ICANN

Moderator: Ozan Sahin
September 20, 2018
2:00 pm CT

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 1900 UTC. On the call today, we have our (Adam Ahmat Amenia), Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Farzaneh Badii, James Njoroge Gitau, Olga Kyryliuk, Ore Lesi, Shah Zahidur Rahman, Shahul Hameed, and Malisa Richards. We also have (David Kolb) as the instructor of the webinar. And from ICANN Staff we have Maryam Bakoshi, Benedetta Rossi, and myself Ozan Sahin.

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 and please mute your phones when not speaking. Thank you and over to you, (David).

(David Kolb):   Thank you, Ozan, and thanks everybody for joining the webinar today. So I wanted to give a little bit of background on how this webinar came about, what's ahead, and just a bit of a look to the future, and some background on why I'm the one doing a lot of talking today. So I began working in ICANN back in 2013 and the original purpose with my firm, (Insight Learning), were professional development, leadership development firm, was really to develop

a - what's best called the facilitation skills program for ICANN Org and that grew into a request from the community to create a leadership program for people that were not necessarily new to the community but wanted to interact more and take on the role of just being a more effective participant.

And we've - the leadership academy has offered in Buenos Aires, in that meeting in Dublin, L.A., most recently Puerto Rico, Copenhagen last year. So once a year that's been offered. It helped with the at-large community but at the same time it's people from all of the constituencies that attend the leadership program and some of you probably have been on that program in the past. So what's evolved from there is our involvement with ICANN has expanded to working with GNSO, with ccNSO, and some of the other constituencies just for various specific requests, facilitating meetings, coming up with a creative process to learn face-to-face sessions.

For example, we work with GNSO counselors at one point when they were newly elected just to try to pull that group together in a more expedient way while we were still on-site at one of the ICANN meetings. So we also do work with many other clients both on private sector as well as public government, and other organizations around the world. So my involvement began that long ago and it's - I'm still learning each time I interact with ICANN more about this very unique organization in my estimation and one that I've really grown a heart for over time.

NCSG came on the radar last year when there was a request for capacity building. And what we came to after lots of discussion was really three events in the current calendar year or actually in the last year's fiscal year, but three events that came out of that. So one was a face-to-face one-day session at the Panama meeting in June, which we did with about, I want to say, about 25 participants for that session.

And then, what came out of that session was the desire for two additional webinars. We've planned on the webinars but we didn't plan on the specific topics until we did the face-to-face session. So the two topics that came out of the face-to-face session that we wanted to do a deeper dive on - so one is the nature of today's webinar, consensus building, and the second webinar that will be offered in October will really be focused around influence and negotiation.

Because one of the issues that came up with Panama meeting, and some interviewing, and researching before that was really trying to take a look at how do we become more active participants as NCSG/NCUC/NPOC members, you know, how do we get this voice of civil society across in a more effective and efficient way in the meetings that we attend and the work groups that we're part of, and the comments that we write as part of PDP, so thus the main title of moving the conversation.

So this session is consensus building, moving the conversation with influence and negotiation will be the next session. So by way of introduction, you know, I think probably I want to turn it over to our group of - we're up to 14 now, which is great. So one of the things that's really going to be helpful for the webinar is we're using different tools today and we'll explain these as they need for them comes up.

So one of the things we'll do is just general discussion, so I'll ask a question and you can raise your hand and we'll get the queue going to get some comments generated around particular challenges and issues. Another tool that we'll use will be a whiteboard and so when the question may come up where we can list things out, it'll give those that are on machines the avail - the ability just to type in some responses so we can see what others are

thinking and typing especially if we're having any audio issues or people's volumes or just clarity of the audio.

And the third thing that we'll use is polling. So we'll ask a polling question where it may be a choice of four or five different answers, which is the most challenging, which is the most relevant, and we can get a feel from our total group of where people's interests lie on that particular question. So the goal here is to not just for me to be talking ahead for a couple of hours but more to get input from the group and to really make this specific to your needs and specific to what you want to get out of that.

So by way of starting a question I'll ask is - so when you think about the consensus building process at ICANN and going through that, you know, what do you find as challenging pieces of that for you? And I'm intentionally not defining what the process is because I think it's different things to different people, but what do you find that's been challenging in the past about consensus building at ICANN? I don't see any hands up yet. Yes, I see a hand. Farzaneh, want to kick this off.

Farzaneh Badii: I'm sorry, (Dave). Just give me a minute, I'm on my bad microphone. I will come back, I would (unintelligible) ...

(David Kolb):   Okay, microphone issues. Others, what do you find challenging about consensus building at ICANN? Where you just see as a very smooth process and no need to - for any challenges? I don't know if we have this webinar, if there weren't. (Detta)?

Benedetta Rossi: Hi. This is Benedetta speaking for the records. I will say I'm not taking part in the question about the issue of consensus building. It was just a quick reminder, especially for those who didn't attend the face-to-face session that

was in Panama. I know that (David) you introduced them the purpose of this webinar and how I came about. So it was just a brief intro and reminder that obviously this is not a webinar designed just for (David) to lecture all on consensus building.

So it'd be really, really great if you could take part either - there's no pressure whatsoever, but take part whether - either via the chat or putting your hand up, and then we'll have, as (David) noted, a whiteboard where you can write some comments and poll throughout the session. So it'll be really, really helpful if you could participate like that, because the sessions will be used for the ICANN learn course that is coming out of this webinar as well as the face-to-face meeting. So please feel free to take part using the tools that are provided. Thank you.

(David Kolb):   Thank you, Benedetta. So I will move on, if there's no challenges to come up, you know, things may come up as we keep going. So let's move into the agenda, so what we would like to cover and we may not go to the full two hours, we definitely won't go over the full two hours, we'll be done by the top of the second hour, is really these topic areas.

So, one, let's take a look at an overview of consensus building and then how do we prepare, how do we think about preparing for the process by using a tool called position assessment that I'll talk about further. And, then, the barriers to consensus, what gets in the way, and I've got a list, but I'm sure that you can add to this list as well. Then, finally, how do we conduct and participate in the consensus building process, what's the mindset that we want to bring into that process in terms of our intentions. And then, finally, a piece around virtual interaction, so how do we do that in a collaborative way.

And if we have time, we can go into the - looking at phases of meetings, that even virtually how do we run meetings effectively, and what do we find that's challenging. So I see in the chat that some folks are talking about having some problems with their mic. So maybe to address that, Ozan, what we can do is when I ask a question we can just put a whiteboard up for the question, in that way people can type in if they're having mic issues. We can get some more input that way. So let's keep moving now for sake of time.

So starting out - looking at the core tasks of consensus building participants, so if your desire is to create consensus, these are some of the tasks that can be - should be put into place to just participate in the process, and not necessarily leave the process. Some of the material that we'll go over today, you know, takes on a leadership point of view. But I think that as a participant, we can make that - we don't have to be the chair or the co-chair to be effective, you know, with everyone.

So, for example, you know, as a participant, you know, looking around the room, looking on who's on a call, who's in a working group to say, you know, "Do - is there enough representation and effective participation from key stakeholders in this?" If I see that there's a really strong voice or a strong advocate for civil society in this issue of intellectual property or privacy or marginalized populations, you know, and there's someone that I really think should be involved in this, because he or she really has something to say and they say it very well. I need to see if I could get that person involved somehow, you know?

So whether it's by proxy or somehow in person, because I know that they would speak with, you know, what I consider to be the voice of NCSG on this particular issue, on this particular topic. Then, the second piece is balancing advocacy with inquiry. This comes from some worker that Peter Senge did in

a book called The Fifth Discipline about 20 years - that are almost - maybe 30 years old at this point. But essentially it's talking about, you know, asserting and listening, and how do we balance those two things.

We spend some time on this in Panama in terms of the skill set, but I think what I wanted - the point I wanted to make with the consensus building process is one of the things that I saw in my research on designing this content is why - I've asked some ICANN leaders, former chairs, people that I've come to know over the years, you know, to tell me about NCSG, tell me about this group, this voice of civil society, and, you know, how are they effective, how are they not as effective as they, you know, how could they be more effective.

And one of the patterns that came up is, you know, I had a few of the folks that I talked to that said, you know, I wish they could speak with a unified voice, and what, you know, in pressing on that, what was coming up was that there was just - there was a lot of different points of view out there on the same topic area. Now, I'm not saying that there should be different points of view, but if we could get aligned on what our message points are on a particular issue, on a particular topic, then, you know, we can balance this advocacy, and we can be better at articulating our point of view in our opinion.

The second piece of this, this inquiry piece, is being good listeners, asking good questions. There's a lot of times in what we want to express, if we can think about how do I ask the right kinds of questions to help someone understand my point of view better to help them think more thoroughly, I can do that with good questions, I can do that by listening well. That's what I'm talking about. I talk about balancing advocacy with inquiry.

The third point I want to clarify a little bit because there's a little bit of a business jargon phrase here, suspend your agenda and be open. So suspending your agenda, what I mean by this is not necessarily the agenda of the meetings or the agenda of the call, but suspending your position long enough to understand what someone else's position might be on an issue or topic that you're trying to deal with, so that you can listen to them more fully.

A habit that a lot of people have when they're in conversation with someone, especially if I've got a strong position on something is that I'm thinking about the next thing that I want to say while you're still stating what you want to stay and I want to get my point out. So if I can suspend that long enough for me to really understand what you're saying and perhaps summarize what I'm understanding as to what you're saying, then it goes a long way toward the other person being open to hearing us or the other people or the other stakeholders, if I can put it that way.

So that's what I mean by suspend your agenda. It isn't getting off track on a meeting or getting - you know, going down rabbit holes or that kind of thing. Respecting confidentiality and private communications, and I'm going to go through this list and I'll come around to some of the hands that are up. So the respected confidentiality and private communications goes toward really thinking about what are the offline conversations that occur. So we might be part of a working group, we might be part of a PDP together, and we have these offline conversations that may help us understand each other better but respecting the confidentiality of those communication or if I want to share some of that, getting permission to share that in a way that's respectful to the comments that you made and confidence to me.

It's not about being secretive and it's not about not being transparent, but it's just respecting the one-on-one conversations that might occur that are not part

of the formal process. Clarifying how decisions will be made and by whom, you know, that is really about, you know, getting clear on what the process, especially for newcomers to the ICANN process which can be multi layered and complex is, you know, what is it that - you know what's the process that we're using to make decisions.

We use this big umbrella of, "Well, it's all by consensus," but also there's other ways to work with consensus that may not look like a consensus-making decision process. For example, creating a work group out of a PDP that's going to make recommendations to the larger process that will finally be voted on, you know, by the councilors, you know, when it's all said and done.

Then, finally, on this to, you know, to help structure and implement a fair process with accountability. So as a participant, I can ask good questions about this, you know, what is our structure, how do we ensure accountability, you know, what's - you know, help me understand what's fair about this or how we're making sure that all of the voices are heard. I can ask that question as participate without being the chair or trying to enforce my point of view on somebody.

So with that said, with that list, I see Farzaneh's hand is up. Farzaneh, you want to go ahead?

Farzaneh Badii: Yes. Thank you, (Dave). I just wanted to setup like a preliminary stage of why we are doing this. Of course, it's more about like what they are going to tell you is more about how to deal with difficult situation on consensus building. And the reason is that most of the time people feel intimidated when they're in big groups and there's, you know, there might be some challenges to express their ideas. They don't know how to do it.

So these are like - for example, for us with civil society sometimes we are very passionate about one issue, but I just also wanted to talk about our values, our - so that - I'll just give an example. So, for example, if you are an NCSG member, we have a set of values which is - (Dave) is going to also mention, but this is about - these are about privacy. We actually sense that there should be a balance between public safety and privacy.

We have - we want to (fight trademark overreach), but also respecting trademark as long as it does not affect our freedom of speech, so - and also we care about diversity, all of these sorts of things. So how do we use issue these values that we have in the domain name space, the domain name policy mentioned without getting into too much conflict we've actually taken - we've actually been able to contribute.

I'd say that what you need to do is a lot of self-study, but also - and learning, but also what the other thing that you need to do that we say is going to - I'm not going to (expert) and that is (unintelligible) state but also be successful in reaching consensus with people that have conflicting views or people that just general you want to intimidate you so that you go and never come back, how do you deal with that? This was the reason that we are having to decide.

So we are not going to go through the policy development processes and the introduction to that. We are going to - we put that aside for some other time, but we are going to tell you how you can actually be integrated in these processes and be able to infuse these values that NCSG has and I think to share in these policy development process. Thank you.

(David Kolb): Thank you. So in looking at this list of the tasks of participants for consensus-building, what else specific to ICANN would you add to this list? And, Ozan, let's put up a whiteboard for folks that are having any microphone difficulties.

So feel free, so the way this works is you'll see the T on the left hand side of the whiteboard. If you click on that, it's a text box, and then I can type then anywhere on the whiteboard and I'm doing an example now as I do this.

And then, if I just click anywhere else on the whiteboard my typing comes up. So we can do that and then Ozan will organize the print in case it's overlapping on something else, but that's how to use the whiteboard. Ozan, am I missing anything on the whiteboard?

Ozan Sahin: I don't think so, (David). That was a nice explanation.

(David Kolb): Okay. Thank you. Okay, so what else specific to ICANN process should be on this list? Feel free to type your responses. Good, reinforce the need to respect. For those that are on mobile, I will read out some of these - the comments that are coming up. So one is - it's been typed in as reinforced the need to respect conduct codes. I know a lot of calls begin with a mention of the conduct code for ICANN as well as for specific groups in terms of their codes of conduct and their rules of engagement, which I think is a good reminder for people. Other thoughts? What else should we add to this list?

Now, I don't see anything else coming up currently, but feel free to re-engage with that topic. You know, what are the tasks that consensus-building for us as effective participants and we can add to this as time goes on. I'm reading a little bit of chat here. Let's see something else. So actively listening so that we are sure to understand what the other party is trying to say, excellent. Yes, and that goes toward that balancing advocacy with inquiry piece. It's really being engaged and actively listening. Okay, well, let's keep moving then.

The next tool - I'm moving a list here. Ozan, help me out here. Okay. There we go. Thank you. So the next tool that you can use in consensus-building

and when you think about, you know, the process that you're involved in, whether it's a working group, whether it's a formalized PDP or even just a meeting discussion that you're involved in, just thinking about doing a position assessment, sometimes this is called a conflict assessment. And I don't want to make it an adversarial term, so I think position assessment is a better way to frame this.

But essentially a position assessment is thinking about what are the other positions that are in the room, whether that's a physical room or a metaphorical room or a virtual room. You know, what will be presented there. So as a, you know, as NCSG/NPOC/NCUC member, if I'm in a larger GNSO discussion or even wider than that is - so what are some of the points of view that I may be addressing? So it's not a matter of just how can I be more loud and clear with my own, but trying to understand what else may be coming into that discussion.

So this position assessment, you know, we've got two slides here with it, and I'll briefly go through these. So one who has the stake in the process and what do those stakes look like, and it was mentioned in the webinar this morning that even the word stake has a little bit of an - a positional, you know, or a possessive feature to it. Yes. So what's - what is it that's going to be a value to me in this process and what's a value to others? So, you know, Farzaneh made an interesting comment when she was talking about NCSG values as, you know, we want to respect trademarks, however we don't want that to affect (BL) and infringe on our freedom of speech, you know?

So there's - it's almost like there's a voice of civil society, you know, there's two sides to this. You know, we want to respect privacy and we want to respect public safety, but we also want to make sure that there's a balance between those two things. And that one isn't done at the, you know, expense

of the other and how do we find that right balance, right? You know, so who has a stake in the process and what issues are important to the stakeholders like some of the ones that I just described?

Determine whether it makes sense to perceive given the known constraint. You know can this process, can this discussion move forward given the constraints that we might have? And it may be that somewhere in a discussion, somewhere in the process that there are too many things going on right now for us to move forward with this. So there may be like the new regulation in Europe or the new - or net neutrality in the U.S. There's a larger issue that has to be addressed before we can really move this discussion farther, so let's just put this off and work on things more important for now while these other issues get addressed or while these constraints are being dealt with.

Determine the circumstances in which parties will agree to participate. So, you know, think about, you know, the different points of view that might be part of that discussion and then what are the circumstances that would be ideal for all parties to be able to participate and I'd hope on an equal level, but that's not always the case, obviously, where you don't feel like you have the power with that. But what are the circumstances that we need to participate effectively with each other.

I'm looking at the second piece of this and this goes back to some of the core tasks, is identifying the essential participants, the obvious stakeholders, are they being represented here or is there a point of view or a stakeholder that's not being represented that may come up later in the process when it's too late for them. So getting the essential stakeholders involved early on that have an interest in this and then, you know, who can best represent those interests. And then from the essential stakeholders or the essential participants, we find

out who the secondary participants are, this next bullet point of, you know, who else should be involved in this process, just to make sure that we're getting all of the points of view covered early on.

One of the issues I've heard from not just NCSG but from GNSO and from others that are dealing with policy issues is far along in the PDP suddenly we're getting new points of view and were past that part of the process where we're looking for points of view. We're now refining the recommendations that we're trying to make on policy.

So getting those points of view involved early on, so no one feels marginalized or diminished in some way because their point of view isn't being considered just because it is a long process and we're far along in the process. And then, discussing the position assessment you've done or have it as a conflict assessment here, but discussing this assessment then with the conveners or the people that are in charge of this particular PDP or this particular working group and saying, you know, "Do we have everything represented here? Do we have all of these points of view that we should have working?"

So it's being - really, if it's helping the leaders of a process do even a better job, because they might not have thought about it because there's so many moving parts when one of these, you know, policy development processes gets underway. So that's the tool of the position assessment and just something for you to think about. For sake of time, I'm sorry, I used the down arrow instead of my cursor, I'm going to skip this scenario at this point in time based on what we did earlier on - I'm sorry, what we did earlier on this morning, there just wasn't a lot of participation in trying to understand or digest this. So I'm going to keep moving with some content here. We can come back to that later though.

So the other piece in terms of when we talk about identifying essential and secondary participants is, you know, think about - or one way to think about that is what's the credibility, you know, who do we need here to be credible. One of the comments this morning we were talking about challenges people had is someone had said, you know, "I don't feel like I have the confidence to speak up in the group. I don't feel like I've got my ideas, you know, articulate - you know, there - I'm not articulate enough to really share what I need to share in the group, whether it's, you know, verbally or written."

And it was great that she shared that with all of us, because I think what happens is we start to doubt our credibility in a group. So one way to address that if you have that feeling is bring someone else into the discussion that has credibility with the group that you can build on and that you can collaborate with, and it gives you that unified voice that I was talking about too, that this isn't just me talking, this is really a point of view that we've developed as a group here.

So meet with individual groups if needed. And what this meant here is, you know, when you start to understand what the different points of view are is thinking about, "Okay, so who do I need to talk to within this group perhaps offline to get a better understanding of where they're coming from, a better understanding of what their position might be and why?" And that should be the intention of your conversation. Obviously, you want to also share your understanding too, but try - going in with the intention of getting a better understanding of them is a helpful way to frame your mindset as you enter that kind of discussion when you're meeting offline with someone.

Use proxies for hard to represent groups. You know, we've got a lot of areas in the world that are underrepresented at ICANN, because the economic

means to get to meetings or to be, you know, or even the technology isn't there for them to be full participants. So are there proxies or alternative representatives that could be used to represent these underserved populations that are out there, you know, which are obviously all parts of civil society. With the bottom line, obviously, being - making sure that all relevant points of view are included. That's your goal here in any consensus process. There's no surprises down the road. We've got the relevant points of view here from the beginning and, you know, I can - as a participant, if I can make that happen, that's going to further the conversation and move it along.

So Farzaneh talked about values a little bit before and that was a great lead-in for this particular piece. I think that this diagram is important because we enter into a conversation with a position, you know, and when we think about a negotiation, we've got a position, a place that we're starting from. So, you know, if I want to make sure that if it's a privacy issue in the scenario that I skipped over before is about law enforcement and WHOIS, that law enforcement really wants access to WHOIS data so they can find out, you know, who is running these sites, who owns these domains that we're having issues, that we're having crimes with, that's a position, you know?

And then there is this voice of civil society saying, "You don't know how much of that data should be on WHOIS and, you know, what should be shared." So it creates this position that you come in with, but it's interesting to get to some of the underlying pieces of what goes into creating a position and these underlying pieces are issues, interests, and values. So when we talk about this, you know, so one of the things is - you know, so think of a position that you have on something. So it might be a process that you're involved in right now, it also might be something you'd like to be involved in, thinking about some of the stuff that's on the NCSG radar. So here's the position that we have, here's what I'd like to get involved in.

So what are the issues that are driving those position, what happened that makes it to my - I don't want to use the term radar too much, but it makes it onto my conscious thought of what are these issues that are coming up that are creating this position for me. And then underlying the issues are these interests and these interests are what I look through to my filter, if you will, to see what issues become more important because of the interest I have. The interest I might have could be underserved populations. It could be, you know, intellectual property or trademark and making sure that points of view are balanced out.

And underlying to those interests are values, you know, in, you know, so when you think of NCSG values, you know, Farzaneh mentioned trying to get the right balance between trademark and freedom of speech for example, what are some of the other NCSG values or NPOC or NCUC values that - if we were going to create a value list and - you know, we will do just that, and we'll have a whiteboard to do that. You know, so if we're creating - you know, so the question is, you know, so what are the values of NCSG using that as a large umbrella? Ozan, if you can either pull up another whiteboard or rename - so he's titling that. Think about it.

And, again, so with the whiteboard, click on the T, type in your response and then click anywhere on the whiteboard and it will come up. So what are the values of NCSG, what's driving your interest, your issues, and ultimately your positions in this group. Type away. If you're having trouble seeing the whiteboard, (Bruna) said the she's happy if you want to type it into the chat, she's happy to put it up on the whiteboard for you. And I'll read these as they come up for those that are on mobile and not necessarily typing it or don't have a keyboard in front of your screen.

Great. So one that's coming up is public interest. Another is freedom of expression. Another is privacy. Anything else that you'd add to a value's list? Freedom of expression, public interest, privacy, and I'd say under freedom of expression comes freedom of speech too. Diversity of perspectives. Human and digital rights. An important takeaway on thinking about values and, you know, knowing why you signed up to be part of NCSG/NPOC/NCUC based on what you do but also it's based on your values.

There is something about that group that attracted you to be part of that and be part of that voice. There's a basic value set. And the challenge for people is when you're trying to understand someone's position, you can ask some question about, "So what are the issues that are driving that division and what are the things that you're interested in that make these issues important to you?"

There is a good level of conversation to connect to people. And then, finally, what you're getting to with that is, you know, what are the values. If I just ask someone, "So tell me what your values are." You know, that's a heavy duty question of self-disclosure and they feel very uncomfortable, you know, giving cultural interactions as well as just, you know, (minding) privacy things. And I might not be able to articulate that right off, here's my top three values, because I haven't thought about it in that context. But I can tell you what I'm interested in, and what I'm passionate about, and what gives me a pain when I see it, not in a bad way but it just hurts me when I see, you know, trafficking or I see underserved populations whatever that might be, that's what's going to drive issues and ultimately drive my position.

Because one of the big challenges with consensus-building is dealing with someone who has a value position that's different than yours. So you've got fundamental value differences, but you - that's something you really can't

negotiate, because that's a value set. What you can start to negotiate are what are the issues and what are the positions, a little bit farther away from the basic values that we're dealing with. So just an important slide, an important framework to keep in mind.

So what gets in the way of a consensus-building process? So here's my list, so institutions sometimes get in the way. We've always done it this way. So, you know, we've got kind of two layers within the ICANN context. You know, we have the ICANN way. This is the way that we do policy development and - you know, and what we found over the years, and I say we, I'm not speaking of - since I'm not part of ICANN Org or really part of the community, I really have a foot in both camps, it's about, you know, what's - what is it about the position that we should change to be more effective or about the process that we should change to be more effective, and it has evolved over time.

And I know that one of the important things in policy development and this will be covered more when there's something specific to it, is really adhering to the policy development process, especially in the position where we're trying to have a voice for civil society, and we've got business interests that are coming in. If I see a malfunction somewhere in the process or we got off the process somewhere, I can invalidate the whole process of that policy if I don't want that policy to go through.

So making sure that we're adhering to the policy development process or the guidelines of the working group, and you can do that as a participant in the process, is to make sure that those things are being adhered to, and those things or those boxes are being ticked. It's probably the best way to think about it. You know another thing that gets in the way is deadlock. You know, we just can't agree on anything. Sometimes I've heard the expression

used of consensus by exhaustion, that someone keeps advocating a point of view over, and over, and over again, and will not back down.

And the thing that's difficult about this and we talked about it in Panama a bit that - is - there's no magic bullet for that, especially if that person is being - has an incentive to have that position because they're not necessarily a volunteer for ICANN, they're paid to be there to represent that organization within GNSO to have a position. So it's difficult to figure out how do we get out of that deadlock in some way. You know, so that's something that gets in the way. Escalation and positional bargaining, it becomes personal. You know, it's about making judgments about you, it's about, you know, you wrote a three-page memo on this, and I didn't even know what you were trying to say. That's a judgment about you versus trying to figure out exactly what are the points that you're trying to make here. So it's advantageous to you to be very clear, concise, and compelling in your communication with other people.

You know, communication, just not connecting and listening, and there's a breakdown of trust somewhere along the way. Complexity and ambiguity, you know, there's a lot of - for a lot of people, you know, entering the ICANN process, you know, whatever it might be, it's hard to tell where do I jump in and is it the deep end, is it the shallow end, and being overwhelmed by all of the layers of complexity that are there - that, you know, some might argue that are necessary or unnecessary to really create good solid policy for others to work. And then just the lack of clarity, the ambiguity that might be there. Those are the things that get in the way.

So we have a whiteboard up for this question. So what barriers do you experience at ICANN, looking at this list, but also what are some of the barriers - other barriers that you might experience at ICANN that gets in the way of consensus building? And feel free to type it into the chat and we'll put

it up on the whiteboard if you're not being able to access the whiteboard well. It's something that's kind of off to the side. So language and lack of experience, okay. And then, it looks like the word prejudice is off the side of my whiteboard there, it looks like prejudice.

Yes. Vested interest, yes. That's what I was alluding to as well, is I've got - it's not just the stake, but I'm - you know, I've got an incentive to keep it that way. PDPs might be quite long lasting and difficult to catch up with those huge amounts of information. Boy, isn't that the truth, definitely gets in the way. And like I said, it's not necessarily, you know, here's the answer to get rid of these barriers. Knowing what the barriers are and being able to identify them will be helpful.

Other things that get in the way that you'd add to this list? Time zone differences while organizing meetings affect participation. Absolutely. And obviously - it's funny I was just thinking as that comment was coming up, geography. Yes, so it's about time zone and it's just also about access, you know, just - we had someone in the Puerto Rico meeting, you know, at the leadership program from the Cook Islands, and I think, you know, we were - one of the things we did as an introduction was how long does it take you to get here, and who would win with the longest travel.

Her travel was, you know, close to 30 hours, you know, to get to the meeting, just that geographic distance of trying to get there physically or access the technology to even participate remotely. Any other things that get in the way that you would add, barriers?

Let me move to the next line, this might encourage some other things too or bring up some other thoughts for you, and this will be our first polling slide, is thinking about considerations for consensus, you know? So one of the things

that came up was language and lack of experience which, you know, goes toward, you know, language, you know, language issues is on this list. Social and cultural issues, you know, so what are our social norms and my - you know, either ethnic or organizational cultural norms that, you know, preclude me from the conversation, don't allow me to participate as fully as quickly, economic issues, historic issues, procedural issues as we see on our list in terms of the barrier that comes up.

So the poll question for you is this, so which of these issues is more prevalent at ICANN in your estimation in your view. Ozan, will you tell us a little bit about how to work with the poll.

Ozan Sahin: Thank you, (David). This is Ozan speaking for the transcript. So you will see a poll question in the bottom right corner of your screen and you can click on the circle to the left of the each multiple choices there. It's far easier than using the whiteboard, I guess. Thank you.

(David Kolb):   So five have responded thus far. I know for some that are on mobiles, you won't be able to respond as readily or won't be able to respond at all since you don't have the screen in front of you. So we'll see - we'll give it another few seconds and see how things come out. Another 15 seconds.

Yes, I've closed the poll. So Ozan, what are our results here? Do we have - is that a different display on the results or just the percentages? So I see a 16% for cultural and social issues, 15% for economic issues, 33% on procedural issues, and 33% on language issues. So those tend to be the more prevalent of the issues for ICANN then, just the procedural process of PDP, and the language issues. You know, I think that both of those can be worked on, you know, I got some background noise there.

So both of those can be worked on in terms of refining the PDP process or making it more effective. And, you know, it is an evolving thing, but I know that it seems like those that are in charge of that are fairly open to it. The other thing is helping people understand PDP. So new comers to ICANN or to NCSG, how does that whole thing work? And we are going to spend some more time on that on a different webinar, different presenters that can be much more articulate about it than I can, so definitely, you know, not my bailiwick.

And then language issues, a little bit more of a challenge. You know, we've - I know that in a lot of the physical meetings, we've got the translation booths, you know, for like the GAC, and some of the others, and we've got translations online that people can click on, and get better, you know, more language specific translations. With that said though, you know, are all of the languages with the relevant points of view being represented in a given issue? And maybe that's something to advocate for if it's a particular PDP that you're involved in or a working group is if there's a language issue you can identify, not necessarily yours but someone else's, is to get the right translation and so that voice can be heard.

Let's move into the next part, we're right at our first hour here and usually the - and we're tracking pretty well, because the next two pieces are a little bit more content intensive, and we - just this morning we came up just at about two hours when it was all said and done.

So I'm going to skip over this scenario since we're having some trouble with just interaction and using some of the tools and move into how do you conduct yourself in a consensus dialogue. And this piece is really around, you know, if I'm in a written, if I'm in a phone, a virtual or a physical meeting or a physical process of consensus building, what's the mindset that I need to enter

in with, what is it that - what are some of the things that I need to do to be as effective as possible as a participant in this process?

So the first thing is to really have a problem-solving orientation. So you're there to share your point of view, you're there to have a position, and to try to get your point across, and at the same time you're trying to solve a problem. So to Farzaneh's point earlier, you're trying to solve the problem of the balance between respecting trademarks and also respecting freedom of speech and freedom of expression, so - which will infringe on the other, how's that going to work? Or respecting public safety but also then respecting privacy, and how much data should be available, and how should it be accessible to other party?

You know, those are things that, you know, 30 years ago we never thought we'd be struggling with. And then, suddenly, we've got, you know, this whole new thing and let alone going into the social media world of, you know, what are some of the issues that we have to deal with that just weren't there before. So having a problem sort of an orientation though is a great way to think about this. When I was polling old, I'll say, old ICANNers and I don't mean that as you people that are old, but they've been around ICANN for a long time to get some points of view on how to be the best chair and how to be the best kind of facilitator in the community, one of the comments that stuck with me by one of the people that - he's no - he's retired from ICANN at this point, but he had a great comment which was, "You know, instead of thinking about it as a problem, think about it as a puzzle. So you're trying to find that piece of the puzzle to make this whole, to make this - create this whole picture."

And so how do I, you know, treat it as a puzzle versus a problem to work on this. So when we think about a problem-solving orientation, you know, it's - I'll call it a puzzle solving orientation. You know, so some of the points on

here is suspend your agenda, you know, so put aside your position so you can understand other positions. It's like looking at these pieces around your puzzle piece to see how it's going to connect.

You know, act the way that you want others to act no matter how they act. So what I mean by that is, you know, acting in a way that your intention is positive and your intention is constructive. You might be frustrated, you might feel overwhelmed, but your intention here to be constructive and positive to move the process along. So acting in a way that - you want others to act, the golden rule of consensus, if you will, no matter how they act.

I mean, because they may have this vested interest that came up on the whiteboard that they really can't back off of their position, but maybe I can connect to them in a personal way to better understand some of the underlying interest or values that they have that I might be able to appeal to, and who knows how I might be able to start to peel that onion to get a better understanding.

Express concerns in an unconditionally constructive manner. So as you're trying to express your concerns about something, asking a question, it isn't a matter of throwing the grenade into the meeting, and then watching how everybody scrambles, but it's more of a matter of how can I be constructive here and offer this up in a constructive way that isn't a judgmental way on others into, I think, it was (Bruna)'s point before, you know, engaging in active listening. You know, how do we become more active, and how we're listening to a conversation, and not just being, you know, erring on the side of advocating or saying it louder, and slower, and longer like the typical American in a non-English speaking country.

At some point, someone's got to understand English, if I just say it louder and slower or add a funny accent to it. But rather, you know, engaging in a way in trying to figure out what they're trying to say and maybe learning a bit about their language to meet them halfway. Disagree without being disagreeable, so you can disagree without coming across as being angry or aggressive. It's just a - it's a disagreement, you don't agree with that point of view and then finally being transparent, all part of a problem-solving orientation.

So - and here being transparent isn't necessarily giving up all of your information or all of your reasons for having this position, because some things you may want to keep to yourself, but being transparent in terms of making your thinking visible to others. How do we come across to someone else and, you know, I might state my position, but if I haven't explained how I got there, it might not be as easy to understand as I may think it is, because I've spent a lot of time thinking about this.

Along the lines of active listening is asking good questions. You know, so - you know, what do we have already? What are the points of agreement that I have with these other parties, these other stakeholders in the room? And then, I'm not seeing my - there we go, and then what do we want? You know, what's the outcome? What's my desired outcome out of this discussion or this piece of the process and the whole process too? So what do we have? What do we want? How do we get there?

So those are the kinds of questions you need to be asking to move toward consensus. And starting out with your points of agreement sets up a pattern of agreement, so as the discussion continues, when you get to disagreements, you already know how to agree. This - if you've got a list of issues, prioritize those in a way where the low-hanging fruit, the easy points of agreement are

your first points of discussion. Do you know where you're already agreeing on things before you get to the points of disagreement?

And then, finally, you know, think about solutions in the future versus the past and the - you know, the point below there, it says, "Unproductive to focus on what's happened to you in the past without trying to learn from it." You know, in a process I was in before, you know, we did this, and this, and this, and it never worked, and it's going to continue to be like that, because we'll keep doing this, this, and this, you know? So, because then if you do that, you just become an expert at what didn't go well.

Einstein had a great quote at one point that problems can't be solved at the same level of thinking at which they were created. So it's getting past that, that problem that was created at a certain level of thinking and changing your level of thinking, changing your mindset in a way that will help you get more toward a solution or solve the problem. The next thing - so we have, you know, ask - so far what we've covered in terms of this, I want to make sure it remain - to maintain the problem-solving orientation, ask questions and then develop options.

There's two pieces on this, so two slides on this. So get everyone educated on developing the - you know, to develop options, make sure that everyone has the information they need so they can start thinking about this, and problem-solving whatever this challenge or this issue or this piece of the process is. And then, you know, whole group brainstorms the options. You know, it's another way to develop options, so if you're involved in a working group for example, we'll be spending time as a whole group developing what these options might be for us to move forward, and then, you know, task groups develop recommendations for the whole group.

So this is one of the things that in consensus-building, you know, we might find that we're at an impasse as a whole group, so perhaps we could break off into smaller groups so that everyone is getting a voice and come up with recommendations from smaller groups to bring back to the whole group is a technique for consensus. Proposals for single text documents are prepared, so from, you know, the options we've developed, let's create some proposals. If we need outside experts to come in, in terms of how this policy might get executed, what this might look like, the problems that you might encounter, who those experts that we could bring in, those other voices.

Interest groups develop proposals for the whole group. So some of these sub groups designated by the whole group say, "Okay, instead of 30 people trying to develop this proposal, we are going to designate five people to develop this proposal for us to think about further." So - I jump the gun here. So that's sort of, you know, in terms of developing options, you know, these are some of the things, there's probably things you could add to this list, but if you think about consensus building in its general form, this is the basic list on developing options to move forward.

The next thing as I alluded to you before is looking at value differences that we might have. This - probably the most difficult discussion that you're going to have is a discussion where your fundamental values differ from the other person or the other parties that are involved, and being the voice of civil society, this happens more times than not, that you've got commercial interests, government interests, you know, other public safety.

I mean, there's other side of the coin if you will, you know, to what you believe or what you want to see happen. So being aware of this value difference is really important. It's not an all or nothing scenario necessarily, but it will feel that way because your value set isn't in alignment. So some

things to think about when doing that is to be careful when speaking about deep value differences, because they're serious, and the way that we talk about them can make problems worse, because you're talking about my values and that feels like a judgment, and that feels like an attack to me when you're attacking values that I hold that you might not necessarily hold.

You know, so - and it definitely will make problems worse because if we don't agree on these, how can we agree on anything. I mean, we're definitely seeing it in the political climate, in the U.S., and in the political climates in, you know, Poland, and Italy, and other countries where there's just such a polarization of, you know, within the government structures right now. So another piece then is need ground rules to create a safe space. So if you've got an ongoing group, ground rules or rules of engagement or group agreement, it's probably the least invasive way to say that, what can we agree on as a group that will make us effective in our dialogue with each other?

So it's one of the things that as participant not necessarily as a leader, you can say, "You know, let's come up with some ground rules here of how we can be most effective with each other." And get those out that we can all - and that also sets up this pattern of agreement that I was talking about too, because you're agreeing on ground rules to begin with. To spend preconceptions about others and listen. You know, no matter what I think that other person's position might be, how outrageous I think it might be or how intractable I think it might be, you know, I still need to respect them enough just to listen to their point of view. I don't have to agree with it, I'm just acknowledging that they have a point of view and I'm trying to get a better understanding of that and just to listen well, keep circling back to that listen thing.

Learn interest that underlie the issues. So remember that chart that we had of positions, interest issue values. When we're thinking about deep value

differences, it's taking it to the next layer. Under this issue that I'm talking about, what are the interests that are there, that are driving that issue to be so important to you, and that's going to get me closer to understanding what the value differences are that I'm dealing with. Craft practical options that work for all parties.

So trying to do something, you know, trying not to get lost in the clouds of being too theoretical or too far down in the weeds and the ground where you're just trying to, you know, cross all of the Ts dot all of the Is. You know, but what are the practical options that we've got for - that would work for everybody? You know, what's a good solution? You know, it's said that perfect is the enemy of the good. You know, we don't have to drive for perfect all of the time, but what's a good solid solution that we can move forward with.

And then, finally, create mutual gains not poor compromise. You know, part - big piece of consensus, by definition, consensus simply means to - that all parties would leave the room, and they could say, "I can live with what we've decided and I can defend how we decided that." And that's the agreement, the theoretical agreement on consensus. I can live with it and I can defend how that decision was made. I can discuss, you know, I can be transparent about how that decision was made or how that recommendation is made.

So creating mutual gains not poor compromise. It's not about compromise. It's about trying to get gains. It's the win-win, you know, for all parties or the win-win-win-win-win as we see sometimes with the multiple points of view that we have to deal with. But how do we create gains that are mutual for all parties, how do we get - you know, we might not get the giant step, but we might get five baby steps in there toward a more - a better voice for civil society. So how do we get those gains as part of this process.

So those are the pieces about - thinking about some of the value differences that we've got to deal with. Any questions so far before I move into this virtual interaction piece? I'll give it a second, if people have questions or comments to be made. I don't see any hands up. I'm not seeing anything in the chat. So I will move forward.

So a lot of what we do in ICANN tends to be virtual. You know, where we've got the - you know, if you've got the privilege of being able to attend the physical meetings, and I say that because I think an ICANN meeting is just a fascinating place to be, and it's just wonderful even though it's messy, and it's frustrating sometimes to watch the process, the discussions are solid. The discussions are good. You know, and - at the end of the four-day - I see people on that fourth day just exhausted from all of the work they've done and all of the fun they've been having too as well.

But even that fun is also part of connection and it's part of connecting to those people that you may have to deal with down the line or down the process further along that that connection that you had at that meeting may be an important piece of it. But we move into this virtual interaction realm, so I will - I took a poll when I was developing a - some content around what some of the best practices are in chairing a group. I think some of these are transferable to being, you know, best at participating in a group, and being an effective participant, and the poll went around again to my contacts that I've made at ICANN across the community, some folks within ICANN Org as well to really try to get a general view on what they see as best practice. I think there's a lot of different perspectives there.

So there's - I've got two pages here and I'll just briefly read through this and this - the first one, these aren't necessarily prioritized except for this first one,

and I have it in bold because this came up over and over again with people, is to be realistic about the amount of time it takes, and that's really specific to thinking about, you know, thinking about how much time it takes for a PDP and how much time it takes to just really get things done, because you are developing process or policy for the world when it comes to the internet, you know, on these specific domain name issues or whatever it might be.

So it's just being realistic and being patient, you know, a lot of people I think go into ICANN and they think that - they're just going to contribute, it's going to be taken up, and it's going to become policy, and they just run screaming into the night. So it's just, you know, it's difficult that way. So I'm reading a little bit in the comments here too.

So Cheryl, we've got - so virtual - so you're currently in three overlapping development - this is a great example right now, right? So bandwidth, personal, and actual is often not considered. So I think - yes, so what makes virtual collaboration, this isn't necessarily a best practice, but this definitely is a challenge is - you know, you've got three things going on at the same time, and by the way this is a volunteer thing for you. This isn't like it's your full-time thing that you do and get great money from it as well.

So, you know, so back on the best practices, you know, thinking about what really goes into virtual collaboration of, you know, fostering positive productive relationships with support staff. And I say that because I've seen this - it's almost, you know, examine us position. The community against org, org against the community, and the - and to me it's an issue of perception more than anything. I mean there's been some history here and there on both sides of saying, "You know, I'm feeling manipulated. I'm feeling pulled. I'm feeling like I'm not being served."

You know, but it's really trying to figure out what are the positive productive relationships that we can develop with our support staff within ICANN Org that will be helpful moving our position and moving the conversation forward in fostering these relationships, developing these relationships, and trying to understand if it's not going well why that's not going well. Be neutral and stay that way. I thought that was a great comment from one of the ICANNers of just - you know, continue to keep this aspect of neutrality so that you can be effective listening to multiple points of view and contributing your own as well and then lead from behind, you know?

So lead from behind is simply, you know, you don't necessarily have to be pulling along, you can nudge them, you can push them along a bit, you know, enjoyed learning from the group, you know, take the mindset of a learner not as just a teller or, you know, or be all know all. You know, just - what's the mindset of the beginner's mind, if you will, how can I learn from this group. You know, maintain the working group as an open and safe space to work in. Be curious and creative.

This comment I mentioned before treat surprises as puzzlers and not problems, and apply knowledge in a creative way. Think about, you know, trying to be creative with suggestions that are coming up. Be comfortable in the knowledge that everything is going to work all the time. Know when to discard an idea that isn't working, you know? You might frame an idea, you might reframe the idea in a way that's more understandable, but there's a point where you can say, "You know, this isn't working."

There was an old Lakota Indian expression in the U.S. that said that if you're riding a dead horse, sometimes it's a good idea to dismount. So know when to put that idea aside if it's not working. Encourage others to be innovative and share their ideas. Try to nurture or mentor newcomers to this process, if

you've been around the process for a long time. Function well and diversity, appreciating and leveraging it. You know, when we talk about social and cultural differences, you know, there's also, you know, gender, and age, and, you know, ethnicity to that - you know, differences as well, but appreciating that and leveraging that in a way, because you do have different ways of seeing the world, and different points of view going on based on the diversity in the room.

Set and manage expectations more proactively. Know your IQ. So what gets in the way. You know, before we started this webinar, Benedetta, and, Ozan and I got on the call, and we did a test early in the week just to make sure that everything was working, so we're not spending time on the webinar trying to figure out IT problems. You know, and if you're leading a call, it's a good idea to have someone designated to deal with IT issues, so if you're leading the call, it doesn't have to be you, someone can be working with someone that's having audio problems behind the scene. I think that's a great best practice.

And then, finally, spend more time building and maintaining relationships. It's funny as it, you know, that that came up over and over again as well. To spend that time when you have it face to face in the meetings or on calls of getting to know the people that are around you, and getting to know, you know, and I'd say getting to know, you know, the people that you might disagree with.

So one of the things that's helpful with virtual collaboration too, when you're starting a group is to come up with some sort of a charter, and this kind of goes toward our rules of agreement, which would be a subset of the charter, but really getting clear on what are the goals. You know, a new working group is formed around this particular issue, this particular topic to create

recommendations, you know, what are the goals of this workgroup, what's the desired outcome, what's our scope.

Your scope as a working group is not to develop the full policy. It's develop recommendations based on a particular piece of what will be the policy that results from multiple working groups, you know, coming together. So - but what's our scope in this particular group, so we don't find ourselves working out of scope. And, again, as a participant, you can rein that in, you can pull that to say, "You know, is this within our scope? It's great to talk about it, but do we actually have influence to make something happen on this?"

If we want to move the conversation forward, are we within scope? What are our resources both financial and human? To Cheryl's point before that she's currently on three overlapping Adobe meeting calls, you know, that's a human resource there that's being pulled in three different directions. You know, so what resource we have within this group so we can be realistic about what we're asking people to do, and, you know, be realistic about what we need. We may need more resources; financial, time, human, whatever it might be, how do we advocate and get those, so we can be effective in the group to meet the goals that we have.

You know, schedule boundaries. You know, what are the time zone constraints? What are the major constraints that we have? You know, that the call shouldn't be set up all of the time in the leader's time zone. You know, sometimes - everybody needs to be a little inconvenienced on calls now and then. You know, so sharing that burden, if you will, by being time zone sensitive and others scheduling and constraints that you might have. And it may be that a constraint is just after an ICANN leading, just before an ICANN meeting, not a great time to schedule calls, you know, because you'll be having face-to-face meeting.

And then, milestones, you know, we've got these goals at the top of the list, but what are the milestones then that we're really trying to consider, you know, that will let us know that we're getting closer to our goals. On top of that, thinking about the roles, you know, so when we think about being in the public space, you know, what are the roles that people can play, so that everyone knows what everyone does, and you don't have overlapping roles in the group.

And I'm probably going a little bit more (weedy) with this in terms of being in the weeds on it. But if I've got a long-term working group, it's going to go together for a while or be together for a while, kind of knowing what role I can play as a participant is helpful for me to be more effective than just being, you know, where I feel like it's just unclear, and I don't know where to step in. But taking on a task, volunteering for a role within a call or within a meeting, you know, is a great way to get involved. Then, who owns the task and then what are the processes that we're going to use.

And then, finally, you know, as we talked about before, what are the group agreements, what are the codes of conduct that we're going to have within this group. And then, finally, the last piece of this particular section is really when we talk about building those relationships, it's really, you know, meet with the colleagues that you have. And I say meet but then it doesn't mean that you're going to, you know, increase your travel budget 10 folds, you can be face-to-face with people, but, you know, taking time to maybe have a Skype call with somebody, if you feel like they had a point that wasn't expressed as well or you're trying to understand it better, but finding out more about them.

You know, it's basic human connection. You know, so where are they based? You know, what's in their background? What's your common ground with

them? You know, what kinds of things they worried about? When we think about positions, and interests, and issues, and values or issues, interests, and values, you know, what are the things that are interesting to them? You know, what are the issues that are most important to them? You know, which tools do they prefer to use to communicate and how, you know, good are they at those tools, whether it's a Skype chat, a Skype conversation, it's WhatsApp, I mean there's so many different applications out there for communication at this point that you do have a good way to meet your colleagues.

But it takes time and it takes an investment on your part to do that. And I'd say there's the old - and, again, I don't want to - I hate using military terms, but, you know, keep your friends close and your enemies closer. So when you think about someone that has an oppositional point of view and a value point of view that's different than yours, making the extra effort to try to connect with that person and just find out more, and it's not this false, you know, I'm trying to create authenticity, I'm trying to fake sincerity, you know, it's really, really trying to understand your point of view.

I'm really trying to understand how to better connect with you. You know, especially for those you just don't feel that connected to. Okay. And how we're doing here? So we got one more, let's see here.

So virtual meeting phrases. So this - I wanted to include one piece on this about - thinking about the phases of meetings. When I think about preparation, opening, conducting, closing, and following up meetings, you know, each of the distinctive phase, you know, so - you know, I've got some slides on each which, you know, these slides will be made available to you, you know, after the session. So I'm not just going to read down the list per se, but, you know, am I taking all of the boxes on preparation.

So whether I'm leaving the call, you know, so if I'm not leading the call, I'm a participant, did I receive an agenda for this meeting coming up? If I didn't, I need to request an agenda. If I did, I need to go through the agenda to understand what's going to be covered on that call and do I need to be on that call or in that meeting. Because it might not be the time for me to voice my point of view or maybe that time has passed or maybe there's people in the room that can do that for me if I'm not going to be physically there.

So that's part of your preparation to figure out - we kind of go back to the position assessment, thinking about who's in the room, what their points of view might be, and then going over the agenda in advance, thinking about the subject matter, the expectation, the scope, and the things that we've already talked about, all of that is part of the preparation for the meeting.

Then, we move into opening the meeting. You know, how's the meeting, how's the stage set? You know, and if the chair or whoever is leading the meeting, doesn't have a good grasp on how do we open this up, and how do we make this, you know, you can do that as a participant, and it's not a matter of overtaking them or undermining them in some way, ask questions. So, you know, given the time that we have for the meeting, what are we hoping to accomplish on this call? You know, so welcoming people. You know, so it might be that - and if we're using Adobe Connect, for example, in the side chat that we have on the left-hand side of our screens right now, as people come in, welcoming them into the meeting, saying hello just on chat, making them feel welcome.

It's something - I read a piece of research recently both physical and on call meetings that if you actually have people speak their name, even if they know each other, but you have them speak and say something in the beginning of a meeting, and if the group is manageable size to do that, that they have a higher

tendency to contribute to the content of the meeting, and to answer questions if they've already spoken early on in the meeting. So I know what I'm doing in physical meetings, I always make it a point to do a round of introductions when I open a meeting, even if it's people that have been together and know each other. And it's just as simple, "Here's my name. Here's how long I've been with the organization and here's what's on my mind."

You know, so there's something different. So I'm learning something new as colleagues, but just by having them voice, you know, be heard early on, they have a better tendency to be heard as the meeting goes on too. It's an interesting feature research. So remind the group if there's group agreements. As we sometimes do on calls, remind them about the code of conduct, remind them of what we've agreed to, to be most effective of each other. Go with the rolls for group members.

And then, let's see, let's move into conducting meeting. I have the what else, so I'm going to ask that as a general question when we get to the end of this. So conducting the meeting. I've got really two pages on this, but just keeping the focus on the agenda, this isn't a matter of your position suspension, but get - staying on agenda, staying on the subject matter, and being careful not to go down side trails or rabbit holes they're sometimes called. And if someone is as a participant you can pull it back in, and you can say, "So connect that for me to what we were talking about before." If I'm in the meeting.

Non-judgmental, but it's a way to reel somebody back in if they've gone off on a story. Help balance participation. You know, maybe suggest going around the - if we're in one of those ICANN news, going around the view to get input from everybody in the group on a particular topic. Obviously, it can be unruly at a large group and especially one that's (miked) and recorded to get everyone

to do that. But it's just one technique to try to balance the participation in the room.

You know, don't just schedule status updates. You know, so if you're going - if you're part of a working group meeting, you know, make the calls count. You know, so it's not just a, "Here's what I've done. Here's what you've done. Here's what she's done." You know, and then, you're done with the call, but what's the purpose of that call or that interaction that is going to move the conversation forward. You can do status update just by reading them. You don't necessarily have to say them.

And, again, you can do all of these things as participant. So other things here, you know, not getting sidetracked, I mentioned that, addressing questions quickly, offering to add an explanation outside of the meeting. I had a good friend at one point that used to use the facilitation technique of the parking lot and he would say that, "You know, well, we're going to put that in the parking lot," and, you know - but sometimes his parking lots would turn into what I would call - more of like a graveyard.

So, essentially, I'm going to take your position and I'm going to bury it over here and never address it again. You know, so if you are using something of saying, "Let's come back to that," that you actually do come back to that as part of your closing on the meeting to make sure that issues are addressed. Politely call out bad behaviors right away. You know, if someone is interrupting someone, you know, just to, you know, say, "I didn't catch that last point. You know, (Julia), could you repeat that for us?"

You know, you can do that as a participant. You don't need to be the chair to do that. And this mute button, this last piece is kind of interesting. You know, I say, "Minimize the mute button." And what I mean by that is really

to maintain your focus. So in conducting a meeting, whether you're in charge of it or a participant in it, is really to be fully present and focused there. So if it's on the phone, I'd like to keep my mute button off if there's no chance of background noise or distraction or audio issues. That's a technicality where I might use the mute button as many of us need to do on this call. You know, but minimize that because it keeps my focus there and suddenly I don't find myself multitasking, and I'm off track of what the meeting is.

Ending the meeting, you know, you summarize the conclusions, actions, next steps. As a participant, once again, I can ask that question. So what are our next steps and who's going to be responsible for what, I just like to know how we're moving forward. You know, appreciate and acknowledge people that disagreed and spoke out or spoke up, and just acknowledge their contribution to that. And then, you know, any kind of housekeeping that's there that - and, again, depending on your role, this is kind of more from a leadership role, but just attending to the fact that notes and recording is where they're going to be asking those kinds of questions.

And then, finally, following up, you know, to make sure that there's accountability, and that people actually do what they say they're going to do. To me, I think, this is one of the most challenging pieces for me personally. But on that note, a poll question for you, so what phases of meetings are the most challenging? When you think about this, you're opening the meeting, conducting the meeting, closing the meeting, and following up on the meeting, what do you find is the most challenging phases? Now, I'll give you a minute or so just to click on what you find is most challenging and we'll see where the strength of opinion is. Go ahead.

Six responses so far. Give it another 30 seconds. What are the most challenging phases in meeting (streaming)? Okay, about half of the group.

Nine over here. Okay, we've got ten responses. I'm going to end the poll at this point and let's take a look at where we are.

So open the meeting, 20% - back up, it's freezing into this - oh, there we go. I'm sorry. Tools, IT. So open the meeting, 20%, conducting the meeting, 10%, and then following up, 70%. Yes. I definitely agree with that for me personally. Because, you know, that's the piece that we don't really have a lot of control over. You know, as participant, I can't control who's actually going to follow up. What I can do is I can try to nudge the chair or whoever is in charge of the process or the co-chair whoever's been designated, what's the follow-up on that meeting that we had two weeks ago, how is it coming.

So they might then go to the people that are accountable for different action steps going forward. I think this is where the processes get bogged down or tend to be protracted for longer than necessary, is it - in this follow-up stage of do people do what they say they're going to do, and do we actually get a physical commitment from them, and not just leave the room, and they don't do what they said they were going to do in the first place.

Okay, our last slide is closing out this webinar. So first let me just summarize where we are. I see something in the comment here. A need for more clarity with regards to action points, yes, when following up. Thank you, (Bruna). Absolutely.

Yes, it is fascinating. Yes, and then Cheryl's point saying that, you know, the meetings are too close together a lot of times. Yes, it's hard to follow up with - I've got multiple meetings with multiple action points coming out of them, so the question to be, you know, how can we get good at that, you know, so that's great. So let's start to close here. So, okay, by way of a bit of summary, so really the points that we've covered here is we've looked at consensus as a

process, we've looked at barriers to consensus, we've looked at how do we - you know, what the participation mindset that we should have in a consensus process, and then we move into virtual consensus, virtual collaboration, how do we - what are some of the best practices for that and how do we do that in a most effective way.

And then, finally, what are the phases of meetings that we find challenging, because that's all part of getting to a consensus decision. There are multiple meetings and, obviously, overlapping meetings as well. So any questions or comments at this point? There's some typing going on. And while the people are typing, Ozan, if you'll go ahead and put up the whiteboard for key takeaways. We'll get ready for that.

Farzaneh, can you say a little bit about this, you know, there's too many meetings and how would we work with the mailing list more to be more effective instead of having meetings, just give us a little bit of clarification on that. I think that's an interesting point.

Farzaneh Badii: Sorry, I'm with my terrible microphone, so - and I can't dial back in. But if you can just bear with me (toward the call). So basically what is happening to the meeting is that (the chair of this) agenda, the (whole optimal team) is not clear, and then a lot of people can disrupt the meeting, and just get the microphone, and talk. And so the - and also people are more prepared when they intervene on the mailing list, because they actually have to write something and think about it while they are (at the paper) when they talk. And I think it's very difficult to do everything on - do policy on just having meeting, I hope you see what I mean.

So this is my point and also like - it's like (also wakes up) (unintelligible) because they want to interrupt and they want to say, "Okay, it is time to work

with people on this issue." But I think the use of (mailing list) responding and (mailing list) is one of the main tool that we use in NCSG. And, yes, exactly, and (unintelligible) said there is this (call up) and (mailing list) that some - in some - I was going to say it's geographic even. It's not about the region, really it's about the people's preferences on how this work. They like to hear themselves sometimes in the (unintelligible).

(David Kolb):   So there's a lot of echo there, but I'll see if I can summarize a little bit. So what I was hearing is that, you know, a lot of times in, you know, physical meetings or even on the phone, people get the microphone and there's lots of information that comes out. And some of that information could be delivered to the mailing list, to either preliminary to the meeting or following up on a meeting to get that point of view across, and on the record too, by the way.

I know that my experience in some of the ICANN meetings has been, you know, people want to get something on the record, because it's being recorded, so it's now part of the public domain. But, you know, leveraging mailing lists and leveraging other technologies, and Cheryl made a comment as well like some country in APAC, you know, have limitations, cultural and technical. So sometimes, the mailing list, you know, can limit participants in some way.

So we - you know, I think a summary point on that is that, you know, that the challenge is within this environment that there's new ones all of the time, right? I mean, within the ICANN community, we're dealing with this unique, you know, medium of the internet and, you know, the challenges are new, and exciting all of the time in terms of what comes up in terms of censorship and governments, in terms of, you know, countries that may have, you know, various limitations that are there. There's just so much that comes to mind and I'm always encouraged in webinars like this and in my face-to-face interaction

with you all of just the amount of commitment and the spirit of collaboration that's there, even though it's not necessarily felt all of the time to really keep the internet a free and open space, that's respectful of human rights and civil rights. And for you, obviously, the voice of civil society.

So on that note you see the whiteboard here, so the whiteboard is essentially just what's one key learning from the webinar. You know, we want to keep - we want to capture this information for future ICANN learn courses and content that we've developed. But also just, you know, as you thought about what we've covered in the past couple of hours, you know, what is - what's one thing that you take away from it and if you'll type that into the whiteboard, that's great, and then I'll read these as they come up for those that are on mobiles. So, so far we have importance of post meeting follow-ups, understanding other values and interest is key to moving forward with the consensus based decision.

Importance of introduction came up in the chat, we can add that on. Considering the different perspectives when listening to others. And there's one overlapping that - okay, importance of introduction. Yes, I challenge you to try that out the next meeting, just having everybody speak at the meeting at the beginning and see if the level of participation is higher. I have found since I read that, that it absolutely is.

Other key takeaways, we've had two that came up simultaneously. I'm having a hard time reading the print on some of that. Ozan, is there a way to make the board bigger or to - wait a minute, I've got an idea. There we go. So, firstly, you need to understand the core values that you stand for, okay. Understand your core values first. I think somebody is typing the same thing. Offline conversations matter, especially when the people is having opposite points of view. Good. Thank you.

Other key takeaways? Okay. Well, I want to thank you for your time and energy today, and I really appreciate the participation. It's - I've got a lot of webinars where it's just me talking for an hour or two hours, and as much as I enjoy hearing myself speak, I'm being (facetious), you know, it's great to have the feedback, and it's great to have something coming back at me. So it's great to hear from you and we can make this even more relevant for you that way, (too excited).

I know I've made in fight adjustments, because I've gone along between this morning and this afternoon just to make it more relevant based on what I was getting this morning from feedback. So Benedetta will provide us with a link to an evaluation. And so we really appreciate if you've got some time now since we haven't quite hit two hours, just to click on that evaluation, it's very quick, just a couple of four or five questions about how the webinar was for you, what was the most useful for you, how did I do, what else would you like to hear, those kinds of things, and especially in the what else, what other content would you'd like to see.

You know, as I've said in the beginning, you know, we're looking at doing a second webinar focused on influence and negotiation in October, sometime before the Barcelona meeting. Because our goal is that when you get to Barcelona that you had - some of you will have the face-to-face in Panama in this webinar and the second webinar, and for some the two webinars. And we did this in a way that, you know, you didn't have to be in Panama to do the webinars, that - just a deeper dive of what we started to address in Panama.

So we want to really get you ready for Barcelona to be the most effective NCSG participants that we have ever seen hit the stage when they get to the ICANN - when they get to ICANN. I guess, is it ICANN 63 or 62 in

Barcelona? 63? So, thanks again for your time. And, Ozan, are there any parting comments, final words from your point of view?

Ozan Sahin: Thank you, (David). I will thank everyone for joining and (Kevin), can you please stop the recording and disconnect all lines please?

END