such a session, there should be a - let me say a proposal should come up with regards to prioritization. A proposal made by the Chairman or us, a smaller group or wherever it comes from.

And this is just a proposal, not - and it could be (unintelligible) and all these things. And after this a ranking is to be made, by not coming up with that rather than just to start from scratch.

It may help also the discussion. It may help finding people a direction.

And it will not, let me say, impede people though to stand up and tell us their opinion. Really not, but it may help the process.

Olga Cavalli: This is Olga. I think that if we do - if we don't do previously our work individually or in a group, small groups or big groups, the one hour session won't never - will never be enough. It's just to finalize the work and to finish details and exchange last ideas.

But it's only one hour. It's not a lot of time.

Chuck Gomes: Guys, I'm going to have to jump off. So I will let you continue to grapple with this.

And it's possible I won't be able to make a call next week, but I encourage you to proceed without me if I can't.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Jaime Wagner: Thank you.

Ken Bower: Thanks. I can give this some thought between now and the next session. The - I think I hear Olga saying that to try to do the - a group session with the entire Council would be burdensome and would take a very long time.

And...

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Ken Bower: This is Ken. I tend to agree with that assessment. I think it would.

I'm also not figuring out how the Council could just do - tie up loose ends or something. Well, let me go back.

Remember when we did our individual ratings? If we found any project that had a consensus already based on the individual ratings then we didn't discuss it in the group session, right.

And we had some of those, right. There were three or four of them we didn't have to discuss on the - on both axes.

That could happen here. So if we had 15 projects, we might only have to discuss 12 instead of 15.

But the thing is once you have 20 people rating instead of just four or five, there might be wider gaps. And therefore there might not be any ones that have a consensus already.

So one of the difficulties I think we're going to have is trying to figure this all out without really having tried it. You know, it's hard to know what's going to happen until you actually try it.

Jaime Wagner: What I understood what Wolf was saying is that even with - if we recommend a process and the people - the individuals at the Council can speak without following the rules of the process. Is that your observation, Wolf?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: That's correct. So I just wonder whether we could find a way because, you know, for me it's - if that was a - do we start with it from scratch, do we just let the Council start from the scratch again, just according to some rules we are proposing?

Or going beyond that - do we go beyond that also to come up with a proposal and prioritization proposal of the list and then let's discuss and then goes through this prioritization process.

Jaime Wagner: I understand. The list we made or the ranking we made will not be disclosed to the Council.

We will - the Council will do the work by itself from scratch and following the rules, the methodology that we've suggested. But even though there will be always some individuals in the Council that will not follow the rules.

The existence of the law is not enough to be obedience, okay. But I think we should plan for a two hour session in our first exercise.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, but why couldn't we go to the Council for this discussion and offer these alternatives; either starting from the scratch or starting with a basic proposal. So...

Ken Bower: Wolf, this is Ken. May I ask you when you say a basic proposal, do you mean a ranking?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. Yes. A proposal, it is not binding. But just a proposal with something we have thought about.

Okay, maybe not everybody is not in line with that, why not. But it may also help to some people.

Jaime Wagner: Yes, I think Wolf is suggesting that if we came up with our proposal rankings, this could -- although it was not our first idea, I think he is proposing that if we do that, this could accelerate the process in some way.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, it could be helpful.

Jaime Wagner: I think this is Wolf's suggestion. I'm not saying that I endorse it right now because I should give it more thought.

Because this is not what we were commended to do.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: But, you know, we're just discussion about the way how go find, how to facilitate the process. So for me, I'm not sure but it could help facilitate, but I feel as a - maybe as a chance.

And we could provide it as a point to discuss about that the next Council meeting as well in Nairobi, to say okay, you have two choices. Just starting from the scratch or coming up with (unintelligible) and then to this prioritization.

And then let the Council talk about this...

Jaime Wagner: Decide, okay.

Ken Bower: This is Ken. I have a slightly modified version of this that I want to throw out real quickly.

What if instead of having - so I'm borrowing from Wolf's idea. What if each stakeholder group put up a single individual that would be their representative to become part of a standing group that would do prioritization?

And so we have four stakeholder groups. And then everybody else would go in like one - would have one representative.

Maybe the one - one of the non-comm appointees or somebody would be - represent all the other groups. Now what we could do is say to those individuals, your job is separately and away from the Council, your job is to get your groups to agree on a ranking of these 15 projects that you will bring to a session with your other colleagues who are also representatives of their groups.

So you're only going to have five people in one standing committee that will do all the prioritization. But they will bring with them a collective understanding that they get on their own from their constituencies or stakeholder groups.

And so they come - so you already have a built-in consensus process coming in, and then those five people do a group Delphi like we did. And when that ranking is done, that's it.

Olga Cavalli: Ken, this is Olga. I think we went through this discussion before.

I somehow agree. But we also thought at the time, and correct me if I'm wrong, that this stakeholder approach could be very biased differently for different projects.

It's only a comment. I like the idea that somehow that the Council is organized.

Jaime Wagner: I don't know if your suggestion, Ken, is that we should keep with the small group approach and you think this would be more efficient than go to a Delphi session of the whole group. I have my doubts on that.

I think we would - a new step that would not alleviate discussion because of what Olga just said because we have the bias of the constituencies. And then when we come to the whole group - and then also entrenched prejudices that are already set up would not facilitate.

I think when we come up with a new idea with prioritization to the whole group as a fresh, we avoid these entrenched prejudices that I - or bias that we already have in the individual constituencies. So I would much more favor Wolf's idea of facing Delphi session with the whole Council and offering them the option of base their ranking in the previous - or knowing a previous ranking or not.

Or to offer them this choice.

Ken Bower: This is Ken. Okay.

I don't understand yet how prejudices would not manifest themselves in a total Council rating. I think the - because the people in the Council come from stakeholder groups and constituencies.

And so if they have a prejudice or a bias about a project, we're going to hear about it in the Council session just as you would if each - if the Council said

we're going to - for the purposes of prioritization we're going to create a delegate system. We're going - we're not going to try to do this en masse, a whole big group.

We're going to - each stakeholder has a delegate that goes to a session and they prioritize with their colleagues in the other stakeholder groups. And they are challenged and charged with the responsibility of collecting up the information from their groups.

I think we end up with the same prejudices, but maybe the process isn't as good. I haven't thought it thoroughly through.

And I don't want to defend it too vigorously here. But I do think it would be more efficient in terms of time spent in a Delphi, because you'd only have five people participating instead of 20.

But, you know, we could try - we're just going to - we won't know until we try, I don't think.

Jaime Wagner: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. Guys, I think we should finish our call. It's - I didn't realize the time.

Ken Bower: I'm sorry, yes. It's 15 minutes after.

Olga Cavalli: No, it's just...

Ken Bower: Okay, so...

Olga Cavalli: ...I have a (unintelligible).

Ken Bower: ...this is Ken. I think we'll have to come back to this subject.

I'll try to do some summaries of what we've discussed there and we can take a look at them.

Olga Cavalli: How much time we have before Nairobi? How many Tuesdays we have?

Ken Bower: We have the 23rd which is next week.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Ken Bower: And then the second of March. When is Nairobi? It's the 9th, right?

Olga Cavalli: It's the first week - no, the second week of March.

Ken Bower: Yes, so we have two sessions.

Jaime Wagner: I will be traveling on the 4th. If I go, because right now everything is on the air.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, I'll be going. And I'll be there Saturday afternoon.

Ken Bower: But to answer your question, I think we have two weeks. We have two Tuesdays. We have next Tuesday and the one after. And then it's Nairobi.

Olga Cavalli: Well, we have to present something in Nairobi so we have a deadline there. And...

Jaime Wagner: Olga?

Olga Cavalli: Yes?

Jaime Wagner: Can I suggest that we prepare a prioritization session of the whole Council to (examine) this as a first item of our next meeting to recommend ICANN to

prepare a whole Council exercise for Nairobi. Would that challenge be considered?

Olga Cavalli: I like the idea. I don't know if we have time.

Jaime Wagner: What do you think, Ken?

Ken Bower: I'm just not sure that we can settle all of the questions that pertain to - you know, we - like the next question that we didn't get to today about whether - what are we going to do with these outputs and outcomes and do we really - we have to make sure that before we ask the Council to go through a prioritization on value that we can answer the first question is, why are you asking us to do this?

Jaime Wagner: Yes, well, that was the fourth item.

Ken Bower: Yes, we didn't get to that just yet today. But we should take that up.

I'll start thinking about whether - if you're suggesting that we might try to do something in Nairobi, the other thing that's complicated here is that we're going to have about half the members in Nairobi and half the members not in Nairobi. So it's not going to be a very good face to face session.

It's going to be mostly half and half, right?

Olga Cavalli: I think it will be a good time to present our outcomes and - to the Council.

Jaime Wagner: But because - my idea is that instead of presenting something to do a hands on job - exercise. And not a first - it would not be the first prioritization of the whole Council.

But it would be a hands on evaluation of our proposal. And it could be done by the whole Council or for - as Ken suggested with a small group from constituency, I don't know.

But I think it could be open to all the Council members that would like to participate.

Olga Cavalli: I like the idea. My question is shouldn't we present before, our outcomes to the Council? So then we can proceed.

Ken Bower: Yes, this is Ken. I think what I hear Olga saying is don't we have to first give them kind of an overview of where we've been, what we've done, why we've done what we've done and what the methodology is we're proposing or where our heads are at the moment.

And then let them digest that and say yes, you're on the right track; no, we don't like this at all, before we actually engage them in an exercise.

Olga Cavalli: That's my comment. This is why I like the idea but I don't know if we have time to go through that procedure before.

Jaime Wagner: Yes, so it was just an idea.

Olga Cavalli: It's a very good idea. I like it.

Ken Bower: Yes. And for sure...

Olga Cavalli: But I know the Councilors.

Ken Bower: This is Ken. For sure as soon as we get the ideas across and they agree that we should very soon thereafter, we should actually do an exercise, right, so they can see how it really will work.

All right, so recognizing Olga's question about ending the call. I think I have enough to summarize here and I'll get something out to you guys in the next couple days.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Thank you very much, Ken.

Ken Bower: Great. Thank you guys.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, bye-bye.

Man: Bye-bye everyone.

Jaime Wagner: We have another...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Bye.

Jaime Wagner: ...the 23rd, yes?

Ken Bower: Yes, next week same time.

Jaime Wagner: Okay. Thank you. Bye-bye.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you. Bye-bye.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you, (Miriam). Enjoy the rest of your day.

END