

## AT-LARGE CONSENSUS BUILDING TRAINING – CONSENSUS PLAYBOOK AND BEYOND

Discussion of consensus building for At-Large members navigating GNSO Working Groups. We will use Consensus Playbook as a point of reference.

### 90-minute Session Flow (5 minutes built in buffer)

Greetings – 5 minutes

Presentation – 25 minutes

Breakout Scenarios – 35 minutes

Knowledge Share – 20 minutes

### Presentation – 25 minutes

- I. **Consensus**
  - a. General – process of coalescing around a shared solution
  - b. ALAC definition – *Appendix 3*
  - c. GNSO Working Group definition – *Play 13 and Appendix 3*
  - d. The ultimate question - “Can you live with it?”
  
- II. **Consensus in the GNSO Working Group – Play 5**
  - a. Codified in the Working Group’s Charter
  - b. Ultimately consensus determined by WG Leadership – but this process of coalescing around shared solution happens constantly throughout the WG process - preparation and constant participation key
  
- III. **How To Be a Part of an Effective Problem-Solving Group – Play 4**
  - a. GNSO working group structures – PDP (Individual) vs. EPDP (Representative)
  - b. Use the CPWG to maximize efficacy in the GNSO WG
    - i. Working within the EPDP Model
      1. **KEY for Success:** Send your representative out of CPWG with a range of options (not a red line or demand) on every situation possible
    - ii. Lean into PDP 3.0 tools
      1. Project management tools – these give key incremental deadlines to help effectively facilitate CPWG work
  
- IV. **Commit to Good Problem Solving – Play 6 and 10**
  - a. Positive group culture is built on TRUST – Operate in Good Faith
    - i. Elements of good problem solving
  - b. WG Leadership sets the tone/expectations within the group, but it is the responsibility of participants to advocate their needs.
    - i. Be strategic when you feel unheard
      1. Make arguments based on interests **and** offer solutions
      2. Counter the points of others by explaining why a possible solution is less than ideal or simply won’t work. Explain, explain, explain.
      3. Raise your concerns to WG Leadership in private caucus

- c. Consensus isn't about winning
  - i. Fundamentally about compromise you can live with.
  - ii. Understand what you/your constituency absolutely cannot live with and what you are prepared to do if consensus doesn't go your preferred way

### **Breakout Scenarios – 35 minutes**

**Melissa note:** As I suspect RSVP's in advance of the webinar are not likely, I ask that during the presentation the Support Team create breakout rooms – max 10 people per room – trying to mix up Leadership, established members and newer members to the extent possible. Is this possible?

Participants: Please take the content of our conversation and apply it to the three scenarios below. Before beginning this work, please identify the following:

- (1) A facilitator – the person tasked with keeping the group on track and ensuring all voices are heard
- (2) A recorder – the person who will record the group findings
- (3) A presenter – the person who will share the group findings with all webinar participants

After 35 minutes, the breakout room will automatically close and we will return to the main Zoom room to share findings.

**Scenario 1:** Situation where CPWG needs to give GNSO WG representative guidance and perimeters on a specific issue. Some in the CPWG are advocating for red lines, others advocating for a range of possibilities. We will ask how the CPWG should proceed in light of the material covered in the presentation. I'm thinking a Sub Pro example might work here. Thoughts?

**Scenario 2:** You are a member of a GNSO Working Group. The WG feels dysfunctional – discussions are not interactive, but rather involve members speaking past one another. The WG Chair doesn't challenge any position statements and it feels like everyone is digging into their corners vs. working collaboratively. What, if anything, do you do?

**Scenario 3:** You represent the At-Large community in a GNSO EPDP WG. The CPWG has given you a range of proposed solutions on a few issues before the working group but has a red line on one particular issue. While in the EPDP, it becomes clear that the CPWG's red line is not the consensus view. What, if anything, do you do?

### **Knowledge Share and Wrap-up – 20 minutes**