

**ICANN Cartagena Meeting
Development of Criteria for Initiating New Projects
TRANSCRIPTION
Saturday 04 December 2010 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 being recorded. If you have any objections, parties may disconnect their lines. Speakers, you may begin.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very operator. Good morning everyone. (Unintelligible) (I used to talk a lot) in Spanish so my English may be lazy this morning.

As you know, maybe you already heard about that (Chuck) is sick. He's in the hospital. Unfortunately he will not be able to join us at least this morning. Maybe we will see what happens today. He has a meeting with his doctor during the morning.

And so we will handle the session of today with Stéphane. Also he arrived late early this morning and he will join us in a while. So we are recording this session. We also have a transcribed session and we have people on line. We have Ken Bour and it could be good if we can present ourselves within the table so - and also when you talk identify yourselves for the recording purposes, for transcription purposes and for people who are not here with us so they know who is talking. Could we start with Adrian.

Adrian Kinderis: Good morning everybody. My name's Adrian Kinderis. I'm from the registrar stakeholder group. I'm not sure about formalities this morning but I'm about to email the list and update my statement of interest as (most) registry international companies that I am CO for has recently achieved registry stakeholder group observer status. And I'll update that and send that around. Thank you. Do I really sound like that, by the way? Because that's horrible.

Olga Cavalli: It doesn't sound very - it sounds very loud at least for me, like echoing. Thank you very much Adrian.

Adrian Kinderis: I sound very Australian. I don't know what that is but I'm not pronouncing my words properly. I'll try Spanish. Thank you.

Olga Cavalli: Oh please do that. It would be very nice for some of us. Thank you Adrian. And at least send to Glenn a state of - your statement of interest. And...

Chris Chaplow: Good day. Chris Chaplow, vice chair of the business constituency.

Marilyn Cade: Marilyn Cade, chair of the business constituency.

Debra Hughes: Debra Hughes, non-commercial stakeholder's group.

Kristina Rosette: Kristina Rosette, IPC.

Jeff Neuman: Jeff Neuman, registry stakeholder group.

Wolf Knoben: Wolf-Ulrich Knoben from the (unintelligible) constituency.

Jaime Wagner: Jaime Wagner, IFPCP.

Glenn Desaintgery: Glenn Desaintgery, the GNSO secretary.

Woman: (Unintelligible), GNSO and vice-chair.

Julie Hedlund: Julie Hedlund, ICANN staff, sector of (affect) and policy support.

Marika Konings: Marika Konings, ICANN staff.

Margie Milam: Margie Milam, ICANN staff.

David Olive: David Olive, vice president, policy development support.

Liz Gasster: Liz Gasster, ICANN policy staff.

Rosemary Sinclair: Rosemary Sinclair, non-commercial stakeholders group.

Alan Greenberg: Alan Greenberg, ALAC, GNSO (liaison) from the ALAC.

Edmon Chung: Edmon Chung, registry stakeholder group.

Mike Rodenbaugh: Mike Rodenbaugh, business constituency.

(Don Berard): (John Berard) from the business constituency.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you very much everyone. We have until 10:00 this morning, then we have a break. Then we have a session about development of criteria for initiating new projects. As you may recall, we, at the beginning of November, if I'm not mistaken, we ended (at the) discussion or we just started a new discussion about the - how to prioritize our own work, how to use our resources the best way we can.

Which projects are more priority (stable) or not then others. And we did, if you recall, we did an exercise in Brussels. Some of us thought it was maybe useful. Some of us or others of us thought it was very complicated and very long.

So the idea of this session today is to exchange some thoughts about how to prioritize the work in the GNSO, if it should be (done) with formal process, if this formal process should be done once in while, once a year, two or three times a year, if we should use the same process that we used in Brussels or maybe modifying it.

What I asked Marika to upload in the screen that you can see and for you can't, that you're remote, we have the project list in the screen. This project list was - it's not that we developed it. We didn't invent it but just we rearranged it and the way that it is now which in my modest opinion I think it's more nice looking and easy to work this. We did rearrange it in the prioritization working group that I chaired.

And so this is the (price) of this that we already have in the GNSO. It is updated once in a while by - mainly by Liz. Thank you Liz for all the work and for - by the staff.

So that's the idea of the session today. I - this morning I've been checking our list, our council list and I don't want to take a lot of time but just share with you some thoughts that we exchanged in our council list.

Let me find email - about if we should use a prioritization process, if we didn't want to use it, if it's needed or not. One thing that I would like to share with you it's during the work that we had in the work - in the working team. What I realized, and it was - maybe it sounds like an obvious thing but it was not when we were working in it.

For every council member that were participating in the working group, the priorities were totally different because of different business because they were from different stakeholder groups, they had different interests in different things that were related to GNSO. But all of them were part of projects of the GNSO list.

So how - my big question after the long work we did and the work for us in the group and Jaime also tracked it, a lot of work with us also, how to put priorities in different projects that are differently relevant for every council member. How can you build a prioritization when, for example, I remember vertical integration working teams, some gave zero to it and some of us gave the highest and they have the reason for it.

So I don't want to take more time. Just share with you some thoughts on the list. Some of us thought that it could be valued to have this process done once in a while because it could improve general awareness by the council members of the working that is going on in the GNSO which is - could be a valuable tool for leadership and figuring the degree of consensus of the relative value of the different projects.

Others thought that may be - it was also a question done to the - to Stéphane and myself as council - sorry - as candidates for chair, sorry. It's the Spanish (that counts) I want to (start) my English. So we both had different views.

I had the view that maybe we couldn't have to participation in the GNSO, making it more broader and having more people working in the working team. And Stéphane thought that maybe it could be good to (start to) use more on relevant projects which I think both visions are fine and different.

So it's open to any of you. You want to comment? I think I've talked too much and I open the list. Maybe Ken, you want to add something to what I said? You also participated in the working team. You (unintelligible).

Ken Bour: Thank you Olga. No, I don't have anything to add at the moment.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you. Comments. So Jaime.

Jaime Wagner: Well just one consideration on you're talking, is that (earlier today) is not as much as what to do. It tells also what not to do and I think to focus in the highest priorities we must defer or postpone or eliminate the lowest priority. So - but this is a decision that must be made by the leadership that this prioritization doesn't - does not involve a decision.

Prioritization gives the means and the information for the - for leadership to make decisions. So the main decision would be to decide which project

should be kept apart and waiting or - and which ones should be given more focus and resources.

That's my opinion but many of the council members expect that prioritization, the process - prioritization process should include some decisions. Decision is something that is done afterwards. That's my opinion.

Olga Cavalli: (Thank you) Jaime. (Michael).

(Michael): So I think we've been talking about this prioritization exercise for about 18 months now and I think it's pretty obvious that it hasn't really come to any consensus amongst the council. As Olga said, we all have different priorities.

I don't think that's really ever going to change. But where we're at today, my understanding is really that the staff and the GNSO, as of the work that's on the table as of today that's been approved by resolution is not really overwhelming, that we have, you know, enough stuff to do the work currently. And I'd love to hear from the staff on that whether that's true or not.

But that's sort of my view that as of today, everything seems to be going okay with the work that's out there. But looking towards the future as we, you know, many of us still want to add new things to GNSO's plate constantly, I would suggest that we need to, as a part of all of our future resolutions, the commission or working group or otherwise, we do a prioritization exercise at that point and give staff our view of where the new project fits into the ongoing project tax risk and priorities.

If we could just sort of agree on some - if we could somehow agree on some objective criteria for how certain types of things would be prioritized over certain types of things that might be helpful but I don't necessarily think that's going to be possible either. I think they're just going to have to take it case by case with each new PDP and work team or whatever issue, and again, come to an agreement at that time as to where it should be prioritized.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you (Mike). Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I think (Mike) makes a very good point, and I think it will become very relevant in the discussion this afternoon, for example, on the recommendations on the registration of used (publicities) working group. Because that group has a list of, I think, 14 recommendations all of which require for the work if the creation of a working group or a drafting team staff work, I think the suggestion of making - looking at work that's coming in, kind of prioritizing maybe that - those efforts. Because that's not the only working group that comes up with recommendation requiring more work.

There are others in the pipeline - IRTP, that probably have more work that will come from them - from that. So maybe it's easier in these prioritizing work that's coming in instead of trying to prioritize efforts that are already ongoing and there are big differences in opinion on whether it should be put on hold, stopped, work harder to finish it early. So it might be worth considering.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Marika. Adrian.

Adrian Kinderis: Yes, I think (Mike) brings up a good point but for me it's about trying to reconcile when you do the prioritization. And the issue that I have has been a motion that's passed. Oftentimes there are dates built within those motions and it's almost that we need to do the prioritization before a motion can be passed or otherwise, you know, be conscience of the date that goes in there.

Sometimes we have no, you know, if the board's passed on something that we have no flexibility with the date and so that sticks. But you always don't have to throw something out of the bucket. You know, and then my organization we do this all the time and simply have a bucket. The bucket's full of three different things - the must-haves, should-haves and nice to haves.

And some - they're bodies of work. And when something comes in, the first thing that gets taken out of the bucket (for live) body of work are the nice to haves. And that's how we continually do our prioritization of all the tasks that we're working on internally.

So I guess two points coming out of that is I don't think you're ever going to get away from continual prioritization including those that are currently being worked on as they will always be shifted down the order when something new comes in. So you need to have a sense of what is the prioritization of the current workload otherwise how do you move something out when something new comes in.

That's number one. Number two is moreover the timing of prioritization. When do we sit down and work out when something's brought in I think is also paramount because as I said earlier, when we build in timelines into motions and so on and so forth, oftentimes we are - we're doing that without understanding the implications of what that will do to our current prioritization. I hope I made some sense in my Australian. Thank you. Rosemary was with me the whole way.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Adrian. Rosemary, you wanted to talk now?

Rosemary Sinclair: Sure. (unintelligible) now that everyone's got the Australian ear into gear. And Adrian's idea of just talking about the way his organization does things, that's what I've been thinking, that in my little organization we have a once a year strategy planning session and we work out at an overarching level what the priorities are going to be because we're tiny. There's really just a few of us so lots of people want us to do all sorts of things.

And we just have to have a way of focusing on what we can do with our resources. And that's the other thing for me, that prioritizing without reference to the resources that are available either in the staff or in the community is just not practical.

So for me some sort of prioritization would go back to - Olga but I think we can just leave (him) for just a moment - goes back to kind of the strategic plan, operational plan. That's kind of the administrative scaffolding that we've put in place for the whole organization.

The issue for me is that this is ICANN where staff can't comment from the community and so I think there's a conundrum for us all the time in trying to use corporate structures which are very helpful that in this context is the community leads the discussion.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you Rosemary. Adrian.

Adrian Kinderis: Yes, great points Rosemary. You know, I put it down to - and there'll be many people out here that understand this farther than I but a (tough) way development and the way we do it internally is probably not a bad model to follow in that we have a set release time.

And within that release, oh as I say, we have these different categories of items but you might have a bug come up and, you know, I'm doing an analogy for what may come up from the community from what you were saying. So that bug needs to get addressed immediately.

That gets thrown into the release for the expense of something and as I said, that's where you need to do it. So there are other methodologies we can certainly follow and when we had this discussion way back then, that was where I sort of started this basis of discussion.

One point I wanted to bring up about something you were discussing was about the implications of the staff and I think that that's key here. I think that oftentimes we look at the GNSO, you know, us around a title, what our bandwidth is but I don't know that there is a great understanding of (three ways) of what the staff's bandwidth is.

And oftentimes we can take advantage of that. And I think to - what we need is some sort of operational, you know, a single point that we can go to within staff to say at every time where we've got to prioritize work from what we can do, at the same time prioritizing from what is available bandwidth for them. Otherwise we end up either, A, stretching them too thin and burning them out or being - not being able to meet deadlines and that's not necessarily their fault. In fact, it's not their fault in that circumstance.

So I just want to make sure that whatever ingredient we do I would like to ensure that we are respectful to the staff's bandwidth that supports this because every single time we do something, we do require the support of the staff to assist.

Olga Cavalli: Other comments? Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I think one of the issues that we have to remember is we're not talking about a single pool of centrally managed people. In terms of staff there is certainly a finite amount of work they can do even if it's 30% above their eight hours a day they do right now.

Nevertheless, in the reasonable term, if indeed there is more work to be done in the GNSO then the current staff can do then one has to try to make an argument for more staff. But the volunteers are a completely different set of tools of resources.

On the projects that come top down - vertical integration, that's the best example perhaps, there's an awful lot of council involvement - counselor involvement. On some of the other PDPs, certainly on (headner), there are not formal counselors on the PDP.

IRTP, I don't know how many there are. An awful lot of (Marika)'s (says) there are none. So an awful lot of the resources are community resources which,

although not infinite, it's a different pool then we're talking about here and it is possible to try to recruit new people into it.

So it's not just the staff and programmers and they can only do certain number of hours a day. It's an elastic staff in terms of the volunteer work and very often quite different people are involved in one thing then another.

So when we try to prioritize it, it's very much an issue of looking at whose time are we prioritizing? Not all out of a single pool which is why the single prioritized list doesn't really make a lot sense in this case.

Olga Cavalli: And now Marika, you want to talk? Just one clarification. Alan, you said that it is - could be possible to recruit more people from the community? That's what you said?

Alan Greenberg: That is what I said.

Olga Cavalli: I didn't get the sentence complete. Margie, yes.

Margie Milam: Thank you. It's Margie. Yes, I wanted to follow up on Adrian's comment. From the staff perspective, it all depends on how much work the volunteers are going to do in the working group. And I'll just give an example. We jumped into the morality and public order discussion fairly quickly in a very tight timeframe.

And at the time that came up, I believe Liz, you know, indicated that we were pretty heavy on staff load and the commitment was that the volunteers would do most of the work. Well it turned out that that wasn't the case. As we got close to publishing the report it got thrown on my shoulders. And, you know, I mean, that's part of the job but it wasn't the expectation when we came into doing that project.

And so I spent hours and hours rewriting this report with very little input or writing help from the drafting team or the group. So a lot of it has to do with how much the volunteers are willing to do up front and to stick with that commitment. Because, you know, even if we say we can support it, in the end it's the - if everything gets thrown to staff when it wasn't intended to be initially, that essentially upsets the other works that the particular staff person happens to be doing.

So I just want to, you know, raise that issue. And then the other thing I think you have to think about is really the council's bandwidth because I think we've seen already situations where we're voting on things that the council members have not fully analyzed and spent the time to understand the issues.

And you're dealing with very significant issues that have consequences in the marketplace or even in just procedural and I think, you know, when we're too busy we rush through or not we, but the council, rushes through making decisions and not really understanding what the implications are so this (unintelligible). But I just wanted, you know, you to think of that as well.

Olga Cavalli: Margie, I have Adrian and then Adrian and then Stéphane. Adrian.

Adrian Kinderis: All of the points I've heard today have been, they're very good and I think that there's plenty to glean from them. My question is what are we doing? What's the objective here? And, you know, I'm looking at my two vice chairs here for some assistance. But what's the end goal here? How - what is this debate going to bring and what do you hope to achieve?

Olga Cavalli: May I comment? The name of the session is development of criteria for initiating new projects. And the idea came afterward we would view what we did in the (present) session working group so that ideally we could finish the session, having just two or three key points and having to develop this criteria but at least it is my idea. Stéphane.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thank you Olga. I was going to go to the same place that you are at Adrian, which is the discussion's interesting but I don't really hear anything that we haven't discussed before. We've been talking about this for the last year and what I'm really looking for are proposals for a way forward to prioritize our projects.

I made a proposal awhile back on the list which would be to have a model based system but compliment that with some kind of input from the council leaders. And that's the chair and the vice chairs, them being at least copied on most of these, if not all of these, working groups and drafting teams and other items and other projects.

They have a good view of what's going on. And I think the council chairs could propose to council some kind of prioritization method which would stem from - I mean, it would need to start from the model.

But this could be augmented by the council chairs proposing something and then council decides. But we need to have, I think, some kind of input to move things forward and say, here's is - does council think this project is more important then this? And I don't think it can only be based on the way we did things in Brussels which was overly complicated. I think most of us felt that way.

Olga Cavalli: Adrian - someone else from this side. Rosemary before Adrian or?

Adrian Kinderis: I...

Olga Cavalli: Adrian, go ahead.

Adrian Kinderis: Yes. Stéphane, I'm more then happy to support that (unintelligible). I see no harm in giving it a shot. So if I'm understanding you correctly, just let me sort of throw it back at you. So the council would come up with some I'll say loose framework but, you know, maybe loose isn't the right word, but a framework

then of prioritization which would - we would then proceed to our elected leaders of the council.

And today do any final tightening up of that framework themselves and then propose that back to council. Is that what I'm understanding?

Stéphane Van Gelder: What I'm saying is the model system should be simpler.

Adrian Kinderis: (Yes).

Stéphane Van Gelder: And a simpler model would (probably) not be good enough to just determine prioritization.

Adrian Kinderis: Agreed.

Stéphane Van Gelder: So the council leaders must step in and say council do you agree that this and this and this project is important and should be ranked above the others? The council says yes or no. We move on.

Adrian Kinderis: Yes. And how would you handle a - so that's like how would your existing prioritization for existing tasks and then how would you input a new task into that model?

Stéphane Van Gelder: It actually works better when you input a new task because then you can ask straight away which task would you need to push aside to make room for this new task.

Adrian Kinderis: Who answers the (board)?

Stéphane Van Gelder: The council answers. I don't think it should be anything but the council's decision.

Adrian Kinderis: Yes, I think that's where you're going to run into problems. Again, because once again, as we know, we've already got competing...

Stéphane Van Gelder: I don't think it should be - I don't think it can be just the council leader's decisions that push out (a topic).

Olga Cavalli: Kristina. Oh, Jaime or Kristina. Who was first? Go ahead Kristina.

Kristina Nordstrom: Thank you Jaime. I am intrigued by your suggestions, Stéphane, but I also think that one difficulty that we need to address is when it comes to council how exactly do we allocate that? And one option that I think we might want to look at that perhaps we didn't explore fully as we could, would be to essentially divide the point system and each counselor would be allocated a certain number of points that they could then allocate to particular tasks accordingly.

So if there's a project that I absolutely feel has to happen and I really want to I could theoretically allocate all of my prioritization points to it. And conversely, if there's something that I didn't think was important, you know, then I could do the converse.

And I think one of the issues that we ran into in Brussels from my perspective is that there was nothing built into the system from me allocating everything as high or whatever the actual system was. I didn't have to make any tradeoffs. And I think to a certain extent, we all need to decide what the tradeoffs are as opposed to saying, well we think everything is equally important because otherwise we end up back where we started.

Olga Cavalli: We have some people in the (unintelligible). Would you mind waiting a little bit? Have both Marie and Jaime teams and Stéphane. Sorry, Jaime, I think Rosemary was first. Thank you.

Rosemary Sinclair: Okay, I'd like to suggest three questions to maybe cut through all this. If a project is coming forward, so I'm starting from a position that we have an existing workload that needs to be finished. But if a project is coming forward then I would suggest the proponents of the project include some information about why this is a priority for ICANN. And that to me is a reference to the (strat) plan and the affirmation of commitment.

Second would be a question that is this about higher priority than existing GNSO work. And in the third question, do we have the resources to do this work, both staff and to take Alan's important point, community resources.

I suggest that we try that the next time a piece of work comes floating by and what comes out of it and do we have the resources - staff resources, (the ICANN) and community resources.

Olga Cavalli: Just a comment. I think that's a very interesting approach. So when a new project comes to make a kind of a first analysis grid (work on a ticket). Thank you, Rosemary. It's Jaime.

Jaime Wagner: Well I'm happy to be - to go after Rosemary because I can comment her proposition.

So as I understood they're fun. As I understood your proposition was to give - was to have a simpler model. You don't take a side the need for a model to achieve some because I think we (a party) from work that already have been done.

And I think the harder part has been done in Brussels to achieve some kind of degree of consensus and awareness of all the counselors on the ongoing project.

So once we have a structure of priorities for the ongoing project then a project that comes in can fit or either the proponents or even leadership can

fit this and (propose) and come back to the Council and say well we think this fits in this structure.

But in this point of the structure, what do you think should we go in this point or and delay or there's some other projects? I don't know if - for me I don't have (an opinion now). It's the proponents that should do that or leadership or leadership role.

But and I don't know also if the (tenants) are very acquainted with the amount of staff or resources, community resources that can be.

So I wouldn't be very concerned about the proponents talking about the resources. I would leave this to the leadership. I think this is a leadership role to value the importance of the project and the available resources.

So but the proponents should make a point on the already given structure and where they think it would fit, the new project would fit. And this should be.

So we will always need some kind of model. I think that instead of figuring new models and since I have the strong opinion and feeling and it's almost a fact that another round of this effort we did in Brussels would be very, very lower in effort, very much less hard work then I think we should maintain this effort while we don't have another model in place. And we should have at least once a year another round of prioritization.

Woman: Have Tim, Stéphane and Jeff and Alan.

Tim Ruiz: Seems we have a pretty good plate of work already in front us, right, so I'm not sure that need any model right at the moment. So I think we do have sometime to sit back and maybe relook at how - to relook at that model and come up with something that might work a little bit better. I don't think we're in urgent need to use anything at this point.

But some of my concerns I guess kind of have been touched on but because the questions I had as far as how you described going forward Stéphane were how do we tell that we're full or, you know, that, you know, we've got a full plate and we - if anything else comes in we may have to knock something out.

But I guess I'm still a little sort of fuzzy on that whole concept, you know, just what resources do we have available and how do we tell when they've kind of been maxed out.

So it might be something to give some thought. And there may not be a clear line or a clear answer but we should have some kind of general idea.

And then the other would just be, you know, some - I don't think it will be that easy to necessarily knock something out all the time either even when we deem something to more important.

When a policy development process for example is so far along the way it could be very disruptive to try to stop that and then reallocate resources or whatever we might do.

So we want to give some careful thought there to as to how we would, you know, if we needed to move resources or stop work or whatever that, you know, we want to give that very careful thought so that we don't disrupt things, discourage the volunteers or whatever it might be.

Woman: Thank you Tim. And I have Stéphane.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Yes, several points there. Just to come back to what you were saying Jaime, I - the basis of what I was saying was to keep the work that's been done already because I don't think we should throw away six months of work on the model. So that's why I was combining a model and leadership approach as you described.

But there are other approaches. My main focus on this today in this session is to come out the session with some sense of direction of where we go now.

So I have other ideas and I'm sure most of us have other ideas. I mean there was one that's been floating around the registrars which is which I think I submitted at some point on the list which was - which would be to wipe the slate clean at the end of each year and start again and introduce things like Congress does in the States.

And there are - I'm not saying the first idea that I put forward is the deal and end all and the best way forward. What I'm saying is that it would be nice if we came out this session with more than just another round of discussion maybe not this session today but at least this ICANN Meeting so that we can really start to move forward on this prioritization aspect as soon as, you know, we leave Cartagena and we start the New Year as it were in Council terms.

There are several I think ideas that we can explore. I'm not sure what mechanism to explore them is. But the Prioritization Drafting Team is soon in existence, isn't it?

Woman: Depends on the Council decision. Let's see here it's Wolf. And maybe we can (revisit that).

Stéphane Van Gelder: The work was finished and presented so it would be another.

Woman: Okay, another one, yeah.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Another work (group).

Woman: Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, thank you. And I'm glad this topic is being discussed because this is one of those topics that's discussed over and over again by the policy process or Policy Development Process Work Team, you know, it constantly comes up as far as with respect to PDP how that's prioritized.

And I think one of the issues we keep grappling with in that group and I'm not advocating any - none of us are advocating any (teams) to this. But the reality is that there's such a low threshold to initiate a PDP that when you do this exercise and when you have one group that may not constitute a majority of the Council, you know, that could be fairly small percentage of Council that wants an issue raised.

You know I think the questions that Rosemary raised are exactly the right one but you have this conflict of when you get a small percentage of one house or even a majority of one house but none of the other house, you can still initiate the PDP.

And then how do you determine where that fits in in the priorities. It might have to become another session of cases turn. And (Mike) reminded of it yesterday, we have another gaming technique, right, where you have one house that wants an issue to be raised and (policies out) process. The Council initiates the PDP because it's met the threshold and now all of a sudden you have another decision at the Council level as to where to put that in the priorities. Because the other house could basically say well we don't think that's a priority at all. We didn't want it in the first place. So basically it's put at the very bottom of the list.

It's a tough issue to deal with. It's one that we have to and frankly the next topic which is the role of the Council, I mean this is it. This is in my mind, this is one of the primary roles for the Council to manage the process and spend more time on thinking about how we get the resources to do the issues that we have or to do new issues. So this is it. This is the job of the Council. It's very important.

And I think there are tough issues we need to deal with and need to consider when we do prioritize this stuff.

Woman: Thank you very much Jeff. I have Alan, Marika, Wolf and Jaime and Tim.

Alan Greenberg: One of the issues I was going to raise Jeff has just alluded to. I'll put it in slightly different words. We don't want a position where one group within Council says we don't have the resources and effectively has a veto over something they didn't want to begin with. That's a real danger of that happening.

The second thing is I'll ask a radical question. I'll probably get stoned for it; to what extent is this whole thing a red herring?

I think we are reacting to the huge workload we've taken on over the last couple of years associated with the Council reorganization.

On that top list of 4 of the 11 issues are policy issues; 7 of the 11 issues are administrative overhead issues. Most of them should go away and that load is going down right now. The PDP Work Team is still heavily in the middle of it but that's probably the only one which is really heavily in it. The other ones are almost (related) occasionally or were really almost finished where we have some tweaking to do.

I don't think the workload is all that high if you extract the overhead ones which we should not be spending all of our time on. Council has to get past the point of being process limited that is process focused and oriented and get back to the work here we're supposed to be here doing.

Woman: All right thank you Alan, and Marika.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. This is first in response to Alan's point as well. If you actually look at the list of all the projects there are actually only three PDPs on there if we're talking about, you know, policy being the main objective or main role of the Council. There are actually three PDPs and all the other activities are either operational or other efforts with other groups.

And coming to back to as well I think any kind of prioritization we need to look at as well where are these projects are, at what stage. Because I think it's very tempting when working groups put out recommendations and say oh well they've done their work. People have heard the issue over and over and put that then to the backdrop.

I mean Fast-Flux was an example where that's still on the to do list but people kind of have lost interest. It took a long time for the group to actually to do the recommendation and get to where they were. And now no one is really interested in taking it forward. So recommendations stay lying on the shelves and, you know, don't get done. And I think that's a worrying thing. So there would need to be some kind of provision as well between initiation of projects, projects that are ongoing but also recommendations and where they fall.

And coming back to the point that Kristina makes, I think it's probably worth maybe looking as well at one of the examples. I know a system that for example the European Parliament uses to manage their workload where every political party gets allocated a number of points that they can spend on projects so people can really think carefully what is it that they value most, what projects that they want to carry out throughout their term. And as well as promote as well cooperation with others because you don't want to spend all your points by yourself. You prefer we share that with other groups as they also consider that a priority.

So I think that might be, you know, one of the other examples or projects or models that might be further explored if that's the (wish).

Woman: Thank you Marika. I have Wolf.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: Thank you (unintelligible). I (would like to try) to find out (which) practical steps to move forward and I think the prioritization is (blocked), you know, to have two elements, you know, and the one is, you know, that all that comes up from the - from different (industry) groups could find a kind of coverage here in this prioritization process on the one hand. And on the other hand the question has been how to from the management side how to manage it.

And for this I think Stéphane's approach is something with which I could find a way to do so. Well you have to work it out in detail more really so what is behind. I mean that fits both elements so coming in from the more broader community or Council basis, some interest in and then fizzling it or structuring it from the management point of view.

And the other point is it is really essential though very early to link that process to what staff is doing. So really it is not - it could not be the case that (we) coming up, discussing and discussing and then come up with a priority list and then going to hand it over to staff and say okay, that's it. Just do it.

So not entirely dependent on the resources but just depending on the process because of staff themselves. They are doing strategic work in advance. They are doing prioritization in advance.

And I can't remember that if there was anything at the time being to discuss that, discover it's staff management but it is how to interlink it. At what time we should start. I think that's very essential though that we have done a more combined step forward. So that's my own opinion.

Woman: Thank you Wolf. I have Jaime and Tim and...

Jaime Wagner: I would like to first to bring back - to bring this back to the very title of our meeting today, development of criteria for any shaping new projects.

For me in the end this comes back to two aspects. One is the requirement. I think Rosemary brought this and I think it was a great contribution. I think we should stipulate some requirements for the proponents.

And I would suggest that somebody or I don't think we need to - a task group to come up with a requirement for the proponents of a new project. So I think we could begin with Rosemary's proposition and try to have some degree of consensus. And the list, I don't know if we need a group, a formal group, another project to make requirement for proponents.

And the other thing would be on Jeff's suggestion to have voting thresholds on the Council to initiate (the plan). It's not the PDP. It's a project.

So we should not be so formal and have some kind of, I don't know if we have - we must take into account the houses and property.

But I think our work should be divided in these two ways. But I'm glad that Marika brought something. We aren't so glad, so gladly initiating things and we are not so (enthused) when we finish them.

And I think prioritization comes about with this also. And I think that there are two ways to finish projects. One is happily congratulating each other because the group and the projects came to an end and achieved its result. Okay, everybody's glad.

But the other one is when something is out-of-date or for any reason it needs to be counseled and this requires I think a team express some concerns. But this decision should be taken by the Council too and should be brought to the Council by the leadership. It's not so happy but it's something that should be done.

Woman: Thank you Jaime. I have Tim and someone else and Rosemary. Tim, please.

Tim Ruiz: As far as, you know, the, you know, the point system in that like Kristina suggested and I think there is some merit in that. My concern would be - and I think Jeff raised some very good points too about the threshold being low.

So my concerns there as (Alan) said on one hand, you know, we don't want to create a situation where a single stakeholder group could potentially just block progress.

But on the other hand I think that only, you know, a point system or something of that nature doesn't necessarily put the (constant) on work that actually perhaps it should be doing, that should have that priority. So one of the things I think that I would like us to look at is impact.

Whether it's impact on perhaps existing projects, you know? For example, new gTLDs, something that would have an impact on delaying or progressing new gTLDs would certainly, I would hope, have a high priority with the council right now.

Something that has the impact - a demonstrated impact on registrants should certainly have a high priority. And in those kinds of things I think that the point system wouldn't necessarily solve all the problems. So I think impact is something we need to look at as well in various areas.

And as far as the existing model that we have I just want to clarify something I kind of referred to earlier that we've done - we've gone through this prioritization model already with one that we'd come up with. I think that's good.

So what I'm suggesting is that we stick with that for now, that we don't go - we don't do that exercise again until we have a model that - a new model that we all agree with would work much better.

So that doesn't mean we can't initiate new projects of new things that come up, although I think our plate's pretty full. But I don't think we need to go through this prioritization process again. If anyone was indicating that I'd like to discuss that further.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you very much Tim. We have only five minutes left. I have taken notes of all that has been said in this section. I think that perhaps I may summarize and feel free to disagree with me if I'm wrong.

I think Rosemary did a very interesting suggestion of doing first evaluation with some key questions about what's new, if it's really relevant.

I think Jeff and team also made very interesting comments about avoiding the (sense) in the council of (control) group order constituency taken, perhaps capturing the kinds of projects that are being proposed to the council. Then I think (Justin) made a very good suggestion about using a model.

I'm not sure if we agree in using the same model or a new one. I didn't have that sense now but maybe we can think about it. And then once the model gives an output - someone mentioned about giving points to the projects. I don't recall who did that but I think it could be added to the model.

Then the leaders could make a suggestion to the council and then the council decides. What Kristina suggested about the parliament that could be also part of the revising the model and adding it to the process. And what else did I write?

One question comes to my mind and it was mentioned by several people that have been speaking. It's about the staff. I think staff is great but they have their limitations. So it's difficult for me or maybe for some of you, knowing when we are asking too much from them. They have limited resources.

Perhaps we could interact with them in the first part of the process and get to know if they're available or not. (Justin) said that the model should be simple and I agree with that. And (Haley) thinks that (unintelligible).

So my question to the group of you, to the council, is how could we perhaps draft some (unintelligible). Of course disagree with me if you don't like it. Maybe we can get some of these points that were raised today and we draft something and we share into the group.

Maybe we can rebuild a very small drafting team for this. How do you think we should move forward with this idea? I think some of them were very interesting ideas and we should maybe write down in a small draft down document and share with the council. What do you think? Rosemary?

Rosemary Sinclair: May I ask a question...

Gisella Gruber-White: Sure.

Rosemary Sinclair: ...before we respond to that? I just wanted to engage Jeff's discussion. Because it seems to me the policy development working group, I think, I just want to be sure whether there is anything coming out of that process that could inform this discussion that we're about to have on criteria.

It just seems to me that there's been such a lot of effort put into thinking about policy sitting - policy development there that we must be sure to capture anything that's relevant from that work into this discussion.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you Rosemary. Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Yes. So there's a little bit. I think in the initial report that the PDP work team put out we were deferring to this exercise by the council to help inform that process.

There are some recommendations so far in the initial report and will probably make it through to the final report, that talk about thresholds for raising an issue in the first place, kind of the pre-PDP activities. But I think the point was raised that really only applies to policy development.

And it doesn't apply to all of the administrative and some of the other activities that the council has engaged in.

So there's a little bit. And Marika and I - we can extrapolate some of the provisions from what we have right now and send it around to the council to see if this helps or at least to the team that's created.

Gisella Gruber-White: Tim?

Tim Ruiz: I turned my mic off. Sorry. Yeah. In regards to that, you know, the policy, the PDP process of course it's used for two types of policy. There's policy that results in consensus policy but it could also be used in another type of policy that has just as important an impact.

But it wouldn't necessarily result in what contracted parties for example, would consider consensus policy.

So whenever we are looking at impact I think that's an important factor to keep in mind too, in prioritizing because impact on contracted parties or the impact on the consensus policy on registrants or whatever, you know, is different, you know, that other types of policies that we might look at.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you Tim. Stéphane?

Stéphane Van Gelder: Thank you. Yeah. I just want to say that although I understand the ideas of thresholds, points and other systems I think one of the problems that we've had is not keeping this simple and that's why we haven't been able to come to a solution so far. So I would advocate that we try.

And I've tried to put forth solutions that could be implemented with what we've done in a simply, timely manner.

And that's something that I think we should all, you know, maybe strive towards because otherwise I can see us continuing to talk about, and the discussion itself is extremely interesting obviously and let's have it.

But if we're looking to an actual solution to this problem then perhaps we need to keep it simple.

Gisella Gruber-White: Tim?

Tim Ruiz: I don't disagree Stéphane. I just don't - I wouldn't want to go too far. You know, when the teacher presented to me a simple problem when I was sixth grade it was much different than a simple, you know, when you're halfway through college.

So things get more complicated as we get older and I think we're in a, you know, a pretty impactful situation here. So simple - we just need to keep it relative.

Gisella Gruber-White: So we are on time. Do the question again. Should we draft something - build a small drafting team. What do you think Stéphane? Yeah, I agree. So you think it's a good idea to start a small drafting team? I would volunteer - I can start drafting my notes from this session. That's a start.

Rosemary are you volunteering or do you want to say something? You're volunteering, right?

Rosemary Sinclair: I'm suggesting a new structure instead of a drafting team. Could we have a coffee club or some...

Gisella Gruber-White: I like that better.

Rosemary Sinclair: Just an informal little get together and have a first (unintelligible).

Gisella Gruber-White: Yeah. I understand your point but at a certain point you need some formality of commitment because if not then people don't show up. And I know everyone is so busy. So I can start with a draft and maybe other volunteers could let us know and the council list if you think it's a good idea.

Some other volunteers who would like to join me? Rosemary. (Walt).
Stéphane. Great. We have a team. Jaime?

Jaime Wagner: Yes, Jaime.

Gisella Gruber-White: (Unintelligible). And who else? Stéphane says get Tim. Okay. Okay, I think we have a plan. We have something to do. We have a small drafting team.

Thank you very much for being so active as participants in this session today. And we have a break and we meet again at 10:30. Thank you very much.

Man: Hi everyone. Just to let you know we'll start again in five minutes and the next topic will be role of council. Okay. Can I ask everyone to come back to the table, get your seats, we'll start if possible. So the next topic is on the role of the council.

And this topic was - came out of a discussion we had in Brussels during our wrap up session if you'll remember. Now in the sheets in front of you, you have a brief description of what the topic's about. And the idea is to try and better understand what the role of the council is.

Now why has this question come up now? And part if it is due to the GNSO restructure and the fact that we've undergone a few changes over the past

few months and years that leave some people unsure of what exactly the GNSO council's role should be.

So perhaps I can start by just putting forward in the discussion some of the questions that were asked. Obviously the first one being what the role of the council is. And the second one, just as important in my view, is what the role of the council is not.

What should the council be doing? What shouldn't it be doing? Basically the role of the council today as we - if we want to summarize it to the extreme is as the manager of the policy development process. Now once we've said that it's clear to some people what that means. It's not clear to everybody.

So perhaps I can open up the discussion at this stage just initially to get a few comments or questions forward from people on what they see the role of the council as being and I think just as important is what they think the - which areas they don't want to see the council going into.

Does anyone want to start that discussion off? Jeff I see you've got your mouth full so that's probably bad timing.

Jeff Neuman: I think it's a good question that you're asking. But I - and I think this group should be asked that question but I actually like that question totally for the stakeholder groups. I'd like to hear what the stakeholder groups believe the role of the council is as well as what we all think it is.

Because I think, you know, I'm glad this - again, this is another topic that I'm glad is on the agenda and I in fact had raised some issues in Brussels, you know, during the council meeting on this very topic.

At that point in time there were some things that had come out that seemed to me a little bit more substantive policymaking versus the management role.

Those things included - there was - at the time there was a letter on IBNs and new gTLDs and forgive me because the exact substance is not - come into my head exactly what it was.

But there was a notion - there was a letter drafted by council and until I raised the issue council just seemed okay with drafting the substance of what the policy should be and sending it straight to the board.

And there was no kind of public comment period or any time for the stakeholder groups to really consider it. And that to me crossed the line of management versus policy.

There was a second example that I wrote down that was - hold on while I go back to my page here - right, on the vertical integration. So while the vertical integration working group was going on and doing its work and we all know that it didn't have any conclusions.

But while that work was going on, in Brussels there was a substantive discussion between members of the council and members of the board on vertical integration which as a vertical - I was not a councilor at a time.

As a member of the vertical integration working group we had been asking the board on I don't know how many occasions, please give us clarity on what you meant by your March resolution or, you know, what are your concerns? What are the things that you guys are talking about?

And they refused - to put it bluntly, they refused to talk to the working groups. In fact I think the very first working group meeting a couple of board members showed up and actually did a little talking.

And from what I heard they were chastised after it and they never talked again on any working group call. In fact I don't even think they showed up. They were pretty much told not to show up and not to contribute.

So those two areas, especially the latter one, where the substantive discussions on policy between the council and the board are things that we really should try to avoid. Or if it happens, they should happen in an open environment and one in which minutes or other things are referred to the community.

My view of what the council should be is of the management process and like you said Stéphane, it's hard to exactly put it into words.

But there are certain things when it comes to - if you are commenting on policy especially where there's an existing working group in place, then that's probably something the council should not be doing as a council, but rather leave into to a working group if the board wants to know something but it should not be the managers in that position.

Stéphane Van Gelder: Marika?

Marika Konings: Thank you Stéphane. I'm going to speak in my capacity as the Chair of one of the constituencies, to pose a question. And I - let me start out by saying that the GNSO is a supporting organization. The council is focused on policy, management and coordination of gTLD policy.

Having been here forever, and having helped write some of those words along with some other people in this room, in the early days of the GNSO and then (sheparding) through changes, I think we were pretty clear that the function of the council is policy.

Now the other thing to keep in mind is that the GNSO is composed of stakeholder groups and as constituencies all of whom have executive leadership teams. And of course the policy council...

END