
BARCELONA – Fellowship Daily Session
Wednesday, October 24, 2018 – 12:00 to 13:30 CEST
ICANN63 | Barcelona, Spain

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: We have five more minutes to go with the lunch. Please wrap up within that timing. Hello, everyone. How are you? Did you like the lunch? I hope you enjoyed. Okay. So, we have very, very interesting session today, which we actually piloted last time for fellows and we got a lot of feedback, positive feedback, how interesting session this was and we decided to repeat the session here as well for all of you. With great pleasure, I would like to introduce you my dear colleagues in public responsibility team, Ergys Ramaj and Elizabeth Andrews.

So, Ergys is a Director of Public Responsibility Team and Betsey is the link with ICANNLearn. So, the whole content there is up to them. First of all, Ergys, happy birthday. Thank you for spending your birthday time with fellows. It's a pleasure to have you here.

ERGYS RAMAJ: Couldn't think of a better place.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you. So, without further ado, we have one hour for our session. It will be a very interactive session, so the floor is yours. Thank you.

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

ERGYS RAMAJ:

Thank you, Siranush. Hello, everyone. Good afternoon. How is everyone doing? Sounds very positive. As Siranush mentioned ... First of all, let me do the introductions. My name is Ergys Ramaj and I am Vice President for Public Responsibility support at ICANN Org and this is my colleague, Betsey Andrews, and she is the queen of ICANNLearn and many, many other projects within the department. So, if there's any questions that you may have about capacity development in general, Betsey is your person. But, you can also ask anyone from our team.

So, we piloted this presentation last meeting and the feedback was overwhelmingly positive, so we figured why don't we make some tweaks based on the feedback that we got last time and we go at it for a second time and see what your reactions are and get your input, and hopefully this will continue to get better each time we engage with the fellows.

In short, this is a presentation or workshop or whatever it is you want to call it on conflict resolution. When Betsey first approached me with the idea, I asked her. I said, "First of all, look at me. Do I look like I'm here to resolve conflicts or start conflicts?" But anyway, it is what it is. Here I am. Don't let the appearance fool you.

So, what we're going to talk to you guys today is a brief introduction on conflict resolution, theory. What is it in practice? How does it apply to the ICANN context? We're going to have a group role play and then we want to hear from you. We want to get your feedback, your thoughts. Again, what worked, what didn't work, and how we can improve it in

future rounds. So, I'll start with the first few slides. Oops, I went too fast. Okay.

When you think about conflict, you – most people – probably think about something that is aggressive in nature. You think of individuals in the hallway and any environment going at it, yelling at one another, moving around, body language, all sorts of different gestures.

It's a little more than that, but it's essentially any disagreement. It doesn't have to be a verbal or physical confrontation. You may disagree with a viewpoint. You may also disagree with whatever it is a person has to say. It doesn't have to be verbal, either. It could be a silent disagreement. It does not have to be confrontation in the traditional sense, or at least how we think about it.

Why does it occur? There are a myriad of reasons and what we've listed here is just a few of them, but miscommunication is one of the key reasons you'll encounter in our day lives, in our professional lives, that conflict occurs because of miscommunication, either because the other party did not understand and communication happens when the person who's on the receiving end of the communication understands what it is you're trying to say and understands what it is you're trying to get out of a situation.

So, on the expressions of resistance or conflict, there are about ten of them that we've listed here or more, and the first one is details. So, have you encountered someone who is either asking or giving too much details? I see a lot of nodding. That's probably the case. Again, that happens both in our professional lives but also in our personal lives.

There's not enough time. There just isn't enough time. We cannot make time. That's one of the things we cannot make. We don't have enough time.

The third component is it's just not practical. It wouldn't work in this case, right? A one-size-fits-all solution is not something that translates very well from one context to another.

I will go through these very quickly because I don't want to take too much time because our time has been shortened from one and a half to an hour, so I want to give Betsey an opportunity as well to weigh in.

But again, people who are too quick to jump to solutions. They sound like a broken record, keep hearing the same thing over and over and over. And that could be for, again, many, many reasons. It also could be overt versus covert, something you can see and something you can not see. There's ultimately a lot of confusion. Again, uncertainty after many, many times of trying to explain the same situation, people are silent.

You've probably heard, in the ICANN case, do we have consensus on this? Oftentimes people just don't respond, and a lot of times, people take that silence for agreement and that's not always the case.

Moralizing situations. If they could do it the way I think, then it would be good. So, my way or the highway kind of thing. Again, methodology, questioning the way you go about doing things.

Lastly – and again, this is not an all-inclusive list – it's the notion of those who have been around for a while saying, "Well, it was like this, but it's better now." Or vice-versa. So, outdated information.

But, how is this useful at ICANN? And I always use the examples of the multi-stakeholder model at work. So, ICANN, by definition, brings together stakeholders from all over the world, different backgrounds, different goals, different objectives.

So, one of the things that is inherent in the multi-stakeholder model in the way of reaching decisions in a bottom-up way is conflict. So, conflict is not necessarily a bad thing. It's actually a good thing because if all of us in this room believe that I am great – and I hope we all do – then we wouldn't get anything done, right? We have to disagree. You bring your viewpoint. You bring your culture into it. You bring your professional experience into it. You bring all sorts of things that make you who you are into the conversation.

Oftentimes, you cannot de-link the notion of achieving a policy objective with who you are as an individual and your personal viewpoints. I know that we strive to do that. I know we always talk about keeping it very professional. But, ultimately, we are who we are. We have our own biases. We have our own views. And that is not a bad thing. You have to bring it to the table, but it has to surface at the table and you have to have that conversation. You have to have that disagreement. And it's a healthy thing. It's not necessarily a bad thing. Now, it could be bad if it's disruptive, but we'll touch on that in a second.

So, on the theory, I will pass it on to Betsey for her remarks. Betsey?

BETSEY ANDREWS:

Thank you, Ergys. And thank you again for having us here today. As Ergys has been talking about, when we are together at ICANN trying to have conversations, oftentimes we totally agree on the end goal. It's very complicated, however, to find how to reach that end goal.

So, one of the reasons we want to talk to you as the future of ICANN and the future of ICANN leadership and participation in the policy process is because we want you to start thinking about the how process. We want you to start thinking about what it takes in order to get to what you might think is common sense.

Going through the practicalities that we've just gone through and the ways to recognize the things that can cause conflict, that slide that Ergys was explaining with the multi-colored flags, that's really helpful when you're identifying what conflict is.

The reason it's important to even go down that road is because you need to recognize multiple points of view. So, while this is a conflict resolution workshop, what this really is, is a big-fat reminder that when you're going into a process to build consensus, you need to think about how to best articulate your own view, yes, but you also need to think about the views and the manners and the interactions with other people. And that's a lot to keep in your head, especially if you're doing this with your free time or especially if you're doing this because it's a part of your job and you have a very clear objective.

So, thinking about these skills and how you want to approach this environment is going to help you to be successful at ICANN. But it's also going to help you in your life, because you will start to recognize these

kinds of styles that we go over here, and that's why the theory of conflict and conflict resolution is important. So, as you see on this slide, managing conflict matters because you're recognizing multiple perspectives.

So, you can manage a conflict in an assertive way and others can manage conflict in a cooperative way. And when you start to recognize the relationship between you and others, that could be an individual or it could be you and a group or it could be various parties or community groups that you're working with within ICANN. If you start to recognize different goals and perspectives and attitudes and processes that people are undergoing in order to build and reach consensus, then you're better able to identify conflict and that's the first step in resolving conflict. Uh-oh!

ERGYS RAMAJ:

Adobe is not our friend today. Shall we go to the next one?

BETSEY ANDREWS:

Go ahead to the next one. So, this approach ... I really like this image of the iceberg. Can you see it? I'm sorry I'm standing in front of you. This image of the iceberg is really helpful because if you look at what's above the surface, what we see, the beautiful picture of an iceberg, those positions, that's what's overt on the top. That's what you can see. But, notice in the picture the bulk of the iceberg is actually underneath the surface and it makes for a really great metaphor for how you can approach conflict.

So, we see the interests are sort of buried right below the surface and it expands because of the temperature of water and what happens when it freezes. But, when you get down to the very bottom, the needs, those are deep. There are deep needs and they're not always identified in life with conflict and also at ICANN in conflict.

So, this is a really helpful way to think about approaching conflict and how we can identify and identify with what those deep needs are, both our own and on other sides.

So, you'll definitely have access to these slides at a later date, but if you just consider what's visible and how much more is hidden underneath in terms of subconscious motives and what deep needs are, that's going to help you when you start to approach a conflicting situation and also to decide what approach to take when you're moving forward to try to resolve that conflict and that's what we're going to talk about next.

ERGYS RAMAJ:

Adobe is still not our friend. Shall I skip to the next one?

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN:

I'm sorry. The issue is that the PDF was uploaded and not PowerPoint, the PDF version. So, if we take out now the ... We need some time to upload the new version. But if you need the Adobe part ...

BETSEY ANDREWS:

If you just let us see what's on the slides, we can talk to it even without the image.

ERGYS RAMAJ: Yeah. I think that would be useful. Apologies for the technical difficulties here. I could try to entertain you guys otherwise, but I'm not a very good entertainer. I could sing for a minute.

While we're waiting, let me just acknowledge and recognize the presence of another member of our team, Fernanda lunes. Could you please wave to everyone? She is the glue to our team. If you guys have any questions, again, about what we do, how we do it, why we do it, Fernanda is your person. She's based out of Washington, DC, with me.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Betsey, I have you as—

BETSEY ANDREWS: I brought it up. Thank you. I appreciate.

ERGYS RAMAJ: We've got a portable presentation.

BETSEY ANDREWS: So, if you'll excuse my prop, we have a portable presentation here. We were talking about the theory behind conflict resolution and now I want to move into practicalities about conflict resolution.

So, there are three main approaches that we're going to talk to you about today and then we're going to give you an opportunity to practice those approaches.

What we're hoping is not to make you experts in conflict resolution. We're not experts in conflict resolution. But, when you start to understand some of the core underlying principles, you'll start to recognize them in practice. So, that's really our goal today.

So, the three conflict resolution styles that we're going to be practicing is advocate, avoid, and compromise. I've got a beautiful image illustrating those that you can't see right now.

So, to advocate when you are in a conflict resolution situation is to be able to clearly articulate your point and advocate for it. The word is related to advocate that we use in the legal profession. In the verb form, it's about being able to organize your thoughts and present them and advocate for your position.

So, when you think about that slide that we showed you before where Ergys was describing the many different aspects or elements of conflict that you can recognize, with each of those, you can start to think, "Well, how can I counterbalance that and still advocate for my position?" This is very easy to do when you're thinking about it ahead of time. It's much more difficult to do when you're in a heated argument situation where you're trying to resolve conflict. So, that's the first.

The second is avoid. Avoid is not necessarily a bad thing because sometimes the conflict is not relevant to what you're trying to achieve.

So, avoiding the conflict can be a deliberate strategy that you employ in order to resolve the conflict at hand.

The third is compromise and compromise is usually what we think of when we're talking about conflict resolution. The idea of compromise is that we both may have views and we can both reach an end solution that suits us, that we're happy with.

However, you will notice that, by definition, compromise is not consensus. So, that's not always possible, particularly in an ICANN setting. So, these three – advocate, avoid, and compromise – are the three strategies that we're going to be talking about and practicing.

ERGYS RAMAJ: Can we still put the slides up?

BETSEY ANDREWS: They're working on it.

ERGYS RAMAJ: We're working on it. Okay, sounds good. Maybe we should give it a minute so that it's easier for everyone to follow us as we go through the slides in here, which you can't see. Maybe another minute? Or should we carry on? Whatever you guys would like.

So, what's important, just to continue what Betsey was saying, no matter what style it is that you have in communicating with others, it's important to note that style and it's important to understand what kind

of things you could do supplement that in order to get what it is you want to get out of a particular situation.

For example, if you're someone who likes to avoid confrontation, then what is it you can do to at least become a part of that process, a part of the solution, to let others know where it is that you stand? Even though you may have to come out of your comfort zone, you still have to first identify what your style is and then what is it you can do within a given context to ensure that your voice is heard? Because you could ultimately always gravitate towards where your comfort zone is and that is, "You know what? I don't want to be a part of this. I don't want to engage in this."

But let's say, for example, that your role is to represent the viewpoints of X place. It could be a government. It could be any other institution. Your job is to go back and report to your superiors on the outcome of a particular situation.

Now, the only way to grow professionally and individually is to get outside of that comfort zone. You need to be able to challenge yourself. The only way we all get better is to challenge ourselves and get out of that comfort zone. So, it's important, again, in this context to know who you are, what your style is, and what it is you can do to be better, what it is you can do to challenge yourself.

BETSEY ANDREWS: The second half of that – I'm sorry, I didn't mean to interrupt.

ERGYS RAMAJ: Go ahead.

BETSEY ANDREWS: The second half of that is to be able to recognize what approaches other people are taking because that's going to help prepare you to know how to meet them in that situation.

I heard a really interesting anecdote by David [Kolb] who is one of the individuals that we call upon in the leadership program to teach us some of these skills. He said that oftentimes the skill that you default towards is the skill that works best on you.

So, think about that. Think about how you tend to behave in a situation with conflict and consider how that might actually be what's best when somebody is trying to resolve conflict with you.

A good example of that is when I'm in a conflict situation, I need to withdraw for a minute, get my thoughts together, and then I can be very straightforward and resolve the situation.

My three siblings all need closure immediately. They do not want to take a break. They do not want to step back from the conflict. They want to keep talking about this until we get it resolved because we should not leave this room until we are all in agreement and have built consensus, whereas my style is exactly the opposite.

So, now that we recognize that, it's a whole lot easier because I can say, "Look, guys, I know we need to talk about this, but I need some Betsey

time.” And that’s just one of the ways that you can analyze what your style is and what others are.

So, we’re going to take you into a practical situation now – we’ll be less dependent on the slides – and give you an opportunity to talk to different people about what their styles are and practice some of these concepts of compromise avoidance and advocate.

ERGYS RAMAJ:

Okay. Just to close up what Betsey was saying, if there’s one word to describe all of this, it’s adaptability. You have to adapt to the situation. That’s all that it is, human nature. You have to adapt.

So, we were thinking earlier this morning. We said, “What is a scenario that we can share with the fellows that they can relate to, that they can easily understand and then have them engage in a conversation as a group?” or in three separate groups, rather.

Both Betsey and I thought about what happened this week where we were in a room and we were having discussions with two different groups about the fellowship program. On this side, we had those who were saying, “Hey, guys, the fellows are doing a great job. We see them everywhere. They are leadership positions. This is a great program. Let’s keep it going.”

And on the other side, you had those who were saying things like, “Yeah, but the return on investment on the fellowship program is not clear. We don’t have any metrics to show that the fellowship is working and we’re

spending a lot of money on it, so why keep it going? What’s the point? What’s the purpose?”

The scenario we wanted to create out of that is the following. You are in a room where there are two parties arguing for and against the fellowship program. We’ve got five minutes on the agenda and the party who is against the fellowship program has the floor and they’re saying, “Okay, we’re going to wrap this up. We all know where everybody stands on this. Can’t we just make a decision quickly? Let’s just make a decision. Whatever. Let’s get this done with. We’re tired of this. We’ve been discussing this issue for a long time. We’ve only got five minutes and we have to make a decision.”

And on the other side, you have those who are saying, “Wait. Whoa. This needs a more in-depth discussion. This needs something where we all can come around and have a discussion that we discuss the pros and the cons and everything else. But we cannot make a decision within five minutes.”

So, what we wanted you guys to do is to break up in groups of three. I’m going to start here with number one, two, three, and you go around the table. Wait, there’s no four. One, two, three, and then you start back at one. Okay, so let’s do it again. One Wow, this is perfect. Well, we passed the counting part.

So, why don’t we start with group one over here, group two in that corner, and group three over here. See, we’ll compromise. We’re group three.

BETSEY ANDREWS: Group one, you're going to practice the advocate resolution style. Group two, you're going to practice the avoid resolution style. And group three, you're going to practice the compromise resolution style in this scenario.

One thing that I would like to say, if you can hold your comments for just a minute, if you could stop talking for just a minute ... Okay. So, one thing that I want to say to keep in mind while you're practicing these styles is that no one style is going to solve every conflict, and oftentimes you need to employ multiple styles.

So, for example, avoidance isn't going to work forever. So, you need to be able to master all of these skills to advocate, to avoid, and to compromise. But this scenario that we want you to practice on is because we want you to then have a spokesperson in your group who can explain what that skill is going to look like ... Are you going to know what to do later if you're talking now?

You're going to need a spokesperson in your group who can explain what avoidance would look like in this particular scenario where you've got two different sides of this debate. Is everybody clear about what we're asking you to do?

ERGYS RAMAJ: Yeah. I see a lot of confused faces. So, if you have any questions, let's resolve those before you break into your own groups. So, if you have

any questions, please just put your hand up. Either Betsey or myself will come to your group and help clarify.

BETSEY ANDREWS: We have a question over here.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: We should describe the skills of the persons who are in this group? I mean, who should be in this group?

ERGYS RAMAJ: Yeah. But, also, as a group you identify a spokesperson. That person will tell us, “How are you going to address this issue, given the role that you’ve been given as a group?” Okay. Any more questions before we give you guys about five minutes or so? No more than five minutes. Okay. The time starts now.

BETSEY ANDREWS: We have a half-an-hour left. So, I think for the next scenario we should keep them sitting until we’ve explained everything and then break them into groups.

ERGYS RAMAJ: [off mic].

BETSEY ANDREWS: So, we have them go over what worked and we need to not spend very much time on that and then we go straight into the role play. But I think we need to have them stay where they are.

ERGYS RAMAJ: Yeah, that's fine.

BETSEY ANDREWS: Think about what it would look like if you were ... Let's say you're the chair. You're the person in charge of this meeting that's happening and you've got one view over here that is, "Fellowship is a no-brainer. We're going to fund it. Whatever. Let's just move on. We're running out of time in this session."

Then, you've got somebody over here who's saying, "I don't know. I'm not seeing a lot of evidence of participation of the fellows in the community. We spend a lot of money on travel. Maybe we need to revisit the underpinnings. Maybe we can have a really long discussion about this.

So, imagine that each of you are the person who's trying to get resolution in this meeting. So, how can you use compromise if you're the mediator? Think about it as being the person in between. What would the elements of compromise look like if you're trying to get this person who thinks it's a no-brainer, let's just pass it, and this person who has the perspective of this may need a much deeper dive. What would you do as the chair or the co-rapporteur of that group? What

would compromise look like? Yeah, that would employ the skill of compromise.

There was just a question of what exactly you're trying to achieve in this group. Imagine you're the moderator or the chair or the rapporteur of this particular [inaudible]. So, you have an individual on one side speaking who is saying, "Fellowship is a no-brainer. Let's just go on about other things we need to discuss in our agenda. Yes, everything is fine. Let's move forward with it."

Then, you have someone who has a different perspective on the other side who is saying, "Well, I actually question the fundamental concept in having a fellowship program. I'm not seeing a lot of evidence of [inaudible] and we're spending a lot of money on it, so I'm not sure the resources are justified. Maybe we need to do a deep dive."

So, imagine you're the moderator in the middle of this. You've got ten minutes left in the session. You can't achieve both aims. So, how do you use avoidance in order to move the meeting towards a close? What would that look like if you were to employ the skill of avoidance? Does that help?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Does avoidance mean [inaudible]?

BETSEY ANDREWS: Well, if you're avoiding conflict, if you're the person who's moderating ... My microphone is picking this up. If you're the person who is

moderating the conflict, what element of discussion [off mic]. In what way would you avoid the conflict? So, there are multiple options here and no right answer. But, in this example, [inaudible] the actual disagreement between, yes, we should move forward, and no, we should not [inaudible]. [background chatter]

Then you have to consider what the [inaudible] effective avoidance is and that's a part of this exercise as well. So, if we avoid this discussion and we say let's put this off until the next ICANN meeting, well, what happens in between? Well, the fellowship applications are six months in advance, so then what have you done with the Panama meeting? [off mic]

... Discussing is how avoidance might get you through the next ten minutes without argument, but then the [inaudible] of avoidance can be negative in terms of productivity. So, that's the thing. [off mic]

We're going to do role play next. We'll give you different scenarios to work out.

Well, what a moderator would do is clearly articulate both positions.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You're advocating for which position?

BETSEY ANDREWS: Both of them.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: For and against?

BETSEY ANDREWS: But that's part of the chairing [inaudible] complex for this.

ERGYS RAMAJ: [off mc] because it's very difficult to understand [off mic].

BETSEY ANDREWS: Let's get rid of the fourth one. Are you okay with that?

ERGYS RAMAJ: Yeah. I'm good with it. Let's just do it in order, one, two, three.

BETSEY ANDREWS: Okay. One more minute to wrap up. Be sure you have a spokesperson and you know what you want to share with the group. One more minute.

Do you want to go ahead and [inaudible]? It's on, unless you turned it off. IT is controlling the mic. You don't have to turn it on and off unless you did turn it off.

ERGYS RAMAJ: I did turn it off. Okay, everyone, let's wrap it up, please and we are going to get started with group one. Group one, do we have a spokesperson that is going to share with us the outcome of this conversation? Okay.

So, is everyone else paying attention, please? You can stay in your groups. Everyone is paying attention? Okay.

So, the spokesperson will have to identify themselves, also mention which one of these approaches, which one of these styles, they're employing, and then share with us the agreement within the group on how it is that they're going to approach this. So, please.

SALVADOR HERNANDEZ:

I'm Salvador from Mexico. We were discussing about the [inaudible] advocate about the ICANN fellowship and we believe that, first of all, to support something we need facts. And for facts related to this issue, we have the undeniable fact [and refutable] that two board members, like two actual board members, are former fellows. So, that's a way how we prove that the program is working and, yeah, it can take some time. But, it's working.

Also, fellows have assumed leadership positions in different constituencies. For example, NCUC with Bruna. So, there is another fact. We're more about facts than just saying, "Yeah, it's necessary." Furthermore, fellowship program engages global diversity, because as we all know, fellows, we are from all over the world, all over the regions, so we are covering the whole region. There you go, please.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

Okay, thank you. We're sharing this, to actually illustrate how diverse we are. We discussed the issue of fellows participating in the policy development process and the reality is, without fellows and without

this participation, ICANN is not going to achieve its mandate to ensure its community participation.

This is one of the strongest points that we have in favor of the fellowship. Apart from the fact that what does happen? Even though you might not find all fellows assuming leadership positions, there is another reactionary effect. There's a ripple effect that happens. And this is why Siranush always says, "Once a fellow, always a fellow." Because you've got to think about the mind shift and the change that happens to somebody who has this exposure. Even if they don't return, they obviously would have had some passion for Internet governance, some passion for multi-stakeholderism, and I'm pretty certain, even though not every fellow participates in the ICANN PDP process, what does happen is that the training that they receive, the exposure that they receive, the networking that happens, that does have a ripple effect in their countries far beyond what ICANN could possibly measure.

So, I think that the opportunity that this fellowship program presents is something that we cannot underrate. I think that the influence that it has is something that has great value.

BETSEY ANDREWS:

Thank you, group one. That's a good example of how to advocate for a position. I'm going to hand it over to Oliana now who is going to give an example of what it would look like as the moderator to employ the resolution style of avoidance.

OLIANA SULA:

Hello, everyone. It's me, Oliana, from Albania. Just a first thing that came to my mind was that avoidance – into the mind of all the groups, actually. Avoidance is something in between the two other styles, style A and style C, compromising and advocating.

So, the moderator in this case should not only be assertive, so should not take part in pro or in being against or in compromising with this resolution, but the most important skill is to find this middle way and to be assertive in any case, and also to go [inaudible] maybe in some more meta question or some more bigger theme in order to avoid some kind of conflict inside the discussion. And maybe to move the discussion into a next stage.

But this is a main risk because you know what it means for a fellowship program to block the discussion and to not take any decision about conflict resolution. It means that the process would be frozen and what happens next?

We are not very advocates of avoiding position but we have to compromise with that, so I hope we are clear.

Basically, it's just being assertive. We said there are two kinds of people, of moderators who avoid, usually. One that is passive by nature and would let the flow go and will say, "Ah, you are okay, and you, too, you are okay." And the other one who knows what are the consequences of his actions but he will move towards maybe some bigger theme or bigger way. It is very difficult to do conflict resolution, so I hope that we can be mediators one day. Thank you.

ERGYS RAMAJ: Thank you very much. Group three, do we have a spokesperson? Please identify yourself and do share with the rest of the group your findings.

MILI SEMLANI: Hi, I'm Mili. I'm from India. We tried the approach of compromise, which is a nice one. As a group, we came up with three different approaches, just like a step-by-step process. To achieve a compromise, we first listen to everybody in our group and different views and opinions that are coming out. What this gives us is the ability to recognize who are for and against it and why they are for or against it which helps us identify the pain points which we can then use to compromise.

To give you an example, if somebody who is against it says, "Fellowship takes up a lot of funding," and, "Why should we do that?" to reach a compromise with that person. We could reach consensus saying that we could probably lessen the funding a little bit and make the program a little bit more impactful by adding different approaches, thus making this person who thinks it takes a lot of money a little less [inaudible] and the person who want it and the people who want it and are for the fellowship problem, still keeping them happy, that yes, the program continues to happen. Maybe with a little less money, but still everybody trying the same effort to keep it going.

Hence, we had a very interesting approach to balance views of different parties, both in their own opposing ways. But find the middle ground, give a little piece of the pie to decide and give a little piece to that side

and reach the consensus, I think were the most impactful in getting a consensus. Thank you.

BETSEY ANDREWS:

Thank you very much. That's a great explanation of what compromise would look like in this scenario. We're going to skip ahead a little bit and do a different kind of role play that I think that you will enjoy. So, we're going to knock off group four. We're just going to go with group one, group two, and group three. We're going to stay in the same groups you're in. But, in this case, we'd like you to nominate a different spokesperson. We want everybody to understand what the group scenarios are, so that when the groups give the explanation at the end, you're familiar.

So, group one, there's an argument on a mailing list and many individuals appear to be taking a hostile tone towards one particular individual. So, there's a ganging up situation going on. What do you do?

Group two, on a conference call – this is you, group two. You're on a conference call. There's only a few participants and another participant dismisses your recommendation saying you don't know what you're talking about because you don't have enough experience in this field. How do you handle this confrontation?

Now, group three, in a small group session at an ICANN meeting, a participant consistently gives too much detail each time he or she speaks. What would you do to keep the conversation on track and keep the group productive? Okay. Thank you. You will have about 10-15

minutes. Correction. You're going to have about five minutes for this. I'm sorry. Time check.

ERGYS RAMAJ: And just to reiterate, you're going to have to find an alternate spokesperson. It cannot be the same person as before. Thank you.

BETSEY ANDREWS: Let's take about one more minute to wrap up and be sure you've selected a spokesperson to explain to everyone else how you would resolve this confrontation.

ERGYS RAMAJ: Alright, everyone, we're wrapping up. Does group one have a spokesperson and have you guys agreed on next steps? Can we have everyone else please tune in? Group one is about to deliver their remarks.

BETSEY ANDREWS: Read the scenarios.

ERGYS RAMAJ: I'm going to reread it again just so that it's fresh for everyone. Group one, there is an argument on a mailing list and many individuals appear to be taking a hostile tone towards one particular individual. What do you do?

MOHAMED: Hi, my name is Mohamed. I think the first thing to do is support that individual because he is looking for that support in that particular time. Then we share the mail list rules with everyone again to encourage all of them to read it again and to respect those rules.

ERGYS RAMAJ: Before you go any further, do you mind explaining what you mean by support that individual? Are you saying we're supporting their viewpoint? Are you saying we're supporting their arguments or are you saying we're supporting them as a person to say we understand your challenges, however, this is not a way to go about this. These are the rules of engagement, etc.

MOHAMED: [off mic].

ERGYS RAMAJ: Okay. So, basically, what I'm hearing is that this individual is using the mailing list as an outlet, but bullying ... Okay. So, then, your approach is to say, "We understand you. We understand you're frustrated. However, this is not the way to go about this. There are rules and procedures in place." And you point them to those rules and procedures. Okay. Thank you very much. Any questions from anyone? Okay, why don't we go to group two, Betsey?

BETSEY ANDREWS: Group two, the scenario here is on a conference call with only a few participants another participant dismisses your recommendation saying that you do not understand and do not have enough experience in this field. How do you handle this confrontation?

JANOS SZURDI: Hi, my name is Janos. So, we identified three approaches and the first one is to avoid and not contribute to the mailing list anymore. But we really advocate for avoiding avoidance, so wouldn't really take this [inaudible].

The other is you could question how to [inaudible] this person who is questioning your experience or questioning this person's experience in part of the issue, what his experience is in it.

We also don't really like this idea because this can go into a more personal fight between two people is of solving the problem. And the final solution could be is that you basically express that in certain parts of the field, you have an experience and [inaudible] important for the group and what your experience is. This is what we advocate for more strongly.

BETSEY ANDREWS: That's great, Janos. Thank you very much. We're going to move on to group three. In a small group session at an ICANN meeting, a participant consistently gives too much detail each time he or she speaks. What would you do to keep the conversation on track and productive?

KRISTINA HAKOBYAN: My name is Kristina. Let me go over there. First of all, the person who is giving the session, I mean discussion, should announce rules before the start of the conversation that there is some things that everybody should respect each other, their speeches, etc., and then we decided with our group to set a time measurement for each person, each conversation. Then maybe some person who is interrupted this time, show him a card, a red card, or I don't know which card it will be. Then if after this the person doesn't keep the rules, maybe some [inaudible] and of course with all of this, we should respect each other and [inaudible] opinion.

ERGYS RAMAJ: Thank you very much. Okay, guys. So, this is the last bit of this workshop and that is to hear from you on what worked and what didn't work. Again, we don't have a lot of time but we do want to hear from you while you're here and your thoughts are still fresh. So, if there's anyone who wishes to share any feedback with us, please just raise your hand on what worked and what did not work and why and how we could improve this workshop for future cohorts. Did we get any hands up? Do I take silence as this was amazing, do it again, keep at it?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: We were able to learn different ways to solve a conflict, different approaches. Let me see if I can find the right words. Not to be so defensive. Not to go for the attack. But towards reconciling. Now, what

did not work? Well, nothing. Everything is okay. Perhaps a little bit more psychology.

ERGYS RAMAJ: But it sounds like things are working quite well. It's all about psychology of it. Okay, that's great feedback. Thank you. Anything else? Anyone else?

BETSEY ANDREWS: Yes, Alfredo. Alfredo, go ahead.

ERGYS RAMAJ: Go ahead, please.

ALFREDO CALDERON: Okay. I keep saying Alfredo for the record because of all the meetings, but anyway. Yes, I like the workshop this session. It works for me, but we need more time and a suggestion is to have some pre-preparation, if I may say it that way, how probably if we had some sort of a course and learn to prepare us better, so that we come to this session instead of dealing with the theory we can do more practice. Does that make sense?

BETSEY ANDREWS: I paid Alfredo to say that. Just kidding. I did not.

ALFREDO CALDERON: Thank you.

ERGYS RAMAJ: We have Oliana here. One moment.

BETSEY ANDREWS: These are good ideas. Thank you.

ERGYS RAMAJ: Oh, you're going to use this mic. Okay, good.

OLIANA SULA: So, for me, personally, it was very, very useful because usually in my classes, because I work at the university, I use a bit other approaches of conflict resolution, but I will try to apply this. I will take it from there.

Just one thing. When it comes to my mind the concept of conflict resolution, what about ethics? So, I didn't see a lot this aspect of the ethical behavior insight and to which extent we should be ethical and what is unethical in these kinds of cases. This is very important also for ICANN environment as well.

BETSEY ANDREWS; I think that's a great observation and perhaps drawing on the expectations of behavior would be a good way to do that. Thank you, Oliana.

ERGYS RAMAJ: Do we have any last comments before we wrap it up here? Because I see that there's another session that's about to start in the next two minutes or so. If not, thank you very much for your time.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Thank you, Ergys and Betsey, and thank you, everyone. With this, our meeting is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]