

**ICANN Brussels Meeting  
Open Council Project Prioritization Exercise  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Saturday 19 June at 0900 local**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. 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.

Coordinator: Today's conference is now being recorded. If anybody has any objections you may disconnect at this time.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. If I can have everyone's attention please, is there anyone - I'm not officially starting yet. I'll do that in a moment. But is there anybody who has not logged into the Adobe Connect room? That is critical here. Please do so.

Ken sent the link around. That is critical for this exercise. There are handouts so make sure you get the handouts as well. Make sure you have your name tags. Those are still being distributed. There are special procedures for folding those name cards. If you need training, Gisella is our trainer. I would like to request that the recording of the meeting start now please.

Okay. I want to welcome everyone here for this session. This is going to be a first time exercise on a prioritization project that has been going on for a while. And too, I do welcome those who are watching this. You might be able to observe some things that we don't. There will not be any participation from the observers and you'll probably figure out why once we do the exercise.

But after it happens you may have observed some things that we can learn from and in the next weeks we will be evaluating this process and hopefully you can provide some input in that regard. My name is Chuck Gomes. I am

the current Chair of the GNSO Council and fortunately I am not going to be leading this exercise. Ken Bour from the staff team and one who has been extremely helpful in this process will be leading the session.

I want to ask again is there anyone who has not yet logged on to the - is there a problem? Okay. Wendy is having trouble logging into the - and you used the link that Ken sent? Glen, do we have any technical support people that can maybe assist Wendy? Anyone else that hasn't been able to log into the Adobe Connect room?

Okay. All right. Okay. While we're waiting for that let's have Glen do a roll call please.

Present. Caroline sent her apologies. She's at a wedding today.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you. Edmon Chung.

Edmon Chung: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Adrian Kinderis.

Adrian Kinderis: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Tim Ruiz.

Tim Ruiz: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Stéphane Van Gelder.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Here.

Glen de Saint Géry: Penny Davis. Zahid Jamil. Mike Rodenbach. Zahid, (you might want to say something perhaps)? (Unintelligible) - David Taylor.

David Taylor: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: (Unintelligible).

Man: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Jamie Wagner.

Jamie Wagner: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Rafik Dammak. Great. Deborah Hughes.

Deborah Hughes: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Wendy Seltzer.

Wendy Seltzer: Here.

Glen de Saint Géry: Leslie St. Pierre.

Leslie St. Pierre: Here.

Glen de Saint Géry: Mary Wong. Olga Cavalli.

Olga Cavalli: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Andre Kolesnikov.

Adrian Kinderis: Present.

Glen de Saint Géry: Alan Greenberg.

Alan Greenberg: Present.

Glen de Saint G ry: Antwon Lee. I think we have apologies accepted from Antwon Lee. Thank you Chuck. You may continue.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Glen. At this time again let me confirm Wendy, were you able to get in? Great. Adrian? You're getting in? Okay.

Man: Chuck, I'm in but I have a blank screen in the middle, not what shows there.

Chuck Gomes: Got it? Okay. Very good. I'm going to now turn the session over to Ken and just before I do that please understand that we have 15 projects to prioritize. So it's going to be very important that we do this efficiently when we get to the comment period.

And I'm sure that the panel suggests this, we're going to need to make our comments brief and to the point in order to get through all of the projects. And one last important reminder - hopefully all of you saw the email notice that Glen sent out in advance of this meeting and that is that there will be a photographer taking some shots during the meeting blinding us with flashes and so forth.

And that is not intended to interfere with what you are doing but hopefully they will get some photos that can be incorporated in the history of this meeting. So please be aware of that and make the best of that as we can. Ken, it's all yours.

Ken Bour: Thank you. Is this microphone on? It sounds like it. Good morning everyone. Thank you. What we're going to do today is hopefully we're going to rank - actually we're going to rate 15 projects that have been determined to be eligible.

I notice that we wanted to get all the preliminaries done in 15 minutes. I am going to fly through some of the preliminary stuff so that we can get right into the very first project and I'll explain which one that is. Just a quick reminder, we are in step three of a four-step process that the Work Prioritization Model Drafting Team put forward to the Council and the Council approved in April.

And I'm not going to put that chapter, annex or any of the procedures up. I presume that we can just sort of walk you through it if you don't remember the details. The next step, actually the first step of the process was to determine what the eligible projects would be. And I have those displayed up here. You can see some of them.

So in May the Council actually approved the eligible project list based on the staff recommendation. I don't want to say any more about that. There is a handout in front of you that actually has the eligible projects listed. You're going to see mostly up here on the screen I'm just going to use abbreviations. And so if you can't remember what the abbreviation is you can consult the document that is in front of you.

With that, I'm going to have to go up and down here to manage the room. Just a second. Okay. Sorry about that. I'm going to try to work this room and also facilitate. So step one was to get the project list done. Step two, all of the councilors individually rated the 15 projects by filling out a spreadsheet. I think we had 19 responses and we aggregated all those responses and that document is what is displayed here in the room now in front of you.

You also have that sheet as a handout. Hopefully it's color coded. I think I see them around the room. And so you should consult the screen might be a little harder to read so you have that document in front of you. And in a second I'm going to go through and explain how it's organized and what all the data means and what the colors represent and all of that.

So that was step two was to get the individual ratings done. Step three is today and that's what we're actually through group discussion try to limit or reduce the variability in the ratings that you guys did individually. I'll just call your attention right now if my laser works here - there are several different measures that you can use statistically to determine variability in a set of data.

And if you look at your sheets in front of you down at the very bottom, you'll see this one called range here in bold. And the range is simply the high value minus the low value meaning if somebody rated it 7 and somebody else rated it 1, 7 minus 1 is 6 and that's what the range shows. The work process team, the drafting team decided that in the event that in the individual sessions we could get a range equal to 2 or less we could eliminate a project from discussion, accept the median value.

By the way, when I use the term median, that just means if you rank all the ratings it's the middle one. So there were 19 people who were involved. The tenth one is the middle right? Nine on either side, the tenth one, that's the median. But we weren't able to do that because as you can see from looking at this range statistic, every range in that list was greater than two.

So as a result, we will not be exempting any of the 15 projects from discussion today. Okay. Process. So the very first column, which has a range less than or equal to 2 preliminary - that's the one I just talked about. You see it's all full of zeroes. What we're going to do is go project by project and we're not going to go in this order but I'll explain the order in a second.

If at the end of the discussion round we end up with a range less than or equal to 2 at the end of the first discussion round after you guys vote again and I'll show you the polling in a second, then we will stop, take the median and go on to the next project. If we are unable to get a range less than or equal to 2 at the end of round one we'll do a round two.

At that point we're looking for a range less than or equal to 3, high minus low value. If that doesn't work after that polling round we'll try one more time in a third round of discussion and if regardless of what happens there we will do a poll, we'll vote and we take the median value and we're done. So that's the process very quickly outlined.

Now I just want to talk briefly about this polling process. I'm not sure how many of you have used polling in Adobe Connect. It works very nicely and we'll actually practice one in a couple seconds here. We'll use it really but you'll see how easy it is to do. When asked to do so, all you have to do is select 1 through 7. It's a radial button.

As soon as I get in the neighborhood of 22 I see that we have 22. I presume that there is no one in the Adobe room who is not a councilor at this point. We have two liaisons and actually that may not be true. But I'm going to ask that people who are not councilors or liaisons to the Council, please do not vote because it's only for councilors. That's the way the process was defined.

And I have a way to actually look and see and hopefully we won't have too many stray votes. Anyway, so when I ask you to, you will just go ahead and mark a radial button. I'll display the results and then Gisella my helper here will record them in a spreadsheet. I'll indicate to you what I think the median is and you can confirm for those of you who want to do the math.

And off we go. Okay. Now let's just talk a little bit about this spreadsheet in front of you. What you're going to see is there were the 19 people who responded on the left. This reference number only indicates it just so happens that that was the order in which they came in. It's not relevant to the discussion. The folks that were on the drafting team were kind enough to be the very first ones in and so they have very low numbers there.

But it's really nothing to do with just the order in which the data came in. The names are listed alphabetically, okay? Not by stakeholder group or any other

way, just alphabetically by first initial of the first name. Now you're going to see the 15 projects but they are not in the order that they were in the spreadsheet. The order that they're in is based on this value called standard deviation at the very bottom of the sheet.

It's not important that we go through the statistics on that. Standard deviation is a measure of central tendency. It tells us how councilors were in their ratings and it occurred to us when we practiced this a little bit ahead of time that it might be better to take the ones in which there is the highest degree of uniformity in responses versus the ones that were more controversial.

And so we have ordered these column by column based on the standard deviation. The smallest ones hopefully should be the easiest. We'll find out in a minute, won't we? Now the color coding. You're going to see green. It doesn't show up very well on this. You'll see green indicates a statistic called the mode and the mode is really nothing more than the most popular value.

That's all it is. So if seven or eight people said I rate it a 5, 5 is the mode. The yellow color is the bottom 10 percentile. Okay. So what we're doing is highlighting the extreme values. And the pink, light pink, reddish color is the top 10%. Okay? With that, I don't think there is anything more to discuss about the process, the data or how we collected it.

And so with that, I'd like to go ahead and start with the very first one, which is IRTPB and open up the discussion. Now I'm going to suggest here that maybe Kristina who rated it a 2 and perhaps Mike Rodenbach who gave it a 6 might want to provide a very brief statement like in one to two minutes or whatever as to why you rated it the way you did and then we can get some group discussion and then take a vote.

Kristina Rosette: My rating incorporated my understanding of how much further work there was to do. So even though if I carved that out I would rate it higher given my understanding of where the issue was in the process. It didn't seem that there

is that much more to do. So if I'm going to take it from a pure value kind of carving out how much Council time I think it needs I would probably adjust that upwards.

Ken Bour: Does anybody else want to comment? I actually think that at this point now this is a good process point. Mike Rodenbach is not here and therefore his data will not show up in the poll. And therefore if he didn't sustain - if no one else sustains the 6 we won't have that number, right?

Jamie Wagner: I would add that Andre has the next highest value. It's 5.

Ken Bour: Thank you Jaime. Andre, would you like to comment?

Andre Kolesnikov: Yes. This is honest policy. There are real people behind it, real and the procedure is such a regular (common use) and so it must be really good to go through (unintelligible).

Ken Bour: Okay. Anyone else? If not I am going to actually suggest that we take advantage of the nice commonality that we have already and go ahead and open up this poll.

So what I'm going to do is I'm going to click open poll and now that it's open, please go ahead and select a value from 1 to 7 based on what you just heard and what you have done before. And when I see the value up around 22 or 20 or something along those lines we'll close the poll. So we're up to about 10, 11. Liz.

Liz Gasster: Ken, I have a question. It has to do with Mike not being here. Is there any reason or advantage to registering his existing vote again in his absence? How do you account for his opinion? You just don't do it? I wanted to just be sure of that.

Ken Bour: Yes. The team actually discussed the flip of that, which is somebody didn't provide individual ratings but wanted to contribute in the session. We said fine. I'm thinking that if they're not here then the flip side of that is we wouldn't be able to.

The whole point of this is to create consensus and in the absence of the input we wouldn't be able to do it. Now his score and his rating will never be lost. I mean that is part of the official record of these proceedings. So it's not part of the group discussion but it will always be there. How are we doing?

Has everybody voted? Is anybody - raise your hand if you still need to vote. Okay, one more. All right. There is 19. Everybody okay? I'm going to go ahead and broadcast these results so that everybody can see them on the screen and we end up with 15 fours, two fives and one six. And so that's what you put in the - is that correct?

I'm sorry. We have one three - it keeps - let me broadcast. Let me go in and look at the data because again I want to remind folks who might be in the room that we do - anyone who is in the room who is not a councilor or a liaison should not vote. So it looks just scanning through to me it looks like everybody who has voted is a councilor.

All right. So at this point I want to declare that the median result is a 4. And that's the official rating of the Council. Have you captured the data? Okay. Then I'm going to go ahead and I'm going to close the poll, clear the results. We have got the data. Okay. I'm going to go to the next project, which is VI.

So I'm going to highlight that here on the screen.

Man: And we have a range of three in this first.

Ken Bour: Very nice point. Thank you. I lost track of that. Right. So as it turns out at the end of the first round we did have a range of three, right, because we had a 3 and a 6 score. 6 minus 3 - okay.

So theoretically we go to a second round. With the 3, I can say - well, I just cleared the results but if the 3 would mind sharing. Yeah. We didn't capture it.

Man: The 3 was mine and I'm willing to change it to a 4 to go on.

Ken Bour: And you can just change the result. Okay. That's cooperation. All right. The next project then is VI and just quickly scanning the data it looks like Andre rated it a 4, the mode is a 7 and there were 63% of the councilors who rated it a 7.

You'll see that data on the bottom of the screen and actually since 7 is the top 10% value there isn't going to be anybody in the red zone. So all we have are the ones on the other end. Andre, would you like to comment first?

Andre Kolesnikov: Of course. Of course. This is my lovely. I believe that no matter what will be the decision at the end of the day on the VI there will be no impact in general on the address space.

And my thought is that it's artificial restrictions of organizations applied to the business of the domain names and I'm still not convinced that the Council should focus on this issue very highly. However, I do understand that a lot of commercial entities presented and a lot of commercial interest is being considered in the Council.

But this is my personal belief - I don't think there will be a real impact on any decision that comes out of this working group.

Ken Bour: Jaime, your vote was a 5. Do you have anything different to add to that discussion?

Jamie Wagner: It's only that it's a reinforcement. It's just that this is very important to the commercial business community. And but it has not the same impact in the overall community.

Ken Bour: Adrian. Yeah. What I was hoping to do was to collect that side of the discussion and then ask if anybody on the 7s would like to comment. Yes absolutely. Thank you. Olga, anybody else who rated it less than a 7, anybody else want to make an additional comment relative to this point?

Olga Cavalli: Ken, this is Olga. I somehow agree with Jaime. I think it's important so I rated it a 6 but not for higher because it's not for the whole community or the whole representativeness of the GNSO.

Ken Bour: Super. I have Alan next.

Alan Greenberg: I rated it a 6. I might well have rated it a 7. I'm not in it for the commercial interests but I feel - and I'm not one of those who say we need 1 billion new domains. But I believe we do need some new domains and this right now seems to be an issue, which is in a position to stop the process. And I think we need to clear the slate of it and get it resolved even though I have no commercial interest in it myself.

Ken Bour: Thank you. I think I had Adrian and then Kristina.

Adrian Kinderis: Yeah. So I think this has two aspects to it. One is the impact as Alan just spoke about, the impact to the new gTLD process (and stock). So that's why I think it's an important issue to deal with at some stage.

The second one is the issue itself. I believe vertical integration does impact all users by the way that inevitably it may impact the way that domain names are bought and sold and how you can get them for end users. So that's why it's vitally important not just to commercial entities that are doing the buying

and selling but the end users that will potentially purchase them. So that's why I think it's a 7 and also because of it's importance to the new gTLD process (and stock).

Ken Bour: Thank you. Kristina next and then Stéphane.

Kristina Rosette: I would just note that in my view in addition to it being an extraordinarily important issue in its own right, how it is resolved or addressed for purposes of both the first and ongoing future rounds is going to directly implicate the number of entities and by extension users that will be affected by GNSO consensus policy.

And that was regardless of whether they are commercial or non-commercial. So that was in large part the basis for my rating.

Ken Bour: Stéphane.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Just to echo those two statements, I think it will also impact users because it will give them greater choice depending on the outcome of VI working group and the policy that is implemented.

You will get either greater choice and a greater number of entities being able to run TLDs or you will get less choice. So it does impact users in that way too.

Ken Bour: Okay. Thank you. Facilitator, it sounds to me like we have at least heard both sides of the arguments and I would suggest at this point we would go ahead and open up the poll.

So I'm going to do that and if everyone would please go ahead and start putting in your votes. Again, I think there is a guest in the room; the guest - please do not vote. Two - the number we're looking for is about 19? Okay.

I've got 16. Anybody else? So we'll take your vote. We can take it manually if necessary. I've got 17 votes.

Any others? Wolf, are you still unable to vote? I can see already that we have thanks to Jaime reminding me, I can see we already have a problem - well, I say a problem. We have a challenge. We have a 7 and we have a 1. So our range just got worse. Actually, no it didn't. Yes it did. We used to have a range of 3 and now we have a range of 6.

All right. I have 17 votes, is that it? No. I have 19 now. Okay. Very good. I'm going to close the poll and I'll broadcast the results so you can all see them. And now you can see that indeed we have one that went down to a 1 and we have 12 that are a 7 and the rest are scattered. So at this point we go to round two and if the 1 wouldn't mind commenting?

Man: Yeah. A quick question - can we just put up who voted where so I can see the 1 or unless someone wants to put their hand up? You? Really? Okay. Good. No, that's fine. I've got no problem with that.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Okay. Can I?

Ken Bour: Yes Stéphane.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Is the aim of the exercise to get people to change their votes so violently to explain it or not?

Ken Bour: That's a great question if I didn't talk about it earlier. The goal is really to just to create more commonality and more agreement, that's all. There is no particular number.

If after discussing this for a while we cannot get any better than a range of 6 there is a procedure for carrying forward. So it's not to achieve a number but

it is to achieve agreement. And it is interesting that it got worse as a result of the discussion, which we did not anticipate.

Woman: But we also acknowledge that there are going to be cases where there is going to be a disparity and to identify those cases to really distinguish between cases where people just may not be thinking about it the same way.

Or may not be informed about the status or the depths of a project the same way that might bring people closer as they understood kind of where things were or what the details of the project were versus just like a philosophical difference of opinion where there isn't going to be agreement. So it's not to force agreement where there isn't. It's to make sure that if there is the possibility of agreement we capture it.

Man: I would say that it's to increase awareness and the awareness of the positions of different people around the table and the extremes are required to justify their votes. So I will pass to.

Ken Bour: Jaime, before you I saw Alan's hand up.

Alan Greenberg: I think I'm not sure how relevant it is in this particular one but I think one of the issues is where many of us are using different rules for how we set the priority. For instance, I could have easily voted a 1 on this on the theory that it's going to go ahead.

The work group is not going to disband no matter what we say so why waste votes on it if votes were rationed? On the other hand Kristina said if something is just about closed as several of these are, it's not going to be a huge draw on us by the time we figure out what to do with these priorities. It may be off the table. Why give it a lot of votes? If something is almost closed or has very, very little participation, it's not a draw on the Council and therefore people are changing their numbers. And I think because we're not using a common set of rules

((Crosstalk))

Ken Bour: Point of order. There is a definition of value. I have it on the screen here. I was going to point it out earlier. I'm sorry I didn't. This is all about value and benefit to the GNSO and to ICANN.

It has nothing to do with how far the working group is along, what the board has said about it. It's all about your perception individually and then collectively as to what is its value and benefit to GNSO? There will be another time after this session when the Council will begin to discuss issues around practical issues concerning how far is it, how close can it be? If we drew on a little bit more resources could we get it done?

Should we stop it in progress - all of those kinds of things? So it's all just about value. So hopefully everybody is using the same definition.

Man: Yeah. I think it's important that we rate these at the present moment because there are procedures that we'll follow going forward as projects drop off, as new ones come on and so forth.

So I think that reinforces what you just said. Write them now today. It may change tomorrow but we'll have procedures for dealing with them.

Ken Bour: Okay. Is there any - let me I guess at this point Zahid, do you want to - you don't want to comment? Okay.

Zahid Jamil: (The process is required to come).

Man: I wish I had known that before I voted. My individual - I'm just thinking of the importance to the GNSO. I know it's important to the (new daily process) but I wish we were doing other things instead of opening up these sorts of issues.

That's just a personal view. But let's see what happens in the second round.  
Sorry Adrian.

Ken Bour: Stéphane.

Stéphane Van Gelder: I don't want to labor the point because I think there's no need for it. But this explanation, I just find it extremely strange considering his constituency was the one that introduced the motion that led to this working group.

Ken Bour: Adrian, did you want to comment? Okay. Fine. So let me just ask if it's the will of the group at this point that we declare it over at the end of that last round and not go to another vote? Another vote? Okay. Great.

So I'm going to go ahead and open the poll. I'll close these results and then put it - the poll is open. We have 12 votes. All right. I have 19. I'm going to close the poll. Everyone has voted. I'm sorry. Okay. All right. Now I'm going to close. I've got the 20th vote. I think we might have one too many.

Man: While he's checking that, next time we do a second vote or a third vote, let's not have anybody vote until we know that the other one is cleared. I think that created some confusion.

Ken Bour: Well, it won't matter as it turns out. We're going to record the data as it shows here and we'll go back and look at it later. But I want to let you know that the median in this case is a 7 because it's the tenth value, it's the middle point.

And you go up 10 and you're already into that number 7. So I'm going to go ahead then and we'll record that and we'll go on to the next project. All right. We have a range now of 7 minus 4, which is 3 at the end of the second round. That's correct. We're done. I'm sorry. I did not see the 2. Did you have a 2 on yours?

It's not going to matter because if the 2 changes to a 1 or it doesn't matter. We're still going to be at a 7. So I would recommend at this point we just go ahead on to the next project. Okay. The next project is IRD and may I ask Wendy rated it a 1 and perhaps we could start there. And then there are a couple of 6s on this particular one. Wendy, would you like to comment?

Wendy Seltzer: Sure. I don't see that we have something teed up that is ready for policy decision. While there are interesting technical questions I don't see that we have a policy decision to make.

Ken Bour: Anyone else want to - how about those who would be at the 6 level? Anybody want to comment? I see Andre's hand.

Andre Kolesnikov: Yeah. I would comment. We're dealing with this issue basically on a daily basis and it's a very important item I think because currently the Whols asking page first of all in my personal opinion that should remain given that we understand that when IDF is coming online there are decisions to make.

And these decisions will be really significant to keep the Internet basically the way we see it today. So people can understand what is written, not lost in translation.

Ken Bour: Okay. Thank you. I saw Chuck first then Jaime.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. It's important for us to keep in mind that our work within the GNSO is ultimately policy oriented. But we will oftentimes have projects that don't result in policy may end up with best practices or whatever.

So my personal opinion is that whether or not it is close to being a ready for policy development and I totally agree with Wendy that we are not that close yet, it still may be very important and we need to commit resources to it. In this particular case we have a protocol that is ancient, that is way outdated, that is not flexible enough to deal with the issues that we have nowadays.

And so even though we are a ways from - we're not even starting a policy development process yet, I think it's still of pretty important value and it's one that we have put on the back burner for too long.

Ken Bour: Okay. Jaime.

Jamie Wagner: I would like to add just that we are here rating values independent of the particular case of being a process or a policy. And value not only for GNSO but for the entire Internet community (first).

And I think that this issue of Whois data is critical for security reasons and also to build up the trust in the Internet. And this is very important from the user aspect, which is the interest we all should rate first in our mission here at GNSO.

Ken Bour: Anyone else want to comment at this point on this? Yes sir. Eric.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Yes. I just want to agree with that last point there. This becomes a big deal as far as national security. It becomes a big deal as far as international security of the Internet.

Ken Bour: It sounds to me like we are ready to go to a poll at the end of round one discussion. Is that okay? I'm going to go ahead and fire up the poll. It's now open. Wendy keeps getting logged off.

Okay. We have got 10, 12 - yeah, so we're just going to ask either Liz or Marika, go ahead and register a 1. Okay, I've got 18. Anyone else? Has everybody voted? I've got 18. Okay. I'm going to go ahead and close it at this point. Sorry. Okay. Close.

Chuck Gomes: While they're tabulating that, the photography is going to happen a little bit differently than what we thought. They would like each of us to find a

convenient point and go over there and they will take your photo over there.  
So find a spot and go over there. Tim.

It's to collect - like usual, they take pictures throughout the ICANN week of meetings and post those for just and for the new Web site as well.

Ken Bour: All right. Just looking at the data here we have a range of 7 minus 1 or 6, which would indicate that we would go to a second round. And so maybe I don't know Wendy if you want to make any further comment on this?

Wendy Seltzer: I will add that the moment we start talking about Whols we enter an intractable swarm of privacy and other issues that has been plaguing GNSO since it was DNSO. And I strongly disagree with many of the uses of Whols. I don't particularly want to get into that set of debates again.

Ken Bour: Thank you. Zahid was I believe a 7 on this one.

Zahid Jamil: Some work I've been doing with (law enforcement officers), this becomes extremely important. And I think that's why I...

Ken Bour: Kristina.

Kristina Rosette: I guess I'm confused. And I was under the understanding that this IRG group is not talking about specifically what Whols data should be published. But setting that aside, whatever Whols data is decided to be published is how you display it in a non-Latin script. And if I have misunderstood I probably need to speak up.

Ken Bour: Does anyone want to address Kristina's last comment?

Man: Yes to that. It's also touching to think about fundamental things like protocols. Maybe some additional development to the Whols protocol will be required. We don't know yet.

There will be a presentation about it later but I mean still this issue is very, very important because Whols is actually what connects the user of the domain to the rest of the world. And it cannot be blinded. It should be easy to read and understand.

Man: And have a set of commonality also to all, not to humanize but to automatic reading and have a format that is common to all.

Ken Bour: I have Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Kristina, just to answer your question, add to the answer, it might change what is collected as well because if we start collecting addresses for example in local language then that is additional data that might be collected. Or it might be just collected in internationalized factors. So there are some changes to what might be collected as well - that could be.

Ken Bour: It sounds like we might want to stop here. I'm sorry Alan. Go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: I think Kristina's interpretation was very close to mine. My understanding is we could come to closure through some miraculous happening on all of an unending Whols debates. We would still have to do this work.

Kristina Rosette: I'm getting that. It's that it's my understanding that the privacy issues associated with Whols are not particularly relevant here because we are talking about how to display and possibly collect whatever is actually - how it's displayed. Not what is displayed - that's a different story for a different ten years.

Ken Bour: Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: I'll be really brief. Wendy, and I may be wrong on this but I understand that if we were at a point where we were going to decide to initiate a policy

development process that you would probably vote no. I don't understand your vote at this stage for the work that is going on.

Wendy Seltzer: I don't see this work as a priority for the GNSO. I see it as a priority for people in other parts of the community holding discussions about the technical standards questions for implementing this. But I don't see this as something that should be occupying the councilors' time.

Ken Bour: This is my recommendation at this point. It sounds like we have had good discussion. I'm sorry. Go ahead Jaime.

Jamie Wagner: I would like to answer Wendy. What we are rating here is precisely value for all the communities and also for GNSO. In a second rate level if something is important to the community and it depends on the work of GNSO so it is a priority for GNSO. That is my understanding.

Ken Bour: Okay. I'm going to ask everyone to stop here. We have a lot of projects to go and I can see already that we're going to be up against it here on some of the time. We started this particular project with a most popular answer of 4, a median of 4, we still have a median of 4.

The 4 is still the most popular answer. The range has gotten worse. I suggest we take one more poll unless the results changed then we move on to the next project. So I'm going to clear the results and I'll open the poll in a second. The poll is open. We are on IRD. Okay. I have 18 results, which is the same as I had the last time. Has anybody not voted?

Okay. Thank you 19, 20. I don't think we have more than 20 so I'm going to go ahead and close it here. Okay. So we have one more 4 and the range is still 6. And that's - it doesn't sound like it's going to get any better. So I think we should go ahead and declare this one solved at the end of round two even though the range has gotten worse than it did on the individual round.

We do have a very strong median result, which happens to be 4. So I'm going to suggest that we move on to the next one.

Man: Ken?

Ken Bour: (Yes).

Man: Did we decide not to if someone is not here we are not going to try to include their vote in a subsequent poll. Is that my understanding?

Ken Bour: Yes, that's correct.

Man: Okay. So can we take that into account on GCAN and cut that one pretty short or not?

Ken Bour: I'm all for it. Let's see where we are. Let me go ahead and just read it out. We have a mode of 5, 63% of the council has voted that way. Yes, we have a 1 that is not in attendance and everybody else was very close. So we could go ahead and have the discussion around and then take the poll. But Wolf had it as a 7. Maybe we should hear from Wolf first.

Wolf Ulrich: Yes. Thank you. Wolf Ulrich. Thanks. Well, if you look at the table in my version 7 applies for all of the organizational projects. So maybe I also assess it in that way not only the value to the overall community in the GNSO but because I seem to be a little bit (unintelligible) - the question of how to come to an end (and such).

In this respect I feel that those organizational projects of high priority because these are the basis for our future work on the one hand. And then on the other hand we have to come to an end as soon as possible because other things are more important like policy process development.

So let me summarize. I could come to a lower value in a further round but still on a higher level.

Ken Bour: Okay. Does anyone else want to make a comment? It sounds to me like we just go ahead and move to a voting poll. We may very well be within the range of 2. I'm sorry, Jaime. That was a thumbs up, yes? Okay. I'm going to go ahead.

So now we're on GCOT and I'm going to open up the polls. All right. The poll is open. I have 15. Anyone else? I've got 16. There are still a couple missing. Would your raise your hand if you haven't voted yet or maybe somebody left the room? I have 16. I'm going to go ahead and close it at this point. Whoever didn't vote may just have chosen not to.

I have 17. All right. I'm going to go ahead and close it now. Okay. So we have a range of 2 at the end of the first round of discussion. That is terrific. We have the mode is clearly a 5, the median is a 5 and so that will be our official score. I'm going to now suggest we move on to the next project, which is JIG. Let's see. We're on JIG.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Wendy Seltzer: Yes. I think IDN has consistency among the registration act is critical to a lot of people in the community and does involve serious policy work from the council.

Ken Bour: Okay. Thank you. Does anyone else want to comment? Those of you who might be down a little bit lower, we started out with a mode actually, the most popular answer was a 3. Does anybody or does Rafik or Terry wish to comment? You were also at 6.

Terry Davis: I would tend to agree with Wendy. Wendy said that I think this is a very important implementation issue.

Ken Bour: Zahid.

Zahid Jamil: I agree with all the previous comments. I think this is with the new gTLD coming out especially it's going to be extremely important. I come from a developing country with different scripts. I would definitely give this priority.

Ken Bour: Any other discussion? Edmon.

Edmon Chung: Yeah. I know I answered a 3 because of the registry. We sort of work together. But I want to say that the JIG is working on a couple of pretty important policy matters that does affect the new gTLD implementation as well, one of which is a single character IDN gTLD, the possibility of having a single character IDN gTLD, which is an important thing I think especially for Asian languages.

And also the staff implementation team that did the report that came out specifically talked about that and essentially required the GNSO council and the CCNSO council to work together on this policy. So I think it should be important. I apologize. I'm actually missing a couple of the registry stakeholder meetings, which resulted in our position.

I'll be happy to take it back to the stakeholder group. I think Chuck can add to that. But that is one important aspect. The other important aspect is variance, which again is a matter that pretty much requires the GNSO and the CCNSO to work on a policy going forward. So I'd like to urge our stakeholder group to up the rating. I don't know whether Chuck wants to add.

Ken Bour: Okay. Great. What I would suggest we do now is to go ahead and do a voting round and see where we are. So I'm going to go ahead and open the poll. Okay. Poll is open. We're voting now on JIG round one.

I have 15 results. Anybody else going to vote? Put your hand up please if you still are struggling to get a vote in. Okay. Jaime needs to vote. We'll give him a second to get around the table. All right. So our range is 7 minus 3 or 4. We would theoretically need to go to a next round. We have a very strong median and mode of 4.

I guess I should just ask if anyone - well, does the 3 wish to comment or the 7? Adrian voted the 3 and Zahid and Wendy were 7s.

Man: I voted 3 because Adrian did.

Stéphane Van Gelder: This is Stéphane. Same for me of course.

Adrian Kinderis: We have no comment. We're happy with our 3.

Ken Bour: I'm sorry. Say again Adrian. I missed that.

Adrian Kinderis: There is no comment. Nothing to add.

Ken Bour: I'm sorry. Am I hearing that the 3 wishes to change to a 4 or no?

Adrian Kinderis: No.

Ken Bour: Okay. Am I also hearing that there is no point in going to another round of discussion or are we in another round of discussion? The question is should we give it another round of voting?

Adrian Kinderis: I can move to 4 but I think that in my mind there are more important things to be - it's as far as understanding the other topics, that's where the JIG fits in my seeing things.

Ken Bour: Right.

Adrian Kinderis: So I didn't think it was any more or any less than a 3 but I can go to a 4 if it's going to take away some of the pain. You want me to jump onboard this?

Tim Ruiz: This is Tim. I could go to a 4 also. Again, it's just a matter of trying to look at the value of these different projects in relation to each other and just not seeing JIG at the same value. That's actually what it is. But I can go to a 4.

Ken Bour: Yeah. I would just - go ahead Terry.

Terry Davis: I could comment that unless we get this right with the JIG one of the things we're going to have a horrible time doing is getting our security (implementation). (There in those) scripts are (unintelligible).

Ken Bour: I guess we should probably just do one more round. Theoretically, right, according to the rules if the range is bigger than 2 we're supposed to go to another polling round.

So we have had the discussion. Unless there is more I would open the poll up. Well, if we have a range of 3 we're done. So I'm going to go ahead and open it now. It's open. We have 15 results, 17, 18 and Kristine. I'm sorry I missed you.

Kristina Rosette: I just have a broader question. I'm just wondering how - I guess what I'm concerned about is that in many cases I know I have on at least two changed my vote mainly so that we could close this and move on given the time constraints.

And I'm concerned that that is going to give kind of false data for purposes of okay, once we have gone through this exercise then relying on those numbers. And I wasn't clear to what extent there is some kind of built in discount to take into account the fact that yeah, we have got two hours, we've got to move on. So people may be changing their votes solely for the purposes of staying within the time limit as opposed to actually as Adrian and

Stéphane were commenting, truly reflecting what the view is in terms of priority among (the members).

Ken Bour: Yeah. We sort of talked about this earlier. There is no - it is not necessary to reach particular values here. The numbers are just a methodology for progressing through the discussion.

It's perfectly okay at the end to have 1s and 2s and 7s and everything all over the map and indeed so in any case we have always had pretty strong modes and medians even though there has been variability. So yeah, and we also always have the individual results and they are permanent.

Chuck Gomes: Ken, may I respond to that?

Ken Bour: Yeah Chuck. Sure.

Chuck Gomes: I would discourage you Kristina from changing the vote just to get it done. We want really it to reflect and if it means there is still a big range, if that's really what it is, that's what we need. And that's why at the end of the third round we will go ahead and just take the middle.

So I think it's better not to change unless you're convinced that your constituency would support you doing that. Does that make sense?

Man: I would like to add something. I think our work here is not only to force a consensus and also to be aware of the amount of dissensus that we should manage between ourselves. So this work here gives also this awareness of the amount of dissensus that is amongst us.

Ken Bour: Okay. So we will close that last one out. That was JIG. I'm sorry. Stéphane.

Stéphane Van Gelder: I also have another question I'd like to ask about the whole process, which I'm still actually struggling to get to grips with. At what range do we decide that a project will be put aside?

Ken Bour: Right. That's a great question. This particular exercise is only to create the values, the ratings and the sort of prioritization. You will as a council and it will not be part of the WPM drafting team's work - you will subsequently decide under a different set of rules and guidelines that haven't even been written yet as to what to do about all of this.

And that's the sort of management process we have talked about several times and then that has been deferred. And so I'd like to go ahead now and move to the CSG project, which is now highlighted on the screen. It was originally project sequence number one. We started out with a mode of 5 and we have Mike is not here. He was a 1 and Terry Davis was a 1 and we had Wolf had a 7. So perhaps we can start with Terry as to the value of a 1.

Man: Excuse me Ken. (Just a comment). Could you restate the final value of the median and the range for the JIG project?

Ken Bour: Yeah. The range was 3 and the final mode was 4 and the median was 4.

Man: Okay. Thank you.

Ken Bour: Sure. Terry.

Terry Davis: (Instead of other projects) that we could be working on I just didn't find this one to be as important as a lot of the others. I think this is (a 1).

Ken Bour: Does anyone else want to comment? Wolf Ulrich?

Wolf Ulrich: Just to repeat what I said about the other organizational projects (unintelligible) - in that sense to come to an end as soon as possible because with more capacity to focus on our (policies). (Unintelligible).

Ken Bour: Yes Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Real briefly. This one I think is really important to constituencies and stakeholder groups because it's going to result in some recommendations that will guide how all of us operate in constituencies and stakeholder groups.

Ken Bour: Stéphane.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Sorry. I actually have to at least question what's just been said because I would expect it to be left up to the constituencies and stakeholder groups to find their way of operating and their way of functioning. And I'm not sure it's that important for the council at this stage to do that for them.

With the exception that I understand it's part of the restructuring process and that is a process that we'd like to finish, which is why I think we voted 4 because a medium vote. But I don't think it's actually that important for the council at this stage or the GNSO at large to give the constituencies and stakeholder groups instructions on how they want to work out their own rules.

Man: I think there is a misunderstanding Stéphane because this rating is not intended to address what is important for us to do as a council but what issue is important for the community and for the GNSO community in particular.

And I think if this is important for the communities even if it is not a work or a task that should be for the council to take over. It is important and if you think that it isn't important then you should rate it with this consciousness.

Ken Bour: Yes and I just want to remind us we still have a lot of projects to go and 45 minutes left. So Stéphane.

Stéphane Van Gelder: I do agree there is a misunderstanding there because my understanding is that the basis of this whole prioritization project was that we were trying to manage our work as a leadership body as it were for the GNSO and not - I understand what you're saying about part of that is looking at what is important for the community.

But this is us trying to make sure that we manage the resources that we have at hand. That was my understanding.

Man: The work that will be done after.

Ken Bour: Yeah. Let me go to Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: I think first of all we're not making a decision right now whether you're going to approve the recommendations that come out of this group. But I can tell you that the recommendations of this group deal with the issue of how much flexibility each individual group should have.

And in that sense it's very important to us to make sure that we're in agreement that that be dealt with. So we're not deciding that issue right now. What we're really deciding is how important is it? Do you believe that each group should have a lot of autonomy then that makes this really important this particular project.

Ken Bour: I have Andre and then Tim.

Andre Kolesnikov: Yeah. I'll be short. I'm just not happy with the idea since I am on the project manager that the groups should be dynamic and adaptive.

Ken Bour: Okay.

Tim Ruiz: I guess I'm concerned too that maybe in some of these there isn't - we're not even in agreement about what it is we're voting on as far as the project is concerned. Because I have heard like three different versions of what this was about and I don't know if you look on Page 3 and then you actually read it, it's actually not any of those three.

But it's close to really all of them but I wonder if that wouldn't help in some cases if we kind of reviewed what the project really was so we'd know what we were voting on.

Ken Bour: Yeah. Our hope was that the brief descriptions would have accomplished that. But I can see that councilors have different points of view about what these projects are doing and so forth and so on.

But I promise you that if we take time now to try to settle this one we will certainly not get through the rest of the ones that are on the list. May I suggest that we have had some discussion and it's been pretty good. Let's go ahead, open the poll, take a round of votes, see where we are and then decide if we need to go forward.

Man: Okay. I'm going to open the poll now.

Ken Bour: This is CPSG the work team as part of the GNSO improvements. Okay. I have 15. Anyone else? Yes Stéphane. Okay. Cool. 16 - anyone else? 17 going once, 18. I'm going to go ahead and close at this point.

There are your results. The range is 6 minus 3 or 3 and this is our second round or first? I've lost track. It's our first round. Okay. We have a very strong median result and a mode of 5. Again, theoretically we should go to a second round. Does anyone - let's see. Who voted the 3? Alan, would you care to comment?

Adrian Kinderis: I'm 3.

Ken Bour: I see Alan here as a 3.

Alan Greenberg: I certainly did. Maybe you did also in which case it's counting them wrong.

Adrian Kinderis: I voted a 3.

Alan Greenberg: Then I'll defer to Andre.

Ken Bour: But someone will have to explain why we only have one tally. Yeah. I only show one 3 here on the poll results. It doesn't show Andre voted. It doesn't. I thought I saw his name.

Adrian Kinderis: You voted after he had closed it, yes?

Ken Bour: Let me open it back up Andre and you can go ahead and enter your results. There a dock in the 3?

Man: You need to put your mouse right in that circle and see that dot appear.

Ken Bour: Okay. Is it there now? Where is the dot? I see a 2 now just entered and a 3. All right. I'm going to close it again.

Man: I'll answer the question anyway if you'd like.

Ken Bour: Somebody just eclipsed you. That Terry rated it a 2.

Terry Davis: I just raised mine slightly there.

Ken Bour: Okay. We would again according to the procedure we could continue this discussion, go on to the next one. We have nine people rated it a 5. In the interest of time I guess I'm suggesting that we make an exception here, count

the 5 as the answer, keep the data the way it is now and go to the next project or we will not finish at this rate. Wendy.

Wendy Seltzer: I have a procedural question. Given that in every instance so far we have ended up at the same median as we began with, are we accomplishing anything by this discussion?

Ken Bour: I think that's an excellent process question and I would beg the council to consider it at its meeting on the 23. Okay. Hearing no objection I think I'm going to declare this one done. We have got these data recorded and we'll move to the next project.

Okay. The next project is RAA and we started out with a mode of 4, the most popular answer. We have low scores by Rafik and by Wendy. If you guys would want to comment on RAA?

Wendy Seltzer: I have been speaking too much.

Man: You have been waiting too (extremely).

Wendy Seltzer: Where the incentives lay.

Ken Bour: I'm sorry. Am I not facilitating very well here? There were a couple of 2s and we heard from one? Kristina.

Kristina Rosette: Wendy, I actually given that your constituency was one of the two that wanted specific work to be done after the last vote on the amendment and mine was the other, I would be interested in hearing your view as a councilor from that constituency. Adrian. Okay. Wendy, you're up.

Wendy Seltzer: I guess I was testing my vote based on the importance of the work that I think is actually being done as distinct from the work that should perhaps be done around the registration accreditation agreement. So I don't think it's moving in

the right direction and therefore I don't think that that is the work that I would like to see prioritized.

Ken Bour: Yeah. And again process point - may I make a distinction that that is another managerial aspect of the council's work to decide what is supposed to be done is being done properly, not necessarily what this exercise is today. Who was next? Adrian?

Adrian Kinderis: We are talking about the issues.

Stéphane Van Gelder: I'm dropping mine down to a 1 on this one just giving a heads up. The reason being that my understanding is that the current RAAs that are in place will be so for the next four years. So there are probably some other things that should take priority over that.

Ken Bour: Again, may I make a differentiation that it's not the timing of when the work should happen. Only its importance generally irrespective of timing.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Ken, I would say that this timing aspect in this respect has some importance because it brings some urgency. And I know that we talked about this. But it's a different perception of urgency.

Ken Bour: Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I believe that Adrian's comment is wrong in fact in that the group can come up with consensus policy, which would be in effect immediately, not wait for contracts to be signed.

Adrian Kinderis: Sorry.

Ken Bour: Stéphane.

Stéphane Van Gelder: That is true but registrars aren't blinded by that until the next four years when they resign their contract.

Alan Greenberg: It would take effect immediately I believe.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Ken help.

Ken Bour: Okay. Facilitator - I'm going to suggest that we open the poll and take a round and see where we are. It sounds like we have more variability than we started with. But let's go ahead and do that.

I'm going to open the poll right now. Okay. We're on RAA. Please make sure that radio button highlights before you - I have 17. Wow. 18 - anyone else not voted yet? Going once, going twice - I'm going to close. Okay. So we now have three 1s. Yeah. We're much more spread out than we were before. Three, four, five, six - we still have the median result is a 4, which is exactly what it was before.

So the results didn't change but the spread clearly did. So what's the will here? Should we accept the median result and move on or go through another round of discussion? Okay. I'm going to go ahead and accept this as the end of this round and we're going to move to the next project, which is okay we're going to begin with the discussion of GEO.

And we started out with the most popular answer was in fact a 1 although it was not strong. Only 32% of the councilors voted it and we have Terry Davis at a 7. Maybe we could start there. Again, we're not going to have a low 10% because the most popular answer was in fact a 1. So Terry, you're up.

Terry Davis: Yeah. I look at the GEO problem as a fairly major thing for us to resolve. Certain conflicts separate them from business things.

Man: We're talking about geo regions, not geographical names.

Ken Bour: Would that change your sense of value or rating on that project, Terry?

Terry Davis: I'll think about it here and see what else. I don't have my notes with me where I rated these.

Ken Bour: Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Terry, this is in the working group where we are participating, Zahid and myself (unintelligible) - so it's not a direct GNSO working group. But it's about how regions are reflected in ICANN's office and in ICANN's different supporting organizations.

Ken Bour: Is there anyone that feels compelled to make any other statements about the GEO working group? If not I would suggest we open up the poll and take stock of where we are. Okay. I'm going to do that. Okay. The poll is open. We're on GEO round one.

I've got 11. Anyone else? Marika, would you kindly answer a 4 for Wolf? 17 - anyone else? Going once, did everybody get their vote in? I can display the individuals who - let me go ahead and close and display. Okay. Our range is a 5, which would require us to go to a second round by the procedures. We have a median result of 3.

That's interesting the median is a 3. Only two people voted for that particular number. Let me go ahead and display the results. And so looking at the high end, Terry had it as a 6 and Zahid a 5. Terry, do you want to comment at all about the 6?

Terry Davis: Yeah. I remember my notes without it but from Olga's comment. Getting the diversity and everything seems (to me).

Ken Bour: Does anyone else want to make a comment? We have a fair amount of variability. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: This is one of the curious ones. As Olga pointed out it doesn't involve a lot of resources. It's absolutely crucial to ICANN in that the results are used in board selection among other things. So I think it's important that we get it off the table, that we finish it.

My personal prediction is that we're not going to change anything but I think we need to remove the uncertainty, make a decision and go on because there are some really important aspects that are related to it.

Ken Bour: Well, we have four individuals who gave it a far below average. Is any one of those persuaded by that logic? That would be Wendy, Kristina, Stéphane, Tim. Tim?

Tim Ruiz: I don't want to change it. I'll just comment to it and that is that again, that's exactly the concern is that I don't think anything is going to change. I don't really see how it could.

And if it is I think the issue is much broader than just GNSO and I don't see it being a focus of GNSO but perhaps other groups as a matter of fact. So at any rate, its value in relation to other things that I think we can have much more influence with, is just very low.

Ken Bour: Okay. I would suggest at this point after having gone through two rounds we go ahead and accept the median result, which is a 3. And the next project up is travel.

Okay. For travel we ended up with a mode of 2 so that would be moderately below average in terms of value. Kristina gave it a 1, Alan gave it a 1. Why don't we start there? I see Mike did also but he's not here.

Kristina Rosette: I thought the work on the travel policy was done. So I gave it a 1. Am I mistaken? It's still ongoing?

Ken Bour: Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Kristina, yes it's still ongoing. By the way, we have a face to face meeting with travel staff because we have at least four requests from GNSO to address and talk to them.

Ken Bour: Okay. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I gave it a 1 as a protest essentially and a statement that it shouldn't be on this list. It's a background activity that council has to participate in. It's an administrative issue. It's not really a work group.

Ken Bour: Okay. Let's see. What I would suggest is to go ahead and open up the poll and just go ahead and see where we are. So I'm going to do that. Okay. Poll is open. We're on travel. While you're voting I just want to let you know that we have in the neighborhood of 20 minutes left and we have one, two, three, four, five, six projects.

At the rate we're going it's not possible to finish today. I'm not sure what remedial action we'll need to take but we won't get all the projects done. We could do that. I'll make a motion on that idea. So clearly after the result of discussion I think this pattern is sort of holding up that we are creating more variability after the discussion than we had before we started.

So now we have a range of 6. We have three 1s. We clearly have a median result of a 2 and but we have got people all over the map. I would recommend that we go ahead and accept the median result, which is a 2. Nine councilors voted for it. Now just again looking at the data, at the time, it's not possible for us to continue this approach and get through the remaining projects in my judgment.

We have a couple of options here. One would be to continue another time with more to continue the dialogue. That would be one, maybe not a very popular one judging by the visceral reaction. A second would be to pick already using the statistics and I'm happy to go through them one by one and tell you where we are results wise.

And we can say that result is fine and that's going to be the one that the council approves. And I have got a document that I am preparing where I will post all the ratings and you will see that on the 23. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Can I suggest that we press forward as quickly as possible and try and get it done. If we run into the next session a little bit, our next session is to plan for our joint GNSO/GAP meeting this afternoon. I think we can probably do that in about 45 minutes and especially since people are really eating lunch now, we're not going to have to worry about any interference with regard to lunch. So that is my recommendation.

Ken Bour: All right. Then let's go ahead and give it a try. We can come back to that question about what to do if we don't finish. The next project up is Hedner. It's highlighted on your screen. We started out with a mode of 5, which slightly above average.

These are getting where we are having increasingly more variability as we undertake these projects although maybe less than we - yes Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: We shouldn't be bothered by the fact that we're getting increased variability. What we're trying to do is to get ratings that reflect where we're at as a total council. And if it means more variability and that is the reflective of the group, that's good to hear.

Ken Bour: Excellent point. Wendy, Stéphane and Adrian were 1s on this for Hedner. Anyone wish to start off? I'm sorry. I'm on Hedner here. We finished travel.

Jamie Wagner: I would like to add a proper reflection also, Ken.

Ken Bour: Yes Jaime.

Jamie Wagner: Because this is meant to increase awareness, awareness of the project, awareness of the positions and the motives behind those positions that should be expressed here more I would say adequately defended.

Ken Bour: Okay. Thank you. We're on Hedner. The mode is a 5. We have Tim and Stéphane and Adrian. Okay. If you'd like to, about Hedner in terms of why you think it's far below average compared with everyone else.

Adrian Kinderis: I think I can speak for the three of us there just to say that that was - we have people on that group and the feedback that we're getting is that the group is not that productive and the work that has been done there is not that productive. And so we just didn't feel that it was that important.

Ken Bour: Yeah. And just again, the differentiation would be that is the work itself important to the GNSO and to ICANN even if the group that is trying to do it is doing a very bad job of it?

Adrian Kinderis: I didn't say that. I didn't say the group was doing a bad job. I said the work wasn't productive. I'm not saying anything bad about the group.

Ken Bour: Okay. Sorry. Didn't hear this and I didn't either.

Adrian Kinderis: How do you qualify people that do a not productive job? They are unproductive.

Man: The subject itself is not - doesn't lend itself very easily to productive outcomes. You don't necessarily have to blame the people working on it. The topics matter itself may be something that we need to consider at this stage.

I don't think that is the only example of something the GNSO is working on that maybe it would be better time spent doing something else.

Jamie Wagner: Just clarify me - I would like to understand. Are you saying this is very complex or very controversial?

Man: Bear in mind this is the feedback that we are getting. So it's something that we are being told third hand. It's just that the outcome itself will not be very useful. That's what we're told. The work itself is not really necessary at this stage.

Ken Bour: I'm sorry. Do I have a hand and then maybe we can ask Wendy because you gave it a 7.

Man: I'm not sure this is a discussion we should be having during the prioritization exercise since we will be discussing that project itself later. But I'll point out for those who aren't participating that this is a project talking about whether policy should be made to change what registrars do, and it's not particularly surprising that that reaction may come from the registrars' constituency/stakeholder group

Ken Bour: Would you like to comment at all?

Woman: I think it's an important question to registrants, many of whom are noncommercial. What I would suggest we do is go head and open up the poll and let's take stock of where we are. Give me one second.

Okay. Poll is open. This is on Hedner. I have 18 - anyone else? Has anyone not voted? Raise your hand. One, two - okay. Okay - 19. Everybody in? Okay. The range dropped by one from a 6 to a 5. We have a median answer of a 4, which is exactly what we had before. The three 1s did not change. We did have one 7 drop down to a 6.

I would suggest at this point we probably have reached critical mass on this one. Accept the median answer and move on? Everybody say okay. Good. Let's do that. The next project up is Fast Flux. We have a mode of 1. That is the most popular answer and 59% of the councilors voted for it. Since it was the low value, we'll go to the top 10%, which was Mike and he's not here.

Olga rated it a 5, Jamie a 5. Do either of you want to make any comment or do you want to go straight to a vote?

Olga Cavalli: (If you ask me) I think it's important for security and this is why I put a 5.

Chuck Gomes: And let me jump in since you are not seeing my hand. The thing with Fast Flux in terms of what came out of that group, it obviously has not been considered a priority by the council because we keep putting off doing anything about it.

So and part of the reason was there is really not much that we can do in terms of development there in terms of policy because the issues even go beyond the GNSO scope. So that is a reason why as registries rate at the lower.

Ken Bour: Marika.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Just to point out that the poor person for the group initially, the group did product recommendations that were all adopted by the council and while that basically is it's waiting for a drafting team to be formally formed to determine how to move forwards on the recommendations.

Those are not indeed policy changes but many of those emanated from further discussion, further research. So just to make clear why this project said its recommendations were adopted and they're just waiting to be implemented or to be added to the list.

Ken Bour: Jamie.

Jamie Wagner: I just want to - I think this is of enormous importance to security and trust on the internet. And I think this is right in the aim of GNSO if the work did not achieve this then we should revisit it because this issue is extremely important to security.

I understand this way. Maybe I'm wrong and the technical guys can make me change my understanding.

Ken Bour: This is Tim is up.

Tim Ruiz: Yeah. I don't think that at least from my point of view and the registrars that security stability is not important. It's just that I think that approaching Fast Flux directly is taking the wrong tack.

The conduct that we're actually trying to prevent that we're concerned about has to do with phishing or other issues and this is just really a very small component of that. It isn't going to solve that problem directly. And in fact, Fast Flux is actually used by very legitimate businesses in very legitimate ways. So it's not that Fast Flux is capable, it's not Fast Flux itself.

I think something else is what we're really after and continuing to pursue Fast Flux I think is just misdirected and taking time that we could best spend otherwise.

Ken Bour: Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And Jaime, I want to be clear, I'm not saying it's not important. What I'm saying is the issue is much broader than the GNSO and there is limited amounts of impact that we can have within GNSO work and it has to involve a much larger community. So please don't misinterpret me to think that it's not important.

Jamie Wagner: I understand that and just to clarify my understanding, I understand that Fast Flux will not resolve all the issues behind but it is a small part of it and I think Fast Flux is in the scope of GNSO to solve. So if we can contribute I think it's a matter of example of good faith at least.

Ken Bour: Yes Alan and maybe after Alan we'll take a vote. Go ahead. Last comment.

Alan Greenberg: I think Fast Flux is one of the great examples of something we're looking at in the PDP working team of can we come up with a fast pass PDP. Once we actually decide the policy needs to be changed and we can do it in a very focused way, I don't think it's being done structured very well right now for most of the reasons that were already mentioned.

Ken Bour: I'm going to go ahead and open up the poll now on this one and let's go ahead and vote and see where we are. Now open. Fast Flux. I've got 17. Anyone else? Raise your hand if you haven't voted. I don't see any hands. Going once, going twice. Okay. I'm going to close it.

All right. There are our results. We have 6 minus 1 or 5 is the range. The median answer is a 2, which is one higher than it was. It was at a 1. Would you like to accept the 2 and move to the next project? I would suggest we do that in the interest of time.

Okay. Done. Next project is RAP and we started out there with a mode of 2. We had a 1 although Wendy I'm not going to go to you this time because it's so close to the median. Let's start with Mike gave it a 7. He is not here so I guess I'll drop to a 6. Kristina, Andre, Alan - any of you want to comment at all about why you thought this one was more important than a 2?

This is RAP. Okay. Anyone? If no one wants to take air time I'll just go ahead, clear the results, open the poll and we'll move right through it. So give me one second. RAP poll is now open. We've got 10. Has anyone not voted? I

only have 12 votes, 14, 15 - okay. Please raise your hand if you still would like to vote and have not done so.

Okay. I'm sorry. We've got one more - Rosemary. Okay. We have 18. I'm going to close it. Well, you can't check but I can display the results at any time if you want to see your name.

Alan Greenberg: My dock disappeared so I'm assuming my name did too.

Ken Bour: Okay. Let's check. Alan, you're up there as a 6.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. It's back again now.

Ken Bour: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: That took action on my part I'm just pointing out.

Ken Bour: Okay. Excellent. I've got 19 results so I'm going to broadcast them. Okay. So wow, we have a range of now 7 minus 1 or 6. The median happens to be a 4. Yeah. I think we're getting more variability after our discussions so I guess that could be a good sign.

Should we go ahead and accept the 4 as the council's answer and move to the next one? Again, in the interest of time I don't think we can have another round of discussion. Any objection? Sustained. Next project up is PDP and I know we only have two more after that so we're doing good. The mode answer happened to be a 4 average.

The low value was Mike, he's not here. And Wolf Ulrich gave it a 7. There were several 7s actually - Edmon, Chuck, Caroline and Wolf. Anyone there would like to make a comment? Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Sure. We have been realizing for the last, I don't know, three or four years, almost since the beginning of the existing PDP was established that it needed serious revision.

Now true, we have kind of made some changes on our own along the way but I think it's very important that the bylaws be changed, that the policy development process that is in the bylaws be updated and that it reflect in many cases what we have been doing a lot in our working groups process and so forth. So this determines almost everything we do.

Ken Bour: Anyone else like to make a comment? Okay. I'm going to go ahead and open up the poll. PDP is open. I have 16. Raise your hand if you haven't voted yet. Stéphane, thank you. I've got 17 - anyone else? Going once, going twice - okay.

There are our results. The range is 5, 7 minus 2. The median answer, 7, 8, 9, 10 is a 6, moderately above average. I recommend that we accept that answer as the council's and go to the next one. Any objection? Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Ken, before we go to the next one, I'd like to make a comment before we do anything on it. The IN fast track and Edmon, please correct me if I'm wrong on this - I think this is probably a project we should have eliminated from the list and we missed that.

And do you concur with that Edmon? Yeah. So unless somebody wants to leave this one on there I would suggest we eliminate it because we're not doing any more work on that. It's just - yeah. Well, no this has to do with gTLD not CCTLD. It's a fast track for gTLDs, okay? Now there may be other things that can be done in that regard but this particular issue, we're not doing any more work on that.

Ken Bour: Can I make just an observation? Are you suggesting that IDNF might have gone to Table 2, which is non-eligible project? Okay. Is that the will of the

council to go ahead and do that because then we don't have to talk any more about it. I'm sorry Edmon?

Edmon Chung: Just a comment. Obviously this is one of the things that I brought up and I had thought it was important. The issue is I don't think we will ever come to any kind of consensus to move forward. And that's the reason why I think we never - we just couldn't muster enough interest to create that consensus. That's the reason why.

Ken Bour: Andre.

Adrian Kinderis: Yeah. I'd like to say about the same. The idea of a track for this particular project for GNSO was very good. But the consensus is not feasible.

Ken Bour: Okay. So what I'm going to do then is I'm going to take IDNF off of the Table 1 eligible projects, move it to Table 2. We'll code it appropriately. It will not then be on the list for the ratings. So we'll skip this one now and move to the last one. Yay.

And that is the WG working group team. We started out here with a mode of 6, which is moderately above average and this one had the greatest amount of variability. We have a 1 from Mike who is not here as we mentioned before. Let's go to the 7s, Adrian, Stéphane, Tim and also Wolf Ulrich. Who would like to go first? Tim, you're up.

Tim Ruiz: Yeah. I think this project is extremely important I think for many of the reasons that were stated for the PDP except that I think that how this works out or how the working groups conduct themselves directly affects the effectiveness of the PDP process.

And even if we manage to resolve the time constraint issues and those kinds of things in the PDP process itself, if the working group doesn't operate efficiently and effectively all of that is for not. I mean it all gets derailed. And I

think even lately just in some of the working groups that I have observed or that I have participated in, I can see certain issues exist that I think need to be resolved and they need to be resolved quickly if we want to have an effective process. I think the working group level is the most important part of an effective PDP process.

Ken Bour: Stéphane.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thanks Ken. For me it's four letters really summarize it, VIWG. That working group has really shown because there are so many people in there, because there is such a wide variety of interests, because it's a passionate subject. But we just want to echo everything that Tim has said.

The better and the more precise the working group guidelines are I think the better the working groups will function. And when that happens we will be able to tackle almost any subject, even one as complex as VI.

Ken Bour: Anybody else want to comment? Chuck and Alan.

Chuck Gomes: My comments on this are very similar to what I said on the PDP and to what Tim said. This is where we live. Now I'm wondering if some of the people that rated it low rated it low because it's almost done.

But again, if we rate it for what it - it's still a live project until we get into implementation phase. So I mean and again, another factor is that granted we have kind of had an evolutionary cycle over the last four or five years where we have moved to the working group model so we have incorporated a lot of these things. But that doesn't make it less important, the fact that we are kind of ahead of the game in that regard.

Ken Bour: Did you have your hand raised?

Man: I was just going to echo that it looks like we're almost done but really we have got a ways to go. I mean the sub-team is done with its work. That goes to the steering committee. So that has yet to be reviewed and debated at the steering committee level before it even goes to the council.

So there is still some work to be done so don't think that it's close, it's done. We need to give this some priority.

Ken Bour: Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. I was going to support what Tim said originally but I disagree with Chuck who was agreeing with him. I think in recent months we have learned a lot. We went into this whole process saying working groups are going to fix all of the problems we had with task forces and other things and I think we have discovered the world is not quite that easy any more.

The problems we have had on VI, the problems we have had on Hedner, which we just alluded to, the success we had on STI, which was not a working group - I think we have to be very careful going forward in this thing. And I don't think the task is over at all, and it is where we live and we've got to get it right.

Chuck Gomes: So you disagreed with what, the fact that I said they're maybe close to finished? Is that what you - that's okay.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. (Just that part). I think we may have to go backtrack a little bit because of some realities that have come to light.

Ken Bour: I have one more, I think it's Wolf and then I would suggest we go ahead and do the vote. You may have one other more because I'm just speaking to the others low level voting here because I have (a question for them) what is the reason why? And (so it's their turn).

Ken Bour: Okay. So Wolf is asking those who gave it a low vote if they wouldn't mind commenting on why they gave it a low vote.

Man: (Why are you looking at me)?

Ken Bour: I think you're a 3.

Kristina Rosette: Primarily because it's my understanding that the work teams - a lot of how I voted on these was my understanding of where this was in terms of the process, how much further time was required by the council and communities.

It was my understanding that of among all of these projects, this one is fairly far along.

Ken Bour: Were you accepting of the fact that what we were looking for here was its overall importance, not how close it was to completion? That is. That is what we're looking for total, just the value, not really how close it is to being done.

Kristina Rosette: If you're asking me if I'm going to change my score, I haven't decided.

Ken Bour: Okay. I'm going to open up the poll now and we'll see. All right. Give me one second. The poll is open. This is the last one, working group. Marika, you don't get to vote. Okay. All right. We have 15. Please raise your hand if you haven't voted and I need to get your vote in.

We got 18. Is that right, 18? Anyone else? Okay. I'm going to Chuck, Adrian - you can't buy yourself a drink, though. Okay. So what we have here is a range of 7 minus 3 or 4. I think in the interest of time, let me see what our median score is, 6, 7, 8 - it is actually a 6. And so unless there is any objection we would score this as a 6 and declare the process completed. Give yourselves a round of applause.

I've got to tell you I feel great because I did not think it was possible to get this done in two hours but you did a great job and I appreciate all the comments and your willingness to go along with this. And Chuck, you're up.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Ken and thanks for all the hard work you did not only today but in helping us along. Now I want to let everybody know now we have a motion on the table and it's seconded for Thursday that is to open up a public comment period on the ratings, okay?

So that's pretty much all that it's doing. We will start the evaluation of this process in our meeting on Thursday. We will not finish it in that meeting but start discussions. And then ultimately after the public comment period then we will do a thorough evaluation. We have been talking about prioritization for years.

This is the first real crack at it. We're all going to debate whether or not it was successful, whether or not it was worth all the effort. But even if we decide that it wasn't and I'm not suggesting that will be the conclusion, I think it was extremely important for us to go through this exercise so that we can decide how to deal with prioritization of issues going forward whether it's this method or something different, some hybrid or whatever.

So I hope you didn't find this a total waste. I think we will learn from it. It may be something very different than what we know now and that's okay. But thanks for your cooperation and participation in this. What I'd like to do now is just break for about five minutes and we'll come back and we'll talk about our meeting with the GAP this afternoon.

Jamie Wagner: Just for the register I would like to recommend to publish not only the medians but also the final range and standard deviation because this gives the amount of disagreement between us and this is something that - Ken, did you hear? Okay.

END