

**GNSO Work Prioritization Model  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Tuesday 02 March 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 02 March 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-20100302.mp3>

Present for the teleconference:

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

ICANN Staff  
Ken Bour  
Gisella Gruber-White

Apologies:  
None

Gisela Gruber-White: Thank you. The recordings have been started. Please go ahead.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you operator. (Unintelligible).

Gisela Gruber-White: Yes. I'm on the call Olga. Sorry.

Olga Cavalli: Gisela, can you be so kind to do roll call so that we know who is on the call?

Gisela Gruber-White: Absolutely. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone on today's Work Prioritization Model Group on the second of March. We have Olga Cavalli, Chuck Gomes, Wolf-Ulrich Knochen, Jaime Wagner and from staff we have Ken Bour and myself Gisela Gruber-White.

And I don't have any apologies. If I could also please remind everyone to state their names before speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you. Over to you, Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you. Thank you very much Gisela. Good morning, good evening everyone. First I want to really commend the staff again for sending the PowerPoint.

I think it's a very good summary of what we have been doing and as the first step for our call I would like to ask if we can exchange some ideas on if we have to make it longer or shorter, which lines could we take out? I personally think that we may have two versions of this.

One could be shorter and we have some suggestions about it shorter and deleting some slides and for the counter and a longer one perhaps including other things like the project list and the details involved in the processes that we have been going through for the specific meeting we have about this capture and for the wrap up meeting because my suggestion, I think it's today or yesterday.

And I don't know Ken, if you think these are good ideas or what do others think? I have seen some suggestions of deleting some or leaving some of the slides in the presentation to be done to the council. So I would like perhaps to exchange some ideas with you about this. Hello?

Chuck Gomes: We're here. Do we want to just go slide by slide? This is Chuck.

Olga Cavalli: I'm seeing the first slide in the Adobe Connect so yeah, that's a good idea.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. If I might I think it's important to share what the objectives were in putting this together so that as we go through the slides we can decide if we are meeting an objective or whether the objectives are even appropriate.

I put them in the email, I don't have them on the slide deck, I mean up on the Adobe Connect room. But I thought can just quickly summarize them for you. The first was I thought it was important that we remind and review to the council why this team was created.

And so there will be some slides in the beginning that motivate the original concerns and we'll talk through those. I also thought it was important to show that because there have been some challenges about how long this process is taking, I thought it was important to show the underlying thinking and planning that went into building the six step model that we have been using, right?

And the third thing was to show that the time has been well used. I know that Slide 8 is controversial but when we get to it I would like to try to explain how I think it fits into this and why it's really, really important maybe not for the council or we can decide when to show it.

But I think it's really important to illustrate that there is a really nice trajectory of movement through all the six steps. The six steps were important to the overall process a month into building of the model. I mean because there has been a challenge it was just taking too long.

I thought it was important that we show that that's really not true. Or at least you can make a case that it's not true. And then obviously to show what decisions we have made and then what the remaining steps are and that's the Slide 10 and then Q&A. Is that an okay start just to set the ground work?

Olga Cavalli: It is for me and I think Chuck wanted to comment.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Wolf speaking. So you started with the first two slides, is it? Or are you talking about the first four or five slides all together?

Ken Bour: This is Ken. Actually I was just setting up the overall mission, the overall objectives that were in my head as I was developing all these slides. What messages did we want to send to the council?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yeah.

Ken Bour: And so I want to just cover those briefly so that we can evaluate the slides against those objectives.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. Okay.

Ken Bour: Any comments? And if not, I'm happy to walk through them.

Olga Cavalli: I think that Chuck had a comment.

Chuck Gomes: I put it in the chat the wrap up meeting date is the 11.

Ken Bour: Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Ken Bour: Okay.

Jaime Wagner: I would like - this is Jaime. I would like to - I just sent an email to the group but I want to reinforce here that I agree with Chuck that it might make a very good indeed but for our internal consumption.

And I think it can bring some unnecessary discussions and (purchases) if it goes to the open council meeting.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. May I suggest that we hold that until we get to Slide 8?

Jaime Wagner: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah. I think we should go one by one.

Ken Bour: Okay. Excellent. Well, all right so this is Slide 1 and let me go ahead and flip to Slide 2. All right. So the purpose of this slide is to just talk about why the work process model team was started prior the sole meeting there were some community concerns about work team struggling to complete their tasks, conference calls being cancelled and so that - is everything okay with this slide?

Jaime Wagner: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Hi. This is Chuck. If I can make a comment.

Olga Cavalli: Sure. Chuck, go ahead please.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And this comment will apply to the first five slides actually so I won't repeat it every time. But I actually think the first five slides as I said in an email provide a good background information for the whole audience.

Keep in mind in the open council meeting that there are - it's not only the council that's involved and I think these slides are important for them just as a reminder. But also there is an audience both remote and in person that would be helpful to give them some background.

At the same time I don't think we should spend very much time on the first five slides. I think they could probably be covered in less than two minutes in total. So I don't think we need to belabor it. But it's good to set the stage and to tell people why we are doing what we're doing and to remind them of some of the facts, which I think Slides 2 and 3 do.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Wolf speaking. Can I just comment? I agree Chuck that we should just go briefly through the history. I do not have any problem with Slides 3 and 4 showing the history about that.

But my question is whether we show again those slides if we draw the attention to or misdraw the attention to these kind of statistics. Okay, just to convince the NCUC and the ISPC they are not aware of those meetings. So I'm asking myself if somebody seems to know we can or can we really approve the attendance school prioritizations.

That is the goal and what we should have. That's the only thing that we should show is the prioritizations for me. And one of these targets could be okay to improve attendance to the meetings. And now it seems to be okay. There is sometimes low attendance to meetings. Hence the major goal of the prioritization issue is to improve that statistic. So that's not the case I would say.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. There is no intent on my part to draw a specific conclusion that the work prioritization modeling effort was intended to solve an attendance problem.

As I go back to the beginning, these were concerns, right, that the attendance study was undertaken because there was data available that we could use to maybe draw out some conclusions as to why people think that teams are struggling and conference calls were being cancelled. So the attendance study was done as a way to try to provide some data to support the conclusion that there might be a problem. But there hasn't been any determination necessarily that low attendance can be solved by prioritizing projects.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. But then the question comes to me why shouldn't we show what is expected from the prioritization exercise we are doing?

Ken Bour: Yes. This is Ken. That comes later in the presentation. We developed the purposes and what the team is doing much later in the presentation. This is just some early background work to set the stages for why the WPM was created.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: No. I'm sorry about that. I would like to point out the council puts the task to this working team. Okay. Just start with the prioritization. That's a council decision.

So there must be some expectation behind that and that's the headline. Along those expectations, council expectations, we should then go through the presentation. That's what normally how I see such kinds of presentations. You know what I understand, I think there must be not an overall target, only set by the working team.

But if there have been targets set or expectations from the council, they should be put here on the presentation.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I'm not aware of any.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Ken Bour: But let me go through the next two slides and let's come back to that question because I don't believe there are any. What happened was the staff did this attendance study and presented the conclusions, which is on the next slide.

Right. I put causes in question mark because I don't think there was an attempt to actually determine the causes. That's part of what we'll have to do either on our team or somebody else will have to do. The study conclusion is on the next slide.

So that was there is evidence of sporadic attendance and in some cases low participation by some constituencies and inconsistent. That was the final

study conclusion. Then what follows is study questions. So the report then said here are four questions that the council should ask itself.

How might the work be prioritized, one? Two, is there too much work? And if so, what can we do to assess capacity? These are quotes right from the study. Three, are constituencies providing enough people? And four, what level of participation should we really even target for each constituency, which goes back to the attendance, right?

It might be the right goal is 50% attendance. If so, we're doing very well. We didn't answer the question. So what we did, there were symptoms in the environment that led to the study and the study confirmed the symptoms. And so the work prioritization team was created for primarily to address Questions 1 and two. And that's as far as the council went as I know.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. Can I comment?

Ken Bour: Certainly.

Olga Cavalli: Sure Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: I think we're spending too much time on this one particular issue. Would it be sufficient to just include Slide 4 and not include Slide 3 if there is concern there?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: It's not a big issue, Chuck.

Ken Bour: I could go either way if there is a concern. I think certainly there is a possibility that better prioritization of our work and so forth could possibly help attendance because a lot of people are getting spread too thin and we're doing too much maybe for the number of people that are involved.



But there are other solutions that are even more important than just prioritization. So I agree with Wolf in that regard. I just was okay with the first five slides as is but I would think that four would be okay if there is concern about three.

Jaime Wagner: This is Jaime. Can I comment?

Olga Cavalli: Yes please, Jaime.

Jaime Wagner: I think I have two comments on the first slide. I think the conclusion is the most important in Slide 4 and Slide 3 can be kept or maintained or heightened to the brief (session) I would hide Slide 3 and maintain Slides 2 and 4.

But I have a suggestion in Slide 5 and it's to make more clear in Slide 5 that the classrooms that are tackled by the double PM team are the first two. So this I think the arrows can be modified to refer to the first two (objectives). This is a suggestion for Ken.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. Jaime, are you suggesting then that the arrow and that brown box be moved up under one and two and the three and four be moved below it?

Jaime Wagner: Chuck, maintain the brown box below but make a key or something to make the arrow point to somehow the first two (classes).

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, that makes sense.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I will have to mess around with it. I don't see an obvious way to unless I bring the arrow down from the right side. But I certainly can move the arrow and the work and put it up under one and two if you think that would be clearer.

And then I can take the comment out. It does raise the question is who is dealing with Questions 3 and 4? But that's still there any way. Maybe nobody. They were just study questions anyway so there isn't any strong requirement to answer them.

Jaime Wagner: Ken, if you allow me I can do another slide and send it to you.

Ken Bour: I don't think that will be necessary. I understand the instruction. I'll try to fix it so that we either show a bracket or some other - I'll look for some symbol to change that.

Jaime Wagner: Okay.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. Do we need to go back to Slide 3 and just decide if it's in or out or is it Olga can make that decision?

Olga Cavalli: I like it.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I like it too and I think it's part of the study. I think it was an important symptom of the general problem. It isn't necessarily a root cause of anything. It was just there to motivate that that's one of the reasons why this team was constructed. So that's why I put it in.

Olga Cavalli: For me, I like it but we decide it together.

Ken Bour: All right. So this is Ken. Why don't we move on? We have four and we have gone through five. Everybody is okay. We're going to make a change to five to better draw an attention to Questions 1 and 2 as being the primary focus.

Does anybody by the way agree with that conclusion because that was just my conclusion?

Chuck Gomes: What conclusion?

Ken Bour: That the team is not dealing with Questions 3 and 4 of the study.

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Ken Bour: Arguably we're not dealing with 2 either.

Jaime Wagner: Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck again. Well, I think we are kind of dealing with 2.

Ken Bour: All right. This is Ken. Anything else on 5?

Chuck Gomes: Do we even need 3 and 4 on there?

Ken Bour: This is Ken. The only reason I put them there is they were part of that presentation given to the council and it was just a matter of being true to the record that was presented. That's all.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. Maintain history.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. If you think that there is editorial license that we were given here to remove that, which isn't important then we can simplify this slide.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck again. No, I'm not saying that they're not important. I think they are important but it might distract from the focus of this presentation.

Olga Cavalli: Perhaps 1 and 2 could be added in only one maybe instead of both?

Jaime Wagner: I think there is no problem if we maintain if we do this modification I suggested, Chuck.

Ken Bour: I'm okay with that.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah. Met too. Let's come back to this - sorry. Go ahead Jaime.

Jaime Wagner: I think we are - no, it's just I think there was not too much agreement in these first five, and we are losing too much time on this.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah. Let's continue.

Ken Bour: Okay. Ken. Slide 6 - this just talks about the fact that we spent and I went back and looked at the record, right, so we could make these comments. We spent the first month, all of November, basically scoping out the effort, trying to decide what the modeling should look like, how many dimensions it would have, what components it would take.

And all of that was basically done through a series of emails and so I just showed the illustrative picture here. Again, I don't think you have to spend any time on this but it does show where the first month went. But the point I would make if I were giving this presentation myself is this team wasn't given a charter, right, so we had to actually create its own scope.

Olga Cavalli: Yeah. You're right.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: This is - Chuck, go ahead.

Olga Cavalli: Chuck, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Sorry. I should have raised my hand. My concern about this slide is I like the idea of showing initial months were spent on scoping the effort and I'm okay with the comment that says we actually pursued a model that we liked a lot but then after testing it didn't yield the results that we wanted.

But showing the actual two quadrant thing I think opens up the door to too many questions and why it didn't work and everything else at least for the council meeting itself.

Jaime Wagner: Yeah. This is Jaime. I fully agree with Chuck and I would paraphrase your former base, Ken. Don't fall in love with the fine scent because we spent a lot of time in this model.

It was good but I think it will function much more as a justification and then I think the time we spent in this we should not come to the council to spend time on this. This we already have the conclusion that this model is inferior to the one we value benefit rating.

Olga Cavalli: If I may, this is Olga, I like including it. Also, I would include more information. I would put the exercise of the (delta). But I understand also that this may be confusing. So that's my comment.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I'm hearing it sounds like what we might do here is to show that the initial month was spent in scoping maybe the first bullet underneath that. We could say under consensus that various models were discussed without showing the picture, right?

And just turn this slide into something a bit simpler and maybe a graphic but not the chart.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. That's a good idea.

Jaime Wagner: This is Jaime. My suggestion would be to hide this slide and have in another slide a kind of link and in the event we are questioned what did we do then they're supplied with kind of the - I don't know the word - a show to show our work in this (new access model). But it would be brought only in the event of a question.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. I think Jaime is on to something that is pretty good. I would just warn though that if in fact somebody does ask a question and we go to this slide pretty much as it is, that Olga who is going to be giving the report doesn't allow the discussion to go into the details of this model.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: We can do that at another time.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. In listening to the back and forth discussion I am personally attracted to the first action, which is to take the chart off just for the - telling people what we did and what we didn't do, this is just one of many things we decided not to do.

And so maybe we don't need to highlight that particularly. Why don't I rework this slide and I'll show you another? I do think it's important however to say where the first month went. And that part I'd like to retain if we can because it's going to flow in the presentation.

Olga Cavalli: I would suggest that we may have this as a back up material if needed. Perhaps someone is in knowing which are the models that we went through and then we may be showing this. But perhaps not in the first slideshow.

Ken Bour: Yeah. This is Ken. If I were going to answer the question show us the models that you just started, I wouldn't use this picture now that I think about it. I would grab the final (Delphi) picture that actually had real projects.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Ken Bour: So this one was really just a graphic. It wasn't meant to be discussed. It was hey, we picked a starting model, we are going to talk later on that we eventually abandoned it and simplified it but I wouldn't spend any time going through the - it was really just meant to be a graphic.

Jaime Wagner: This is Jaime. I will make a value objective judgment is to in Slide 7 Step 3 I would make this Step 3 a link to a previous slide that would be Slide 6 modified to show because I understand the (Delphi) result that you show in the Slide 6 is not the result of the real actual project.

So I would show the result of our actual final rating and substitute for this picture that is in this Slide 6 but maintain the slide hidden and with a link with Slide 7 and Step 3 of Slide 7. Make it a full link to this hidden slide.

Olga Cavalli: Right. And this is Olga. This is exactly what I meant one moment ago just as I have it and if needed we can go to the link and show it.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. If we do that let's just not go to the link in the council meeting. We can do it in the wrap up meeting.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I have to - my advice at this point is I think we are making our hole extremely deep. And if we put up a chart anywhere at any time that shows the results of our (Delphi) work, now you have got - you talk about questions.

Why did you put STI where it is and why is the work process - why is the PDP where it is? I think that would get us into - and we abandoned that model. And so spending time discussing it strikes me as being completely not useful.

Olga Cavalli: Well, there will be a day that we will have to face these questions. And the council will go through the prioritization process so this will come. This was only an exercise.

Jaime Wagner: Yes. I agree with Ken. My suggestion - I remove my suggestion for this meeting yes.

Ken Bour: Right. We can develop all kinds of material if we need to down the road for other purposes but I think here we just want to get some basic thoughts and themes out as to what the team has been doing.

And I agree now that I think even discussing this four quadrant model is probably just not necessary. So I think we should probably just take it out at this stage.

Jaime Wagner: Yeah.

Ken Bour: So I'll fix Slide 6.

Jaime Wagner: Just make sure that I maintain the suggestion of keep it hidden as a link in Slide 7.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. Unfortunately there are pieces of this slide I think we need in the presentation. And the trouble is I've got too much going on there so I think I have an idea that we want to talk about what the initial month was in the scoping effort and then talk about how we developed our plan.

Let me see if I can rework 6 and 7 maybe into one slide. I don't know. Let's look at 7 for a minute. The concept here was to show that in the early going we also developed a six-step sort of methodology to go from concept, right? So we build ourselves a modeling concept all the way through to adoption and it involved these six steps.



These six steps come up later in Number 8 to show how we have done with these - what we have been doing with these steps. But I don't think one has to spend more than 10 seconds on this slide, right? We had to develop the project list, do some definitions, develop and test, produce some results, evaluate.

That's why I underlined you could really just go through this slide in 10 seconds and then move right to the next one.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck again, Ken. I wonder if you could just make it seven steps and include the project scoping as the first step and avoid that previous slide?

Ken Bour: This is Ken. Yes Chuck, that was kind of what I had in mind is maybe 6 and 7 could - yes I could make seven steps or a scoping steps and then the six steps. Yeah, I could.

Chuck Gomes: Either way.

Ken Bour: Yeah. I like that idea. So combine the scoping into this slide and hide the former one or eliminate it.

Chuck Gomes: Now this is Chuck again. I think we ought to just change Step 2 to solidify definitions for variables and not put X, Y.

Ken Bour: Agreed. This is Ken. Agreed. I just want to write this clearly.

Chuck Gomes: And maybe - this is Chuck again. Maybe variables isn't the right word. Maybe it's for factors or something because I don't know. I'm open there. Definitions of factors?

Ken Bour: Okay. I'll take a look at that.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. I'm open. I'm flexible there.

Ken Bour: I understand where you're going with that. Okay on Slide 7? All right. Let's go to Slide 8. The controversial slide. Let me say a word about why this was done and then we can eradicate it or change it or do whatever.

I was trying to develop an explanation for what this team has been doing over the last four months. We have been challenged by a few people, actually team members, that we have been either squandering time or not overcomplicating things or whatever.

This really was just meant to quickly show that we spent some time building some starting concepts and scoping out the effort and then we went right into our six steps. And each one of those basically has taken around three weeks or less. The development and testing step, Number 3, was the longest one and obviously there you have to build the methodology then test the methodology.

So it took longer and then I tried to show that this is important I think conceptually for people to understand. You can't walk through any process or at least it's hard to walk through any process without some iteration, without some reconsideration of prior decisions.

You take this step and then you go back, I think I should do that. And so I tried to reflect that with the red arrows meaning we have gone back and that we have changed the definitions a couple of times, we changed the project list, we changed some categories.

We even went back and changed the starting model by simplifying it. And so this is the learning iteration process and now we have actually completed most of that and we're into Step 6. I don't know. I just thought it was a nice illustration of where we have been and I thought it might help to reduce these complaints that we have been hearing and that others might have. I'll stop there.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. This is Chuck. I raised my hand so I'd like to get into queue.

Olga Cavalli: Sorry.

Chuck Gomes: That's okay. Go ahead Olga. You're fine Olga. Go ahead.

Olga Cavalli: I just wanted to say that I like it. The only thing that I would change is the order. I would go from November would be up and March would be down. For me it confuses me going up. But I like it and I think it's good explanation of our work. Chuck, go ahead please.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. First of all I maintain my suggestion that we don't show this slide in the council meeting because I think it will take too much time. On the slide itself I think and it could be discussed in the wrap up meeting, I'd be fine with that. In Step 2 I think we need to change access definitions, we may want to call that the first model that we developed and then we actually - isn't Step 2 develop the first model and then Step 3 is testing that model?

Ken Bour: This is Ken. No. Actually Step 2 was - well, I'll go back and look at it for sure. But I thought it was in fact to create or build the definitions for the - originally that Step 2 was as you know, that was really the X and Y problem. But we could certainly change that to just definitions, right, and take the word access out if that's...

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, that might be okay. I think we want to avoid the word access for sure.

Ken Bour: Right.

Chuck Gomes: Although that was critical of the one model and that's what I was leaning towards okay, we came up with this one model, it had two axes and so we had to define both axes and then we really tested it, we developed it further rand then tested it and that is a time consuming step.

So I think that shows - well, now the last question I have is and Olga, I assume you're going to be taking the lead but obviously you could be helped by others who are there or even on the phone. The - are you comfortable talking to this diagram?

Olga Cavalli: Yes. It confuses me the order I think but I can tell that is not a problem.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Good. That's all I have.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: May I just comment?

Olga Cavalli: Sure. Go ahead Wolf.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you.

Jaime Wagner: I had my hand raised.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Sorry Jaime.

Olga Cavalli: Sorry Jaime. Wolf, hold on a second please. Jaime, go ahead.

Jaime Wagner: Well, I think this slide is very helpful for our own guidance and our own situation in our work and I agree with Chuck also that we should avoid the term access so that it is for (factors) or factors that could affect the priority of something.

And this is also not only the decision but also the discussion, the faculty discussion. But I think this can raise unnecessary criticism on the open meeting. So I would also maintain this slide hidden and be opened for a more maybe in the wrap up session or even if we won't have a (fifth) stage meeting of ourselves?

I think this (fifth stage) meeting will be attended by some people that will be more interested in this work. And then there this slide could be studied and discussed. That's all.

Ken Bour: And Wolf has been waiting so I'll...

Jaime Wagner: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you. So I would like to come back to what Chuck was saying so I also for my feelings, so I would say the Slide Number 8 is not necessary from that point of view that I think we do not need to have an excuse why we just came to this step at present.

So we are here so we have reached some status that is what we can show. But why we came there and how so, that's not the story so that (it's also right up here) - it's also more important for me to show and that's part of what I think the council people.

Especially those who were first (at our meeting) as we charged our group here are expecting it to show and explain when do we finish our work and what is to be expected now? What is still open and when will it come to an end? So that's how I see that and we should really focus on that.

Ken Bour: I see Chuck has his hand up.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. I think Wolf is right that we don't need to be overly defensive on why it has taken so long. It's like what we were talking about on earlier slides there.

If the question comes up and it has come up in our own group obviously, then we can simply say hey, we came up with a model that we were quite attracted to and we spent a lot of time on that. But when we got down to the

results stage we tossed it out because we didn't think that it accomplished what we had hoped.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. If I may, I have noted that we will hide this slide for the council meeting and if it gets turned on at some later stage that can be done. That decision can be made.

I will make an adjustment to the language. If it's okay Olga, I'd like to leave it in its current structure but only because it would be a very time consuming effort to redo it.

Olga Cavalli: No. Of course. Forget about that comment. That's not relevant.

Ken Bour: Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Let's look at it upside down, Olga.

Olga Cavalli: It's my mind. It gets fractured.

Chuck Gomes: Stand on your head.

Ken Bour: Actually one of the things I was trying to do and I eventually just abandoned it, I was trying to draw a line, a curve from the bottom left, all the way up to the top right, just like a straight line to sort of show the upward.

I thought that idea of upward, forward trajectory was a positive kind of message and that's why it's oriented this way from bottom to top anyway. Okay. So Slide 8 is now officially hidden. It will be in the next generation I send out. I'm ready to move to Slide 9. Are we okay?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Just one thing. I think it should be kept in the presentation.

Ken Bour: Yes sir.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: But in our - will we have a (phase) meeting of our team in I think it was Sunday or Monday.

Olga Cavalli: Sunday. Sunday.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. Okay. Then I think I would like to say that I like this slide a lot. It's very helpful for our own work.

Ken Bour: Yes. This is Ken. I will not delete it. It will only be hidden.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: And this is Chuck. The meeting is scheduled for 2:00 to 3:30 pm on Sunday in Nairobi.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Ken Bour: Okay. This is Ken. I have put up Slide 9. The intent behind this slide was to show what things or what decisions the team has confirmed and made so far. And I noted that there is the project list that has been completed.

The model has been simplified to focus primarily on value. That comment may not make sense if we don't talk about what the original model was so I might take a suggestion to make a change there. The third was the definitions have been completed.

The rating methodology has been tested and some pieces of it have been adopted thus far, the scale, the individual rating template and the group process. And then under group outcomes I tried to put a few items there that came out of our last discussion and some email exchanges and we can talk about whether they are appropriate now. I'll stop there.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. Ken, on the second bullet let me go ahead and suggest an approach there. What if we just eliminated model simplification and just said focus initially on value?

And I say initially because we have decided that subsequently we might bring in other factors but that's just a suggestion. You can take that under consideration.

Jaime Wagner: Well, I think the word primarily brings because the secondarily can mean another thing. And I think I prefer primarily than initially. This is Jaime.

Chuck Gomes: I'm okay with that.

Jaime Wagner: And I don't know, I kind of like even though we don't spend too much time in the explaining, we overly complicated before we can do that there was some discussion on simplification and this is I think important.

Chuck Gomes: Chuck again and I'm okay. I was just trying to throw out another alternative. I'm not opposed to the way it looks right now.

Jaime Wagner: I would maintain this slide just as it is.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. Okay. That's fine. Olga, are you comfortable with that?

Jaime Wagner: Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Yes I like it.

Ken Bour: Okay. Any other comments on Slide 9 or are we okay with the outcomes?

Jaime Wagner: They reflect what we discussed. Very good, Ken.

Olga Cavalli: Yes I agree.



Ken Bour: Very good. Hearing no other comments on Slide 9 I'm going to move to Slide 10. These are the next steps as best I could glean them out of our various summaries and discussions.

And I'll cover it just briefly. We need to complete the methodology evaluation, which includes - and I know we have done some of this work but I thought it would be good to show what we have left to do. We still really have to tie down how to incorporate new projects, identify and handle project status changes.

I think we have discussed the frequency but we haven't really nailed that all down yet. And we haven't completely decided on the group individual rating approaches, for example whether to involve the entire council or small groups and that sort of thing.

Second big bullet is to decide if any additional testing is needed. Third was to discuss some recommendations around management tools. We recognized early on that prioritization is although useful, it's not a quick fix and it's only the first step. The council will also need data and management tools to assist in its decision making. And then the last two points have to do with documentation and training.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Wolf speaking. May I?

Olga Cavalli: Sure. Go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So I think the key question is Ken, you pointed out next steps through March and April, which may be a little bit (weak). Okay. I understand that. But the question is really when can we have the first round?

When can we provide or when can we offer the first round of polling to the council? Why shouldn't we come up with a date? A target date please.

Jaime Wagner: I think this is a good suggestion.

Olga Cavalli: It's a good idea.

Jaime Wagner: This is Jaime and Ken, I think in the first bullet we have already a stronger consensus than you reflect in the considerations here. I think we have a lot of discussion on these items, how to incorporate new projects, how to identify and handle project changes and the frequency of prioritization.

We have already I think strong consensus on that. I think we have suggestions and the way you put here, it seems that we didn't discuss it.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I use the word complete rather than start because I think these are just finishing items, right? The emphasis I would put is on the word complete rather than to start.

Yes. You are quite right and I said that earlier. We have done work on all of these areas. None of these are fresh, haven't been touched and I'm happy to take a suggestion if we just take it out or simplify it or however you'd like to present it.

Jaime Wagner: I think this could be - I would suggest that we separate these items into different slides and present them in terms of suggestions. The group has not - and also it can give to the council a sense of participation and because what other suggestions on how to incorporate new projects?

Well, we have a suggestion on this. How to identify and handle project changes - we have a suggestion on this. And how - why not put these suggestions? I thought indeed that there were already definitions of some of them. But if you think there are much more on the suggestion side, I would separate them from the other steps that are not yet tackled.

Ken Bour: Chuck has his hand up.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. I just want to comment on two things. First of all, what Wolf suggested and then secondly maybe let me do my second one first. If we add more let's be careful about adding more.

I think that a reasonable target for this 20 minutes that we have in the council meeting and it's going to probably be a full council meeting, would be 10 minutes for the presentation and 10 minutes for discussion and answering questions.

So as long as the presentation can be done in 10 minutes and allow them 10 minutes for discussion both from the council and the community. Keep in mind these are open meetings that we allow comments and questions from the floor as well as from those participating remotely, that that's a good target.

It should be no more than 10 minutes to do the presentation. Now back to Wolf's suggestion. I think he's right or at least on the right track in terms of the targeting a date. So what I did is I looked at the council meetings in April. We have two actually.

We have one on the first of April and one on the 21st of April. We had to move away from a Thursday on that particular week. So I think that the GNSO procedures require us to post things at least eight days in advance for council meetings. So if we did a target date of the 13th of April to get something produced for the council, do you think we can make it? I think we can.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. I think so.

Chuck Gomes: I think we need to.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yeah.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. Then is it sufficient for me to put WPM next steps March-13 April?

Chuck Gomes: That might work.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. Another idea - I'm actually convinced now that we should just take the four sub-bullets out of Number 1 and then I can take March-April out of the title and put a fifth bullet at the bottom or maybe an arrow or some other graphic that says target complete date 13 April.

Chuck Gomes: Deliverable to the council 13 April.

Ken Bour: Yeah.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: I like that.

Jaime Wagner: Yeah. Okay.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. Everybody okay with that? Because we don't have time - I'm sorry. Go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: The GNSO council meeting is on the 13th?

Chuck Gomes: No. We would need to deliver it to the council on the 13th. The council meeting is on the 21st.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: That's eight days.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: You remember that they need to distribute it to their respective groups and so forth.

Ken Bour: I can put a footnote at the bottom to the slide that says eight days before council meeting on 21 April.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. That's good.

Ken Bour: That will help clear that up. This is Ken. Are we okay on Number 10?

Jaime Wagner: What about my suggestion that - Chuck, I was not suggesting to add anything but to remove from this slide and have a separate slide to emphasize that this step is already almost completed.

Chuck Gomes: Jaime, do you think we need that especially if we remove those bullets like Ken just suggested, do you think we need that extra slide?

Jaime Wagner: No.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. There won't be time to engage council members and achieve any suggestions or have open dialogue about any of these topics. As we know from our own deliberations, they're knotty issues.

It takes us half an hour/20 minutes each and we just wouldn't have the time.  
So maybe...

Jaime Wagner: I think we will finish this in Nairobi and we should have this target to finish this in Nairobi. Completing these steps should be finished in Nairobi.

Chuck Gomes: What steps Jaime?

Jaime Wagner: The complete methodology evaluation and how to incorporate new projects, how to identify and handle projects. All these questions should be tackled and defined in Nairobi.

Chuck Gomes: So you think that we'll complete those in the meeting on Sunday, this coming Sunday?

Jaime Wagner: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. I hope so. I don't know.

Jaime Wagner: Because I feel we have already much more - that's my opinion. We have much more consensus than is reflected in these questions.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I don't think there is any disagreement with that statement and I apologize for making it sound like we don't. I was really just trying to help the council understand that we still have work to do.

But I'll take all those bullets out and hopefully as you have pointed out they will all get settled in Nairobi and we don't have to. So this will be a little bit tighter slide and we'll just have one more bullet at the end that talks about our delivery date.

Jaime Wagner: Okay. I have understood that you would remove these bullets.

Ken Bour: Sorry. Yeah. I made that notation on the right under notes. Okay. This is Ken. Okay to move to Slide 11? I think that's the last one. Okay. Yeah, it is the last one.

Jaime Wagner: Okay.

Ken Bour: Just as I thought it would take us an hour to go through this and it did.

Chuck Gomes: And I have a problem with this slide. It's too complicated.

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Chuck, it would be easier for you to present it.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. I'll do it remotely. Thanks Wolf.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. If I may, I think I don't know if I need to summarize this. I have been keeping notes on the right side and that will be the summary of the meeting.

I'll capture this, I'll put it in a short email to everybody and more importantly I will update the PowerPoint slide deck to reflect the changes that have been discussed and I'll get it out to you in the next few hours really. It's going to be quick because I know time is running out here.

And that way if there are any additional comments we'll still be able to make some additional changes. And of course we want Olga to be comfortable with it. So in the final analysis she has to be capable and comfortable in delivering all this material.

Olga Cavalli: That will be fine. No problem. So Ken, you're not going to be in Nairobi, right?

Ken Bour: I am not going to be in Nairobi but I can make arrangements certainly to participate remotely.

Chuck Gomes: It's only 6:00 am in the morning, Ken. It's not too bad.

Ken Bour: Not too bad?

Chuck Gomes: Considering I'm starting most of my days at either midnight or 3:00 am Eastern Time. By the way, I had my hand up because I just wanted to make sure everybody on this team is aware that when we have working team or working group meetings on the weekend and live meetings that it's open to the public to attend.

Now Olga can control the participation of the public but it is often common practice to allow people to ask questions and comment during those open sessions. So just in case anybody wasn't aware of that I wanted to make sure everybody is aware of that.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yeah.

Olga Cavalli: That's a good comment, Chuck.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I might ask a question of those of you who are PowerPoint experts. When you hide a slide and you send that slide deck to the people that will put it up on Adobe Connect or however they get it out there. The slide that is hidden doesn't show anywhere unless you unhide it, is that correct?

Olga Cavalli: I'm no PowerPoint expert.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: When you send to Adobe?

Olga Cavalli: I don't know in Adobe.

Ken Bour: Yeah.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: I'm not familiar with Adobe Connect.

Ken Bour: That's okay. I'll get the answer from one of my technical people. Okay. Sorry.



Olga Cavalli: If you're showing it in the regular PowerPoint presentation it doesn't show and you can go if you have a link. But I don't know in Adobe. I'm not an expert.

Ken Bour: Go ahead.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: If you print it you have the option and you can print to a PDF file but you have the option to show or not the hidden slide.

Ken Bour: Okay. That's great. I'll test it out myself in a few minutes. Okay. Great. Anything? I guess Olga I'll turn it over to you.

Olga Cavalli: No. I just want to thank you for this. I think it has been a very good exercise through the PowerPoint. Thank you for preparing it. I feel like guilty because I'm the chair, I should have done it.

But I have been traveling a lot. So I really thank you very much. And look forward for the last version and I will add my if I can edit it, I will add my comments. So I can use my comments when I present it.

Ken Bour: Super.

Olga Cavalli: Okay? So see you on Sunday or remotely. Thank you.

Ken Bour: Thanks everybody.

((Crosstalk))

END