

**GNSO – ICANN Nairobi Meeting  
GNSO Open Working session  
Work Prioritization Model Group  
07 March at 14:00 local time**

**Note:** The following is the output of transcribing at the NCPH held in Nairobi on Saturday 06 March at 09:00 Local time. 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.

Olga Cavalli: ...review a document that Ken has been so kind to start drafting where we put all our conclusions and outcomes and procedures that we have been defining.

It's just a rough document that we will go through and try to fill up - fill in the missing parts that we still have to define as we go through it.

I would like to mention that oh, before we start with details I would like to know who's in the call. I'll make a short roll call. So Stéphane perhaps you can help in doing that in the room?

Stéphane van Gelder: Yes. Can you hear me?

Olga Cavalli: Yes I can hear you know.

Stéphane van Gelder: Well do you want us to start that here first?

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Stéphane van Gelder: Yes, okay. So I'm here, Stéphane van Gelder registrar stakeholder group.

Marika Konings: Marika Konings, ICANN staff.

Debra Hughes: Debra Hughes, NCSG.

Mary Wong: Mary Wong, NCSG.

David Olive: David Olive, ICANN staff.

Liz Gasster: Liz Gasster, ICANN staff.

Margie Milam: Margie Milam, ICANN staff.

Jaime Wagner: Jaime Wagner, ISDCP Public Open, ISP constituency.

Tony Harris: Tony Harris, ISP constituency.

Andrew Gillespie: Andrew Gillespie, non-com appointee.

Stéphane van Gelder: Okay Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Great. And remotely we have myself Olga from Buenos Aires Olga Cavalli, non-com appointee. Who else?

Ken Bour: This is Ken Bour from ICANN staff. And I am sitting next to Chuck Gomes.

Olga Cavalli: Is someone else on the line? Okay great. Thank you for joining. Okay the idea is to start the revision and the preparing of a document that would summarize our experience, our outcomes of the three month work that we have been doing since Tool.

And also I would like you to know that the working team has prepared a PowerPoint summarizing all we have been doing up till now. And it will be presented on the Open Council Meeting on Wednesday morning.

I won't be there. I - Jaime are you okay doing that presentation or you want me to do it remotely?

Jaime Wagner: No I'm okay.

Olga Cavalli: Oh Great. Thank you very much for that help. It's - I appreciate that. And the PowerPoint is already prepared and agreed by the Working Team. And it will be presented in the Open Council meeting and then re-reviewed again in the wrap-up session on Thursday.

So this is about presenting our work so far and about now I'm - Ken has sent to the working team a draft document that has the intention to start putting our experience and our outcomes in a draft document. And he has summarized part of our work.

And the idea that we have been discussing in the list is that we start working with the document and putting all the things are still missed. We still have to define something, some part of the procedure.

So as we go through the document and we include these issues we will try to finally define them and prepare final draft document and present it to the council.

Hopefully Ken correctly if I'm wrong, we have a due date for that. It's the - April 13th?

Ken Bour: Yes. That is correct.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Thank you very much.

Ken Bour: And well that was the date that the team agreed to put in the PowerPoint that will be discussed on Wednesday right?

Olga Cavalli: Yes. It will be discussed on Wednesday and it - and it does say it has - is related to the next council meeting that will be held I think some days after that that I think at the end of April. This is why we selected that date.

As you can see it's a challenging date. We have been doing a lot of work and testing different methodologies.

And we have changed some type of models. We went from a two-dimensional model to the one dimensional model.

We made tests among ourselves individually. And we have to still define some things about this.

But I think that we took some time. But we have saved a lot of time in the GNSO. If we were not doing this work perhaps the council should have gone through this experience and it would have been much more complicated and time-consuming. So we think we took our time but it has been very valuable for the whole group.

So Ken, you sent us a draft document. I would like you to suggest some ways to review the document, maybe reviewing the text or perhaps we can work in a general index to see if we are missing some issues.

Do you have any ideas? As you have been so kind to send this first draft perhaps you can give us some feedback about how to proceed?

Ken Bour: Thank you Olga. The email that I sent I guess it was the 5th of March, was an attempt on my part to try to think through how we can meet a deliverable date of 13 April which the team agreed that it wanted to do.

And so I thought well in my mind a deliverable from this team ends up being a chapter or a section in the GNSO operating procedure, right?

Because it's going to actually specify a set of provisions and procedures and methodologies and guidelines that the council will follow in order to prioritize its work.

And since it is going to take the form of a document like that I - at least this is my thinking I thought well maybe I should just start drafting it.

And if I - and I got quite a bit through it but it's very rough in many sections and it's going to need more work which I'm perfectly happy to do.

But I think there's enough material that we could start taking a look at it and seeing if this is an approach that the team is comfortable with.

The theory behind it is that in the act of writing the procedures section by section, chapter and so forth areas where we don't - where we still have decisions to make will become crystal clear.

And at those junctures we will have to make those decisions and then write them up immediately thereafter. And hopefully in the next 4 to 5 weeks we will be done.

So that's the concept. And maybe I ought to just sort of ask if the team members feel that that's a reasonable approach.

Olga Cavalli: That - yes thank you Ken. That's exactly my next question. Any comments from the Working Team? Any comments from the room about the work done so far or this proposed methodology for the meeting today and for the next meetings?

By the way for those who are not part of this Working Team, we have been meeting weekly since our meeting in Seoul. So we did a very hard work (sic). And we plan to do the same until we finish the documents. Any comments?

Jaime Wagner: This is Jaime and I have read the - well I agree with Ken that we should proceed with this in the way he proposed it.

And I have read the - I have - I did the first reading of the document. And I have some already, I have some comments on it.

So when you - I don't know how you want to proceed, to go item by item or to go directly to the recommendations?

Olga Cavalli: I - Marika, would it be possible to see the document? Because the PowerPoint will be reviewed in the Open Council Meeting on Wednesday?

So if you're so kind, maybe you have the document. Ken did you send it to Marika?

Jaime Wagner: Marika just left the room.

Olga Cavalli: Oh.

Jaime Wagner: I don't know if somebody from staff...

Olga Cavalli: Somebody, okay.

Jaime Wagner: I will - I would ask here if somebody from staff have Ken's document, Ken's Word document.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I sent both the Word doc and the PDF to Marika earlier today.

Woman: Ken we know. She's not here. We just need you to tell us just what's the name of it and I'll pull it up.

Ken Bour: Oh it's called - I got it right here.

Olga Cavalli: I have it open.

Jaime Wagner: Oh she's...

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Section 6 work prioritization KBV1 Version 1...

Ken Bour: That's right.

Olga Cavalli: ...it's open.

Ken Bour: Thank you.

Man: And Olga I don't know if you have Adobe Connect up, but Wolf had his hand up.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. I was reviewing the name of the document. Yes Wolf, go ahead please.

Wolf Ulrich-Knoben: Thank you Olga. Well in principle I'm in line with Ken. So in - I mean so that - to come up with a document which summarizes all these - the tasks we're going through and all the results we have achieved whether this document should be done in the form of rules of procedure is the second point I would say. So that we shouldn't spend time - too much time on this or how to integrate or do it in a form for the rules of procedures.

But for me the most important thing is and whether Ken mentioned is when we go through this document we immediately will see what kind of tasks are still open and what we have to do in - for the future in order to meet our deadline on 13 April.

And that's what I'm still missing Ken. That means I'm expecting a kind of a let me say, a action list also just summarizing those points so which are still open that makes it more transparent to me and maybe also the others from the council what is still open here in this. And then we get through, go through those action items one after the other.

And I'm sorry I didn't have a chance not yet to go through that document and to read it carefully. So I cannot comment on all these parts of the document.

But maybe we should discuss the form and the process we are discussing about. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Wolf. And exactly this is something I was referring a minute ago in preparing an index. I mean exactly the same of what you're saying Wolf is having a list index or whatever, a list of things that we have to review, address and summarize in our document.

So I've been reading the document not in detail because I have really not much time. And some of the issues are in it and maybe some others are missed.

So why don't we go through the document in general Ken. Could you please give us an outline of the document and see perhaps we can find the missing parts or where we have to include or we have to expand or put more detail or more (appraisals) and see what is the outline of the document so far.

Ken Bour: Yes I'd be happy to. This is Ken. So I thought that this section might be - might actually go into the GNSO procedures as chapter or Section 6. And so I called it GNSO Work Prioritization.

So the first thing and most of the materials that we've been writing start out with a purpose and scope. So Section 6.1 is entitled that.

Why don't I just - I'll crawl through the major headings and then we'll go back so we can just sort of get a general idea of what's included at least topically.

So 6.1 is purpose and scope. 6.2 is discussion of the prioritized and non-prioritized project list, right?

And so far hopefully you'll recognize that we've made decisions and we are pretty much firm on both of those two sections.

And so we can wordsmith the language but I don't think there are any further decisions left to make in those two sections.

The next one is 6.3 methodology. And this one has of course many subsections starting out with the goals and the methodology, primary and secondary dimensions that we've discussed. And those definitions have now been solidified I think.

Then there's some procedural material that needs to go in the methodology section including the rating scale.

And then this is where things get a little murky because we still haven't made all of the decisions yet with respect to individual and group ratings and how they're going to be done.

And so this material starts to get a little rough in here. But at least I made provisions for them in the document.

Then there is a Section 6.4 called Frequency. And we have had some discussion there. I'm not 100% sure that it needs to be its own section. It may be we put frequency in somewhere else, but it was a topic that was on our list that needed to be nailed down.

And then the last one I have is in the new projects. And again that might fit better in - under a different subheading.

But the concept there was okay fine, we've done the work prioritization. We have the methodology. We've got all the things tied up. How does a new project get introduced into this modeling process? And we have had some discussion already on that and I've tried to put that material in there.

And then the last chapter or section is called Tools. And we haven't had much discussion about this. But I've been trying to suggest to the team that one of the - you know, it's one thing and I think we've all recognized that the prioritization is only the first step in the general management that the council does with respect to the policy agenda.

And so once we get the prioritization done then what happens? And hopefully we can provide some mechanisms and tools, software -- whatever's needed so that the council has the data it needs to actually make decisions based on its prioritization. And so that wraps-up the last part of this document.

But we were - if we were to then go - well let me pause there and see if anybody thinks that there is a major topic left out?

Olga Cavalli: Comments so far to Ken? I have some. I would like to add a specific point about the project list including the finish and - about what is a project for this prioritization.

Maybe it's in the text and maybe I missed it because I didn't go into detail. So if this is the case my apologies.

And what is the project for the GNSO? Why is the project included in the list? And also I would like to briefly or explain how is the project list designed, why there's this abbreviation, there's a brief description and then we have a glossary.

I think we should explain because this will be a reference document. And it should be at least described briefly, not in very long detail, but briefly what - how it's constructed.

Maybe it's in the document and I didn't find it. So if this is the case, apologies. And if not I think it would be included.

Jaime Wagner: May I? It's Jaime.

Olga Cavalli: Sure Jaime go ahead.

((Crosstalk))

Jaime Wagner: I think that in the Ken's document ICANN's six - well 6.2, it's prioritized and non-prioritized it projects. Well I think they - there it's defined what a project means then.

And also but I think Ken, this is a suggestion I made and then I will mail to you afterwards. I make some suggestions and amendments in the document itself.

And I would add the suggestion to have a an annex of the - with the same list that Liz prepared for us for our tests rating. And I think it's missing as an annex to this for a document.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I have a comment about that but I think we have other hands up first.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. I'm looking at the document sorry. We have Chuck. Go ahead Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Olga. The - I want to make sure that we're all on the same page. If I understand it correctly, the approach that Ken has suggested is that we do

our remaining work by going through these proposed procedural changes to - in the GNSO operating procedures.

And the idea if I understand it correctly -- and Ken can correct me - is, is that by doing that we accomplish two things at once.

Number one we complete the remaining items that we haven't reached total resolution on. And number two, we actually end up with a document that could be inserted into the GNSO operating procedures once they council approves it much more easily. So is everybody comfortable with that approach?

Olga Cavalli: This is Olga. I'm okay with that if it doesn't distract us from preparing a clear document with procedures and outcomes.

Jaime Wagner: I'm okay. And I already (unintelligible).

Olga Cavalli: Any other comments?

Jaime Wagner: Yes, well (unintelligible). I'm basically okay as to, but I have the same little feelings that it might disappoint us a little bit. So let's really focus on the content not on the form beyond that.

Because maybe, you know, the operating procedures as well has to be - the other team has to be - has to deal with it just as well.

So and maybe they have some - the operating procedure team has some specific requirements. So let's really focus on the content and then we can go through that to the form of all the procedures.

Olga Cavalli: I have a question to Ken and to Chuck. How difficult will be, say we prepare a document without focusing on formatting in relation with bigger documents and GNSO documents, we just prepare a document focused on our work.

How difficult would be to merge this one into the format? Would it be very complicated or would it take a lot of time?

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I am - I have already structured it so that it is in the - it is consistent with the format in the GNSO operating procedures.

I have helped draft other sections already that are in there. And so I'm familiar. I'll take care the formatting. We can focus on the content.

Chuck Gomes: And Olga I have a suggestion with regard to how to move through this in what I hope is an effective manner.

I suggest that in this - several of us haven't had a chance to review it in detail. But I suggest the way we go through it is at a high-level and that we handle editorial changes on our list.

So another words what I'm suggesting, let's go through the document section by section and decide where we're in basic agreement with the concepts that are in there avoiding the more minor editorial changes and so forth, the wording and so forth that we can all fix on the list.

And then that will bring us more quickly to the issues where we actually do need to reach final resolution. Does that make sense?

Olga Cavalli: So yes it does. So are we okay if we think that within this format we are focusing on content and also the format is already there?

Chuck Gomes: Yes and what I'm saying is it's not just format that we're going to leave for later. The minor edits of wordsmithing and so forth we should be able to try to do that on the list.

And then on a subsequent call if there's some areas where we need to discuss we can do that.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. But my question was in relation with Wolf's concern which is also somehow mine. Let's do a - let's put the substance on substance of our work in the document.

What - but what Ken is saying is that he already formatted in the way that it should finally end up in another document so we shouldn't care about format now.

Chuck Gomes: I agree with that.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Great.

Chuck Gomes: But I'm suggesting also...

Olga Cavalli: Wolf are you - yes?

Chuck Gomes: ...beyond formatting that we leave the wordsmithing to try and do on the list and not just wordsmith every word in this on this call.

Olga Cavalli: I agree. I totally agree with you. Let's see what the rest saying. But Wolf are you okay with this providing issue and content issue?

Wolf Ulrich-Knoben: Yes, yes I'm okay. So...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Wolf Ulrich-Knoben: ...just let me add something. So as I'm also a member of the other working team dealing with the rules and procedures and, you know, I'm really key on open to keep the rules as transparent as possible.

That means for me that they should not be too much detail, you know, going to. So they should be understandable. And that's one point of formatting as well.

So in this respect so we - they'll have a discussion in the other teams so we shouldn't take care too much this team. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Any other comments? I think we have set up the scene to start. And I like the suggestion made by Chuck that go into details of word and edits that go for the general structure of the document and main contents.

So if we all agree, other comments in the room or someone wants to talk?

Great. Ken, can you perhaps go more in detail section by section or how do you think we can review the document?

Ken Bour: Yes Olga this is Ken. I'll be happy to. The - so let's start with section - a paragraph if you will purpose and scope.

This is material that I've - has already been in other emails that have circulated. And hopefully if we just look at those bold - right, the major goals of the effort were education and transparency.

We wordsmithed that on the list. Of course allocation, strategic management, hopefully those are all familiar to you.

Again we - you can go through and read this at a more detailed level as Chuck was suggesting through the list.

I put some, again, all this material comes from stuff we already looked at. The overall process I had three steps listed.

The first is the council prioritizes all the projects right, based on value. And it says that it number one.

Number two is that once they're all prioritized then the council actively manages the workload looking at staff resource availability consequences and so forth.

And then the third step is to provide the data and tracking mechanisms that enable those decisions to be made.

And again we can certainly - so back to my theory. We needed to write a purpose and scope section that we can deliver to the council that says why are we recommending a work prioritization methodology procedure. And the purpose and scope section sets out what that intends to do.

And so this is a draft language that I'm submitting to the team. And we can work through it.

Once we have finished that it's done and we move on to Section 62, right? Now we've got our purpose and scope done.

The second section is - oh, let me stop.

Chuck Gomes: Let me jump in and suggest that can't we right now talk about - I mean for me again, leaving wordsmithing to later, I'm fairly comfortable with Section 6.1. Have we captured the main things there?

Olga Cavalli: Yes I think so.

Jaime Wagner: The purpose and scope are you talking about - this is Jaime yes?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, just section 6.1.

Jaime Wagner: I just have a - well it's a kind of - I don't know it's kind of an editing thing I have only one, the paragraph, although work prioritization is an important for staff et cetera, I think it - I don't see the point to keep this paragraph. And I would delete it.

Man: So this paragraph?

Ken Bour: Yes. We can do that. This is Ken.

Olga Cavalli: Yes I agree.

Ken Bour: Anything else? All right. Shall we move to Section 6.2?

Section two, 6.2 okay, that we set up the purpose and scope of the effort, what is the grist of the effort? And that is in fact the project list, right?

So - and we spent a lot of talking about that what a prioritized project is, what projects are not going to be on the prioritize list and what categories they have.

And so I thought we would memorialize all that material in this section. And that's what you see in front of you.

So you see all of our four categories which include pending, monitor, inactive implementation. And now with respect to the list itself, let me give a thought about that.

I don't particularly think that the list belongs in the procedures. The procedures talk about what how the list gets created. But I would think that the list should live on the Web site.

And it would be in the two tables, you know, one that's just the prioritized list and here's the non-prioritized list. And all of the actions that the council takes would impact that list which lives elsewhere.

Because I think if you make it an annex, as soon as you have another project you have to change the annex to the procedures.

And so we will be constantly updating the GNSO operating procedures for things that could be handled better on a Web site. That's just my opinion. And I throw that out to the team.

Olga Cavalli: Hi Jaime wants to talk. Jaime go ahead.

Jaime Wagner: I agree. I can - I just what I meant by an annex could be a mention of a - of such a Web site list that will be maintained up to date. But we have, I think it's lacking here a mention to do first list or this updated list. That's it.

Olga Cavalli: This is Olga. I agree with Jaime. And I would add here just a brief description of how this document is structured.

That's something I mentioned a few minutes ago, what parts of the list, how there are abbreviations, then there's the description and then there's a glossary just so people knowing what they will find if they go to that link. But that's not a major issue. It's only a paragraph.

Man: And Olga let me jump in. So if it's just a paragraph -- and I agree with you that's probably all it is -- why do you need an annex? Why don't we just state that in this section?

Olga Cavalli: No, no it's I agree with Jaime that it shouldn't be an annex. It's just a link to the...

Man: I'm sorry, did you say should not be an annex or should...

Olga Cavalli: Should - yes no, should not.

Man: Oh okay. I didn't hear the not part. That's...

Olga Cavalli: No I'm sorry.

Man: ...where I was mixed up. I think we're on the same page. Is that correct Jaime?

Jaime Wagner: Yes. I agree. It's not an annex.

Man: Good.

Jaime Wagner: It's just a reference to a Web site.

Man: Excellent.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Man: Good. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: And just a paragraph in this document that refers to what people will find when they go to that link.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. That's fine. I'd be happy to put that material in there.

Olga Cavalli: Great.

Ken Bour: We also have that paragraph or this - in on the Web site where the tables and the list and the abbreviations live I would also expect to see that instruction material there just like we have it in our Word document.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Ken Bour: In fact my proposal would actually be that the Word document we created that has all the projects and all of the descriptive material, that that whole thing be the content that goes into the Web site.

And so it would always have that kind of form. And so the short descriptions would be there. And the description of how they're organized and alphabetized, all that would be in that Web site area.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you. Wolf wants...

Ken Bour: And so we can just - we can briefly mention it here in this document. And all the rest of that material would be on the Web site.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much Ken. Yes I agree with you. Wolf, do you want to talk?

Wolf Ulrich-Knoben: Yes. It may be just an editorial thing. Is this part of it's called prioritize and non-prioritized project list, I'm missing any reference to a non-prioritized project list in the chapter itself?

So at least there should be some - one sentence that in that sentence okay, all the other projects which are not prioritized are non-prioritized projects.  
Thanks.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. Thank you Wolf. I think I've - yes I see that now. And we say prioritized projects do not include. And maybe in parens there it needs to be non-prioritized projects. I think that's a good catch.

Okay on 6.2?

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Ken Bour: Six dot three is the methodology section. And we're - this is where we'll spend I think the bulk of our remaining next couple of three weeks trying to really build this section out.

I have more drafting work to do. And the team will have some hard decisions to make.

I started it out with a goals section. We talked earlier about the goals of any methodology should be user-friendly and so forth, that it should produce realistic outputs that make the council - give the council what it needs to do the management job and is structured as an ongoing task so that new projects can be accommodated.

Once we get through with the goals of the methodology then I moved right into - and I don't know if this is the right terminology, but primary and secondary dimensions.

As you all recall we decided we were going to focus primarily on value. And so that's - that comes up first.

And then we decided that in the event that projects were tied in the ratings on value that we would use difficulty for tiebreaking situations.

And I tried to reflect that here in the language and I included the definitions for both these dimensions here.

This will need to be fleshed out a bit more. But hopefully you get a sense now of what we're starting with.

Jaime Wagner: I - this is Jaime. I think it reflects our conversation and agreement and consensus in the group. I just throw out the question that can be also a minor problem.

But were we not to invite the concept of dimensions or - and we would use the wording factors I think and...

Man: Oh factors.

Ken Bour: Thank you. That - we can certainly change the word dimension to factors if everybody thinks that's a better noun.

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bour: This is Ken. That's precisely the kind of just calibrating that we need to do to tighten the document up and make it a complete deliverable. So yes, I appreciate that.

The next - may I move on?

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Ken Bour: The next...

Olga Cavalli: Any...

Ken Bour: section then would be...

Olga Cavalli: ...other - sorry Ken. Are there any comments in the room that I may not see here?

No? Okay.

Ken Bour: Okay. The next Section 633 deals with procedures. And this is where the guts of the methodology takes shape.

At the moment we have essentially two steps I think in the material that we've done both in our own testing and that we've discussed as a team.

The first step is individual council members would do their own ratings separately privately. And we have a template, a spreadsheet, instructions for how to fill it out.

We have worked through some mechanics. I haven't written all that up yet, but we have done that work. And we know how we could pull all 20 council members ratings into a single consolidated spreadsheet and do some analysis on it.

Chuck Gomes: Hey Olga can I jump in on that? I know we're not...

Olga Cavalli: Sure.

Chuck Gomes: ...specifically focused on editorial things. But I think this particular editorial change, make sure that we're all clear on what step one means.

In other words I think it should say individual counselor ratings rather than counselor ratings just to be clear.

Olga Cavalli: I agree.

Ken Bour: Yes this is Ken. I agree. Then the second thing step - and this is where - so I'm going to skip. Let's see I want to - let me go past 6331 right? Because we've defined our rating scale.

You'll notice that there's some material underneath that in a box. I drew a shadowbox around it.

These are guidelines that we wrote up about how you use the rating scale and what it means to think about an average project.

And I think this material needs to be included but I'm not convinced in my own mind it belongs in the procedures themselves. And so this is where I think maybe in annex could be of value.

We could take for example all the detail procedures that involve the templates and filling it out, the guidelines and some of these other things. And maybe they belong more properly in an annex.

It's just a thought because as I read this material it doesn't read like procedures that we've written in other sections of the GNSO operating procedures.

But let's put that aside for the moment. And I've commented that so that we won't lose track of it.

So 6332 starts to talk about how the individual council member ratings would occur, talks about the spreadsheet, more work needs to be done there.

The next step though -- and this is where we have some work to do -- has to do with the group consensus rating.

So now we've got all the counselors have done their individual ones. The next question is how do we bring the group together? Is it a single council session in which everybody participates in a kind of Delphi technique or do we break up into stakeholder group, smaller groups of six which is what we did in our sub team? We used a smaller group.

And I'm not necessarily suggesting we discuss that today. But that is an area we left I think with some haziness around it at least in my mind.

When - and so this would be an example then of how in the writing of the procedure we actually notice a gap. And we close it, fill it, write it and move on to the next one.

And what I will try to do is make sure that all the items that we have yet to decide are positioned in this document where they belong. And that way we can step right on through it and when we're done we will have addressed all the issues. And then at the end of the process we can go back and read it all for total integrity.

So I'm - one more thought.

This section has if you start reading it, you're going to say wow, this is like - this is Ken talking to the team and this is us talking to each other. And yes, I have not edited and sanitized this section.

I just copied and pasted stuff in there so that I could re-draft it later. And I put that in my email that transmitted this document.

Chuck Gomes: So going back to Wolf's I think concern that he expressed earlier, I think it'd be helpful if we go through this like we are right now that we on the side, keep a little list of the major actions that we need to deal with. And this is one of those.

Ken Bour: Right.

Olga Cavalli: I agree.

Jaime Wagner: Can I jump in?

Olga Cavalli: Sure Jaime, go ahead.

Jaime Wagner: This is Jaime. And Ken, I sent an email to the list. It was specifically on this point. And it was a suggestion for Delphi. It was a very specific suggestion right?

And I don't know if it is reflected in - I was not able to read this. But I would like you to consider that as a first approach to this point.

Chuck Gomes: Jaime can you in a couple sentences tell us what that was?

Jaime Wagner: Well it was to have one first group session. And if there was a difference of a range larger than two then each of the lower - the higher ratings would be identified and would defend their position. And then a new round of ratings would be held. And but this time we would include the range to three.

And so if we wouldn't have a median of three then a third round would be - would happen as the same procedure. I mean the extreme values would defend their positions.

Chuck Gomes: Jaime one point - one question for clarification. Would - in your suggestion was it a council as a whole type activity or in smaller groups?

Jaime Wagner: It - I was thinking the whole council.

Chuck Gomes: Okay no that's fine. I just - I don't oppose that as we can talk about that further. But I just wanted to make sure that I understood that part of it. Thank you.

Jaime Wagner: Yes. I think the only point that remained - I mean more controversial is - and that we didn't discuss between - among ourselves is that if this ratings would be taken in smaller groups or directly to the council, to the whole council.

And I personally, I'm in favor of doing directly to with the whole council. But - so I'm open to hear it, other opinions and to change - and then reserve the right to change mine okay? Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: No. Thank you. That's very helpful. I kind of lean that way too mainly from a time perspective because it takes longer to do the groups and then go back to the council.

Like you said, if we found out that it wasn't working as a council as a whole we could always go another direction. But I'm kind of leaning that way too. But like you, I reserve the right to change my opinion.

Jaime Wagner: Let me jump in again just to say that I propose that to - for us to have a test here in Nairobi. But I say - I saw it is - it was impossible.

But I think we should do a test of how - and I know that Ken has some fear about how spread would be the whole council and if we could find the range of two or three median.

So but I - and I don't know also but I have expectation that is less pessimistic than Ken's that we can even at the level of the whole council that we could converge.

And also I think that the discussion that when each person does the defense of its ratings, I mean the extremes, it is very helpful to the whole council. And it's not very time consuming.

At least if the counselors respect the rule of only the extreme ratings have the right to speak.

That's all.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Jaime.

Chuck Gomes: So a question then I mean for the rest of the work team members -- and of course comments from others are helpful if they can keep up and with where we're at -- the - I mean is this - does this sound like an approach that we want to gravitate towards, the one that Jaime's suggested?

I - and I already stated my opinion. I think it is worth considering. I would love to hear from the other working team members.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, this is Olga. I like the idea. And one question comes to my mind now.

If we define a system procedure and we go to the council, how flexible would it be to maybe changing it in the future?

I mean perhaps we go through this exercise and we realize it's good work or it's not good and then we want to change it, it would be very complicated or would be easy? I'm just talking loudly, not thinking about this.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Olga. Let me respond in two ways and maybe others have thoughts there too.

First of all keep in mind that what we are doing as a team is proposing an approach to the council. So ultimately the council's going to need to either bless it or not or change it before we actually do the exercise.

Secondly, any procedures that we adopt now need to be dynamic. We need to improve them as we find out. Just like we went through a fairly elaborate test on a method and find out - found out that it would - had disappointing results, I am sure even when we do it at the council level that we're going to learn things that we're going to change.

So we shouldn't think of this as being so static that it is not changeable. It should be - it's going to need to be changed.

Olga Cavalli: Oh great. So I agree with Jaime's approach. And I would like to make a short introduction. I would like to comment - a comment from the floor that I see in the Chat section from Berry Cobb.

He just wants to know that the business constituency is participating in this meeting. They just were not mentioned in the roll call. But he just want to say that they're present. So thank you Berry for letting us know.

Sorry for the interruption.

I agree with Jaime's approach.

Ken Bour: This is Ken if I might. Jaime, I have scoured the - my work prioritization email folder. I do not see the email that you made reference to. I wonder if you might resend it to the list.

Jaime Wagner: Okay. And Ken, I have another - to the group, another consideration.

I think and I share Ken's apprehension of - and of how easy a consensus can be rigid.

So I think we should not do the council without having a test. We should propose to the council a test exercise for that particular site.

Not - probably not with all the projects in our list but with a small set of (unintelligible) and to do the exercise of the whole group doing the methodology, does include the - all steps of the methodology.

Chuck Gomes: So another clarifying question Jaime. If the test works then we have actually done the exercise. If it doesn't then we refine it. Is that correct?

Jaime Wagner: But it would not be a - with a whole staff of projects. It would be a small staff of projects.

And well and prioritization should be done with all the projects. So I don't think if the test is done we have done part of the work.

I think we should come again and with the whole staff of projects and to do the exercise again.

Chuck Gomes: The problem I have put that is just timing. We've taken so long to get to where we are. And that's just going to delay it further.

Why not do the complete test, all the projects? We probably know fairly early when we're doing it of whether it's going to work or not and then regroup to deal with it?

Again doing a live test on a subset of the projects is just going to delay the overall accomplishment of what we really want to do longer. And that's where my concerns are.

Olga Cavalli: I agree with Chuck's comments.

I don't see a big difference going through the whole list or a part list.

Wolf Ulrich-Knoben: The - well it's Wolf speaking still. So I - also I'm sitting very close to my friend Jaime so I disagree with respect to Jaime.

So I also would like to share these concerns with regards to our timing. And that's one of the critical issues I have in this respect.

So hello? But it's just into that and then be thoughtful regarding our counselors. So I think we could start really with the entire set of projects.

Ken Bour: This is...

Jaime Wagner: I just want to jump in. And again it's Jaime. And well I don't think this exercise would add much delay because it is already a deliverable. If it works it's okay. We have (Richard). So the next meeting of the council we will have the prioritization session.

By the way, I think the whole prioritization session will demand a special meeting of the council, the first one I mean.

Man: Agreed.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. One approach we might take here is to just stay on track with respect to building the deliverable. And then when we are - when we are finished with it let's say April 13, what we do is instead of saying now we want it to be approved, we call it an interim or tentative or it's an - and then the very first prioritization exercise we do is a live test of the procedures.

And if they work okay and everything goes well then we approve the procedures and put them in the GNSO operating procedure.

And if there's anything that goes wrong or we have to tweak it, then we make our tweaks and the team stays active and we come back with draft two. Does that approach sound reasonable?

Olga Cavalli: Ken, let me ask you a question. Is this at the council level or at the group level?

Ken Bour: Yes, I thought the consensus of the team was we would do it at the entire council level.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. No just a clarification.

Jaime Wagner: Just to show how flexible I am, I agree with you.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Jaime. We appreciate that.

Ken Bour: And this is Ken. And I am not trying to throw cold water on it. And as I have indicated in the past, I am a little bit concerned and I'll tell you why.

We have in our own group work, it has taken us on average seven minutes per project right? And so if we have what, 15 or 16 projects to do, then we multiply that, it's going to take an hour and a half in my judgment. And I think we would have to plan on that.

And I think Jaime, your suggestion about a separate council meeting makes all the sense in the world given that kind of time commitment.

Chuck Gomes: And we should assume that it's going to take the full council more than the seven minute average than that we take. But I mean that's a reality.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. One reason that might be true is there might be more extremes than we - we only had six or five people in our session. And so only two people represented the extremes right? So the conversation was limited and still took seven minutes on average.

If you have 20 people, there might be three people on one extreme and two people on the other extreme. And that means five people have to talk or may want to talk in order to try to persuade the group toward reaching a consensus.

That's the only - I just think we have to be cognizant of that. There are some huge benefits to doing the prioritization work, the rating work as a council as a whole I think.

And so if we can work through the mechanics properly and do it as effectively and as efficiently as possible, I think it has the greatest benefit in terms of producing a prioritization list that everybody can agree to.

Chuck Gomes: So Olga let me just - it seems like then are we ready then to task Ken with writing this process up that was proposed by Jaime with the elements that we've agreed to here for our next meeting to try and finalize it?

Olga Cavalli: I was thinking exactly that, yes. I think it's a great idea if the group agrees.

Comments? So we have comments from the room?

Jaime Wagner: Yes, I will send the suggestion to Ken and be okay with - and nobody in the - okay. Probably it got in the limbo.

Olga Cavalli: I really don't recall but there are so many emails that I cannot be sure what I'm talking about. Great.

Should we go back to the document Ken? Are we still - do we have things to review from the general comments on the document?

Ken Bour: Olga this is Ken. The - we've pretty much gotten through the major issues, right. And again I'm not 100% wedded to the idea that frequency and new projects are separate sections that occur after the methodology.

I just - I didn't have time to think all that carefully through.

But the two that we haven't talked about is frequency and new projects 6.4 and 6.5.

And so at some point we just need to - I think we are already - the team already I believe had a consensus that we would recommend to the council

and right in the procedures that the prioritization sessions would be done formally on all relevant projects three times a year at the ICANN meetings.

Now we may have to come back and revisit that if in fact we discover that it can't be done in the context of an ICANN meeting unless it's just done separately, right?

It's a separate session separately scheduled and separately organized for the precise purpose of doing prioritization if it's going to take an hour an hour and a half to do.

And maybe it's true Jaime that the first time it will take all of that time. And maybe the second and third and fourth times it will take much less time because maybe the projects don't shuffle around as much.

Olga Cavalli: We have Wolf that wants to speak. Wolf go ahead please.

Wolf Ulrich-Knoben: Yes thank you. With regard to the frequency, yes we had an agreement on that.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

Wolf Ulrich-Knoben: I have a but with regard to that. That means we'd only do this every three months or every four months or every ICANN meeting and if needed.

And if needed means it needs a commitment from the council to do so. So if the - if the council is of the opinion okay, at this time it's not necessary to do so than we should skip it.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Wolf. I was thinking that do we have to make it in a face to face meeting or we can do some work and before and then wrap up in a face to face meeting?

Chuck Gomes: By the way Jaime I may have found your document. I think where you communicated a lot of this stuff was in a series of exchanges of emails and you redlined yours. Because I'm finding the points you just summarized for us in a communication on the 18th of February.

But we don't need to spend time on that. But maybe you sent something else but I did find that, so...

Jaime Wagner: No it's that. But I can't find it myself. I cannot find it myself in my - okay. But it was that. It's - I redline it.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. Look at the - well we don't need to resolve this right now. But February 18 you responded to some comment that I had responded to I think a document that Ken had submitted. That may be the one where your ideas were because I'm finding most of the elements of what you just shared with us.

But again we don't need to worry about that right now. Hopefully that helps us locate that.

Jaime Wagner: Okay. Thank you very much.

Olga Cavalli: I'm taking Wolf - I'm sorry.

Jaime Wagner: By the way I would add that I'm in favor of Wolf's idea of keeping one regular priority if the council decides to.

Olga Cavalli: Yes this is Olga. I agree with that. And I also agree with Wolf that we already agreed in the group in - that the frequency would be three times a year every ICANN meeting.

I think we already went through that. So maybe perhaps if we agree we can include that in the document?

Ken Bour: This is Ken Olga. Have you looked at 6.4?

Olga Cavalli: Oh I'm looking at it. The problem is that I cannot see the document in the Adobe so I have to switch.

Ken Bour: Oh.

Olga Cavalli: Six - it's so small.

Ken Bour: No that's okay. Don't worry about it. I will make sure - it is in there. It is in there. This is Ken though. I do have one question in my mind. I'm struggling to understand what it means to say as needed.

If you say we'll do three prioritization's a year and as needed how would one know whether it's needed or not in the absence of doing the prioritization?

I mean you - I mean would the chair say I don't think we need any more prioritization this time around. Somebody might say wait, wait, wait.

You know, I would change the ratings on some of these projects. What how would we get to an as needed? How would that work?

Wolf Ulrich-Knoben: Well it's Wolf speaking. So my suggestion would be okay, we put it on the agenda. But at first when they come to that topic we ask for commitment of the council at that point, you know.

And if the council is of the opinion that there's need to or that there's any talk about the agenda let me say at those meetings, then the council has the right well just keep or to amend or to do anything with agenda.

So and I think, you know, because I was of the opinion if now it reads as a obligatory. You know, it's being obligatory for each ICANN meeting.

So and if that is the case so it's - and it turns out it takes some time to do an formal prioritization work, so if it is not - if we are of the opinion okay, because there was no new project, incoming project or what else, so why should we? Then following our formal obligation why should we turn out a formal prioritization?

Olga Cavalli: This is Olga. I think that where Wolf makes a good point and perhaps the word if needed is not the right way to express it perhaps it can be replaced by a full sentence that says that if the council finds that there's no need for doing the prioritization exercise than it keeps them till the next meeting -- something like that.

Ken Bour: Yes this is Ken. That's all been very helpful. I - we in other procedures that we have written maybe we would do something like this.

Any counselor can put forward a motion that says I move that this 1/3 of a year of prioritization be postponed or canceled on the basis of, you know, a lack of change or whatever or we haven't had a new projects.

And then the council - we would write into the procedure it would take a 50% or it would be the default voting threshold, the council would then vote on that motion.

And if the - if a majority of both houses approved it then the prioritization would be would be canceled. So there is a way for us I think to get that accomplished and do it in a clean way. And maybe that's my suggestion.

Olga Cavalli: So perhaps we could include that wording in the document?

Wolf Ulrich-Knoben: Sorry, Wolf speaking here. I didn't catch - got it right correctly (sic). Because are you saying Ken it should be up to a vote, a council vote how to decide upon whether to do a prioritization or not, a formal vote?

So I wouldn't see that in this way why shouldn't we just - why couldn't we just talk about it through going through the agenda at the beginning of the meeting?

So the other way, just voting on it means okay we need a motion advance, some weeks in advance and all these things. So it's - there would be a repetitive voting, a motion for each ICANN meeting with regards to prioritization.

Olga Cavalli: This is Olga. But I think that would happen only when it's not needed, not every three months. Is that the idea that you're proposing Ken...

Ken Bour: This is...

Olga Cavalli: ...by the motion?

Ken Bour: This is Ken. What - maybe I'll just spend some more time thinking this through. But maybe the way we do it is this.

We say that a formal rating prioritization activity must occur at least once every year and it's recommended to be done three times a year.

However if there is no apparent need to do it other than once a year then the council can make that decision.

The only reason I suggested a vote is that if there's disagreement, that's the methodology that typically is used to decide well do we have - is - does a majority of the council think we should postpone it or do they think we should go ahead and do it? And so I that's why I suggested that methodology.

Chuck Gomes: And I have - this is Chuck again. I have sympathy for what Wolf was saying I think. And let's not make this too complicated.

It may not need a formal motion to do this on a given in person meeting. We may just, you know, if I'm chair I may just ask what is - does anybody, you know, think there's a need to do this at this time? And nobody speaks up, that's fine. Or if somebody expresses concern we can say well how many people object? We can keep it fairly informal I think.

If it comes down to a fact that it's not clear in an informal approach we might have to resort to a vote.

But I think that kind of motion probably all of us would support an exception to this eight day rule on the motion or something like that. So I think this is all workable.

Olga Cavalli: So Ken would you write something about this in the documents and then we can review it?

Ken Bour: Yes I certainly will.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Ken Bour: And so that takes us then to this new projects area. And I think if we're running out of time I'll just very, very briefly.

The - whether a prioritization is done three times a year or once a year there will almost assuredly be some project that comes up in-between prioritizations.

And the question is well what happens to that project? And we have already discussed some - how to handle that. And I have put some of that material in here. It needs to be redrafted. But I'll clean that up and get that to you so you can look at that too between now and hopefully our next session.

And then the last - the very last section -- and I'm not sure if it belongs - is the last section or even if it is a section -- but it seems to me that there needs to be some discussion around tools and project management discipline.

I mean we've talked about this many times that once you create a prioritized list what you do with it, right?

And there have to be some outcomes or decisions or something, otherwise it's just a list.

And so this section is a placeholder really for whatever we plan to recommend to the council as it relates to the management job that the council has to do once it's got its prioritization list completed. And that's it for me at the moment.

Olga Cavalli: Great. Considering that we have only four minutes left I would propose the following. Ken would you include this parts of document that we have discussed and send us a new version and we can review it from the day that you send it until the our next meeting?

I think that we perhaps may focus on editing the new document instead of looking at this old one. Is that a good idea?

Ken Bour: This is Ken. I think it's a good idea. I'm trying to think when I'm going to have a block of time to get it done. When did you propose to have the next meeting?

Olga Cavalli: Well you tell me. I mean this week is gone with the ICANN meeting. Then people go back to their homes and that is - sometimes it's complicated to arrange meetings.

So it could be the other week or the one that starts in 22nd of March. That's up to the group. I'm available in both...

Ken Bour: This is Ken. It would - I think it would help me if I had - I'll have some time this week but not much. And then I would have next week. And then so maybe if we could have our next meeting the week of the 22nd. Does that sound reasonable to everybody?

Olga Cavalli: It would be Tuesday 23rd, right?

Ken Bour: Right.

Jaime Wagner: We'll skip the 15th?

Olga Cavalli: That's - we were talking about that in this moment. This would give Ken more time to prepare versions. Maybe he can send it before the meeting and by the time of the meeting we already have edits and suggestions and we can discuss it more quickly just because we already knew it.

Jaime Wagner: The problem for me is that I will be available on the 15th but I won't be the 23rd or the 30th. So...

Olga Cavalli: If you have the document...

((Crosstalk))

Jaime Wagner: Ken is much more important to the good work than I.

Ken Bour: I'm not sure that's true Jaime.

Olga Cavalli: Well we're all a good part of this team. So you're participation is very much appreciated Jaime.

I don't know, maybe we can - I'm okay with changing dates if it's okay with the group and let Jaime participate. You're the whole week not available or that day Jaime?

Jaime Wagner: It's on the 23rd of that date and also the 30th is - I would be available on the 29th and also on the 22nd Monday. Those two weeks if the group should change to Monday's for me it would be good date.

Olga Cavalli: I'm okay with that. But I don't know the others.

Jaime Wagner: Did it - I'm suggesting the 22nd and the 29th.

Ken Bour: This is Ken. Chuck had to leave because he's the chair of the OSE meeting which is starting momentarily...

Olga Cavalli: I have to leave now.

Ken Bour: ...and we have to get back down to another room. That sounds good to me.

Man: Ken...

Olga Cavalli: Ken would you...

Man: ...sorry...

Olga Cavalli: ...do me a favor?

((Crosstalk))

Olga Cavalli: Sure. Stéphane.

Stéphane van Gelder: Thanks. Ken did you say Chuck was going to chair that meeting?  
Because I have Wong next to me who was preparing to chair it.

Ken Bour: You know, he - don't quote me on that. He said I need to get to the OSE meeting. I thought he said to chair it but maybe he didn't. I might have misunderstood.

Stéphane van Gelder: Okay. Is he still there or has he left?

Ken Bour: Yes. He's on his way down to the other room.

Stéphane van Gelder: Okay. Thanks Ken.

Ken Bour: Yes. I'm sorry Olga I think you were going to make a suggestion?

Olga Cavalli: Yes. Could you please in an email send to the list suggest the two possible times and dates for this meeting adding this possibility of making it a Monday and see what the reaction of the rest of the group?

Ken Bour: This is Ken. Sure.

Olga Cavalli: And if you can include in your document in this email a proposed day - expected date for your draft document to be sent to the list that would be very helpful so we can plan our time.

Ken Bour: That would be fine.

Jaime Wagner: I'll be glad to help you with this document Ken. I will send you first draft, okay?

Ken Bour: Excellent. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. I think we are past the time. And are there any other comments from the room?

Okay, thank you very much for joining. And I'll see you virtually in other meetings. I go to the OSE meeting right now. So I meet some of you there.

And thank you very much Ken for your work, all the time with our group and your effort. And thank you all the group for participating.

Man: Thank you madam chair.

Jaime Wagner: One last word. I'd like to commend Ken's work also. And also I hope your daughter is okay Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Oh she's fine know. Thank you very much Jaime for asking. She's okay.

Jaime Wagner: Bye-bye then.

Olga Cavalli: Okay bye-bye. Thank you.

Man: Okay thanks Olga.

Man: Bye everybody.

Man: Thanks to the whole group. I suggest we take a short break. There's a mix-up in...

END