
YESIM NAZLAR:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Capacity Building Webinar on the topic Consensus Playbook Focused on At-Large taking place on Monday, the 5th of April 2021 at 13:00 UTC. We will not be doing the roll call if it's a webinar, but attendance will be noted on the Wiki page.

If I could please remind all participants on the phone bridge as well as computers to please mute your lines when not speaking to prevent any background noise, and also to please state your names when taking the floor, not only for the transcription purposes but also to allow accurate interpretation.

We have Spanish and French interpretation. Our interpreters are Marina and Paula on the Spanish channel and Camila and Isabelle on the French channel.

Thank you all for joining today's webinar. Now I would like to leave the floor over to Melissa Allgood. Over to you, Melissa. Thanks so much.

MELISSA ALLGOOD:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Thank you to all of you for joining today, especially after for many what was a holiday weekend. So, I very much appreciate you being here today.

For those of you that don't know me, my name is Melissa Allgood, I sit on the policy team but I don't work with any particular community. I get to spend a little time with all communities.

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.

So, today I think it's the Capacity Building Working Group has allowed me to join you guys and we're going to talk a little bit about consensus building and utilizing strategically some of the tools that are in the consensus playbook for building your advocacy, specifically in GNSO working groups.

I recognize that you guys touch communities beyond that, but today our lane is really going to be focused on the GNSO and the At-Large and that relationship.

So, before we begin, the Consensus Playbook, it was published for the community in its final form about nine or ten months ago last summer. And I know some of you have probably skimmed it. I know there's a few of you that have read it cover to cover. But there might be some of you who have never touched it, so I've asked Claudia to drop the Consensus Playbook into the chat, so if you choose to capture it, you have it moving forward.

All of the ideas and tips and tools that I have to help your community increase and be more effective in your advocacy in the GNSO really are going to link back to that playbook.

So you'll see on many slides there's going to be a yellow rectangle that says Play 4 or Play 5. That is a direct reference back to the Consensus Playbook, just so you understand how I have trained for this.

Now, ultimately, the Consensus Playbook can be used in two different ways. It can be used in what I've kind of deemed as a holistic approach, which is really guiding a working group through the consensus building process from start to finish or it can be used play-by-play, idea-by-idea.

We're going to be leaning into the latter today, so we're going to be talking about some specific ideas within a Consensus Playbook.

So, with that, let's touch briefly on our agenda. Oh, I made myself a little too high. I apologize, guys. Let me try to drag myself down. There we go.

We are going to be talking about consensus really broadly and generally today, so we will discuss how there are nuance definitions of consensus but that's not what we're leaning into today and I'll explain that next.

Then we're going to really dive into that relationship between a GNSO Working Group and the CPWG, the Consolidated Policy Working Group. I have some ideas for you guys about how to really make some tweaks to increase your efficacy in GNSO working groups. We're going to talk about problem-solving tools to get you there.

And then we're going to do some breakouts. I think this is the first time that At-Large has done breakouts. So we're going to have three breakout rooms. Excuse me, we're not going to have three breakout rooms. We're going to have seven breakout rooms with three scenarios.

The scenarios are to reinforce and to get you thinking about some of the things we're discussing today. But also I really hope you guys use the breakout rooms as an opportunity to connect.

So, I care less about getting all the breakout room scenarios accomplished and I really want to give you guys an opportunity to hang out together. We've been doing this virtual thing for a long time and I know it's really hard for many of us to connect when you're in a webinar

room or you're in a big room with 50 people or whatnot. So hopefully that's got a dual purpose to it.

Then we are going to come back together and we're going to just share what the findings were of each breakout room.

So, today I really do hope to familiarize you guys a little bit more with the Consensus Playbook. And what I ask of all of you before we start is to really take a step back from your MO, the way that you do consensus building in this community, because I recognize as you're all volunteers, and this is incredibly intense volunteer work and it's always busy, always busy, always busy. Not to mention, you all have professional lives that have demands that come with it and personal lives that have demands that come with it. And we're still in a pandemic.

So, if today you would just kind of take a bird's-eye view on the way that you guys advocate within the GNSO Working Group and hear the suggestions I have to offer. Some of them you might think aren't a fit and that's absolutely fine, but I do think that it's worth navigating how we can best serve your advocacy in the GNSO working group.

And with the evolution of the multi-stakeholder model and specifically a lot of changes that have come through PDP 3.0 in the GNSO, it's worth talking about how the trends that are happening within the GNSO structure wise and how that impacts your advocacy. That's kind of the direction that we're going to go today.

As always, if anything happens today that you want to discuss offline, your whole At-Large team knows how to get a hold of me. I'm happy to do that.

One more thing I'll let you know. I am not going to read chat while I'm speaking. I don't have the ability to flip my brain like that. So, Yesim and Claudia are going to be monitoring the chat for me, so any questions that you might have, feel free to throw those in there and we will make sure that we come back to all of them.

So with that, let's talk about this. I spend my time observing communities, a lot of it. And in At-Large, it really stuck out to me, the [inaudible] in the chat in your At-Large wrap-up. We can be as influential as we choose to be.

And I want you to know I really see that appetite in your community to be a stakeholder group at the table making these consensus policies that are ultimately going to become binding in the various ways that they do and operate in that space—in that [lane]—outside of your advice [lane].

So, I really thought that that quote really stuck to me, especially as many of you reacted positively. So, what [Justine] said, there are some tools in the Consensus Playbook that can really lean into this work.

So, I want to talk about consensus. Now, we all know there are numerous and slightly varied definitions of consensus within the broader ICANN ecosphere, and as you can see in the yellow box, Appendix 3 details some of those. Hopefully most of them.

But for purposes of today's conversation, I hope and encourage you guys lean into the concept that consensus is everyone's responsibility.

It's not the responsibility of working group leadership or perhaps your At-Large rep to a GNSO working group. It's everyone's responsibility. Many tools in the Consensus Playbook can look like they are directed at facilitators, which is oftentimes working group leadership, working group chairs. And some of those tools are directed at those people. And at the same time, getting to consensus, getting over the hump and getting to the finish line is everyone's responsibility.

And because of that, the way I'd like to think about consensus today is it is a fundamentally ... It is a process of coalescing around shared solutions. It's the result of deliberations about everyone's interest. So, you sharing your particular interests or perhaps if you're representing your community, the interests of the community that you represent. But then also actively listening and understanding the interests of people who have a different vantage point than you, then finding solutions that address everyone's vantage point, address all of those interests and concerns to the greatest extent possible.

As I mentioned, I spend a lot of time observing throughout the ecosphere and I see consistently we are pretty good as a community— all of you across the ecosphere are pretty solidly good at expressing your own interests, your own needs or that of the community of which you represent.

Then, to varying degrees, there's active listening and understanding of other people's positions that can get a little bit more challenging when there's assumptions made versus not really asking a lot of questions and drilling down to why people feel the way they feel. We'll discuss that later.

And then, even harder than that is the process of producing solutions that address your own interests as well as interests of other people that might not be aligned with you.

So, those latter two pieces are really what I'm going to encourage you guys to consider leaning into in new and different ways today.

Now, as we talk about operating within consensus and within the GNSO's consensus, many of you may know the language that they love to use in the GNSO is: can you live with it?

So, as you explore the Consensus Playbook, it really does mirror a lot of that "can you live with it" language and definitional thought process. So, know that.

Additionally, on a consensus topic, you'll see Play 5 talks about fostering agreements up front, really leaning into transparency, and then Play 13 takes a deeper dive in understanding consensus and how to get there. There's a lot of tools in Play 13 for leadership, for your chairs and whatnot. But I do think there's value for anyone who's participating in consensus building.

Last thing on consensus. Ultimately, I think that sometimes we get locked into thinking about consensus in terms of the consensus call that may come at the tail end of all of this hard work that you do where you are expressing your positions on recommendations, for instance. And while that's a huge part of consensus, that is really just the end result. When you sit in these working groups, consensus is happening at every single meeting. People are coalescing around ideas and proposed solutions at every step of the process.

So, because of that, I really encourage all of you that have the time and the space—and I understand that’s a big ask right there, but to the extent that you do, observe GNSO working groups that you are not necessarily the designated representative for, for instance, if it’s that model. Observe them. Understand what the landscape is going in or even watch the recordings after the fact if you don’t want to be a designated observer—to really understand what is happening in those working groups.

We’re going to talk in a minute about reps to those working groups, but they have a huge job, so I think the more that other members of your community, be it the CPWG membership or members outside of that, can be observers of working groups and can be more voices in understanding the landscape of what’s going on, you’re really going to help your reps and you’re going to increase the efficacy of your advocacy.

All right. So, GNSO working group structures. The GNSO is evolving on how they’re structuring working groups. And I know many of you see this and many of you are living in it. But for those of you that aren’t, I wanted to kind of take a step back, briefly touch on the GNSO and then we’ll talk about some structures.

So, ultimately, any GNSO working groups that you’re observing, participating in, whatnot, I would encourage you to read the charter and the guidelines. This is where all of the relevant information lives. You’re going to find definitions of consensus, you’re going to find details about norms and procedures that leadership is going to adhere to. And most

importantly, for our conversation today, you are going to find how that working group is structured.

As we had talking about the evolution of the multi-stakeholder model, we're seeing a real shift in the GNSO away from this open model where there's [inaudible] specific criteria for membership, you likely represent your own point of view. We're seeing a shift away from that and we're seeing it more into the representative model where there are very specifically delineated spots for any stakeholder group part of the community and you're likely in that role acting as a representative of your entire constituency, stakeholder group area of the community.

Of course we have the hybrid model and we are seeing that as well and that's something that's kind of in between. And Play 4 of the Consensus Playbook discussing this in greater detail—far greater detail—than I'm going to discuss today. But we can also see the hybrid model as working groups then establish offshoot groups to tackle very narrowly [tailored] issues, we can see that hybrid model come into effect.

But for purposes of today, we're really talking about this representative model because that's what we're seeing the most come out of the GNSO.

And I think it's important to acknowledge that the GNSO—Council, specifically—is trying to be inclusive of stakeholder interests while being exclusive of having so many participants that it bogs down the process. And I recognize that there's probably a lot of people on this call that have strong thoughts and opinions on this evolution, this change or shift maybe, and I understand that and I hear all of that. But for purposes of

my presentation today, we're really just kind of looking at what we're seeing come out of the GNSO and how to use the tools that you have at your disposal to work that to your best benefit.

So, I can't emphasize enough it is essential that you know what type of model the GNSO Working Group is.

The EPDP charter on this issue reads "Members are required to represent the formal position of their appointing organization, not individual views or position." So that then begs the question how do we get to the formal position of your community? How do we do that?

So I started thinking about this, and having spent a little bit of time observing the CPWG working group, I think that that is a great place for you guys to figure out what your formal positions are.

Now, this two-way communication between the GNSO Working Group and the CPWG is really essential for navigating this kind of work. I recognize the CPWG does more than just navigating GNSO working groups. But for purposes of today, we're still talking about that narrow lane with the GNSO.

So, in this representative model, you have a rep—maybe two or three depending on what the group is—who is traveling to the GNSO Working Group to represent the interests, the needs, the concerns of the At-Large community. And because of that, your rep needs to understand what those are. And like any community, I'm sure there are many issues that you are all tightly aligned on but there's likely to be ones that you are not.

So, I was thinking about this in terms of how to support that rep and give that rep the structure that he or she needs to gather that information. And by the other side of that same coin, the membership of the CPWG and even your At-Large community more broadly, you need to understand what's happening in that GNSO working group. You need to understand what sort of proposed solutions are on the table, what people are coalescing around as that group moves to consensus.

And these things are complicated and heavy lifts and a ton of work. So frankly, I would assert that expecting your reps, which is going to only be a handful of people likely, to paint the picture for the entire community, arm them with the information and then facilitate a dialogue where he or she navigate what those positions are, what those pain points are, what that needed, that's a lot to put on your community members who are already so diligently focused. And like we've been talking about, consensus is everyone's responsibility.

So, one of the ideas that I had is, as you're trying to cultivate more involved membership and trying to train up the next generation, having a group of people that, whether they're formal observers or they are simply watching the sessions after the fact, they are in charge of keeping up with the landscape of what's happening in that working group and then having that group of observers come in, paint the picture for your CPWG and we perhaps give them some homework, things to think about, and then a week or two later—whatever the schedule allows, I know this particular working group meets very regularly which is great—then have your reps come in and have them be able to facilitate a conversation where you guys can start to work on your own consensus, coalescing around your positions that are those

formal positions of the At-Large community and then your reps can take that back to the GNSO.

And this is a shift. This is less of an update about what's happening in the GNSO and more of an active facilitation of an information gathering of positions.

So, the other thing that you guys can utilize, as part of the GNSO PDP 3.0 initiative, is they've put into place a lot of really strong project management tools. And while those dates can shift and whatnot, if you can get a hold of those project management tools for the working group that you are participating in, you can then schedule out when a lot of these issues and calls need to happen along the way.

I'm not talking about when we're getting towards final recommendations. You guys know how to do that. This is more while the work is happening to ensure that your reps really are representing the consensus position of your At-Large community.

So, the biggest thing you can do, though, as you are cultivating these consensus positions for your At-Large community is to send your rep out of the CPWG with a range of options at every point possible.

This allows your rep in the GNSO Council to creatively work towards solutions, because again, over there they're still coalescing around shared ideas and trying to come to their own consensus.

Think about it this way. If you send your rep out with a binary position—let's say it's yes or no and you choose yes, the At-Large view is yes—in the CPWG, that group might be coalescing around no. And if all your rep

who is representing your interest has is yes, then your voice is totally sidelined. The At-Large voice is no longer at the table.

But if you can send that same rep with a range of possibilities of “if this then that” then you allow those individuals to continue to work and to keep the At-Large voice at the table and you have a greater chance of having that At-Large position, to some degree, be reflected in the ultimate GNSO consensus view.

So, again, none of these things that I’m talking about are much of a surprise I would imagine than any of you, but I’m just encouraging you to be a little more strategic in the way that you approach the work going into the GNSO as we’re seeing certainly the structures change.

So, then to answer the question how do we get to a consensus view in the CPWG to then arm our rep with, you commit to good problem solving.

Now, these ideas are relevant in whatever group you’re in, but I’m just continuing to lean into the CPWG for purposes of this training.

And before we get into these things, ultimately positive group culture is built on trust and it holds true for any group that you work in. And trust can really be a leap of faith and it’s kind of a squishy concept, but I encourage all of you, especially as you’re working in the CPWG where trust is likely easier to establish because your interests are more in line, I encourage you to be transparent.

Be transparent about what your needs, wants, and concerns are on any given issue that you guys are discussing and then actively—actively—

listen to those positions of others. Try to understand the people that differ from you, that have a different point of view. Actively try to understand why they feel the way they feel. I think human nature, oftentimes when we state our point of view and someone else then responds, we're preparing for our defense. We're preparing for what we're going to say next.

And I really encourage you guys to pull yourselves out of that to the extent that that happens and really understand why the other person is coming—feels the way that he or she does—because when you actively understand other points of view, you're going to naturally be able to come up with better solutions. You stop that log jam that can happen and you start to be able to craft consensus views.

So, the best way to understand how someone else feels and why they feel what they feel is to ask them.

Throughout the community, well beyond At-Large, you regularly see people make position statements. Position statements on top of position statement. And what I'm encouraging you guys to do is to ask the whys, drill down, identify why people feel what they feel. And you might assume that you know the answer, and when you ask the question you might be right but you assumed that and you knew that was why they felt that way.

However, I promise there are people on the call, there are people in the room, that didn't know that. And you're informing everyone's understanding of all of our positions in a group by asking questions.

The most effective way to work through disagreement is to offer solutions. It's a great way to build trust, just like asking questions is a great way to build trust in a group. So is offering solutions.

Even if your solutions aren't met with rounds of agreement, you are demonstrating to a group that you're trying. And one of the great ways when you're utilizing those active listening skills and understanding others' points of view are to offer solutions that go beyond your own needs. Offer solutions that address your needs and perhaps those that are aligned with you, even better if those people aren't aligned with you. That only builds more trust. It builds more credibility. And also it gets you guys closer to your consensus position.

I come from a mediation background—a high-conflict mediation background—and I firmly believe that even the finest, smallest points of agreement are a jumping off point to get agreement going. Agreement builds agreement. It changes everyone's mindset. They start to pull out of their [inaudible] where it feels adversarial and they really start to come together.

I always use the analogy of like a boulder on the top of a hill. The hardest part of getting that boulder going is getting enough momentum behind it that it goes over the edge of the hill and starts rolling down.

Consensus building and agreement works the same way. It just takes a few people to craft solutions that put enough force behind that boulder to get it rolling down the hill.

And ultimately a huge part of this is sharing the burden. You're not going to be as affective as you want to be in your problem solving and

your position in the GNSO if there's only a handful of you that re doing this. I also recognize that training the next generation is an incredibly heavy lift as well. That's why I made the suggestion I did about creating groups of observers that understand what's happening in the working group. I think things like that are a great way to give the exposure, the [inaudible] exposure, to this type of work to really help people to get their brains fully around what is happening.

I also think this is a great space that you can lean into people that are coming out of fellowship, people that have been in the ICANN ecosphere for long enough to start to have their arms wrapped around didn't. I think this is a great space to really bring them into the fold. Again, you can see this is discussed in a number of places in the Consensus Playbook.

Now, what do you do ... And again, I'm not picking on CPWG. We're just going to stay with you guys for now, so thank you for being kind, CPWG leadership.

What do you do if you feel like you're not being heard? What do you do if you feel like your leadership doesn't hear you? Because ultimately, leadership sets the tone in a working group. I think that we can all agree upon that. But again, it's everyone's responsibility to advocate for their own position and their own needs. And at the end of the day, we all as individuals want to heard. We want to feel respected. We want to feel included and we want to feel valued.

I think most of us seek—especially in this type of work, seek some degree of economy over decisions that are going to impact us. We want

to be acknowledged and appreciated for our contributions and we want to play a positive role in the group. I know some of you may disagree on that point but I really want to lean into that because positive group culture is so important.

Positive group culture is directly correlated to more creative problem solving and more collaborative agreement. I imagine many of you who have been in working groups that weren't collaborative and don't feel productive understand exactly what I'm talking about.

So, part of that is when an individual doesn't feel like those needs are being addressed—they don't feel heard, they don't feel seen, they don't feel valued—they're naturally going to be less collaborative.

So, if you're ever in a position that you feel that way, consensus is everyone's responsibility. You've got to advocate for yourself.

So, how do you do this? I would encourage you to continue to make your arguments, your interest statements, your position statement, based on everything that comes through your position on a given issue. But offer solutions. Same thing we were discussing in the broader context. Explain your position, ask questions, and incorporate those answers into your new solution. Really show that you are in it to win it, you are in it to be collaborative, you are hearing everybody else, and you aren't just coming to the table to be [inaudible].

If you feel like working group leadership isn't hearing you, by all means request a private caucus which is just a private meeting, an offline meeting you often hear them called. Request that to discuss your concerns.

But ultimately I really encourage all of you to remember that consensus is not about winning. We're hearing more of that I think in the greater ICANN world that it's about these very extreme winning and losing positions, and that's fundamentally not what this work is. Fundamentally this work is about creating compromise that you can live with, finding those points in compromise that you can live with.

And really key to understanding that and to being effective and to having your voice at the table in the GNSO consensus building is to understand what your constituency thinks, understand what they can live with and what they can't.

And constituency, it's up to you to be knowledgeable enough about what's happening in those working group to be able to share those positions, to have those positions.

So, with that, I know there's a lot of text on this slide but I wanted to hit the highlights before we move to breakout.

Everyone is responsible for consensus. I'm sure you're sick of me saying it but it's true. I encourage you to really be strategic in that communication loop between the CPWG and the GNSO working group. Everybody in the CPWG needs to understand the landscape enough that they then can have positions, concerns, issues, etc., that can be addressed so your reps can understand the formal position of your community because that's likely what they're signing up to do.

And send that rep out of the CPW armed with a range of options to every extent possible so you can keep the At-Large voice at the table.

Obviously all things we just discussed about committing to good problem solving, and if you learn nothing else or take home nothing else, I really encourage all of you to ask more questions. Try to understand other people's points of view more and incorporate those into offering solutions.

All right. So, you guys ready to stop listening to me talk and to go to breakout rooms?

You're going to go to breakout rooms. We have seven. The fantastic Claudia and Yesim on the backend have been assigning those. In each room, we have a breakout room leader that has received a Google Doc from me that has instructions on what you guys are going to do and it has the scenarios themselves. After I go through this breakout room thing, I'll do the questions. It has the scenarios themselves.

We ask that each one of those leaders, which by my last count are Liliana, Joanna, Alfredo, JZ, Hadia, and Cheryl. I don't know if that's changed on the backend but that's the list I had before I started talking. They have the ability to screenshare the document so you guys can see it and you guys can start to discuss.

All of you utilizing language services, both French and Spanish, you're going to stay in this main Zoom room and you're going to execute on the activity here. I encourage you to use the Consensus Playbook and the ideas we've discussed today as you tackle the scenarios.

I ask you identify one person to be both the scribe and the presenter. We're not going to take notes in the Google Doc. We're not going to officially record those. Instead, if this one person would just take their

own notes on their computer, on a piece of paper and just be prepared when we come back together to share where the group landed on a particular issue. We're not going to have a deck when we come back. It's just going to be our faces.

So, to the extent possible, I would really appreciate if that scribe presenter would turn on their camera when we come back together.

You will be asked to join your breakout room automatically and you will be given I think a 60-second timer of when it's going to bring you back to this main Zoom room so we can finish our conversation.

But like I said at the top of this, I'm happy if you work through the scenarios and that feels good to your group, but for me it's just as valuable if you guys sit in the breakout room and connect. As everything, this is your session, so don't feel obligated to work, work, work if that's not what the tone of your room is.

With that, can you give me some direction on what the questions are, if any? Yesim or Claudia?

YESIM NAZLAR:

Hi, Melissa. If you could please check our Slack channel, I captured three questions from Jonathan Zuck, Alfredo Calderon, and from Joanna Kulesza.

MELISSA ALLGOOD:

I appreciate it and thank you for that. I told you guys I can't do more than one thing at a time.

So, Jonathan asks, “Is there a way to represent documents, arrange a position, conditionals, etc., to facilitate approval by the ALAC and empowerment of the PDP rep volunteers?”

Jonathan, would you mind just speaking up and giving me a little bit more color to that? In terms of why you want the range of positions, in essence kind of codified or approved?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Melissa. Can you hear me okay?

MELISSA ALLGOOD: I can. Yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure. Our internal process is that the CPWG is just a recommendation organization within the At-Large and that ultimately it’s the ALAC that approves our positions that go out into the world. So we have a process by which the CPWG passes through something and then passes it to the ALAC for approval, and then from there we evangelize those positions in various fora, whether it’s in a work group or on public comments or in At-Large advice.

But even absent that, ideally ... Because you mentioned the value of sending the volunteers into a work group with a range of positions, so that instead of just yes or no, it’s got conditionals associated with it, which I immediately started to think about how do I document that or create a tool for that volunteer that documents the consensus that

we've built around those range of positions because it's almost like trying to show the relationship between issues in a way that you wouldn't normally to show that, well yes, this is our position on that but our reason for that is because of this. So if there was some compromise on this, then that would change. It's that kind of thing.

I would love for some way to represent that to ourselves internally to document our consensus for the purposes of ourselves, so that we can remind ourselves what we agreed to.

Also, something for the volunteer to carry with them to the PDP and to give something to the ALAC to say, yeah, this looks good.

MELISSA ALLGOOD:

You know, Jonathan, I really appreciate you bringing up that point because that's part of the nuance of your structure that I really hadn't taken a dive into but it is completely spot on and relevant.

Ultimately, I think that if we see that the GNSO is going to move this way towards a more representative model, which you know that's a crystal ball question but it looks like that's the trend as we're chartering upcoming working groups, I think that having some backend structure within the At-Large looping in your requirements within the ALAC structure, it makes a lot of sense, and ultimately I think that might be a conversation to have in the future with your leadership and I'm happy to participate in that if you want to.

That extra layer of involvement in approval is really going to make your scheduling even that more important and I know that we're always all constantly chasing deadlines.

So, I apologize I don't have an easy answer, surprising, ICANN world, but I do think it's worth continuing that conversation, and to the extent that you want me to be involved in that I'm happy to be.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Melissa.

MELISSA ALLGOOD:

Yep. Alfredo asks, "When a consensus is reached and one is not comfortable with the result, is it reasonable to have a section in the position paper with the point?"

So, in the GNSO, yes, if you're talking about positions on final recommendations and you know there are tools in place to allow for those that disagree to state that in a prescribed manner.

When we're talking about the consensus that's happening in a working group, really to my knowledge and to my understanding, there's not a formal avenue for that necessarily unless it's written somehow into the working group guidelines, the charter.

Ultimately, part of consensus is you win some, you lose some. That's part of why I encourage everybody to remember that it's not an all-or-nothing endeavor.

So, those are things you can talk about trying to get ... If you think about a structure that would work for you, to advocate getting in perhaps to some guidelines to the extent that that would fit. But generally, you're not always going to get what you want, unfortunately.

So, Alfredo, I apologize if that's not the answer that you were hoping for, but I think it's always something we can consider thinking about moving forward strategically for sure. Hopefully, that answered your question. Please speak up if it didn't.

And then I have another one from Joanna that says, "The likely representative to what we have discussed in other venues, how do we effectively deal with lobbying, i.e. those who have a professional agenda to disagree as a planned negotiation position to stall, to delay, to [inaudible]?"

I think that, Joanna, you put your finger on the pulse of the overarching global challenge of consensus in the ICANN ecosphere. You have people that, at least by their behavior—I can't speak to anybody's intent in their person but you have people by their behavior act in a way that is obstructionist.

Ultimately, I would say that that becomes the responsibility of everyone in the community to refuse to accept that behavior.

We can lean into ... I just did a training with the fellows about consensus and I went back and actually revisited the expected standards of behavior and they really do encapsulate and codify what we hope everyone will bring to the table, acting in good faith, acting transparently, and I think that we ... They go on and on. I know we have

Herb on the call and I'm sure he could talk to us extensively about it, but ultimately we can't control those people. But what you can do is start to shift the culture away from giving those people power and control.

I think we also learned at ICANN70, we're starting to hear rumblings about revisiting stakeholder group structures, constituency structures, as this model evolved and I think that exactly that point, Joanna, is going to be at the heart of some of those conversations and needs to be, because it is a very different situation when everybody is coming to it and acting in good faith to navigate hard issues that we disagree about versus people that are paid to block, block, block, delay, delay, delay, stall, stall, stall.

I will say, within a particular working group, if people behave that way, it is incumbent on the working group chair to push through that.

In a couple of months, I'm going to be doing a webinar with you guys on facilitation techniques. I also am working with new GNSO working group chairs on facilitation techniques as well. But we really need to cultivate strong chairs that know how to navigate and work around those types of challenges and that type of behavior.

So, I hear you. I think you put your finger on the pulse of it. I wish I could solve all of the challenges, but I think we do it incrementally and I think so much of it comes down to what you guys as a community in At-Large and certainly outside of At-Large as well expect of each other. So, hopefully, that answered your question somewhat, Joanna.

Then, Hadia says, "I always find solving for the other is very important to reach for consensus." Thank you, Hadia. That's the easiest way to get

people to agree with you is to hear their pain points and to feel their challenges, so they feel heard and respected and part of the conversation. So, thank you for that feedback.

I really don't want to take up any more time because it will come out of your breakout room, so did I miss any? As Yesim was sending me the questions from chat, are there any other? Oh JZ, you have your hand up. Do you want to go ahead?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

And I don't want to take up too much time out of the breakout rooms either. One of the issues that I feel is an ongoing challenge for us—and it may be for others as well but I can only speak for the At-Large and the CPWG is that consensus is not the same as unanimity in the group, and David Mackey is bringing this up in chat as well, that as you percolate up, if you will, from the CPWG into the ALAC, into volunteers that have been participating in a working group, there almost by definition needs to be a kind of separation of ... I'm trying to think. A solidarity that needs to happen.

In other words, the person who is in fact representing us on a working group is there to represent us and not themselves, right?

MELISSA ALLGOOD:

Correct.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I think that's something that we have one of the most difficulty with, because I think once people are released to the wild, they often revert back to representing themselves in those fora rather than the consensus that was reached, and I feel like that's a big challenge and really has a direct impact on our ability to be influential when it becomes obvious that that person is representing themselves and not the underlying consensus of this large organization.

MELISSA ALLGOOD:

I think that you absolutely hit the nail on the head, and I think that that's why I really wanted to focus on this change that's happening here today because there's also so many of you that have been committed to doing this work for so long.

Again, the ICANN work is a train that never stops. You don't have lag time. You don't have downtime. You just have busy and busier. And it is really important to step back and go, okay, maybe ten years ago in this working group I just represented myself, but this model is different. And in this model, when I accept to represent At-Large or the Business Constituency or whatever, I am representing the interests of all of the people in my space in the community and not just myself, and that is different.

I think that you make a good point about then what happens when those people are sitting at the GNSO table working group, they're in the working group on behalf of you guys. If their positions aren't aligned—let's say you have two reps and their positions aren't aligned—

inherently there's a breakdown in your consensus policy back in your community and the representation of that consensus policy.

As reps, if you are in this representative model, you need to recognize that the consensus policy that comes out of your community might not be something that you necessarily personally agree with. But if it is designated as a consensus policy, it's your job to represent that, whether or not it fully encapsulates your personal views.

And I will tell you, Jonathan, you're not the only community that is navigating through this in this same way. You definitely see it in other parts of the community because it's a shift.

There are certain areas that it comes more naturally to and they lean into it more naturally, and there are other areas where it definitely changes. So I think that you raise an excellent point.

If anybody else has asked another question in chat, will you just raise your hand and ask it? And then we can ... If not, then we'll go ahead and go to the breakout rooms.

I am going to ask that the breakout rooms be shortened a little bit guys, I'm sorry. If we can shorten the breakout rooms to 25 minutes, Claudia and Yesim. You guys go. Spend time together. If you don't have any other questions for me, you don't need to talk to me. Go talk to each other. Yesim and Claudia, I hand it over to you.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Okay, thank you, everyone, if you could please click accept to the rooms and you can join the breakout rooms you're assigned to. Thank you all very much.

Okay. Almost everyone has joined the room they've been assigned to. Everyone who is left in the main room is in here either because they need interpretation or they are an interpreter. So the dialogue can begin in the main room as well. Thank you.

MELISSA ALLGOOD: If I may, this room is an experiment. We aren't yet able to have interpretation in breakout rooms. Ideally, I would have loved to have a French room and a Spanish room. Because we're not there yet, I appreciate your patience and your willingness to be creative in this space.

The document that I referenced—the Google document—Claudia or Yesim, can you screenshare that please, the document? What I think is probably best to do is to have those of you on the French channel listen to your French interpreter read the document. Can that be done simultaneously with those on the Spanish channel? Can they read simultaneously, Claudia, the document or no?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: As long as someone reads the document, the interpreters will be able to interpret it. Maybe, Melissa, if you can do that, please?

MELISSA ALLGOOD: Sure. I can read the document. I'm going to read it off my own screen because that's too small for me.

At-Large Consensus Building Training: Utilizing the Consensus Playbook tool. Please take the content of our conversation and apply it to the three scenarios below. Before beginning this work, please identify someone to be the scribe and presenter. We will need to identify someone to do that at the end of me reading the introduction.

After a few minutes—it's going to be 30 now—the breakout room will automatically close and we will return to the main room to share findings. Scribe presenter, be prepared to turn on your camera if possible.

So, before we go into scenario one, does someone volunteer to be the presenter for this group? Feel free to raise your hand if you do. Yesim, are you seeing any hands raised to be the presenter? You will be able to present in whatever language you're most comfortable with, right, Yesim?

YESIM NAZLAR: Yes. Correct. Actually, I'm not seeing any raised hands.

MELISSA ALLGOOD: We need someone to volunteer to do it, so that we can move to the scenarios. So, please, anyone?

Okay. Well, let's go ahead and just move to the scenarios, and if anyone changes their mind, please, please, please come forward because I would like to share your thoughts with the rest of the webinar group.

Okay. I'm going to read scenario one. You are a member of a GNSO working group. The working group feels dysfunctional. Discussions are not interactive and they regularly involve members speaking past one another. The working group chair doesn't challenge any position statements and it feels like everyone is digging into their own corners versus working collaboratively. What, if anything, do you do?

So, feel free to raise your hand with ideas of what you do, what you think you can do, since consensus is everyone's responsibility. What do you think, guys?

HAROLD ARCOS: Hello. I would like to make a suggestion.

MELISSA ALLGOOD: Of course. I would appreciate it. Thank you. Please, go ahead.

HAROLD ARCOS Can you hear me?

MELISSA ALLGOOD: Yes. Please, go ahead. I can hear you.

HAROLD ACROS:

This is Harold Arcos for the record. In the current scenario you are presenting, I think that my suggestion would be the following. I would ask for the floor, and in the middle of this discussion, I would say that someone—one individual—should be in charge of managing the queue of speakers, reminding everyone of the standards that they need to follow. But more importantly, to have a live blackboard where each position could be reflected.

So, if you have similar positions they could be merged into one single sentence. In that way, you can see on the live screen, the four or five different positions and that would help narrow down the scope so that people would [inaudible] or accept certain positions and get a discussion more organized. Not everyone has the ability to follow a discussion just by listening.

So, with that [inaudible], that would be a very good tool to organize and visualize all those positions that are being raised to see if we can start having some agreement to some of those positions to see whom would support the different positions, and in this way, we might end up building future consensus.

In LACRALO, we have exactly that mechanism. First, we do a brainstorming exercise and then we [inaudible] the different positions that are similar and we try to put them together and see which suggestions have most of the support of the participants, and that way we can get closer to consensus. Only there is a very strong objection would we have further discussion. But that would be a good way of building consensus. I think that is important, when people make their

suggestions to put them on a screen so that everybody can see them.
Thank you.

MELISSA ALLGOOD:

Thank you for sharing that. I think that is an outstanding suggestion. We have access to support communities with Jamboard. So I think that that's going to be a great tool to put in place for just that position.

I advocate that myself. I am not a fan of the agenda slide thing up the whole time. I would much rather like a document that's got collaboration to it. Excellent idea.

Alberto, what do you think? What are your thoughts on this scenario?
You have the floor, Alberto.

ALBERTO SOTO:

I think that in mediation training, first what we are taught is that you need to listen to others, especially when there are too many positions that may be difficult. But if you want to reach consensus, you need to focus more on those positions that get most of the support.

So, to [inaudible] I always say that in order to put an end to a discussion or in order to reach some level of agreement or consensus, I would invite those that have divergent positions to put themselves on the other side of the table. It is amazing how you can see what the other person's position is when you are on the other side of the table. That way, you can narrow down that disagreement.

MELISSA ALLGOOD: I could not agree with you more, Alberto. Our training sounds similar. So I think that's a great suggestion for this one is having the ... Whether you're the chair or just as a member, encouraging each other to stand in the shoes of one another. It's part of that active listening we were discussing. For sure. Sergio, you have your hand up. What would you like to share?

INTERPRETER: This is the interpreter. I cannot hear Sergio yet.

MELISSA ALLGOOD: Okay.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: I just wanted to ...

INTERPRETER: This is the interpreter. Sergio is breaking up. I cannot hear him.

MELISSA ALLGOOD: Okay. I would like to offer everyone the opportunity, if you are in a position where it's easier for you to type in the chat, please do that as well. I certainly don't want to limit you guys. I'd love to hear from all of you but I don't want to limit you guys if you're having problems with audio.

Do we have Sergio back? No? Okay.

INTERPRETER: I cannot hear Sergio.

MELISSA ALLGOOD: Okay. Thank you for the update. So, what I'm hearing from you guys is that when it feels like this group is just stuck, there might be benefit to flipping up the tools that we use and using something like a Jamboard or a live document that is interactive, stating positions, ideas, so people can start to see the information in a different way, receive the information in a different way, but it can really start a dialogue where we can start to identify where people are finding agreement and finding connection. I think that's a great idea.

Honestly, to all of you, I wish that we saw more of that in the ICANN space. The Consensus Playbook does talk about a number of different tools that can be used within the meeting structure and that's certainly one of them. So great idea.

I'm also hearing that what would be helpful is whether it's done by the chair or someone else in the working group, you really encourage people to stand in the shoes of someone who they disagree with. And that exactly comes down to asking the question, encouraging the active listening, taking your lens off of it.

It could be as simple as Bob and Sylvia have opposing positions and they have both offered solutions and you look at Bob and you say, "Why won't Sylvia's position work? Why won't Sylvia's proposal work?" Or vice-versa.

And what you oftentimes will find is, while people might disagree on a bunch of different points, there might be those few kernels that they agree upon and then that can get that agreement building.

I see that Sergio is back. So, Sergio, I would like to give you the floor to share your thoughts.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO:

Thank you, Melissa. I just wanted to add something to what both Harold and Alberto have already said. To what extent people who are members of a group can build consensus from understanding the other person's position.

I think that in a group it is so important for the leader to help the members understand that there are also things that may be—they may follow the common line, although there may be some differences.

So it is America matter of guiding those individuals through the discussion and see how willing I am to get to understand the other person's position. If you can achieve that, I think that the whole group is going to be able to move forward. Thank you. That was my suggestion.

MELISSA ALLGOOD:

I couldn't agree more, Sergio. That absolutely dovetails into the conversations and the tools—conversations I'm starting to have and tools that are contained within the Consensus Playbook about how to cultivate effective and strong working group chairs, working group leadership using really good facilitation techniques.

The biggest one that I am in favor of, and perhaps you might agree with me, is having those working group chairs that really are mutual, that they aren't doing ... We regularly hear people taking their chair hat on and off. I think that is such a destructive presentation because it makes the member of the group feel like, "Oh, you're not really neutral. You're still a registrar." Or, "You're not really neutral. You're still in the IPC," or whatnot. And that can just be devastating for that trust.

And ultimately, you've got to trust each other to some degree to be able to really work collaboratively and to get to these solutions and just not have it be the drain that we have seen it be in various spots. So, excellent point. Thank you for sharing, Sergio. And I'm glad you made it back. Good deal.

All right. So, I see that we have about seven minutes left. So, unless anyone raises their hand or drops something into chat, I'm going to read the next scenario. So I'm going to give you five or ten seconds to jump in, otherwise I'm going to move forward.

Okay. All right. It looks like I can move forward.

So, the second scenario is you represent the At-Large community in a GNSO working group. The CPWG has given you a range of proposed solutions on a few issues, but one redline on one particular issue. While you're in that GNSO working group, it becomes clear that the CPWG's redline is not the consensus view. What, if anything, can you do?

Again, feel free to raise your hand or to drop your ideas into chat. Do you think this is one where, because you had a [binary] position, you just have to let it go? Or do you think there's anything that you can do

as you are advocating the At-Large formal position in that GNSO working group? Any thoughts?

So, I think this is a tough one. I'll give you my thoughts and maybe that will spark a bit of a conversation. This is why I was really advocating the range of solutions, because when you're representative just has a [binary] position and the group is going that position and your position is over here, in a representative model where you formally represent the positions of your community members, you don't really have anywhere to go. You don't have that flexibility and that ability to shift and be creative if you are adhering to what is the intended structure of the working group, that you are representing the formal position.

That's why where you can give a range, like Jonathan was talking about in the question, if this then that, if this then that, cultivating that in the CPWG takes times and that's going to be its own process. But if you can arm your rep with that flexibility, you really are going to be sending them in from a far stronger advocacy position.

Does anyone disagree with that? By all means, throw it in the chat or raise your hand if you do.

HAROLD ARCOS: This is Harold. Hi. Can I say something?

MELISSA ALLGOOD: Please.

HAROLD ARCOS:

Thank you, Melissa. Well, actually having gone through the At-Large and, with regards to this scenario and there being a redline as the scenario says, it is certainly difficult to have a single position in the interaction with the GNSO.

However—and we should remember here that if we go to the GNSO with one position, it is because At-Large has already developed and built and agreed a position. This has been considered already.

However, I think it is a key function of the representative or the liaison, it is a key [inaudible] of being able to listen. Perhaps through listening, the rep can identify areas [inaudible] to the GNSO and then take note and bring those new inputs back to the At-Large so that it can consider this additional perspective.

However, based on my experience, that is not something that happens frequently. Why is that? Typically, we have the liaisons for that. The liaisons are very successfully managing and taking all positions to the GNSO. And on that basis, would build.

However, again, I think that keeping the ear open and do active listening would also be helpful to pushing our decisions through, even though there is a redline, even though there is a [binary] factor there. Thank you, Melissa.

MELISSA ALLGOOD:

Thank you, Harold. I love that feedback. I love that you took something that felt like was the end of the conversation and made it a conversation that can go forward. I hear you, what can be very

challenging in that scenario where the rep is information gathering to try to go back to the CPWG and to influence their position to come to another consensus decision on that issue. The timing of that can be really hard, right?

In that GNSO working group, everyone is coalescing around a position that's different than your redline. You have enough time to get the position, to get some flexibility to the position to then get it back to the GNSO working group to have that influence.

So, I love the creativity, and when you encounter that, I hope you guys are working towards that. I would also encourage you, as you're having those deliberations in the CPWG to really use the redline as your last alternative. And no doubt there will be things that are redline, hands down. It's going to happen. But to work hard as you cultivate ranges of options, to really use that as a last resort, because then you don't get cycled out. You don't run out of time in that cycle to then have the influence that you want at the table in the GNSO.

Thank you for sharing that feedback. I love that this group is leaning so much into listening and trying to understand. I hope the rest of the community mirrors your willingness to do that.

With that, we are about to leave. Thank you for your time. I've taken notes. So, to the extent that you guys feel comfortable, I will share some of the ideas that you guys expressed here.

Thank you for your time and being creative in this space. You guys are the test case for trying to navigate interpretation, so I really appreciate your willingness to hang through with me.

Claudia and Yesim, as people come back into the main room, we want to ask for presenters to identify themselves in the chat and then those people can be pinned and spotlighted so we can just have spaces and we'll stop the screenshare. Can you guys navigate that for me? Thank you.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Yes. Sure, Melissa.

MELISSA ALLGOOD: Welcome back, welcome back. As soon as everyone is back, we'll get started. Those of you that are back, if you are the presenter for your group, would you please identify yourself in chat or raise your hand so that Claudia and Yesim can get you pinned and highlighted, spotlighted, all the things so that we can have a conversation all together? All right. Thank you, thank you. It looks like Roberto has put his name into chat, JZ, Joanna, Lavish. There you go. I was saying it right. Thank you.

LAVISH MAWENA MENSAH: The word "lavish". It's from the word "lavish".

MELISSA ALLGOOD: Thank you so much.

LAVISH MAWENA MENSAH: You're welcome.

MELISSA ALLGOOD: And I had the opportunity to say in our experience in the main room navigating interpretation, those of you in there were so patient with me, I appreciate it. You are the test case. So, I have taken some notes on their positions and I will be sharing on their behalf as well.

So, Claudia and Yesim, let me know when we are ready to go.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: So, should Lavish ... Would you like to report first, Lavish, for your group? I believe he was in Cheryl's group, if I'm not mistaken.

LAVISH MAWENA MENSAH: Sure. I'm ready.

MELISSA ALLGOOD: Yeah. So, what I'd like to do if we can is just go scenario by scenario. For scenario one, what did you guys discuss and where did you land?

LAVISH MAWENA MENSAH: Okay. So, we commented that consensus ... [inaudible] went through a voting to select one of the scenarios considering the time we had. The one that was done, we went for Scenario 2.

Scenario 2 [inaudible] a representative of an At-Large community and the community has given you a redline [inaudible] and you notice that

you couldn't hold onto that redline. What would you do? That was our question. That was what we really attempted or tried to deal with.

So, we were [inaudible] Dave and then [inaudible] with Cheryl being the leader or [inaudible]. We realized that it is a very [inaudible] role that one will be given and [inaudible] been an effective intermediary about what is being looked out for, in terms of being able to communicate and that which the industry is talking about and the [inaudible] are representing, the At-Large community are presenting as well. Though you may be given a redline [inaudible] that the At-Large community may have [inaudible]. This is also important to understand [inaudible].

It is also important to understand what the industry ... Hello? I am hearing feedback. I don't know.

MELISSA ALLGOOD:

I am as well. Please go ahead. I can hear you. Keep going.

LAVISH MAWENA MENSAH:

So, it is important however the decision taken by the At-Large community which you are representing. It is also important to try to understand the industry perspective. It is not about being loud about the position, but rather being effective, to have a flow of communication both from the industry point and hence when you go back to the community, you [point] to them what the industry perspective is [inaudible] change [inaudible] that have been given because of the transparency of meetings and all that have been discussed at the [inaudible] perspective, the community.

Also, came to the understanding that it is important to use things like “help me understand what you think or what you are saying” in order to reach that consensus.

We also have to look out for the [inaudible] or motivation, [inaudible] being discussed to better inform the community on [inaudible]. As a representative, you are just not a conduit to send information but rather [inaudible] and help the flow of the information both at the industry level and both at a community.

I think that would be a summary or a clip of what we talked about. Thank you.

MELISSA ALLGOOD: Thank you so much. Joanna, since Lavish spoke about Scenario 2, did your group do that one?

JOANNA KULESZA: Yes, indeed, we have. We managed to get through all of these and we have very full takeaways, so thank you very much for doing this and thank you to my group.

MELISSA ALLGOOD: I love it.

JOANNA KULESZA: Yeah. So thank you very much for doing this and thank you to everyone in the group who participated and was really, really very helpful. I think

we got really into the process and thank you for the scenarios that were so relevant. So, I will focus on Scenario 2 as indicated but happy to discuss others as well.

This was challenge because this is a situation that happens so often, as if you knew us so well, Melissa. And based on that practice we have had previously, it was recommended by our group that it might make sense to come back to the Consolidated Policy Working Group and then renegotiate the redlines and see if this is something that we might want to look into.

But what I found interesting in the context of our discussions was also that the Consolidated Policy Working Group itself might consider reaching outside of the working group itself to find consensus, to moderate, to granulate the consensus as it builds, making sure that whatever is discussed there is representative for the At-Large end user community.

So, I think these would be the two key takeaways, the first one focused on Scenario 2; whereas the third one—the latter one—came up when discussing Scenario 3. But I think it's quite universal.

So, within the Consolidated Policy Working Group where our wonderful co-chairs at times struggle to support the consensus, to identify the consensus, possibly to adjust the redline for the At-Large to be able to work with the broader community better, it might be useful for us to seek that consensus also outside and try to renegotiate and try to get a new light shed on the problem at hand.

I'm going to stop here. happy to elaborate. You guys know me but I know we're pressed for time. Thank you so much.

MELISSA ALLGOOD:

I appreciate you being so expeditious and I love that you guys are getting creative in ways to effectively advocate. That's ultimately the most I could hope for. Jonathan, what would you like to share from your group?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thank you for asking an open-ended question, Melissa, because we did very little of our homework. We took to heart your recommendation to spend time with each other. So we started out conversation by just doing a round of introductions and people talking about what brought them into ICANN.

There's an old expression that where you stand is a function or depends on where you sit, which means that the situation you come from, the culture that you represent, the community that you are a part of plays a big role in determining the positions that you're going to take and the priorities that you have when you're participating in something like ICANN. So we were looking to try and dig into those things.

What's interesting I think about many in the At-Large community—and this is reflected in our small little subteam—is that just the value of being involved and creating a channel of two-way communication between the community from which people come and the ICANN community is their principle motivation.

So, unlike some of the other constituencies or even advisory committees within the ICANN community, there's less of an agenda-driven nature to this group. Instead, it's a participation-driven group. So that suggests that we need to improve those communication channels back and forth to communities. That's what's motivating a lot of people.

But a lot of people don't come with "I want to advance the interests of intellectual property" or "I want to advance the interests of registries or registrars" or "sovereignty of my government" or something like that that kind of motivates other participants or even security and stability.

So, there are folks like that in the At-Large community that come from a cybersecurity research position or something, but what I'm finding and was again reflected in our group is that the primary motivation was just to be a part of these conversations and to share the output of these conversations with their community back home.

So, enhancing the tools with which to help people do that I guess should be a priority and that somewhat fits into what Joanna brought up in terms of CPWG trying to reach out to a broader group and figure out how those channels of communication can work and work in a sufficiently efficient way, so that we can still participate in the timelines that get established within the ICANN community so that we're not spending all of our time trying to hear from some community that's far away and we never get around to reaching consensus ourselves. That's our challenge, right? That we're all under these deadlines and increasing the efficiency of these back and forth and feedback channels I think has got to be one of our objectives.

So, that was the primary discussion that ended up taking place in what I think was much less than 25 minutes but I could be wrong.

MELISSA ALLGOOD: It was quite fast.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So we made it into Scenario 1 a little bit. [Mohan] from Hyderabad made the point that there's some value in Scenario 1, breaking a deadlock where people are talking past each other. Part of what we spent some time on was those terms and what does it mean to speak past each other? Because those are sort of terms of art in a way. One that you use quite a bit is "lean" into and I think that's worth ... I shared a definition link in the chat while you were talking because I imagine a lot of people haven't heard that.

MELISSA ALLGOOD: Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: But his point was that one way to break a deadlock is to go back home and do some homework and gain a greater ... Do the work to kind of support the position when you come back so that it's not just you repeating a position but instead giving more of an explanation of why you're taking the position you are and supporting it with some evidence. That was the point he made and that's literally as far as we

made it into the conversation in Scenario 1 because really we just treated it as a fika, the short time that we had.

MELISSA ALLGOOD:

Well, I appreciate that. More than anything—I was just sharing with Cheryl—I’ve now done these breakout rooms with scenarios for a couple of different communities. I appreciate you guys staying on to the extent you can. I know we’re over time.

I’ve been getting really good feedback. I’ve done it with GNSO Council. I’ve done it with fellows. I’m doing it with you guys. So to the extent that you see, as we live in this virtual world, value to doing this type of work, I’m all in it to do it with you guys because I do think that it yields all kinds of benefits.

So, with that, Roberto, would you like to share where your group landed?

ROBERTO:

Yes. The first thing is something that is quite similar to what Jonathan Zuck’s group went but we did it only in theory.

So we said at the beginning of the discussion what we need to do is, first of all, to listen to one another and hear the different positions. But not only that, but to think about the reasons for the positions and then try to find—that’s the beginning to find a compromise already among ourselves because the At-Large is probably the most diverse of the different stakeholder groups in ICANN, so we come from different experiences.

So, first of all, we need to not only to find a compromise among ourselves but also to make sure that you understand the reasons why each of us have those positions.

Then another interesting comment is that we have a sort of a dual structure. That is, individuals. So the At-Large representatives are working in the working groups---generally the working groups, specifically the Consolidated Policy Working Group. But then, at some point in time, ALAC meaning the 15 representatives, have to make a vote. So that's something that has to be taken into account in the discussion, to come up with something that then just takes a vote within.

Obviously we need to come to a consensus position, and one other comment was that we need to have a good understanding of how we are representing our positions, so that the other constituencies understand where we come from and why we make those statements. And this is a sort of basically the same thing from reaching consensus within the group but providing that also to the outside so that we can explain our position.

The last comment is that we were looking at point three and it's just an example. Suppose that we decide that we all agree on the fact that closed generics are a no-no. Of course we have take into account that within some other stakeholder groups, this is a non-starter. So we need to make sure that in the discussion we have also clear what is the level of compromise that we can accept and what are the points at which we are going to [inaudible] but never accept.

So we have to have clear among ourselves before going to the GNSO what are our falling points. I'm translating from Italian. I don't know if you say that in English. What you can accept even if you have to swallow some bad news and what is really beyond our ability to accept. That's basically it, in the little time we have.

MELISSA ALLGOOD:

Thank you, Roberto. I love that your group had that strategic mindset in approaching that issue because that is absolutely part of advocating strategically that we didn't even get into today but understanding how your positions likely are going to be received by other parts of the community and planning for that, and that definitely dovetails into that range of possibility. So, excellent work. Thank you.

Hadia, I'd like to hand it over to you to hear from your group.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

This was my group, actually. Roberto presented what we actually ended up with. What actually important thing that we discussed is the possibility of going to the GNSO with two different positions and exploring with them the best ... Because what [inaudible] as an At-Large or in the CPWG, we end up with two positions. So we actually discussed the possibility of actually going to the GNSO or going to the working groups with two positions and looking what can we reach with that. Sometimes it is what it is, right? If this is where we end up, what do we do?

The idea was it's okay sometimes maybe to go with two positions because this is really what the At-Large community ended up with and exploring with them the possibility of a solution. Maybe one of them may be something in between.

So this is something also we discussed, but practically how does this really work, we don't know.

MELISSA ALLGOOD:

I appreciate, though, that you guys are really starting to thinking about the layers upon layers that go into this process. Lovely. Thank you. I apologize, I didn't even look at the breakout rooms because I see it in the main room. I didn't realize you and Roberto were in the same room.

Is there anyone else that I have missed? Because I will share where our Language Services room shared ideas and thoughts. Did I miss any presenters? I'm not seeing any hands or chat.

Okay, I'm going to go ahead and briefly share the positions and where we landed there. There was a real sentiment to utilize some different tools—I'm thinking Jamboard now that we can use Jamboard—for when you hit those deadlocks.

A great point was raised about the fact that not everyone is an auditory learner, and then you have the layers of challenge with interpretation, and as such it could be really beneficial if there was a digital representation of people's positions in a log jam. I think that's a great tool. It was a great idea. It's something that definitely is also advocating in the Consensus Playbook. So, awesome idea.

What I really loved about the group that I was in and that I've heard consistently across your presentations is you are all taking the position of leaning into listening and that's awesome. That's leaning into understanding why other people have the positions that they have that are different than yours.

We had people talk about going as far as, really, when you're at that dysfunctional thought, forcing people to step into other people's shoes to understand the mechanics behind their positions and their thought process. So I thought that that was outstanding.

There was a big emphasis on strong leadership. I've actually had the chance to go back and read the chat that you guys were doing while I was presenting and I love hearing you guys emphasize the need for neutral working group chairs because that is the soapbox that I spend most of my time standing on. So we'll talk more about that in the facilitation presentation that I'm putting together. But I like that you guys are thinking about that and you're understanding that there are things you can do as participants when we have these tough moments in working groups because we all are responsible for consensus.

But a lot of it is on the plate of leadership as well and the way that they choose to navigate through those tough waters. And I do think that it's worth having some additional conversation about understanding and streamlining that kind of approval process that Jonathan brought up that came up in our working group as well from the CPWG to the ALAC, then, to being able to get to the GNSO. It would be great if we could get creative and evolve as all of this evolves and understand how to be the most expeditious in the interest of time to really allow you guys to have

the space to be the most influential as possible in the GNSO working groups.

So, with that, are there any other questions or presentations? I appreciate everyone staying longer. Thank you to our interpreters for staying longer. Thank you to the awesome Yesim and Claudia for being so seamless behind the scenes. And thank you to all of you for having me. I very much enjoyed it. Anything else?

If not, we're done. Goodbye, all!

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, thank you, thank you. Great vision.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Thank you all for joining. This meeting is now adjourned. Please enjoy the rest of your day.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Melissa.

MELISSA ALLGOOD: You're welcome, guys. Bye! Have a good day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]