

---

YESIM NAZLAR: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the ATLAS III Programme Working Group Program co-chairs call taking place on Monday, 1 April 2019, at 16:30 UTC.

On our call today, we have Maureen Hilyard, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Eduardo Diaz, Vanda Scartezini, David Kolb, and Glenn McKnight. We don't have any apologies for today's call.

From staff side, we have Gisella Gruber and myself, Yesim Nazlar, as well as Heidi Ullrich. I'll be doing call management for today's call.

Again, just a kind reminder to state your names for the transcription purposes, please.

Now, I would like to leave the floor back to you, Olivier. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Yesim. Welcome, everyone. Welcome, David. For some of us, this is the second call back-to-back on At-Large Summit issues. So today's call is going to be really a discussion with David Kolb. For those of you who don't know him, David is with a company called [Inside] Learning and has been running many of the leadership training programs that ICANN has been having for participants.

He has worked a lot with Sandra Hoferichter whom you might know, and he's basically been drafted in or we had a meeting with him. We as in Maureen and Eduardo and I had a brief meeting with him in Kobe and

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

---

basically said, look, we have all this program of plenaries and sessions and so on to put together and we're basically looking at teaching the participants for the At-Large Summit a whole range of things and we really don't have an actual method per se and we would benefit from your help.

Now, the actual agenda, as you know, it's changing all the time. So the actual schedule of plenaries and workshops is changing. It's still not cast in stone, and what we've learned is we might know it as late as in September. So we're not going to go around in circles doing nothing until then, and so what we really need to do is to put aside the whole schedule and saying, well, is it better to have a workshop before a plenary and a plenary before a workshop and are we're going to have this room or that room or whatever. We have no idea.

So instead of concentrating on this, what we need to try and work on now is to see first what David can offer us and would be suggesting the type and format of things we could have in the face-to-face meetings. And then we need to get the group. Now, that's not just us, the leadership of that Programme group, but the whole Programme group that Vanda and Glenn are leading to design the session content which I think is probably going to be one of the more important things. Since if you're going to have some case scenarios, we need case scenarios that are real At-Large case scenarios that will resonate with our people, that will resonate with our community. Not stuff that is out of a book and that doesn't resonate and that bears no resemblance at all to what the reality of things are.

---

So that's a little bit [of a] view I think of probably what we have. David doesn't have a huge amount of time. He doesn't only work for ICANN. He works for other organizations as well, so we need to use his time wisely and try and get a good vision on today's call of what we could do. And then we can go in our corner and then prepare for the next call. Goodness, when? But we need to come out of this call today with a roadmap of what we're going to do next on this.

I think that's what we are going to do. Eduardo, did you wish to add anything?

EDUARDO DIAZ: No. You covered it very well. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks. So I think we're just going to turn over to David Kolb then unless there are any questions at this point from Vanda or from Glenn. I see that Glenn has disappeared from the Adobe Connect.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Excuse me. Yes, I disappeared from Adobe Connect because my connectivity here at the hotel dropped. So the last five minutes I missed. I'm on Adigo.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So you missed me talking.

---

GLENN MCKNIGHT:                    Yeah, which means I didn't miss anything.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:        Okay, fine. That's okay with me. All right, so I'm not seeing any hands up. So, David, over to you then.

DAVID KOLB:                        Sure. What we discussed a bit in Kobe, just to recap some of that in terms of the approach to the content for ATLAS was to think about perhaps doing a case approach so that we develop what I'll call a mini case study. And in the mini case study, we create some back story for the participants so they know where this is coming from. We may use something real that was done in the past or something that we all dread or something that's currently being worked on or something totally fictitious but ICANN relevant. And then we create our scenarios and our content-related information based on that. So we pull a thread throughout the program where we're back to the case and we create case characters and things like that. That's one approach.

The other approach would be to prioritize what our teaching content buckets are. What I mean by that is if we think about leadership in general, one of the topics that came out was writing skills. Which is not my bailiwick, but you'd have somebody else come in to work with writing skills or someone internal. And then I would work around the personal and interpersonal effectiveness.

Since the agenda is in flux, then my thought would be that we would figure out what our teaching content is going to be and prioritize it. So

---

in our ideal world we'd like to cover these seven or eight topics. However, if our time is constrained in different ways, here's our priority on those seven or eight topics. And then from there, I would create the design and the flow of how those topics are going to fit within the time constraints that we have knowing you've also got competing topics too during the timeframes that you want to work with as well.

So I guess my short answer to that long rambling intro is I'm happy to design whatever you want within the constraints that we have and without trying to – if I can use the expression – boil the ocean and do too much. And then also trying to be realistic about what can be covered in the timespan that we have too.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this, David. Any questions or comments from anyone?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you, Olivier. I just wanted to make sure. David, this event is basically four days in a week and you're going to be with us the first three days. Is that correct?

DAVID KOLB: That's what we discussed just to be cost effective for you where I'm not there for a fourth day and I'm only working for an hour or so in the afternoon the way that last draft agenda was drafted. And three days I think would be adequate based on what the meeting sequence looks like too.

---

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this. Glenn, Vanda, I know that you've already done some work on several instances of a potential program. Now that David is there, how do you – do you have any questions specifically on what can be done in here? Bearing in mind I don't know whether you have already discussed the idea of having a case on one side and then the writing skills course on the other and this sort of thing. Am I muted? Vanda Scartezini?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay. Well, we haven't discussed much with the new group because a lot of people have just joined our group. And because of Kobe meeting and [none] after that, we didn't discuss much.

I believe it can work, but I don't know if [I have] some cases. The cases in my opinion should be like workshops where people are dividing around in small tables or in small groups [or whatever] and discussing how they could behave in front of one case that is [exposed], that is presented for them. Because what do we expect [is] people to be acting, discussing how they should behave in front of one real situation.

Because the idea is to have [performance] as a leader demands a lot of training. Some of the members can already have leadership positions, so they can do very well. But many others have no chance to have

---

groups of people or face a situation where they have to deal with some of these difficult situations and coordinate a group of people.

So my idea is really to have people discussing and present solutions, how they will do if they face this or that case in your daily life in ICANN. So that is the way I believe case [studies] can work. Just present them, I don't believe that will add much value for that. So that is from my point of view, but we haven't discussed much with the group so it's just my personal opinion. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks for this, Vanda. From what I hear from David, there's going to be writing skills. What you were suggesting is leadership skills to be another thing that would be taught there.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And that's a good point. And then you mentioned a case study and David mentioned a case study. Are we looking at having one case study or case studies as in a small number of case studies every day or maybe even two case studies a day or something? What works better? I'm asking really David I guess because he's done case studies there as well. Or Vanda.

---

VANDA SCARTEZINI:                    Yeah, go ahead, David.

DAVID KOLB:                            Thank you, Vanda. So, Vanda, we're in total agreement in terms of how it would be presented. And then the way that what I'm calling case-threaded workshop works is we work with one large case, meaning here's the context for this particular whether it's a review or a policy development, whatever we decide is going to be the best – and I'll say juiciest, if I will, because you want some good emotional content around the topics that are there. So we have this big piece of information, but then building from that – and this is to Olivier's point – you've got these scenarios, which could be called mini cases, but scenarios that come off of that.

So if we have this larger context where here are the players that are working on this particular project and then in the breakout rooms, so in the group let's say – so the way it would run is everybody gets previous information before the workshops. They kind of get the history if you will and what I call the backstory. Then when they come to the workshop in November, then we start working with the content as it ties into this. So for example, let's say that we're doing a piece around I'll say conflict and mediation, then we talk about the framework of conflict and mediation and then we create scenarios based on the case that the groups break up into and then they start to go work on. So in Scenario 1, we need to X, Y, and Z to handle this conflict.

Then what I like to design in is some surprises. So for example, some of the ALAC leaders that are going to be attending this, they might play



case characters where they go into one of the breakout rooms as a case character and say, “So what have you got for me? How are we going to solve this thing?” And they’re actually providing the conflict interface for someone in that group to interface with them and practice the conflict handling skills.

Then on the problem solving side, let’s say we move to the writing skills, is they have to produce this whatever would be the appropriate time framed document that they have to produce in this day one or day two part of their work is this one-page summary whatever we want to call it that’s appropriate for the environment and that’s part of their outcome.

The culmination on the third day would be then a presentation of how they would address the case problems that are presented, and they would present that then to the rest of the group or they would present that to the board chair or they would present that to – and I use different characters. We can do it as a role play where they are presenting their information, and then also we can do it as a group presentation where the group plays the role of the whoever the larger audience would be that this solution would be presented to. And then they give feedback and critique each other on how they did both in terms of their written information as well as their presenting and how the group presented that back physically and verbally to them.

Then I’ll break that up into different ways so everybody will actually have to present the findings. The way that I do that is in a group. Let’s say that you’re working in a breakout group of five or six people. So all five or six of you have the message points of your solution. Then when we go back in to the main room with everybody, and let’s say that we

---

---

have four different breakouts, I'll create sub breakouts within the main room where there's going to be one person from each of the teams then presenting to each other what their findings are. So everybody has a chance to physically present the information, and it's not just one person that's speaking for the group that runs the three days. So everybody has to participate with it. So again, the summary there is it's very interactive.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Vanda?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Well, the methodology I completely agree with you. The only point we need to [inaudible] is the language issues because when you break, no all rooms can be translated. So we need to separate groups by language in some way. And this will maybe give the chance for them to participate because [if it's not that, all] in French language or the Spanish language, they may not really participate because they cannot follow. So that is the only point that I believe.

What we have done in last presentation I made for the [content], we just separate the [content] issue. What we can do is how to [include] all the content in a case. Because we need to explain in some way what we expect from each kind of leadership situation. This general explanation could be the first part of the first day. And then the cases mostly all one big case if it is possible must cover all the issues we are talking to, to allow people to exercise leadership [conditions] for the case. So that's the way I believe could work very well. Thank you.

---

DAVID KOLB: [Excellent].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Vanda. David, you mentioned the different groups. Are the groups competing with each other?

DAVID KOLB: They're not competing per se, but what they would be doing is – and again, there's lots of flexibility here – but what I've seen work very well is to have the same people working together as it applies to the case work throughout the three days so they build their solution together which ends up in their presentations at different points throughout the three days.

And to Vanda's point, I think it's a great idea to find out what the languages are in the room and perhaps we create our groups based on that. So that we've got native speakers that are with each other or maybe as a second language at least. Here's the French room. Here's the Spanish room. Here's the German room. If it works out that way. Otherwise, we'll have to figure out a way to solve that problem when we go into breakouts or smaller groups. Because I agree. I don't want anyone feeling excluded because of language skills, and they shouldn't.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, David. We've got four rooms. Two will have interpretation and two will not. So when we make up the groups, we'll

---

make sure that the ones, people who require interpretation will be in the group that will be in the rooms with interpretation. I see Eduardo. Eduardo Diaz?

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Yes, thank you, Olivier. David, [one of] the things that we have been discussing with the groups is giving the people that go there some kind of presentation skills, chairing meetings, and managing the consensus within a group. Is it possible to link some of this when they are doing this [case] workshops?

DAVID KOLB:

Yes, and that would be the intention is that for each of those skillsets there is something then that's case specific that they have to work on. For example, managing a meeting that they have to go into a meeting and maybe for that one – and again, I'm just talking off the top of my head here. Nothing is written in stone yet at all. Maybe that meeting has other team members. So instead of being in their usual teams, now they have people from other teams and they have to do 10 minutes of a 30-minute meeting and then somebody else takes over for 10 minutes and facilitates what's happening within that meeting.

And then for the presentations obviously there are two pieces there. One is how do we present the information, and then the other is what's our presence as we present the information, if that makes sense. So what's our leadership presence? How do we come across to people? As well as how do we communicate information in a clear, concise, compelling way? And we do that with case information as well.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this, David. Vanda, you have the floor.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, let me ask David if there is a possibility to have role play that, for instance, in the second day and during the [time] they are together in small groups they can [circulate] positions inside these [five] people group that each time one takes the lead, the other is the rapporteur, the other is the guy that is fighting, whatever. In my opinion, they need to be [interested] to participate because if easily someone takes the lead and do not allow all the other really to [train in] that position and train to be in front of the others.

So it is normal even in small groups that people are shyer than others or have lack of experience and have a shame to explain their ignorance in that matter. There are these kinds of [people] behaviors. So we need to have something that demands that each one of these sitting in the small group have a place, a position to exercise leadership, exercise rapporteur, exercise – because if it's all together, some of them never really do nothing because they are shy or they have less confidence.

So that is the constraint that I believe we need to make sure that they way we distribute groups, explain how they work, supervise their work with really get the results we expect. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you.

---

DAVID KOLB:

Let me address that, and I'll also address a little bit of what's going on in the chat too. Vanda, to your point, absolutely. I think that when we go into breakout groups, whether we're using a case approach or not, if we're using a learning team approach where they're going in to work on a problem, that we have the leadership within the subgroup shift so everybody has a chance to act as a leader or at least as a co-leader in a given breakout session. We should absolutely build that in. I like the way you think on that.

And then as to some of the [input] in the chat with Glenn and Eduardo and what have you, we're not married to a case approach. And just to be clear, the case approach essentially, I'm not writing the case. You are. I'm going to give you guidelines on the information that I need to put the content into the case. Meaning, how do we work conflict into this or how do we work presentations into this? But you the working group or others designated by you would be creating the case content.

And if we don't use a case approach and we're using, say, scenarios where in that example I would present a framework around, again I would say conflict and mediation just as the topic because the scenarios are really easy usually for those, and you would create the scenarios. I would edit the scenarios to make sure that we've got the right kind of information there for people to work with and behaviors. And then they would go in and start to work on those scenarios in the group.

So it's not – whatever information the we build for them, problems to work on, scenarios to play with, that's all internally generated and

---

customized to this particular group. So there's nothing off-the-shelf, nothing that I have in a library per se. So the relevance to ICANN is as relevant as you make it. So I'm not making anything up here that wouldn't be relevant to ICANN.

So I guess our decision points are do we want to use a case approach? And if so, then I'll send the guidelines on creating that. Or do we want to use a present and then go in breakouts and practice without a case but using just customized scenarios, which is a possibility too? I think some of that would be dictated by our time constraints in terms of how many plenaries we have, how many breakouts we have that you want to devote to the leadership training.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, David. I do have, it's not a question but I guess, well, it is a question in that, do you see then that in order for us and for our community to relate to whichever way we're going to use whether it's going to be a case scenario or whether it's going to be a....

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I lost you.

YESIM NAZLAR: Olivier?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah, we've lost [AC] [inaudible] audio.

YESIM NAZLAR: He dropped, so we'll dial out.

DAVID KOLB: Okay, while we're trying to get him back too, I'm again reading the chat at the same time as well which is always a challenging thing on [inaudible] calls by the way, is that the plenary sessions really wouldn't be dealing with the case that much or the scenarios. The breakout sessions would be where we go to the case or the scenarios. The plenary sessions would be more around the skills of leadership. So if we talk about coaching and mentoring as a skill of leadership, we have a plenary session around coaching and mentoring and some activity within that plenary session obviously.

And then when we go to the breakout session, we'd be working with either coaching scenarios that are specific to the case or scenarios that we build that don't have a case to them but scenarios that we build around coaching. Or we use real coaching scenarios. Meaning, I need coaching on X, so within the breakouts we're going to play in pairs and coach each other on something. Or we come up with a plan on how we're going to mentor new people as they join At-Large. So the plenaries will primarily be content-related, and when I say content, more about leadership skills and the skills that we want to impart while more of the activity and the breakout work would be around cases and scenarios that we create.

Did we get Olivier back?



---

YESIM NAZLAR:                      Yeah.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:        I'm back, yeah. Go ahead, Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI:                I'm just saying that I agree with David that the explanation David has done about how to make the split of the groups and how to teach them how to do. But go ahead with your question, Olivier, because you dropped.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:        Thanks very much, Vanda. It was kind of a question saying, do you think that we should basically take whatever we've done with ICANN Learn or whatever we're subjecting our participants with in ICANN Learn and then take it as a natural progression from the ICANN Learn courses to our case? In other words, having clear paths between A and B.

DAVID KOLB:                        Okay, so tell me what the question in that is.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:        The question in there is that we've got a number of courses that we're subjecting our participants to in ICANN Learn. What is ICANN? What is the GNSO? What is this, what is that, etc.

---

DAVID KOLB: Right.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So should we then really enable a clear path from that to a case?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, I do believe yes.

DAVID KOLB: Yeah, to me learning becomes more effective as many links and ties that we can create prior to our face-to-face time is great. As long as I know what it is that they're going to be taking prior to the ATLAS, then I'll think about that in terms of designing two things. One is what's the content that's additive to what they've already studied with ICANN Learn. And then two, as we develop case or scenarios, that we can thread in some of those things from the webinars or other ICANN Learn tools to integrate that into our case. I don't want to overcomplicate it either.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Vanda Scartezini?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: In my opinion, we should develop a case that will include, for instance, a problem related to the GNSO, a process with the GNSO that [we'll] be

---

doing [inaudible] and this is in fact. For instance, the users for one side. The other side the government is against. So there is a [letter] from the GAC to the ICANN board and all those things can get together in a big case. And the people must define how to solve this big case. We can divide this big case also in some parts.

So, for instance, inside the small group, one guy will be leader [this side], the other will be the [GAC], the other will be the GNSO or the ALAC or the ccNSO. So people will play as a discussion in Cross-Community Working Group and circulating the leadership position, the rapporteur position inside the group where the people defend each one the position related to one constituency, for instance. And then this can be the link what they have learned to what they are doing sitting in that Cross-Community Working Group. That's my suggestion.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Vanda. I do have a question for David, and this is where I'm going to get cut off again, isn't it? Do we have enough time session wise to have a case such as the one that Vanda was just describing now and at the same time also some sessions which are more general or more like discussion or teaching sessions?

DAVID KOLB: I don't know. And I say that just knowing that the agenda is kind of fluid at this point. What I can do as a next step is go through the agenda and be more specific about what I would see as a case and/or a scenario approach. I remember when I went through the last draft of the agenda, I was looking at how many plenaries do we have before we have more

---

of a workshop or a breakout? Because a nice flow on that is, we present this leadership content, and then they go in and practice it using the case context or the scenario context as their background. And then the next thing, we put them back in and we give them a new leadership framework, whatever skillset that might be, and now they go into their breakout and they practice whatever that is using scenarios that we create or using something different.

The advantages and disadvantages of using a case, like a large case that surrounds the three days, the advantage is you're pulling a thread from point A to point Z over the course of the three days working through this case. The disadvantage is we're holding ourselves to this context that we create in the case, and we don't want it too global that it gets washed out and it's just a very general thing. But we also don't want it so specific that only half the group can really relate to what's been created in the case. So if we use scenarios in the breakouts, then we just create scenarios based on whatever the skill session is prior to the breakout session.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this. Next question is to do then what content requirements would you require from the CWG Programme subgroup? What do you see as next steps effectively on this?

DAVID KOLB: If we decide to use a case approach, the next steps would be I've got a set of guidelines on writing case studies and scenarios that I would send out to the group that you can look at and say, okay, so this is what we

---

really have to create. And then I would edit, and then I'd send back, and you'd edit and send back, and we'd go back and forth on that. It would give us our background.

Then simultaneous to that is we agree on what the content is going to be of the skills training. So we have two sets of content. We've got the case content which is the backstory and the things that we're making up. But then we also have just agreeing on in the timeframe that we have these are the leadership skills that we really want to focus on. Then I'm responsible then for marrying those two things into what will become our program and how that flows throughout.

So in terms of what the working group would be generating or subgroups would be if we go with the [case,] here's the backstory. Here's the big idea. Here's the big picture of what we're working on and here's what caused this to happen, whatever this was, or what created this need for this problem to be solved. And then we'd have specific scenarios that we would be designing out of that of, what are the conflicts that we have to work with? Where do people need to be coached? What kinds of presentations would fall out of this? And then whoever you have doing writing skills, what kinds of finished documents would be people be creating or statements would they be creating to practice the writing skills?

Those are the kinds of things that we have to figure out as next steps.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, David. Next is Glenn McKnight.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

Yeah, thanks. I think what I alluded to before on roadmap and I think David talked about it just now, I think we need to give people a clear picture of what their path was, and it goes all the way back to the webinars in ICANN Learn and how it's linked to these plenaries and breakouts. But if we just talk about the case studies, each of the case studies are a building block to an end result.

So I think we need to think about what they're walking away with. So if this theme is the new leaders or leadership within our community, essential blocks on leadership is a core for these case studies. So I know I'm not putting you on the spot right now, David, but do you have the core subjects? I know this thing about conflict keeps coming up. I'm not sure if that – you know, that's a bit of a [fetish]. I don't think it's necessarily one thing that we should focus on. But I think the essential leadership skillsets on these plenaries need to be talked about. So, David, do you have any clear idea what the blocks are?

DAVID KOLB:

One of the things that I had created that fell out of the questions that I had asked in Kobe was – let me see if I can pull it up here real quick – is I had a model that essentially had four elements or four roles that leaders play. And I'm not finding it right away, but essentially the roles were, okay, in my role as a leader I have to deal with, how do I manage change? And what's my presence as a leader both virtually and physically when I'm with people?

---

And then at the same time I have another role as a facilitator. So how do I move the process along? How do I manage meetings effectively? How do I work within a small group context?

And then I had another block that I think is coach and mentor. Like, Glenn, you and I talked about should it be coach or should it be mentor or should it be a coach/mentor. When I'm playing that role, I need to obviously demonstrate coaching skills. And then as a mentor, I need to think about how I think about the development of this leader, not just coaching them on a situation.

And then the other block I think I had was manager. How do I manage the process and get things done? How do I organize my time? How do I set priorities? How do I do those kinds of things?

That's what has fallen out of the questions that I had asked of the group before I did the workshop in Kobe. And I would refer back to that as a straw model for us to work with to say, okay, let's pick this apart and say out of these, for example, we want to add writing skills to this or we want to add this to that. I'm using conflict just because it's an easy scenario thing. But you're right. It might not be appropriate for this group, and we do that a lot with other contexts with leadership program and things like that.

So that's top of head, and I can send around that model again for us to work with as a strawman to start to pick apart.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Glenn, a follow-up question? I see your hand is up. Glenn McKnight is muted. [inaudible] muted [inaudible]. Okay, no, he's put his hand down. Okay, I guess, Eduardo, any question?

EDUARDO DIAZ: No. I just wanted to say that I think with this conversation we have a better good idea of what the next steps are and what we have to do in terms of the work that we need to come up with.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks for this. So I think that as next steps, we're waiting for you to send you the couple of things that you just mentioned here, David. And then for the group itself, I guess that the next steps are for Glenn and Vanda to I guess convene their group and start throwing ideas for the case study, effective, or the way forward when it comes down to the topic itself to be discussed by the group. Is that the right way forward or how?

DAVID KOLB: Yeah, I'll do two things. I'll send that leadership model that I had used in Kobe just as a starting point. Again, I'm not married to it at all. It's just based on the feedback that I had received. And then two, I'll send the guide on creating a case approach that will probably be a better explanation than my rambling verbal explanation on the phone if we use that.

And know that it doesn't become – if we do use a case approach, it's not all about the case. It's about the topics of leadership that we're



---

working with, and then the case is just our tool to explore those topics. So the case won't be this monster that takes over the entire thing, and we create it accordingly. And we can make that as big or as small as we want to. But the important thing is that it is very laser focused on what these people are going to be working with versus something that's more generic that won't make as much sense to them or be as close to home.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. And what do you need from us?

DAVID KOLB: At this point, probably as the agenda shifts and changes, as we get farther down the road what I'll need is what is the final agenda starting to look like so I can really start to design what do we realistically have time to do and how do I divide up the content in a way. And to Glenn's point, what's the cognitive roadmap of learning that goes through these three days and the pre and post as well? How does that all flow, and how does that all click together? Just to create that. And I'll know more once I know what the final agenda is going to look like. And I'll use the most recent version that I have just a very rough guide on what may be possible.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, David. You've heard what I told you. The version will be finalized in September. I think that it's not a joke. It's actually the case. This is the madness of it. So I think we need to, of course, do a lot more before that and reach that level so that you can make some very last-

---

minute changes in things [by then]. I mean, Gisella, am I talking rubbish, or is that a reality.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Olivier, you're not talking rubbish. Unfortunately, it's a reality. Pretty much in the ICANN world, we have moving parts. We will – as I said in the chat – I'm really working hard with meetings team to finetune the block schedule. Things have come out of the Kobe meeting which they will now be implementing into the block schedule for Montreal. Things are never done overnight. So to get everyone to agree on when to have certain meetings, when to have certain session, community-focused, etc., it will take time to put these pieces together.

But I really am hoping and working hard to have something a little bit closer to the final by Marrakech which is in June. And then we'll take it from there. But I will keep you posted at all times on the progress we're making just to make sure that there are no major changes with what we already have. But just as a reminder, we've got two rooms with interpretation and two rooms which won't have interpretation. Thank you.

DAVID KOLB:

Thank you, Gisella.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much for this, Gisella. So I guess the other action item is for the PWG Program subgroup I've noticed in the chat Vanda and Glenn mentioning a call next week. Is that what you wanted?

---

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, something like that to put the group together. And Glenn is saying that we need a Doodle to make sure the majority can participate.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yep, cool. Excellent. So that's fine. I note that this is put in the action items with Yesim to send out a Doodle as soon as possible, I guess.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: For the PWG Program Subgroup to have a call next week. Any specific time that you guys would prefer or [like to] avoid? Because Glenn and you as the co-chairs, it's better when you are there.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yeah, we are in almost the same time zone.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Do you have a preferred day or a day to avoid, just to make sure?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Well, probably the most important is the connection with the other groups like auction group, ATRT, and those groups that we must [have]

---

there. So the other group that we are not really member is not so relevant is we apologize.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this, Vanda. That's noted. And we still have three minutes to this call. Is there anything that we have forgotten to talk about today? Not seeing any hands up. So thank you very much for joining the call, David, today. And we look forward to the follow-up with you. And in the meantime, the group will have probably met as well. And we'll start kicking some ideas around as to [great] topics and so on.

But I cannot emphasize the amount of time – and I speak from experience – the amount of time I have spent in the past trying to divide things according to a specific schedule and then being told at the very last minute, sorry, that's changed. You have to turn it upside down.

DAVID KOLB: We can work with that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So don't spend too much time on that. Let's just look at the overall structure and block of time effectively in the meeting and take it as X number of hours that need to be filled and then we'll work it out. Getting [inaudible] everyone. Any other business, AOB?

---

DAVID KOLB: The last thing that I'll say is getting the skills right is our first priority. This is what we want to teach in this period of time. And the second thing, and this is the thing that we can work on prior to the agenda being finished, is any kind of background information, whether scenarios, case information, etc., all that can be developed and then I can cut and add as I need to in the final design wave that happens between September and November.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this. And, Glenn and Vanda, any last questions or comments?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: No, not for my side.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, cool. I'm not hearing from Glenn, but I see that he was typing. So I think everything is fine. And I can give you all one minute back to your life. Thank you very much for this call.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**