

**GNSO Work Prioritization Model  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Tuesday 23 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 23 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-20100223.mp3>

**Present for the teleconference:**

Olga Cavalli - NCA Chair

Jaime Wagner - ISP

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen - ISP

**ICANN Staff**

Ken Bour

Gisella Gruber-White

Rob Hoggarth

**Apologies:**

Chuck Gomes - Ry SG

Coordinator: This conference is now being recorded. For any objections you may disconnect at this time. To mute and unmute your line during the call please press star followed by 6. Thank you.

Ken Bour: Thank you very much Operator. And Gisella, could you please help me do a roll call?

Gisella Gruber-White: With pleasure. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. On today's Web prioritization model group call we have Olga Cavalli, Jamie Wagner, Wolf-Ulrich Knochen. From staff we have Ken Bour and myself Gisella Gruber-White. We have apologies from Chuck. And if I can please remind everyone to please state their names when speaking. Thank you. Over to you, Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much Gisella. This is Olga. Thank you for joining. And before we started the recording, I was talking with Ken about - that we should start

trying to prepare a presentation for our face to face meeting in Nairobi. My idea is that it should be an open meeting, at least for the council and maybe for everyone.

And I think we already mentioned this in previous calls. We may have some documents sent to the council before the face to face meeting so they have a chance to review it, and we can make the presentation more productive and we can have some part of the meeting for presenting and then a part of it for questions and answers maybe, perhaps half an hour at the end or something like that.

And I was saying - I was offering myself and asking Ken to help me in - or we can make that together as he has been working so hard with this group that presentation. Of course you - Jamie and Wolf are welcome to join us in this document preparation. But that's my idea. I would like to hear your comments.

Ken Bour: Sorry to interrupt. Rob Hoggarth has joined the call.

Olga Cavalli: Hi, Rob.

Rob Hoggarth: Hi, thank you. Thanks...

((Crosstalk))

Jamie Wagner: I'm back again.

Rob Hoggarth: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Jamie, hi.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Wolf speaking. May I?

Olga Cavalli: Sure. I hear very, very low.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes can you hear me?

Olga Cavalli: Yes, now it's much better.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: It's better, yes? Okay so I wonder when - Olga whether it could be possible (unintelligible) speaking directly whether we could have a - say a kind of testing phase in Nairobi of our model. That means so as we have the council together all those people who are attending Nairobi.

So would that be possible just to have a kind of test poll, you know, with regards to our model, or is that too early? That (unintelligible) - my - would be my question. It would be really helpful I, so - just to have a first one.

Olga Cavalli: Well I think it's a very good idea and as we have been receiving some comments about that we have been taking so much time for doing our work. I think that would be great. But I'm not sure if we - Ken do you think that we can make it?

Ken Bour: I wouldn't know what it is we would do. I don't think we have settled on enough criteria. And what - Wolf what would - what do you propose that we would do?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. Okay Wolf speaking. So I'm just brainstorming. So if you had this goal (unintelligible) say to do so or to start, you know, I understand fully that if you have a first weeks plain and to outline what this is about this model. So - and what are our (thoughts) behind that. So it may take time enough to discuss that. That could be possible.

But in case we would find time, you know, (to offer) first one, if people understand and they - and (we) would explain them , okay we are ready without having a - let me say a fully and in all details exactly this cast model,

But we have something available which we also have tested - we - in our small group have tested and we have some experience with that.

Why shouldn't we just present that. If it turns out, you know, throughout the discussion that it is too early because people have too many questions about the details, then okay if you could not do that. But maybe we should have - we should try. Not just to prepare in the very last detail for all of it, but just to test it.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I'm still completely perplexed. In all of our calculations and in all of our testing we estimate a minimum of two full hours to get through 1 set of 15 projects on 1 dimension using a group Delphi if we use the entire council.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes.

Ken Bour: I don't understand - I don't know how we would - if that - if you're proposing that we would do a rating session, I don't know how we would get that done in the time that the council has. And keep in mind that I don't know the final numbers, but something on the order of half the counselors will be attending remotely.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes, yes, yes.

Olga Cavalli: Well this is Olga. I think that we perhaps may do a kind of a test with smaller exercise with people who's attending face to face. Of course those who are attending remotely can join, but maybe they are more listening then participating actively in the exercise. And may be we can go through some examples - some projects just to give them a feeling about what the procedures and the prioritization exercise would look like.

That - in that sense I find it useful. If it's clear that it's only a part of an exercise, it's not a whole process that it's ongoing, it may be confusing but it may be useful. I don't know.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. Well it's Wolf speaking. Ken...

Ken Bour: Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: ...I respect your comment, and I think it's - for me it's also not so clear now how it (unintelligible) where would we end, you know. This - I fully understand. We calculated a lot of time to go through all these projects.

There are two things. One is, you know, that people - to make people understanding the content of the projects. So maybe some of them are more familiar with (unintelligible) than others do. That's one thing. So the other thing is then to - Olga just commented on that means to provide the people -- the council members -- give them a feeling, you know, what does it mean, what - how we are going, which way we are going.

In this way I would agree Olga that maybe in part of - not starting the whole one, but just a - this kind of example, gives them a feeling, what is it about, how will it - how are we planning to manage the whole process. And it's just as an example. Maybe that could help.

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bour: This is Ken...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: ...I'll say agree that is that we need a lot of time now to explain the basics.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. Do we want to take some more time and actually think about the preparation for Nairobi in lieu of continuing our work along the modeling?

Olga Cavalli: Well I think it's a good idea, because Nairobi is coming fast, and it's (better if we) show something there.

Ken Bour: Okay that's great. So let me just start with some thoughts.

What do you want - or what does the team want to communicate to the council at this juncture? I mean what are the messages we want to communicate?

Olga Cavalli: Oh well - the messages -- this is (unintelligible) speaking without thinking. So it - I may have been mistaken. I think we should summarize all the process that we have been going through, all the different models and different graphics that we thought about.

Summarizing - I mean I'm not saying - talking about that the whole hour but perhaps 15 minutes we can summarize that. And so what we should state is that we have been doing this exercise to avoid the whole council to go through it, which would have been much more complex.

And so everyone can see the benefit of this, because this is what I think that some council members are not realizing that now. And then we could go through presenting which are the latest - I wouldn't say sufficient, but outlines of our work, and our ideas to propose a certain prioritization model, and then do a small exercise.

But I think this information could be given before so people have the chance to review it and be more active in the meeting. Just an idea without thinking before.

Ken Bour: So this is Ken. I think it is possible to create some slides that would summarize the activity of the team over the past -- wherever it's been -- four months, five months, three months. I can't remember exactly, but...

Olga Cavalli: So...

Ken Bour: So, yes.

Olga Cavalli: ...from October?

Ken Bour: Okay. So yes.

Olga Cavalli: Three months.

Ken Bour: Yes I mean it took us a month just to get some general idea - yes but we could characterize and summarize the processes and approaches that have been considered over the past time and make a slide or two out of that.

And we can certainly make the point that the team has been conscientious about being thorough and asking a lot of tough questions in order to save the council from all that work. And that I think you're right that is an important point.

Where I'm a little bit struggling at the moment is what's to tell them in terms of where we are. Like what's the current status. We have made some decisions, and I kind of reflected those in the last email I sent. You know, we've made a few decisions.

I don't think we've settled on frequency. We haven't decided what the modeling methodology is going to be. We had four options that were in my email. I see some people like Option 1 with some - but there's still some methodology questions a haven't fully tackled yet.

Olga Cavalli: Like what? What we haven't fully...

Ken Bour: We haven't decided on whether the rating for benefit and value will be done by the entire council or done by smaller groups. Let's see I can look at my notes here. We haven't tested - okay so my questions on the - that I have listed up on the meeting Adobe Connect, some of the questions that we have

to go through are we haven't tested anything like doing this with 20 people all at once...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: Yes.

Ken Bour: ...and so we have no idea how long that will take. I've given some rough estimates here that I could take as long as three hours.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: Yes, yes.

Ken Bour: ...not - counting a 20 minute startup and a 10 minute wrap-up, which is - happens on - every time we do it, and it would certainly happen the first time around.

We have to make some decisions about whether - how tightly the voting and polling would have to be in terms of decide whether we accept the median value or not. That was Point 2. Point 3 was just a question in my mind as to do face to face sessions actually produce longer dialogue than on - being on the phone.

In other words somebody said earlier that it would be nice to do this face to face because that would tend to support the delphi approach, right? Except that I wonder if when people are actually together face to face they talk longer. And everybody wants to talk because they're sitting around a rectangular table and this person talked. "Well if he talks I'm going to talk." And...

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Ken Bour: ...I wonder if - I wondered if just being in person makes the whole thing go much longer than it otherwise would. It's a question. I don't have the answer, but I think we should talk about it.



And then the other question we haven't settled yet is whether we provide the council an initial rating or whether we let them do it from scratch. That was Wolf Ulrich's idea. Remember when we - he talked about sort of jumpstarting the process by saying, "Here's the team's project prioritization, and you guys - you can look at that ahead of time before you start making your own judgments."

Chuck commented I think on the last email that he was not sure about whether he thought that was a good idea or not.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Ken Bour: So these are just some of the questions that we haven't answered yet. It - so we're not ready to - I don't know propose a model and a methodology in which we've thought through all the elements and nailed them down.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Right.

Ken Bour: And so I'm not sure what we would be testing. Just thinking about the idea of an exercise, would we take - would we set up the whole polling apparatus on Adobe Connect, have all the counselors log in, take maybe one or two projects and say, "Okay this is what we're going to ask you to do. We're going to ask you to rate this on a scale of 1 to 7 on the basis of value. Here's the definition for value, and we want all the counselors to do this independently".

I'm going to start up a voting polling thing on Adobe Connect. You will all register your votes, and then we will take a look at them. I mean we could go through that. We could probably do one of two projects -- maybe three -- and then when we're done, what would we have?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, may I? It's Wolf...

Ken Bour: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Sure.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: ...speaking. So Ken I - fully agree to you. And I think it's very, very helpful (unintelligible) to just to discuss right now this (unintelligible) because it's just - it comes to my mind again. So you are just listing those open questions. Well it's really helpful, so we should put those question all together on the table there and just - and go through in there, say "Okay what is, you know, I see two clubs. One is the - to decide upon the model, and how to use some model itself, and the other things - the other circumstances why it's, you know, how often the frequency of ratings we are doing and those things. These are all secondary from my point of view of second priority. They are important but they are another topic that (unintelligible) an additional topic.

So I would agree and say, "Okay let's put together all those questions, because anyway if we present to the council our status, we have at the end to come up with a list what is open still, and how do we think well to cope with?" So it's an open question in time and in terms of content.

So (that's good) (unintelligible) to do it in advance and to really thinking, okay what is really important, what is really difficult maybe to decide upon and what's easier to handle. So that's very helpful. So maybe at the end we will come up with a list at this council meeting and say, "Okay that's the reason why we cannot start right now to - with a test or with a rating with - all together as a council."

So we have - if you need something put maybe also from council members to those questions or we have in addition maybe need someone or two other sessions in the team to decide upon. So that's very helpful. That's enough. I fully agree to you.

But we have a least well to answer or to be faced with the question why can't we do it at the time being. So - and I think - so if - so I know Ken you are

doing the - a lot of work with that. So just list those questions together. Show us, present us those question so we as a team, we can see okay that's all these things. Because for me sometimes because, you know, coming from different business also as you are doing as well.

So then every time we are faced with some questions at each meeting, put all question together and then we have - we go strictly through that question list.

Ken Bour: Right. Okay this is Ken again. But we can do a presentation that summarizes where we've been, talks about the current status -- where the team is currently -- what decisions we've made, what the model so to speak looks like. And maybe what our current big questions are that we are still working on -- I won't say struggling with; I'll say working on -- just to give them a sense of what the current status is.

We should probably take a shot at answering a question that will be on some people's minds, which is when will you finish. And so we probably should be thinking about when do we think we're going to terminate this exercise and deliver a product, because even if we don't address the question, it will get asked of Olga I'm sure, right?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: Yes.

Ken Bour: I do think it's probably not productive to try an exercise. I'll think about it some more in the intervening few days, but I think it would take a lot to set up. It would, you know, it has the potential of going badly just because we've had so much - there's going to be a lot of stress and strain being put on the remote participation, and then we're going to stress it even more by trying to do an Adobe Connect session in the middle of all that.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Ken Bour: And we've got bandwidth issues, we've got, you know, there's a lot of things to think about, not to mention which process questions that we haven't fully addressed yet. So I think - it sounds like that we're all together that we probably should not attempt an exercise in the sense of having counselors try to rate things.

But I - that doesn't mean that we can't describe that process and that Olga can't talk to it, see because I think it's pretty easy to sort of understand. We can mention that there's a capability of Adobe Connect and that it uses a folding feature.

And I think their imaginations will probably work pretty well there. We can maybe discuss how that - how we envision that happening, and we can certainly say that we've tested it right?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: Yes.

Ken Bour: I think there needs to be some more discussion on the team though as to whether it really is going to work to have the whole council do this en masse. And I'm not saying that I'm against it or for it either way, but I think there are some dynamics there that we have to talk through and be careful about and that we haven't had a full chance to do that yet. We only brought that up last week.

So let's see. Then - okay so you got current status - I mean you have a little bit of history of where the group's been, then you have a current status and then you have where, you know, what we're doing now, what we think - when we think we might finish. Is that about - is that a good summary, Olga...

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bour: ...like to cover?

Olga Cavalli: Yes, yes. And perhaps we can get some feeling from the audience about some final destinations that we may have to take and have some comment. And that could be helpful also.

Ken Bour: Sure. I mean I think as part of the presentation we could say, you know, for all of the things we have decided we could show them for example the project list. We could attach the Word document that has all the projects in it, right, and Table 1 and Table 2 and all the short descriptions that we've pretty much gone through.

We could give them the definition that we have written up for the value dimension of the rating and so they can see what that definition looks like. And I'll - maybe there's some other things too that we could provide. We don't really have any charts anymore.

We could show them the outcome of the team's rating, right, as an illustration. Well the team did it, here's what it came up with.

Olga Cavalli: Exactly. Yes.

Ken Bour: Here was - here is the prioritization of those - at that time 15 projects, and here's how they came out using the delphi group technique. So we could do something like that. That could be a slide.

So if you like, what I could do is to take a shot at building a little presentation and sharing it with the team. And then we'll modify it and adjust it between now and - when do you have to deliver it, Olga? Is it the 20...

Olga Cavalli: It's Sunday. It's Sunday.

Ken Bour: Sunday the 28th. Okay. So it's only - oh no it's the following week.

Olga Cavalli: No, no, no. It's six or...

Ken Bour: Seven.

Olga Cavalli: ...seven.

Ken Bour: Okay that gives us a little less than two weeks to get it ready. But I'll certainly take responsibility for preparing a slide deck that we can - that Olga - I presume you would give the presentation, right?

Olga Cavalli: Yes, but it's - you're welcome to lead with us and help us with explaining, because you have been a very important part of this process.

Ken Bour: Yes I would be - I'll be - I will not be in Nairobi but I can certainly join...

Rob Hoggarth: Hello?

Ken Bour: ...remotely.

Olga Cavalli: Oh I thought you were going to be there.

Ken Bour: No, I'm not - no, not going to be there.

Olga Cavalli: No problem. I'll make it. Wolf are you going?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes I'll go. So...

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Jamie, are you going?

Jamie Wagner: Yes I will.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Jamie Wagner: Please - I think you were not hearing when I was talking, and I was disconnected. Can I add something to your considerations that were - you were (making) - you were making before? I was disconnected.

This - that I think - I favor some exercise of one or two projects. I - this idea - this hands-on experience gave last meeting, last call, and I think we should try with - because the - we have - we - many people in the council is waiting for us to show something and they are becoming very anxious about it.

And so I think if we don't show - and even for us and for Ken this exercise could take some worries off consideration. So I think I favor this - the idea of doing an exercise of one or two projects, okay?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Hello? That's the...

Ken Bour: Thank you Jamie. This is Ken. I'm just curious what the objective of the exercise is.

Jamie Wagner: It's two-fold. First to calm down some critics that - of our work, and the second one is to try out some - to calm down some of our worries about how would this function with 20 people. And if the - if people are alert (unintelligible) this trial, they - and it's not for real -- it's not a prioritization for real; it's a trial, it's part of our work -- I think it would add some experience to our model if more people participated in the session - the prioritization session.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Well it's Wolf speaking. So as we discussed before, I don't know Jamie whether you have been connected to our discussion before. So we came to the - to a conclusion in that sense it means. So we have to explain first to the council where we are -- the status, and to - on the other hand we have to (explain) what is still open and how it will be (see) the timeline and then - and our work to be done up in which time we can be - we could come to a result of that.

So it may turn out that already this discussion - this presentation not that long -- maybe 15 minutes or 20 -- but the discussion around that and the explanations around that may take the most time of the session we will have in Nairobi. So that there maybe not too much time available.

We could offer satellite (unintelligible). We can explain them why are at this status, and why we - why it is not - maybe not valuable (at this time) being then to trials. We could prepare - I think so Ken. So if people like to do that like we did in our small group to make such an experiment, I think for one or two project it could be done.

The question is really what is he - what could be the value of that. But giving people a feeling, "Okay that's how we plan to do it," and then - in the whole group and is a whole bunch of projects so they have at least a feeling about. So maybe we will be prepared to do so, but I also guessed (right now) after our discussion that we will not have too much to do so.

Ken Bour: Yes this is Ken. Jamie the - thank you for the two-fold explanation. I think with respect to the anxiety that certain people have expressed about the length of time it's taking, I think the presentation can attempt to address that. In fact, I'm not sure if you heard earlier we talked about doing a some summary - a couple of summary slides to scope of slides to show what the team has gone through, some models that have been looked at and discarded and why. And some of that discussion I think will help explain why it's taken a little while.

And we can certainly make the point that the team has been conscientious in trying to be thorough and to not put the council in a position where it has to go through a lot of trials and tribulations in terms of getting a solution.

With respect to the trial and the exercise, and yes it could - I could see how it would give people a visceral sense of how this would go, but here's the - I think there's also a downside. There's a danger here.



Because we've got this something with Nairobi with half the people there, half the people not there, a lot of pressure on the remote participation links, if something goes wrong and this process either - even if we tried to do just one project or just two, and what if it takes 25 or 30 minutes to do one prioritization for one project?

Then it - then somebody's going to raise their hand and say, "This is a travesty. This a complete failure, and you guys are all," you know, "this is - there's no way we can do 17 projects. It'll take us a whole day to do."

You know, there's a risk because we're not ready and we're not sure what we're doing yet. We could end up doing an exercise that actually makes our - makes things worse than better. That's the worry I have.

Olga Cavalli: Well somehow you're right. Yes.

Jamie Wagner: Nairobi is - it presents some additional concerns that could indeed (unintelligible), but if were - it really had the failure in the regular meeting in a meeting that is - well with full attendance, then I would say well we should indeed start over with a fresh start and our critics are right.

So if - I understand that in Nairobi this trial can be jeopardized by the consider but I will not (interest) on this. Okay thank you.

Ken Bour: Okay. It's an intriguing idea, it's just - I'm - it makes me quite nervous at this point. Okay I think I have enough information -- this is Ken -- that I could put together a skeleton presentation conceptually and then try to get that to you guys very quickly.

Now in the meantime Rob reminded me that presentations have to be sent in in advance. And I don't know what the advance time is. Rob if you're listening, do you happen to know?

- Rob Hoggarth: The requirements are different for council meetings versus the work session. But just in terms of, you know, giving Marika the opportunity to get things up and loaded, and given I think some of our, you know, concerns particular since the weekend will be the first time where we're getting up all of the operations and stuff, I would think you'd want to get something to her by the Thursday or Friday before the council work session on the Sunday.
- Ken Bour: Okay, okay. That still gives us the better part of a week or - a week and a day or two.
- Rob Hoggarth: Sure.
- Ken Bour: Okay thanks. All right, so how about if I go ahead and - I'll just take the - is PowerPoint okay Olga?
- Olga Cavalli: No problem. Yes. You can add, if you want, some comments in the comment box.
- Ken Bour: Okay.
- Olga Cavalli: So if you think that's necessary for me to have in mind. I will review all the emails anyway so I have all the fresh information in my mind, but perhaps if you have been (inviting the) emails and going through the process, you can add some comments in it that only me can see.
- Ken Bour: Okay. Yes I can do that I think. All right, good. Then we have at least the plan for the preparation for Nairobi at this point. What would you like to do next? We have about 20 minutes left.
- Olga Cavalli: We have some things to define. Let me find the email.

Ken Bour: There's one question that we postponed, if I may -- pardon my - I asked a question and then I jump right in ; I apologize. But...

Olga Cavalli: No problem.

Ken Bour: ...I do want to get this idea out.

Remember at the - it was - I don't think it was last week but the week before we talked about this process outcome question. And I think the last person to challenge us on this was Jamie. And that question is, what is the purpose - what is the outcome result, what does the council get in terms of benefits from exercising the ranking and prioritization process? What happens and why is this important to do?

That question we have flirted with here and there, but I don't know that we've really crystallized it. And in terms of a presentation that you're going to give to the council a week from - I mean two weeks from today or whatever, it seems to me that we would really want to have that answer really nailed down, right.

Because that - if I were a council member just sitting listening to the presentation and your talking about prioritization and the models and the methodology and the values and the definitions and the perimeters and so forth and so on, the question that I would be thinking about is what's the point of all this? Why are we doing it and what do we hope to get from it when we're finished?

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Yes.

Ken Bour: Is the team clear that we have a crisp answer to that question?

Olga Cavalli: If I may, this is Olga. I think that somehow we all know what is - good has more priority and what has less priority. The issue for me is that the

resources are limited. The staff resources our limited and our time is also limited. So how we do we as a council decide which would - with which tool we decide how - where to put this result - this limited resources and organize (our work)? I think this is why we are doing this exercise.

Somehow we know, but for some stakeholder groups and for some council members, the priorities made a different. So after a while, putting a lot of effort from staff and from staff volunteers in some projects, other parts of the council may think that this was not good. And how do we measure that? So this is the - for me, this is how I understand this.

This is the purpose of this tool. It's not that we don't know. It's how do we organization the limited resources we have in a determined list of projects and with a certain priority agreed among the whole GNSO.

Jamie Wagner: I have a - this is Jamie. I have another idea of - besides that. I think the prioritization scale is used just to manage resources when they are cut, bit also to orient to state where to go.

And the - but also I think that once this exercise works and if it works, it will be another tool for consensus building around - because there are many interests represented in the GNSO. And I think the - if - this is a challenge for us, but the prioritization model works, it - and will have this challenge of different interests, and it will be a - the council's tool or a kind of consensus building tool.

Ken Bour: And this is Ken. How does that help the council? In what way does it help with the questions that Olga mentioned about resources being scarce and limited and prioritizing projects?

Jamie Wagner: Well when we have one consensus, this - it's not an opinion by one of the houses of - one of - the chair's opinion. It's - it will be second by a whole exercise that reflects consensus. That's my opinion. And what help? This - it

gives the strength to the - even for (chairing), it will be easier than it gives to the (unintelligible). I think so, and I'm trying to defend our work. That's it.

Ken Bour: Yes this is Ken. Me too. I think that we will have yet to really come up with a clean answer. So what - here's - for example -- and I put this up I think last time -- I put up a list of 15 projects that we the team had prioritized based on value at the time we had it defined.

And we - so we had 15 projects and they were ranked number one. There were a few ties in there and we had a couple of projects at the bottom, 14 and 15. And I said something like, "Okay then the last two theoretically - let's say there's a bottom rank. We stop those two projects, right?"

If the purpose of - if the - if it's true that resources are scarce and we cannot do all the work - but see I think that's a premise that we haven't really answered or tested yet; we don't know if that's true or false. We assume it is because people are complaining about having too much work to do, and there's a lot of symptomatic things that we see with attendance on groups as meetings and things of that type. But we don't really know for sure how to make that premise - how to defend if that's true.

Now we - but if we assume it is true and there are scarce limited resources, then why is it we can't stop projects, because the first thing Chuck said is, "Well you can't stop those bottom two." Those bottom two - and then that argued for, "Well maybe we should take those two out of a prioritization list and change their category to something else like monitor or some - create a new category for project work that cannot be stopped," meaning it's mandatory and therefore it doesn't get prioritized because to prioritize presumes that you would stop something. And if you can't stop it, then you shouldn't put it on the priority list. So we take it off.

And then the question then becomes is of the other remaining 13 projects, how many of those would we take off because those can't be stopped? And

maybe you come down to the fact that there's no work that can be stopped, in which case there's no purpose in prioritizing it.

And I'm playing devil's advocate here to just test our thinking about this, because when Olga stands before the council, these are questions that people might ask.

Jamie Wagner: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Jamie Wagner: Go ahead, Wolf.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay thank you. Well we will have (though) it's my understanding also in the future different approaches in - on council level, different approaches just with regards to - to do our work.

So the one is - and it was very clear also during the last council meeting, so it came out I think with (this) regards to the (unintelligible) integration issue. So there are people that just saying, "Okay if the council is of the opinion to do something, it should be - then it should be done. It should be done immediately."

So that means it should be put onto the - in addition to the project list, and ICANN should hire more people in order to do that work. So that's one view people have.

And the other thing is -- and that's what I'm thinking -- is the exercise we are doing and the (unintelligible) could be done. There are - to put some let me say discipline also on the kind - how we are doing the work - well in - on council.

And just to make more transparent - bring more transparency to the council members, what does it mean in terms of if you are doing this and that and put additional projects on that. So the other question is then - is really can we then follow up with the consequence okay to stop one project or the other or to replace one project or postpone one project? That's the second step.

But at first for me is to bring really transparency to the people. And the project list is one of these things and with some additional information. And the other thing is then the consequence, which - okay it should be discussed. That's how I see the process.

Jamie Wagner: This is Jamie and I think what - playing also the advocate - the devil's advocate here, many - I heard already in the council the question that we don't need something to say that resources are scarce, because we should always hire more people and do what have to be - what has to be done.

So the scarcity of resources I don't know if it is a good line of defense. I would prefer to say that we have a new tool for communication, a new tool for consensus building, new tool for transparency, because this tool - this project managing project tool will have to be upgraded - I mean maintained and updated.

And all people will have to participate or will be informed what is happening with the work - what are the work that are in progress, and what kind of progress has been made in each one, and which one is suspended or is in real work. I think this is much more a tool than of a communication than a consensus building tool and a managerial tool.

But it is a managerial tool also, because it will help not to stop the bottom two projects, but to give them less priority. I think yes we can. When you came up with the point that the people that were working at this project that were ranked low would give (unintelligible), this is the outcome of a prioritization. It

will have less importance and this will be transparent and the tool will give this transparency.

And I think this is something that we can say that will not attract, but it will and while the natural outcome and why not - is it good.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I want to - I raised question just as Olga was about to talk. And this is fact the question that we've been considering, but I wanted to loop back to Olga and see where you were going with your thoughts before I rudely interrupted you.

Olga Cavalli: Well I agree with Jamie, and I think the - this is a tool very useful for the council and it will save time and it will organize the work and it will organize the use of the resources. This is why we are doing this exercise. It's - and also the prioritization exercise will be done by the whole council. Once agreed, then it's a reference. It's not that it's wholly truth, but it's a reference to start and use the resources.

So I think that it should be very useful. This is why we have to communicate in our presentation, what I will have to communicate in the presentation.

Ken Bour: And this is Ken. And I think the question that I keep coming up with is how will it be useful. I think it's -we have said many times, "Well this is going to be a very useful tool. We'll get the work prioritized, it'll be a consensus of the council." And when we have the answer and we have the list prioritized, what use will we make - what use will the council make of it?

And in fact, I think maybe if we wanted to test, an interesting test would be let's pretend our team is the council. Let's just promote ourselves to council. Now let's actually take the list and do something with it. And the question is what can we do with it? And once we have determined for ourselves that there are things we can actually do and real outcomes that can come out of it,



then we can tell the council that thing -- these are the kinds of things that would be recommended and these are the uses that the tool would be made.

And if there aren't any uses, if it's just a group list that we prioritized for the sake of communicating to the organization what the priorities are, but we don't necessarily make any management decisions about which ones stop, which ones start, which ones go left, which ones go right.

That - then I think someone may challenge and say, "Well we already had a transparent list of projects. I mean that was already there. What we've done was to take the list and move it and put them in order." And that's the part that I think we want to be clear on is to why putting them in order is so important and why - and how that's going to help the council in its management. And the emphasis there on my sentence is the word how.

Olga Cavalli: How? Because it becomes a reference.

Jamie Wagner: This is Jamie. I would - very candidly this work helped me to understand the - I think the tool to participate and include my awareness of the work that has been done by - in GNSO and a big picture and - well it worked for me. I think it will work for everybody.

Ken Bour: So we might say that it has an educational benefit to the council members.

Olga Cavalli: Educational and organizational. So it's a reference to organize the work. And if someone has other thoughts, then in the next exercise they can give their input and their reasons. Maybe they need to talk to other council members in a meeting and explain why priorities should be different for a certain project, and then it can be reviewed and changed.

Jamie Wagner: It's not - excuse me, it's Jamie again. It's not only the educational because - well it's managerial also because when I will have to give a vote on

something, I will have the - I will use this education, if you want - I had in my vote always will have its consequences.

Ken Bour: Okay. All right, well we've done some additional building on the question. I'll see if I can summarize this material and into a purpose slide that we can talk more about in the intervening week. This is Ken again.

I mean it - it's clear to me that those of you on the team think that the work is very beneficial. And so what I'm going to try to do is see if I can capture those thoughts into crisp statements that we could put on a slide and then can be delivered to the council.

Because I think if we're clear on what the benefits and the outcomes are for doing this process, it'll make it a lot easier to engage the council in the work that goes into putting it together.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. And also we may during this week extend some more ideas about how to do the ratings (unintelligible) individual in groups. There are some opinions already given. Maybe we can work on that in the list and not wait for the next call so we have more issues defined before we make the content of the presentation.

Jamie Wagner: Yes. I don't know if you people received an email where I made some comments over the (unintelligible) and Chuck's observations. Did you Ken?

Ken Bour: Jamie yes, I received two emails to the list from you. One that responded to some comments of Wolf's and another one that had some red comments that were included on...

Jamie Wagner: Yes, that was the one. Yes.

Ken Bour: Okay yes. Yes they made it to the list.

Jamie Wagner: And I made some explicit recommendations on the object recommendation on the cycle of prioritization (unintelligible).

Ken Bour: Okay this is Ken. It's one o'clock.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Man: Yes.

Ken Bour: Why don't, you know, we essentially can stop here and then I will - I'll try to do two things between now and - well first of all do we have a meeting next Tuesday same time?

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Ken Bour: Okay. And hopefully by then I will have a draft of a presentation that we can talk about if you want to use that time, or we can continue talking about substantive issues regarding the methodology next week, or both.

Jamie Wagner: Yes, I want to apologize to the problems with my (line) here. Excuse me.

Ken Bour: Rob just mentioned that he will be on his way to Nairobi the - on Tuesday of next week, so he will not be joining us.

Rob Hoggarth: I don't think you guys will notice.

Ken Bour: Olga I'll turn it back over to you.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, I would encourage - I have to send comments. I haven't because really I have (few) time this week. And maybe we can define some more things that were to be defined in our last call and we didn't work on this in this call. And perhaps we can review a draft presentation that you can prepare, Ken, and plan the face to face meeting.

Ken Bour: Right. Okay. I've got my work cut out for me.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Thank you for joining and we talk again next week hopefully in a different time for me -- at my normal time.

Man: Yes.

Ken Bour: All right, well enjoy your trip back home.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. It's quite long.

Ken Bour: I'm sure it is. Thanks...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Bye-bye.

Man: Okay bye.

Man: Bye.

END