ICANN

Moderator: Ozan Sahin
September 20, 2018
8:00 am CT

Coordinator: The recordings has started.

Ozan Sahin: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the
                     NCSG/NCUC/NPOC Consensus-Building Webinar held on the 20th of
                     September 2018 at 12:00 UTC.

                     On the call today we have Claire Craig, Ioana Stupariu, Jinhe Liu, Nadira Al-
                     Araj, Pascal Bekono, Rafik Dammak, Shah Zahidur Rahman, and on the audio
                     bridge we have Vernatius okwu Ezeama. We have - we also have David Kolb
                     as the instructor of the webinar and Benedetta Rossi and myself, Ozan Sahin
                     as ICANN staff.

                     Please note that this call is being recorded. I would like to remind you all to
                     please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you
                     and over to you, (David).

(David Kolb):   Thank you, Ozan. Thanks for getting us set up this morning. So by way of
                     beginning, we've had about 31 people signed up for this timeslot and we have
                     another timeslot later today that I'm guessing other people are going to move

into. What's nice about having about nine or ten on the call is it gives us a bit more room for discussion.

So the webinar today is called Moving the Conversation, Consensus Building. I'd like to say a little bit about the evolution of, you know, why we came up with this topic and why we're doing this webinar and then also how we're going to do the webinar.

So we have - we blocked out two hours for this. We probably won't go that long but we won't - we definitely won't go any longer than that. So what it depends on is your participation in the webinar and how much you want to ask questions and discussion, and we'll be using some different tools for the webinar too.

So part of it will just be asking questions and having people contribute their responses and then we also be using polling so we'll get a strength of opinion on various questions to see where people fall, and then also we'll use a whiteboard tool as well. And then we'll introduce each of those as we come upon them as we move through the slides.

So the way this came about is back in I think it was last year there was a request for capacity-building for NCSG to ICANN Org of putting together some content and material around how we can be more effective in our participation as the voices of civil society in ICANN. And in talking with Farzaneh and others, we came up with really a series of three events.

So one event was our face-to-face meeting in Panama. I see a few names on the roll of people that were in Panama. So we did a one-day program together and the emphasis of that program was to really talk about a bit on consensus and influence, listening effectively and some general topics around handling

conflict and difficult conversations. But what we found is we didn't really do a deeper dive on how do we participate in that consensus dialogue and how do we get better at influencing and negotiating.

So the topic for the two webinars we're going to do for today we'll be focusing on consensus building, and this isn't a how-to ICANN building consensus, this is more of looking at practices of consensus in general and applying those to the NCSG environment.

And then the next webinar that will be done sometime in October we'll be looking at influence and negotiation, so how do we influence people in a way when we don't really have authority over them in some way, so, and how do we negotiate and how do we determine currencies. But that will be the topic ongoing. Also that topic will shift a bit as we get feedback from the webinars today of what will be a next step or, you know, what more would you like to do. So we'll talk about that toward the end of the webinar.

So the way that I got involved with the webinar is - so I work with a company called Incite Learning, and we'll an international professional development and leadership firm. We've been working with ICANN since 2013 in various capacities, and so we began working with ICANN Org teaching facilitation skills, just how to be effective in conversations, both internally and with the community and with mixed groups in, you know, various situations.

And then we began working with the community the following year with the Buenos Aires meeting and really looking at what has come to be called the leadership program. And although it's housed in and hosted in the At Large constituency, people from across ICANN, you know, joined that program, and I'm sure some of you have been through that. So.

But additionally from the leadership program, we've done work with GNSO and ccNSO and obviously ICANN Org and have, you know, actually been to about six or seven different ICANN meetings. So the biggest challenge as an outsider to the ICANN Org and ICANN community is just learning what ICANN is and how it works. So we've had a great deep dive into ICANN and feel pretty comfortable.

So as we discuss today when you, you know, use acronyms and things like that, if they're commonly used acronyms, you know, please just say those. If they're a little bit - if you're not quite sure if people know what that acronym might mean, if you will just say what that means. That'll just be helpful to other people on the call.

So that's by way of introduction. So let's get started on this. So the agenda we'll be looking at this morning -- I say this morning because it's morning for me -- is we'll begin with an overview of consensus building and how do we really begin thinking about our position in a consensus-building process in a ICANN discussion and then what gets in the way of that, and then how do we really participate and conduct ourselves, you know, within, you know, I'm thinking within both, say, a working group discussion but also a PDP that we might be involved in as part of a working group.

So although we're not talking about writing and being effective in writing, I think some of the things that we'll talk about will transfer over into that medium as well. And then we'll look at virtual interaction in terms of how to run calls effectively.

Now I realize that a lot of you are not necessarily running calls or leading the group. So when I talk about, you know, doing something on the call or doing something in the discussion, don't think that you have to be the designated

leader in order to enact those behaviors. You may easily, as a participant and just as an effective group member, participate and help the leader or help those that are in charge of the call get more effective as well just by doing things in the background and by, you know, making clear, concise statements.

So let's keep moving. So starting out - well actually, let me just ask a question to open us up here a little bit. So when you think about the ICANN interactions you had, whether face to face, on calls, or in Adobe Connect in different meetings or writing in comments, what is it that you find challenging? I mean as the voice of civil society what are you finding that's challenging you that's inspired you to sign up for this webinar or if you were in Panama to attend that session? So talk to me a little bit about, you know, what some of your thoughts and then we'll go from that.

I see a hand up. Claire, you want to begin?

Claire Craig: Hello?

David Kolb: I can barely hear you if you're speaking. Okay that's better.

Claire Craig: I find though because I am relatively new to NCSG and NCUC and so I'm a little bit intimated by some of the discussions in the chat because it seems as if, you know, people are very confident in putting across your position or your opinion because it could be very - misinterpreted or not taken in the right light. So I felt that if I joined this session I might be able to build up that confidence so that I will feel a lot more empowered to contribute to the chat.

David Kolb: Okay. So if I can read that back, in case people were having trouble hearing that, it's really feeling a bit reluctant to speak up or to put your voice forward, just needing more confidence, wanting to be clear, wanting to be concise, so

really looking for how can I feel more confident about doing that, how can I have a better voice.

Claire Craig: Exactly. And I forgot to say my name is Claire Craig for the recording.

David Kolb: Thank you. Others? And if you think you're having trouble with your audio, I see Benedetta just typed into the chat that you're welcome to type it into the chat as well.

Okay for sake of time let's keep moving then. So the slide I have up is looking at the core tasks of consensus building, so thinking about being in a discussion or being involved in a process -- and I know I'm clarifying a bit when I say that just because ICANN really does have you involved in a lot of different methods of communication in this consensus process.

It's an interesting organization and frankly in my work with corporate non-profit government clients, it's like a combination of all of the above, you know? You do have this extensive policymaking process like a government entity and then you also have the ability to contribute verbally over a period of time and be in advisory and working groups. So it's an unusual organization, especially in the fact that it is this grassroots consensus-led effort to create effective decisions to keep the Internet and a free and open space.

And I think that NCSG, NPOC, NCUC all have even a larger challenge as the voice of civil society to try to bring in just what is that point of view, what is that position of the, you know, everyday person or the non-profit user or the non-government entity or non-business entity user.

So let's look at some of the tasks, thinking about, you know, what we need to do to be effective in a consensus-building process. And again, think about this

in terms of being an effective participant versus having, you know, being in charge of the group too. So some of the statements may be framed that way but let's think about them in different ways.

So just reading down the list: the check for representation and effective participation of key stakeholders. And what I mean by this is who needs to be participating in this discussion? One of the things you can do to increase your effectiveness, even if it's not you speaking directly, is looking around the room if you're face to face and looking at the people on the call and getting familiar with who expresses well, who has a strength of opinion, who has good expertise in the area that you're trying to contribute in and getting them involved in the process.

So if they're part of NCSG -- and I'll use that as the umbrella for all three groups -- you know, is making sure that the right people are being represented in some way. So - yes. So that's one key piece is are the right people in the room, if I can use that expression. The next thing then is what we're calling balancing advocacy with inquiry. So listening is a key skill with any kind of communication but it's even more important in the ICANN environment.

And I know it sounds a bit counterintuitive with what Claire just share for example of, you know, I want to be a better advocate, I want to be better in terms of discussion but listening becomes a part of that discussion too because one of the things that I learned as I was doing research on designing this content for you is I talked to other constituencies and I talked to GNSO Council members and I talked to others, you know, that I have met and learned about in ICANN, some of the what I'll call the old-timers, if I can use that expression, who've been around ICANN for a long time and I said, "So when you think about the voice of civil society, you think about NCSG and

their involvement with GNSO, what kinds of things come to mind that make them effective or ineffective?"

And on the ineffective part it was fascinating. They said, you know, they don't really like to listen that much. They like to, you know, jump into a conversation, they'll put their point forward and then keep persisting on it but I don't feel like they're listening. So.

And what I interpreted, because I think about it from a behavioral standpoint and not from making a judgment about people, and what I find is that it's not - the behavior that's missing is before I make a statement is really trying to inquire to understand what the others' point of view is and appreciating that point of view, acknowledging it -- not agreeing with it. You're just acknowledging that point of view.

This expression of balancing inquiry, I'm really trying to understand your point of view, with advocacy creates more of that two-way communication. So I think the takeaway on that point is to, you know, in any given conversation where you're trying to make a statement, you know, within a phone call, within a face to face, is to spend some time expressing what it is you understand to be the other positions in the room or to be what's been discussed so far, so you can show how you're building on that or showing how you're connecting to that in some way.

The next thing then is suspending your agenda, and I really kind of just talked about that. So you have a point of view - and suspending your agenda, I don't mean giving up your agenda or, you know, disagreeing with yourself in some way, but just putting it aside so you can be more effective in a conversation or in a dialogue so you can be open to hearing that other point of view that we just talked about.

The respect confidentiality and private communications, you know, I think that in any kind of working group outcome and also within the policy development process, there's both a formal and an informal interaction. So the formal interaction is contributing, you know, making for the public comments, you know, being in the work group, being an effective team member, but the informal conversations then are things that happen behind the scenes.

It's a discussion that you may have outside the room, both physically and metaphorically with someone and respecting the confidentiality of that discussion, and the privacy of that communication goes a long way toward building trust, you know, with the group that you're working with if you're involved in a working group for example.

Second - the next piece then is clarifying how decisions will be made and by whom. This is a great thing for many people and if you've got a large group that's involved in a process, it's okay to ask that question to say, "So talk to me about how decisions are going to get made and by whom and how it's going to be taken forward." So playing the I'll almost call it the child role, you know, of, you know, even though I've been in this process but for this particular group, tell me how, you know, how we're going to decide how to decide.

And consensus building is this great large umbrella topic but for some things when you can to an impasse, you know, how do we try to get past an impasse? Are we going to operate in good faith? You know, those kinds of things and just clarifying what that structure is.

And then the other thing that you can contribute too is just really helping to structure a fair process, you know, so even though you might not have authority, you ask good questions about that. So an example might be so how

do we avoid, you know, what's commonly called in the ICANN world consensus by exhaustion, you know, where people are just pushing their point of view so hard and so long, they hope to wear everybody down and then finally get their way. So, you know, that's kind of looking at that.

So I see a hand up. Let me have your question. (Nadira)?

Nadira Al-Araj: Yes. Hi, (David). Nice seeing you here. My question regarding the suspending of the agenda, I'm with you, like giving the priority of the going on discussion before moving to the next step of the agenda. But if you are a member of a team where the chair or the co-chair of the meeting is the one who's pushing the agenda, how will we handle that aspect?

Because I mean a member like they usually the chair have to respect them and kind of respect because they are just wanted to achieve the agenda until it's over and just kind of - they are kind of - they are graded in a way that oh we are committed to the agenda exactly that sometimes it's like - it goes like this way. So what is your opinion about that? Thank you.

David Kolb: Thank you. So two things with that. So, one, there's a literal - so there's kind of two definitions of agenda here. So one is we have an agenda that we're trying to move through, and you're absolutely right, we need to stay with the agenda that we design. And we get a little bit deeper into this. We'll talk about what - staying on track and not getting off track of the actual agenda that we're trying to move on.

In this context too, and I'm sorry because it's kind of a jargon term of suspending your agenda, you know, agenda here is your position, so for an individual or for, you know, the group of setting aside my position, my opinion so I can actually hear yours. So in this context when I say suspend

your agenda that's my intention with it of just being able to set aside my point of view momentarily so I can hear your point of view, acknowledge that and then bring my point of view or align it or connect it into yours. So I didn't mean it as staying on track, you know, for a meeting for example.

But I think it brings up an interesting point, which is that as a chair or a co-chair, you if you keep getting pulled off of the agenda into an area, that is something to look at because maybe there's something important that needs to be discussed before people can move on, you know, in the next agenda for that meeting or in the agenda for the next meeting as well.

So don't - there's an old facilitation tool called the parking lot that many of you are probably familiar with. It's like let's just put that in the parking lot and we'll come back to it. And as a friend of mine once said is to make sure that you actually do go back to the parking lot and it doesn't turn into a graveyard where people contribute an idea and you put aside but you never come back to it again.

Claire, I see your hand up. Question?

Claire Craig: If you suspend your agenda from a personal perspective, are you talking more compromise, you know, is there a need for you to compromise in situations and then if you find that you continually have to be compromising, how do you (unintelligible) that?

David Kolb: So what Claire said, in case you had any trouble hearing, is so if I suspend my agenda then, am I talking about compromising in some way. And here I'm not talking about compromising yet. We will talk about compromise as we get a little bit deeper into it and definitely we'll talk about it more on the next webinar, negotiation.

But when you suspend your agenda here it's just really being able - it's being open to someone's point of view. It doesn't mean you're agreeing with it, it just means you're acknowledging it. So you're not reducing your position or compromising your position at all.

You're just trying to put it on hold a bit because what happens with me, and it probably happens with you, or it happens with all of us, is as we're listening to somebody, many times we're thinking about the next thing that we're going to say because if we're - especially if we're having a discussion, or dare I say an argument about, you know, your position doesn't match my position, then, you know, I can't really see what you're trying to say because I have this filter of the position that I'm looking through.

So in this context what we're trying to say is really trying to think about, you know, what is the other person trying to say, what is that other point of view. And sometimes it's going to be obvious but just acknowledging that helps it not being repeated over and over again. So. I hope that answers the question.

Benedetta, I see your hand up.

Benedetta Rossi: Thanks, (David). This is Benedetta Rossi speaking for the transcript. I just wanted to flag that Pascal Bekono on the chat asked to this list you can also add clearly defined participants' expectations. I just wanted to capture that for the record.

David Kolb: Oh good. So, Pascal, I'm assuming that what you mean by that looking at the core tasks, I have what else specific to ICANN process should be on the list. So. And that's my next question, so a great intro. Thanks for that. So clearly defined participant expectations, yes. I think that's great. And also I'd add to

that clearly defining what role people are intending to play in the discussion, so getting some interesting - you know, getting some background of, you know, what is their position and what role are they trying to play in the whole process.

And that brings me to this question actually. So thinking about the ICANN environment, this question at the bottom of this slide, so what else should be on the list? You know, check for representation, balancing listening and asserting, clarifying how decisions are made and helping to structure implement of fair process.

So you see the tool just came up. It's our whiteboard. Ozan, why don't you tell us a little bit about how to use the whiteboard?

Ozan Sahin: Thank you, (David). Hi everyone. This is Ozan again for the transcript. So now we can see a whiteboard on the last - left top of your screen. In order to use it, you need to go to the black pane and click on the T icon, which stands for text, and after that you need to click anywhere on the whiteboard and then you can type your inputs. And once you're done, in order to make your input visible to everyone in this call, you need to click again somewhere on the whiteboard. Thank you. Over back to you, (David).

David Kolb: (Unintelligible). Thank you. And I put up here's an example. Yes, so just take a minute or so to think about what else should be on the list that's not there that you can think of. So, you know, Pascal had mentioned clarifying or clearly defining participant expectations. So what else? And, Pascal, if you will, go ahead and type that on to the whiteboard and that way we'll capture that because we want to capture these whiteboards for future use too.

I know everyone is visibly typing at this point. Ozan, we need some whiteboard music to go in the background but don't try to do that. I just added that at the same time. So anything else you can think of? I'll give it another 30 seconds or so and we'll move through.

Benedetta just typed into the chat, "Let us know if you're having trouble using the whiteboard."

Oh nice. So what tracking mechanisms are used for tasks. I like that. For sake of time let's keep moving through our content here. So, Ozan, if you want to take that whiteboard down and we'll come - we may come back to that later if we have time but if not we'll use this as an ongoing building strategy for example for adding to that slide on, you know, what's going to - what's expected.

Let's move into another tool here. So the next tool here is position assessment. For some reason I know that on the board here, the slide that - there we go. You can read that now. So essentially position assessment we have two slides on this. So this one of who has - well I won't read it down. And then our second slide, you know, has more points. So let's start with this first slide.

So when I think about a consensus position assessment, this is also sometimes called a conflict assessment. It's really trying to get into the other person's world and think about -- or the other group's world, if you will -- to think about what is their position, you know, what and why and what is it that they're bringing to the table or why is it so could be I'll use the expression dug in on a position of just thinking about, you know, what are the different positions in the room?

Because you may be involved in a working group where you've got varying positions within your own community of NCSG, NPOC, NCUC but then also then you have the positions coming in in the various representatives from GNSO as well as part of the policymaking decision process. So a position assessment is a way to think about, you know, how do we want to deal with those positions.

And I think something that would be helpful to NCUC - or not NCUC but NCSG -- see I stumble on the acronyms as well sometimes -- is what is our voice on this particular topic? You know, when we think about privacy, when we think about underserved populations, when we think about, you know, intellectual property rights, you know, what is our voice as one on this?

One of the things I heard about in Panama when we were face to face for the day was that we don't -- and this isn't across the board but on some of these topic areas -- we have a lot of arguments occurring internally on our different positions where we when want to take it external from NCSG into the civil society sphere, we have a hard time coming up with one voice to push forward and therefore our message gets lost.

So a position assessment is a great way to sit back and reflect a bit as a group, as an individual of, you know, trying to figure out where others are coming from, which will help you formulate more about how to best work with them. So let's look at this list a bit.

So who has a stake in the process? You know, so when you think about being in a meeting a lot of times it's easy to say, "Okay, yes I see, you know, GNSO, I see, you know, business owners, I see some of these, you know, members, they definitely have a stake in this because they'd like to have access to the data." I think about, you know, a scenario that we'll take a look at. So I think

about law enforcement, who wants to be able to access a lot of data across the board, but what's the privacy rights of the individual here that we're trying to represent. So who has a stake in the process?

What issues are important to the stakeholders? So where - you know, what is it that beyond their positions, what are the issues that are driving some of their opinions, determining whether or not it makes good sense to proceed given the known constraint.

So sometimes, you know, you do have to ask the question of like okay is this the fight that we really want to have? Do we want to put a lot of energy into this because there may be something else that can be, you know, where ground can be gained, you know, where we can win, you know, if we really put our energy over here? So do we want to make our stand with this particular thing or do we want to go somewhere else just given the constraints that we may have and the situation?

I'm not saying give it up, I'm just saying kind of prioritize, you know, what are the arguments that you - you know, what are the positions that you want to make? Then determine circumstances in which parties will agree to participate. So think about what are the conditions that need to be present in order to get agreement to make things happen.

Let's move to the second slide. It's actually a continuation. So then identify essential participants, you know, the obvious stakeholders with an interest as well as others who can represent those interests. So again you don't necessarily have to be in a leadership role here but think about within your own position and your own topic areas that you're trying to express, you know, am I the one that can put this across in the strongest way possible or is

there someone else that I might try to bring into this discussion so I'm creating a bigger voice?

You know, to Claire's point earlier, I believe it was Claire, that said, you know, I really would like to feel more confident in expressing myself, you know, in these meetings, you know, so it wouldn't it be nice to have someone else with you to help express that too or have someone where you feel like there's a larger voice behind you so it isn't just one, you know, one voice in a large crowd. So what is the one voice that we can bring forward, what are the older stakeholders that we could bring forward?

And then the secondary, the next bullet point here, so identify secondary participants suggested by central participants. So essentially as you start to talk to people and thinking about consensus building in general, is I start to think about who has a stake in the process, who would be best to, you know, be voicing this position for us. They may have other people they would suggest as well, what we'll call secondary participants.

And then, you know, you may want to take this what I'm calling a position assessment, and here I have it as a conflict assessment, and taking those to the conveners, taking that to the chair or taking that to your chair and your group members to say, "Okay, am I on track with how I've made an assessment of this?" You know, am I thinking about this the right way or are we thinking about this the right way?

And this helps you create what your voice is going to be on this particular topic area that you're working in to avoid some of that it sounds like we're getting a mixed message in terms of what NCSG wants, you know, in this particular PDP.

So questions on position assessment? Okay. Let's move on. So I wanted to play with this a little bit. Joan, I'm sorry. I see your hand up.

Joan Kerr: Great. Can you hear me?

(David Kolb):   I can.

Joan Kerr: Hello? Oh great. Good morning everyone. I'm going back to the other slide. Part of what my observation in ICANN as a whole is this word of multi-stakeholder, using that word because it almost gives a messaging that you come in having already with a stake and there's a other side of it that we use the term ICANN ecosystem.

So we sometimes forget that it is an ecosystem and so I find, in our constituency anyway, I try to think of the ecosystem how will things work but then there's this whole thing that, you know, you have a stake in it and you have to have your position and, you know, and so it become sort of almost like in itself a conflict because I tend to think of the big picture but then you have also have to think about that stake.

So I find that the concept of multi-stakeholder is a good one. Obviously it means participation by many groups but the stakeholder means that I come in already with my concept, with my beliefs and so the whole sort of ecosystem then gets in conflict and gets split. I just kind of want to make that comment.

And I think that's part of the conflict that happens that everyone thinks that, "Oh, I'm here for my stake" and then the conflict between civil society and business ends up happening because (unintelligible) you know, overall rights perhaps, and maybe that's an assumption as well, and business is thinking how can we do all of things. So it becomes a conflict. That's all I'm saying. It's just

the word stake and multi-stakeholder I think gives an impression that you're at the table to defend your stake.

(David Kolb): Thank you, Joan. I appreciate that. Also let me add to that a little bit too. So when you mention the ICANN ecosystem, when you think about a systemic environment and you think about a system, I always think of the classic example of the spider web, you know? If I touch a spider web over here, the ripple effect is going to occur around the entire web. So the whole system gets impacted when I touch it here.

So if I've got a stake in that process and I voice that, you know, that has an impact on the system, whether minor or major, and if we want to make even a larger impact on that system, having a unified voice or a unified stake in some way within our own community is going to be a louder, more clear position on something. But you're absolutely right, it kind of sets up just using the word stakeholder, you know, as a I've got a stake in this and so…

You know, another way to think about that is, you know, what's the relative value of that stake? You know, to me it has a very high value. To you it may night. You know? To a business person, that voice of civil society may somehow get in the way of the stake that I have. So, you know, how do I work with that, how do I do that better?

Farzaneh, good morning. Or yes, good morning for you. So jump in.

Farzaneh Badii: Thank you, (David). Good morning. So I just wanted to add that in ICANN we are stakeholders and have established positions and, based on those interests, we have our stakeholders and constituencies at GNSO. And I'm only talking about GNSO. ALAC is something else.

So basically what we do is that - and definitely we are advancing our interests at ICANN. We are trying to infuse our values into the ICANN policymaking processes and this is why - but, (David), if you heard and has been telling us how we can do that in a more effective way so that we can come to consensus when we have like clash of stake or clash of interests with business and how to ally with the more like minded and how we pick our battles.

So I think that we are stakeholders but it does not really take us away from coming to consensus. And on multiple occasions we have worked with people who have other interests at multiple times conflict with our interests and our stake. But for example if you look at ICANN's ability of ICANN as a whole or groups that look at ICANN governance, then you not - then a lot of the stakeholders and the constituencies have similar ideas about how our mission for example.

Most of the (unintelligible) representative stakeholders in ICANN wanted IANA transition and wanted it more accountable. So there are like - but yes of course, we have interests, we have a set of values and it clashes with other stakeholders and groups and we are here to learn how to come to consensus, advance our interests but at the same time not to crash and die. Thank you.

(David Kolb):   I like how you closed that out, not to crash and die. The expression I use sometimes is making the decision of is this the ditch I want to die in. You know, is this the battle I want to have right now or is there something, you know, more appropriate that we can have a discussion about?

So let's keep moving. I realize, you know, we're about five slides in of about 30 slides and, you know, we're almost at the top of our first hour here. So I have a scenario here, and what I wanted to do was try to do some thinking

about position assessment when we think about this scenario. And with just 11 people on the call, it's great because we can have a discussion about this.

So read down through this scenario, and I'll just read it out loud if someone's on the call that can't see slides. So at NCSG we wanted to stop trademark overreach in domain name policy. Trademark lawyers always want easier access to domain name registrants' personal data. We also don't want ICANN to be the content regulator, while the IP group does want that. With these two things in mind, you have joined a group to write policy to address these concerns.

So here's the scenario. So you've joined this group. You want to show that Whois personal data gets used for legal actions and also for the prosecution of innocent people in an undemocratic process. So you're meeting with the law enforcement community members to discuss how the document could be worded to address your concerns. You believe that law enforcement needs legitimate reasons to access personal data and you have concerns regarding blanket access of law enforcement globally.

So if we go back to our position assessment, this slide of, you know, who has a stake in the process, what issues are important to these stakeholders, determining if it makes sense to proceed given the constraints, let's focus on this page versus this page, which is kind of identifying people. But on this first page think about that scenario and then think about some of these points to say, "Hm, you know, what are some of the things that we need to consider if we were doing a position assessment on this particular scenario?"

So I'll bring up the scenario again that you can take a look at, and just contribute, you know, just let's just do this. We don't need the whiteboard. Actually, Ozan, if you will let's pull up a whiteboard on this. That might be

easier for some people to type as were looking at that tool before. And if you've got something to say, just raise your hand and we'll go from there. And you can just title this Position Assessment Scenario.

So in that scenario, who has a stake in the process? Let's just get started with that?

Man: (Unintelligible).

(David Kolb):   Is that background noise? Yes, that's just background noise?

Man: (Unintelligible).

(David Cobb):   Just to speak with - this just came from the chat. Make sure that your lines are muted. We're getting a background conversation in this.

So obviously on the scenario, you know, one stakeholder is going to be law enforcement and then the other stakeholder is going to be yourself. I mean that's pretty straightforward. So what are the issues that are important to law enforcement? What is it that law enforcement? What's their stake in this? If we set aside our agenda, what's going on? I'll go back to the scenario here.

Benedetta?

Benedetta Rossi: Thank you, (David). I just wanted to reinforce for the group that the purpose of the webinar, as (David) was saying at the beginning of the webinar, and some of you might have missed it and joined late, is really to make this as interactive as possible, so as a follow up to the face to face that took place in Panama. I know not everybody could obviously attend that.

So it'd be great if as much as possible you could use the tools provided, such as the whiteboard, later you will see some polls, to make sure that once we create the ICANN learn course out of this - including this webinar, we get the maximum experience following the additional budget request process, where this specific webinar and course actually came out from.

So I appreciate all of those who have spoken so far but please do try and use the whiteboard. And if you have issues, obviously just please put your hand up or write it in the chat and we'll help you type it in. Thank you. This is not intended to be just a lecture on (David)'s behalf was the point I was making. So please do participate as much as you can. Thank you.

(David Kolb): So if there are no questions around position assessment, it sounds like - I'm going to make the assumption that silence is compliance in that everybody understands what this is. You know, I'll keep moving through the moving content if I'm not seeing hands up or anything on the whiteboard. Ozan, go ahead and take down that whiteboard. Let's keep moving here.

So the - if I go back one slide. So if we think about the essential participants and the secondary participants, just to get clear on this because this next slide builds off of that, so one of the things that you can do to be effective in the group is again making sure that the right people are in the room, and I mean physically as well as just being involved in the process is a probably a better way to put it.

You know, so who is needed to make the process credible? So to the point that was made earlier about having confidence in speaking, you know, and having my voice, so who else do we need in here to even give this more credibility, who can we bring in, maybe even outside of NCSG or getting new membership to NCSG, to make this even a more credible process in the eyes

of those that, you know, have other points of view that might be in disagreement with ours?

So then meeting with individual groups if needed. So thinking about when I mentioned before the side conversations or the informal process of honoring those communications, this point really is around having those communications. So outside the process, who do I need to talk to? So if I'm on a call, if I'm in a meeting and I have a particularly - I think someone really wasn't understanding me, they were misinterpreting what I was saying, is coming outside of that group and having that conversation to clarify things so that our next discussion might not be as adversarial as the first discussion was.

Claire, I see your hand up. Question or comment?

Claire Craig: I'll take a stab and I will say that probably we need to hear from the registrars who are the ones who are (unintelligible) as well as we would want to hear from participants (unintelligible) you want to know from (unintelligible).

(David Kolb): Claire, if you could say that one more time. I could hardly hear you on that and I'm not sure if others are having trouble hearing you or not.

Claire Craig: Okay I said I would take a stab at this and say that there are two particular stakeholders that you would want to hear from. Those are possibly the registrar who sells the domain as well as persons who purchase domains or owners of domains. So those are two stakeholders that I think need to be (unintelligible) in this.

(David Kolb): Thank you okay. And that's referring back to the scenario that you were just talking about?

Claire Craig: (Unintelligible), you see how the (unintelligible), you know, who are the persons who needs to be consulted in coming up with a position.

(David Kolb): Right thank you, right. And obviously, you know, it will vary. The context changes each time, you know. So but it is important to think about who does need to be involved in the process and I don't want to just, you know, keep driving on that. But I think it's just important to make sure that the voice is unified in a way with the people that are most credible. And then, you know, the third point on here is using proxies for hard to represent groups.

So if you're especially with civil society where you're working with developing countries where the voice isn't as loud and clear or they have trouble getting, you know, they can't get to a ICANN meeting is how do we get their opinion, their view recognized in some way, and then proxies may be I'm here to represent X, you know, I've their proxy in this decision-making process. And then identifying alternative representatives. So just, you know, who are the people that we can use if the others aren't available that we think are important to the process? But just making sure that all relevant points of view are included, you know, is going to be a great way to think about how do we unify our voice on things - on something.

So the - I want to talk a little bit of about what leads to positions because I think this is where we get bogged down many times is, you know, we have a position on something but basically what drives that position and I think this diagram is helpful. So, you know, so think of something that you have a position on. So think of something that you may be either actively involved in or something that, you know, within the ICANN context you'd like to be involved in because you have if I can borrow, you know, (Joe) you've got a stake, yes you've got a position on this. So what creates a position is if you so if you think about what that position is that you have and the next layer down

is what are the issues that you have seen or that you're seeing that are driving that position, you know, so what's the population that's getting marginalized in some way, what are the human rights that are getting violated or are in jeopardy of getting violated, you know, that are leading to this position?

And the next layer down is we have these interests that lead to the issues going on our radar. You know, so we have these personal interests in areas of I'll use remember the same areas, intellectual property, privacy, marginalized populations. You know, we've got these interests then and so those issues when they come up they're definitely visible to us. They're definitely on the radar which leads us to a position for this particular policy which may be in process. And then underlying all of that is this basic value set.

Now you think that essentially if I'm a member of NCSG, NPOC, NCUC that we probably have some common values around civil society yet and we probably have some differing values too. But when you think about your position on something and I'll think about it from two points of view, so when you think about your own position in something it's helpful to delayer this a bit. So what's driving my position? What are the issues that are driving that position? What are the interests that are making those issues more visible to me and then what's the basic value set that I hold that makes this very important to me in some way because when you get into a value discussion this is so fundamental to our nature if we want to behave our values it's really our goal in life and kind of our purpose is behaving our values. So, you know, trying to get down to what's the value that's driving this for yourself is helpful because that allows you to start to observe the other party to see what's driving their position.

So they have a position in this – but I can't think of something off the top of my head but, you know, law enforcement for example in the scenario that we

were talking about. And jump in if I'm, you know, going off track here because it's not my - necessarily my area of expertise for that particular scenario. But our position is we want to be able to access Whois data so we can find out who's driving these Web sites, who's owning these sites that are, you know, causing whatever the crime might be or whatever the risk may be to others. So the issues then that are driving the positions are, you know, these out of control Web sites or these Web sites that we can't find out who the perpetrators are. So the interest then obviously is having the access so we can build the cases so we can prosecute on things that are illegal, you know, that are happening on the Internet with the value set being we're trying to do the right thing, we're trying to protect people. But then that becomes, you know, there's all sorts of side topics that come into that, you know, from a privacy or from an intellectual property view, but especially a privacy view on this. So being able to build up to see what creates the position this is a great diagram to use for that.

And if you have questions along the way just raise your hand. I want to move some of this as we come into our second hour here. So what gets in the way, you know? So what are some of the barriers that you experience at ICANN? Let's just talk about some of the things that get in the way of getting to a decision in getting to consensus. You know, one is, you know, we've always done it this way. There's institutions that within ICANN this is the process that we've always used. And it's a good process by the way in terms of trying to get to something by consensus.

Within the constituencies I think of GNSO and I think of some of the members of the, you know, GNSO of, you know, they have – they're coming in with even though it's an individual position I come in representing X company. You know, and we might be a registry or a registrar and it's important for us to, you know, kind of do things we've always done or within

ICANN this is the way we've always had gotten decisions made so we'll continue to do that.

Deadlock, you know, we just can't agree on anything. You know, I'm so dug into my position and it seems like you're so dug into yours that we really just can't have a discussion on that. Escalation positional bargaining, you know, it becomes personal and it's more transactional versus trying to get to something there's not a commitment to do that. Communication and not connecting or listening there's no trust in complexity, just overwhelmed by all the layers of it. And you can imagine coming into ICANN for your first time as a NCSG member and looking at all the layers that go into a policy development process that may go on for a year or two years that is a level of complexity that's interesting. And then there's this ambiguity too of just it's just unclear as to what the process is or, you know, how, you know, we, you know, get in our own way.

So Ozan if we can do a whiteboard on this so what barriers do you experience at ICANN? So when you think about, you know, what gets in the way of getting to consensus what are some of the barriers that you experience that may be helpful for all of us to be aware of for those that haven't encountered them or those that encountered them repeatedly? So take a few minutes and put some things up on the whiteboard. Ozan I see your hand up. Did you want to say something?

Ozan Sahin: Thank you (David). Yes this is Ozan speaking for the transcript. As participants think about their comments to put on the whiteboard I'd like to remind everyone to how to use the whiteboard again. It's actually written in the housekeeping rules part of the agenda & housekeeping rules pod. So let me read that out. Back on the white board please click T which stands for text on the black toolbar and then click anywhere on the whiteboard. After typing

your input please click anywhere on the whiteboard again to make it visible to everyone. Thank you.

(David Cobb):   Thank you. And Farzeneh I see your question in the chat. I'll bring that back up. We'll do a separate whiteboard on that. So let's cover the barriers off first then we'll come back to something. The language barrier, absolutely. Yes it's hard to find common ground when it feels like the divisions are so oppositional or so polarized. It's (unintelligible), it's really yes it's excellent. It requires a lot of energy to participate. It absolutely does.

I see how exhausted people are at the end of a meeting and I can imagine the exhaustion for someone that's dialing in to a four day meeting constantly to try to be part of that process too. And by the way it's a volunteer position so it's not like you're getting any kind of value back other than the satisfaction of your voice being heard or a position moving forward. So inclusivity in terms of limited knowledge around the complexity of topics and issues being discussed.

So I'm assuming from that comment it's about feeling a bit - could be feeling diminished in your, the strength of your point of view in the larger discussion or in the complexity of everything that the voice gets lost. Time zones, absolutely. But these are some great comments in terms of what gets in the way of full participation. So I'm going to keep moving. We'll capture this whiteboard and we'll keep adding to that as well. Farzeneh had asked a question before of which was basically so what are the values of NCSG members? Ozan if we can create another whiteboard. I just saw something else come up for Eastern countries.

Thank you. For Eastern countries we need to know what ICANN is first. Nice yes, yes just kind of getting in the countries where ICANN is not as widely

known, what is this organization and what is its actual purpose? Thanks for those.

Ozan go to the what are the values of NCSG? And let me go back to that diagram. So I think that this is a good question. Let's just spend a few minutes on this. So just again whiteboard type on the T type your responses and then just hit anywhere on the whiteboard and it will post. So what do you think are the core values of NCSG that are driving some of these interests that create these, they get those issues on the radar and create these positions? There's got to be some values folks, come on? Are there any stated values? (Unintelligible)

So to finish my comment is are there any stated values to NCSG? I didn't come across any on the Web site that I haven't done. You know, I wasn't looking for that in particular. So when I joined this group I know that the common values might be X or Y, and if not that might be something to do. So the comment that was just typed in is understanding the subject and reacting within the time limits that is expected. Is that to the things that get in the way, the barriers whiteboard or are you considering that a value? I thought it might be. No words. We'll add that into the barrier whiteboard.

Okay let's keep moving. It seems like there's not as much interest around this particular question. So let's take down the white boards and we're going to move into our first poll. And so as we look at the, this slide so culture is - so consensus considerations, society, so social and cultural issues, economic issues, historic issues, procedural issues and PDP language issues. And language issues came up as a barrier.

When you look at this list of issues, you know, in terms of consensus I want to take a poll in how, you know, where you see these. And the poll's going to be

structured -- Ozan will tell us about it -- but it's going to be a multiple choice. So when you think about this, you know, what are the more prevalent issues in the consensus process that you see within ICANN? I'd like to see what a strength of opinion is around that. So Ozan you want to tell us a little bit about how to use the poll?

Ozan Sahin: Thank you David. This is Ozan speaking and you will now see a poll question the right bottom corner of your screen so it's very easy to use. Just click on the round circle to the appropriate choice and we'll give you some time to pick your choice and then I can broadcast the results. Thank you.

(David Cobb): Thank you. And sometime in this context is about I don't know 45 seconds. Okay we have five out of nine results so far. We'll give you another 10 seconds on it in case someone hasn't voted in. While were finishing up the pole I see the chat from (Pascal) there's a question, not a question but, you know, can we say that NCSG values is to defend the interest of NCSG participants? And I say that could be a value but if you – if we're thinking about it from the point of view of NCSG participants is to me when I think about a value I'd say that that's an interest is to defend the position of NCSG participants but it's on the value is it basically that we value privacy, we value freedom of expression, we value freedom of speech, you know, and I would suggest that if that's the value set that's there that if I'm comparing that to GNSO if we come into the values of the people that are bringing in maybe a GNSO counselor, you know, they probably share some of those same values. So a lot of times we can have a value discussion around those – the relevant the common ground that we have when we talk somebody has suggested that one of the barriers is finding common ground. You know, if we can get down to that value discussion that may help us unlock some of those interests that lead to our positions.

So Ozan let's see what the poll looks like. It looks like we had six responses to the poll. I'm not seeing a visible result yet. I'm seeing 50% on social and cultural issues and 50% on procedural issues. Okay so three and three out of the six respondents.

So the things like so social and cultural and procedural issues being the things that get in the way. I can see where economic other than, you know, the economic issues it's just we don't have the ability to actually get to ICANN meetings and we're feeling underrepresented. Historic not as much, language definitely, so it seems like our consensus around consensus considerations is that social cultural issues and procedural issues within PDP, you know, are the two things that get in the way the most or not - the two things that we really need to take into consideration on those, not get in the way necessarily.

Yes let's keep moving. I want to cover some more material here. So for sake of time I'll just skip over this particular scenario because we're going to go back to looking at, you know, how do we use this in a ICANN context but based on kind of interaction that we're having? Let me just move into some more content as we move forward.

So the next piece here is thinking about so how do I conduct myself in the consensus dialogue? And this goes to some of the objectives that we talked about earlier in the conversation of, you know, as we get into these phone calls these writing processes or these faces, face to face considerations, you know, what's the mindset that I need to participate fully and effectively in the process? So the first thing is thinking, really maintaining a problem-solving orientation. You know, at one point I had pulled some ICANN just historical characters for lack of a better term some people that were very well-regarded in the ICANN community and had led in various constituencies when I was trying to learn about ICANN and I was also putting together a cheering skills

workshop. And I asked them, you know, I said so what's helpful and when you've seen successful chairs -- I'm going to transfer this to successful participants -- what's been helpful, you know, in - as a way to see things, as a way to frame your point of view on things?

And one of the comments that was made that I thought was fascinating was to think about it is, you know, it's not a problem, it's just a puzzle. So it's a problem to be solved but the word puzzle is a little bit less intense than problem. You know, when we think about having a problem, you know, there's an intensity to that. When we think about solving a puzzle there's more there's a curiosity to it. And I think maintaining this problem-solving orientation but thinking about it as solving a puzzle how do we put this next piece in? So I love that comment that was made and it led me to think about what are some of the points behind that.

So, you know, suspend your position so that you can understand the other positions. We talked about that. Act in the way that you want others to act no matter how they act. And what I mean by that is there is this, you know, participating and observing ICANN process and phone calls over the years I have seen people would just dig into their position and they will not back off of it. And I – and it's - I'm going to say something yes so I get that because in some of these for some of these people they're being paid to have that position and not to back off from that. And it's really difficult trying to figure out how to deal with that and I have no magic bullet on that, I have no magic way to think about how do we get them all positioned when they have incentive for maintaining that position? But for you though acting in a way that you want others to act no matter what the act is coming towards you now there is this karma piece to the whole thing of acting in a way that you've got good intentions.

Expressing concerns in an unconditionally constructive manner. So always trying to be constructive in the dialogue and not getting offended or getting defensive or getting judgmental and making it personal but trying to be constructive as you participate, you know, and as you try to solve the puzzle. Engage in active listening, we've talked about disagree without being disagreeable. I love the way that that statement rolls off is that I can disagree with you but it doesn't mean that I'm being disagreed, you know, I don't need to do that in a way where I'm just being disagreeable or stubborn or intractable but I could still disagree in a way that's constructive to the process.

And then finally be transparent. I mean there's been a lot of transparency in the past few years within ICANN, you know, within ICANN org as well as the community but just trying to make your thinking visible to someone. If you're trying to solve the puzzle, if you're trying to state your position just do that in a way that's transparent where you're not necessarily holding anything back. Now what I'm saying with that too is I don't mean be transparent in a way to increase understanding. Don't be overly transparent where you also give all of your concessions that may come up which we'll deal with more in negotiation but just being transparent to make your thinking visible to others.

The next thing in terms of participating in the process is asking questions. You know, what do we have, what do we want, how do we get there? So what do we have already, what's the mutual agreement that we have around a topic? What would we like to see, what's our ideal outcome, then how might we get there and then thinking about the solution in the future versus the past. So not how we've gotten here before. You might use that for context but trying to be more future focused than past oriented, you know, because unproductive this statement at the bottom I think is important, you know, it's unproductive to focus on what has happened in the past without trying to learn from it. You just become an expert at what did not go well. And so essentially you become

an expert at the problem, not necessarily an expert on what the solution might be or what that actual, you know, policy how, that might read in a way that includes your point of view.

The next piece then, and again this is all around participating in a consensus dialogue is developing options, you know, to get everyone involved, get everyone educated so when you're thinking about the options is everyone on the same page here? Does everyone have an understanding of what's going on?

And then whole group brainstorms, you know, options. So having the whole group brainstorm what the options may be. And this is something you can suggest as a participant. You don't have to be the chair or the co-chair of the process to suggest a larger discussion on what are all the possible options for us to move forward with as the policy that we're trying to develop or the resolution that we're trying to come to.

Task groups to develop recommendations for the whole group. So if you've got a whole group that can't come to a consensus, dividing them into smaller groups to develop recommendations for the whole group. And it may be that if we're overly – if we got overly represented populations in the whole group is creating a working group that's a sub piece of that group that can come up with recommendations representative to the whole group. Proposals or single text documents are prepared. This is all around developing options. Outside experts are consulted if need be on assistance for things and then interest groups develop proposals for the whole group, so really kind of thinking all about, you know, how can we get a more effective discussion? So for example in our Webinar this morning or this afternoon or this evening depending on your time zone having a group of eight contributing to the process versus a

group of 50, you know, there's much more chance that you'll be heard if you've got a question or a comment in the process.

The next thing I think is the thing that gets in the way of consensus discussions most of the time. And that's why I was really emphasizing the whole value of discussion in terms of what leads to positions is being aware of value differences. You know, so be careful when speaking about value differences. You know, they're serious but the way we talk about them can make problems worse.

If it sounds like I'm judging your fundamental value set I've lost you in the conversation right away because it's something that's integral to you, and something that sits at the core of you, you know, is this value set that you have. So being careful about making judgment about someone's values or making or having it seem that way the other person's important.

Creating ground rules to create a safe space. So as part of an initial let's say a working group that's convening for the first time or two is as a participant I can suggest so what are our ground rules to a point that I think that in fact (Ella) brought up before of, you know, what are the expectations of the people in the room? How can we be most effective with each other? So what are some ground rules that we can use to create space?

Suspend preconceptions about others and listen. So just whatever judgment you might have about that person, whatever interactions you've had with them before just framing it in your mind as maybe there's something to contribute here and I'm going to listen to this so I'm going to suspend my preconceptions.

Learn interest that underlie the issues. We've talked about that on the value slide. Acknowledge and recognize concession and effort. When someone makes a concession, someone had brought up before about this is not compromise but if someone compromises or someone makes a concession as part of this discussion to get us to consensus is, acknowledge that and appreciate that because, you know, I appreciate the fact that you gave that up. You know, I appreciate that, you know, acknowledging that there was a concession there.

Craft practical options that work for all parties and then create mutual gains not just poor compromise. So those two things I think are important of just what are the practical options that we could create that work for all parties? And one of the things when we talked about suspending your agenda before is that if you're part of this discussion this is a great time to put yours aside and really think about what's going on in the group and what's a practical option that we might use to move the conversation forward. And then creating mutual gains instead of poor compromise. You know, how do I express this in a way that's going to be a win win for people?

So any questions on participation at this point or thinking about how do we participate in the consensus dialogue? So what we covered in terms of conducting yourself is maintaining a problem-solving orientation, asking good questions, developing options, and being aware of value differences. Questions or comments on that?

Okay let's move on. So let's look at virtual interaction. A lot of work done within ICANN is virtual. You're on calls like this, you're looking at screens like this or you're just on a phone and you're trying to contribute. And I know that when I was initially working with ICANN I sat in on various calls with various constituencies and I was just amazed at, you know, there were actually

60 people on this call. And then when I went to my first meeting in Durban in I think it was 2500 people showed up for that meeting which I was told was kind of a small attendance for an ICANN meeting. I thought this is a beast to try to wrap your head around what this is. This is just amazing.

And so just kind of looking at that and saying how do we do this, how do we interact in a way that we actually do get policy done? And that's why I think the process is – tends to be a long process is to make sure that everyone that needs to have voice, wants to have voice, has voice. But a lot of this is virtual interaction.

So one of the things that I did is I really pulled people that do a lot of work in ICANN in the community and said so what's the best practice? When you think about the virtual interactions what's the best practice? And there's a couple of slides here on best practices when I synthesize the list that came up. So I'll just read through these briefly in case you're on a, just and audio. So and this was again this was derived the community so this isn't from any other research other than community members.

So be realistic about the amount of time it takes. I think where a lot of people get discouraged is they see that, you know, this is going to take how long to actually get this policy interaction that - I have that in bold because that came up from many, many people. Foster positive productive relationships with support staff. You know, there is this us and them mindset I see with ICANN org and ICANN community. And I see the best of intentions from both parties but somehow sometimes it's not met. I think it's gotten better in the most, you know, in the recent years but there was a time where it really felt like there was – it was almost an adversarial position where the community was saying well, you know, they're just trying to push us around or trying to manipulate us in some way and, you know, they should be serving at our pleasure. And

the staff was saying we're really just trying to facilitate the process try to make this effective but people get frustrated sometimes.

So just positive productive relationships with support staff, you know, because, you know, each of you are interconnected and are dependent on each other so it's helpful to have good positive relationships. Be neutral and stay that way, lead from behind. Enjoy your learning from the group to really have a learner's mindset on things, maintain the working group with an open safe space for people to participate, be curious and creative.

And this is a common I talked about before is treat surprises as puzzlers, not problems. It's a puzzle to be solved, not a problem to be solved. Apply knowledge in a creative way. And moving to the next page be comfortable in the knowledge that not everything will work. You know, it's not going to work perfectly. It's not going to be your way 100% but know when to discard an idea that isn't working. Encourage others to be innovative and share their ideas, function well in diversity appreciating and leveraging the diversity that is in the room.

Set and manage expectations more proactively. Know your IT. I love that one because I've seen calls kind of get derailed because of an IT issue. And then spend more time building and maintaining relationships. If you do have the opportunity to go to ICANN meetings physically that's a great time to build relationships. So but when you're on calls with people, you know, it's really you've got a face, you've got a connection with them and we'll talk about that a little bit deeper in as well.

So moving on in terms of virtual collaboration something that's helpful is, you know, a virtual collaboration charter. And so and again as participants you can do this yourself. You can really think about suggesting, having some kind of a

charter. You don't even necessarily have to frame it that way if, you know, you feel like it's going to come across as something, you know, some tool that might be (unintelligent) to the process. But essentially again with the working group with how we're going to work together virtually, you know, just getting clear on goals and expectations, what's the scope, what are we trying to deliver here and just so we know that we're within, you know, the scope, you know, and we're not just working way out of what we're trying to enact. What are the resources available to us, what are the scheduling boundaries? That's where time zones come up again, you know, and how will we know that we're making progress? You know, what are the milestones that we're going to be looking at?

Then also what are the roles? You know, what is in terms of the public space, you know, what does everyone, you know, what roles need to be played in that group? And as a NCSG participant what role might I step up to to help facilitate a conversation?

Who owns the tasks so you know who to talk to about what. And then processes, you know, how are decisions made, how do we track progress, how do we share updates, what's the technology? And then establishing ground rules that that's helpful to the process especially with an ongoing meeting.

So the last piece of this in terms of, you know, working well virtually and this is what I was going to come back to of just spending more time building relationships is meeting your colleagues. You know, when you have some time on the phone and you're just waiting for a meeting to begin if you see someone there that you don't know or someone you know minimally is, you know, finding out where they're based, I mean not personal information and all that but, you know, what's their background? You have, you know, time over coffee at a break, you know, at a ICANN meeting. You know, what are

some of the things where you can make some connections? And also if I'm going to work with you as a colleague on this working group and we're going to work closely asking some of these questions, you know, which tools do they prefer and where are their proficiencies? You know, so meaning do you want to use Adobe Connect?

Do you prefer to use Skype? Do you prefer to use, you know, WhatsApp? You know, what's that, you know, there's just so many tools and apps that we can use with each other to communicate especially across time zones and especially trying to be cost-effective. You know, finding out what's going to work for someone is best.

What gets them excited about being in the group? What are the conflicts of interest in serving in this group? Those kinds of things are all just ways to connect better to some of the colleagues you're going to be working with. So I think at the end of the day when we talk about, you know, working with other people it's still people to people that are making this policy. It's not some sort of AI that we're plugging an algorithm into. It's really about how do we get along with these other people, how do we find the common ground?

And I would suggest doing this meeting your colleague piece, you know, around the people that you don't feel connected to and around people that feel adversarial. I mean you may have an adversarial discussion but when you get outside that discussion, you know, knowing the person in the background and knowing the person that shares some of the common values is a really helpful way to frame your conversation with them and even as you get back into the professional environment it really does a lot to have that connection to make the conversations more civil especially if they've gotten out of hand in some way.

Questions on virtual collaboration or virtual consensus, anything so far? Okay the last piece that we're going to look at is meeting phases. And really, you know, there are some pretty obvious phases to meetings. There's preparation, there's opening, there's conducting, there's closing and there's following up a meeting. And this happens physically as well as in a virtual environment on a call. And when we're participants in that we can help the facilitator or the chair move the conversation along by playing an effective participant role.

So when we go through these -- and I'm not going to just read down the list. There's, you know, lots of stuff to read and these slides will be made available to you as well but thinking about getting each phase correct and making sure that each phase is present. Sometimes I've been on calls where there was a lack of preparation so opening the meeting people weren't really clear on, you know, who was opening and what roles people would take. So preparing for the meeting becomes important.

You know, and one of the things for you to decide is this a meeting I need to participate in because a lot of our time is taken up in meetings and especially in a volunteer capacity do I need to be on this call in this meeting or is our voice being represented in a way that is fine and, you know, I don't necessarily need to be on?

If I'm in this meeting what do I want to accomplish? What is it that I want to say or do that I want to put across in this meeting? You know, what's the agenda for the meeting? Have I looked at it? Is there anything that I suggest on that before the meeting occurs?

Going over it in advance with ICANN staff if you're in that role but also just going over it in advance for your own. And then some of these other things in

preparation are for chairs but, you know, taking the platform is going to be the most helpful for that particular meeting and something that should be saved for a face to face ICANN meeting. You know, so basically part of your preparation is try to figure out the most effective way to communicate, you know, the situation or the policy or the, you know, what you're trying to solve and what you're trying to resolve.

And opening the meeting, you know, again, you know, it's important to set the stage. And if the chair hasn't done this or the facilitator hasn't done this depending on how the meeting is being conducted you can do this. You have the ability as an effective participant to, you know, step in and say so what are our time limits if that hasn't been discussed? You know, what are the expectations, you know, so getting, you know, finding out so are we on agreement on this agenda point in coming back to that? So there's ways for you to participate and to have a voice without it necessarily just being trying to get a position across. So you can become a good effective group member in the process.

Remind the group of any group agreements that you may have had. If you're in a working group for example and you have some things that you've all agreed to and if someone is violating one of those agreements in some way you can always come back and say, you know, based on our group agreements I think that we had all agreed that this was this or this was that. Global roles in group members and then, you know, what else would you include in opening a meeting and just kind of that's a good reflection piece too.

Conducting a meeting, I think I've got two slides on that. I'm not going to read through all of it but do when you take your time can think about how do we run meetings effectively, so keeping the focus of the group on the agenda and the subject matter, allowing the bait but don't let it necessarily overwhelm

the discussion. You know, at some point you might say as a group member as a participant to say sounds like, let me just summarize the debate that I'm hearing. There's this and there's this. You know, perhaps we should move on and come back to this or how can we resolve this but trying to get them more future focused is something you can do and you can help balance out the participation.

Other things, you know, of trying to avoid the rabbit holes or and getting sidetracked on things addressing questions quickly and if people feel - if you're feeling like there's others that aren't getting their questions addressed bringing that up as a point, you know, to the group member or the chair or the facilitator. And I - it's funny, I go back and forth on this last point of minimizing the mute button. I think the mute button is super important as we found out on the call today to minimize background noise that you might have. But I also think it's good to minimize the mute button. When I'm on a call I try to minimize it so I can be fully participating. And it helps me from multitasking and so I'm answering emails or clicking on things while I'm in the midst of a call. If my mute button's off I'm just more fully attending to the room again thinking about a virtual environment.

And then ending the meeting, you know, summarizing the conclusions, the action steps if this isn't happening, you know, you can do that. But the participants to summarize what's going on and, you know, what are the action steps, action items and the next steps and along the way that's going to bulldozer overrun the facilitator or the chair but in a way this is going to be helpful and effective in moving the process forward because that's our whole objective here is how do we move the conversation forward.

And then finally following-up on the meeting making sure that, you know, points of view are acknowledged and that actions to be taken and who's going

to take those or follow it up. And this is more of a, if I'm responsible for this group but you can also send reminders to make sure the process is moving ahead. So here's my second poll question here for you. So as you think about these stages of meetings, when you think about preparing, opening, conducting, ending and following-up what phases of the meetings are the most challenging for you or do you see as the most challenging in the process that you've been involved in within ICANN? Just take a minute or two and throw your responses in. Claire I see your hand up so while people are polling what's your question?

Claire Craig: But basically around hosting an ICANN meeting or just virtual meetings in a room because (unintelligible) ICANN?

(David Kolb):   More ICANN context I think for this one.

Claire Craig: Thank you.

(David Kolb):   Thank you. Thirty more seconds and we'll close the poll. Anymore responses to (unintelligible)? Okay so we just have, we had have four responses, so what do we have? So opening the meeting I see is 50% and I can't see the other three. Can you tell us?

Ozan Sahin: Thank you David this is Ozan. So we have one response for conducting the meeting and then another response for following-up on the meeting and in total we have four responses.

(David Kolb):   Okay so it's interesting the two were saying opening the meeting is sometimes the most challenging thing, you know, so and then the strength of opinion around conducting and the following-up. And I can see where following-up becomes an interesting stage. As many times as the meeting ends and we

don't hear anything more or we don't hear what happened or how the message is communicated which kind of goes back to opening and being clear about how those things are going to get done by (unintelligible) yet all feeds a need because I think what's helpful about thinking about virtual meetings or meetings in general is just making sure that you address each of the phases of the meeting. So we think about consensus building as a process, you know, we are in these meetings whether virtual or physical and as a participant in that process I can help each of the phases be more effective by suggesting some of the things that we've talked about for those phases.

To close up our Webinar today and our timing is actually going very well here so I want to close with, you know, a few – we've covered a lot of ground here. Yes we've looked at, you know, consensus building process in general. We've looked at thinking about position assessments, what are some of the barriers to consensus, how do we participate in a consensus dialog, how do we think about virtual consensus in the environment that we're operating in ICANN a lot, and then finally how do we look at virtual interaction in terms of the meeting process? And we've covered some ground. So any questions or comments before we close out?

Okay not seeing any hands so as we're going to close this Webinar I've asked Ozan to put up our final whiteboard which is entitled key takeaways. So I I'd love to hear from each of you or see from each of you, you know, a key takeaway. What's one thing that you'll take away from the Webinar?

And then the other thing on this whiteboard too and you can say if you will just say takeaway or learning, you know, is this, and what's something else that you'd like to have covered as we think about our next Webinar coming up that I was looking at its influence and negotiation, what are some of the other things that you might want to see, you know, covered in that Webinar or in

other content moving forward? And also just by the way Benedetta is going to send out an evaluation on the Webinar which we really value your feedback on it will help us with the next as well as with ongoing content with ICANN or in other medium, so that will come out shortly. But for now just key takeaways and any recommendations for additional content?

Okay Benedetta's put of the survey link below that you can just click on to do the evaluation. We really would appreciate it while it's fresh for you. We'll actually give you a few minutes at the end here before we close out to go and do that.

Any additional key takeaways? And you're welcome to speak those as well. You don't need to write them up necessarily too.

Okay so not seeing any more hands so I'm not seeing any additional comments there so I'm going to close this out. And Ozan I'll let you have the last word but I'd love to okay, I see one more key take away coming up so let's move that. Ozan can you move that print. We have one over top of the other.

Ozan Sahin: I can try (David).

(David Kolb):   Yes thank you. Yes no worries. Okay good. So I know it's challenging in a Webinar environment. And I know for me personally a lot of times I just like to listen, I don't really want to participate, you know, if there's that. I appreciate the questions and the comments. And I appreciate you taking the time to listen. And I hope this has been helpful to you as you think about consensus going forward in the ICANN environment.

And you're welcome to send me an email if you've got a question or additional comments. And then our next Webinar will be in mid-October timeframe. We haven't scheduled it yet but it will be prior to the Barcelona meeting because our goal is between Panama and today in the next Webinar is when you arrive in Barcelona if you're physically attending or if you're dialing into Barcelona that you'll be fully prepared to be as effective and efficient as possible with NCSG in moving the conversation forward and that's kind of our larger title for this entire series. So thanks for your time and I'll turn it over to Ozan and Benedetta if there's last comments that you might have?

Ozan Sahin: Thank you (David) and (Simon) can you please stop the recording and disconnect all lines please?

Coordinator: Absolutely. One moment please.

END