
MONTREAL – ATLAS III Plenary: Conflict and Influence

Tuesday, November 5, 2019 – 08:30 to 10:15 EDT

ICANN66 | Montréal, Canada

DAVID KOLB:

Come on in. Get settled and we will get started.

Good morning, everybody. It's funny. It feels like you're getting farther away from me. The room is filling in towards the back. Is that a bad sign? Make sure that, wherever you are sitting, you have a microphone handy since we are doing translation and recording. Also make sure – I'm saying this for myself as well as I am for you – to speak slowly when you're speaking so the translators have a chance and the recording can pick it up. And say your name for the recording.

We have a busy day today, very busy. We're starting with the agenda here on the screen. I want to run through the day with the sessions that you may or may not be involved in besides the ATLAS III sessions, too, because there's things in between our sessions today.

This morning, we're going to be covering two of my favorite topics – conflict and influence – because they go hand-in-hand. We'll get into that in more detail obviously.

After we finish the presentation and the discussion here, we'll move into a breakout. In that breakout, it's going to be a little bit different than it was yesterday. When we get to the breakout, I'll describe what that's all about and what your purpose in the breakout is going to be.

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.

Then that takes us up to – let’s see here. After the break, we’re in the breakout. The breakout will be about an hour if everything is on time and all is going well. Then you’ll come back and hear from the last 30 minutes of that piece. We’ll get set up with intercultural awareness and your observations when you got the GAC/Board meeting later in the day and what you’re going to be doing there on your covert stealth mission of observing for culture. But don’t tell them because we don’t want them to know. That’s all in the name of transparency. Don’t tell them.

Let’s see here. We transition to lunch and then there’s the ISOC lunch today. It’s an invitation-only lunch. That means don’t bring all your friends with you. I know they would love to come, but it is invitation-only lunch so we’ll be considerate about that.

From there – let’s see here – we’re down to 2:15. That’s the ALAC/GAC meeting that occurs from 2:15 to 3:00, which doesn’t apply to all of you but probably applies to some of you. Just to keep that mind. Another coffee break because you’re going to need the caffeine. Then you go into the joint Board and GAC meeting. That’s where you’ll be doing your observations. Transition then we’re back in here at 5:00 to 6:30 for: I want to follow up on the cultural pieces and your observations and then also talk about coaching and give you the opportunity for some coaching work with each other. Then there’s the tribute to Tarek tonight. That is the end of a long day. So that’s our day.

Is there any other housekeeping that we need to take care of? Gisella, anything to add?

GISELLA GRUBER:

There's been a slight change on the schedule. The Board and GAC meeting is only a 60-minute session. I just had confirmation for that. So you'll have a slightly longer break before coming back to the 5:00 P.M. session. But please do be back here on time for the 5:00 session this afternoon. The ISOC lunch will be up in Room 720. You may already have been up there. It's a very large escalator leaving from where registration is, just a little bit further one. We'll all be going there together from this session at 12:00 to be there on time for 12:15.

Just for the ISOC lunch, there is no interpretation. However, there are many ISOC people as well as ICANN staff speaking French and Spanish. We would like the French speakers to sit at a table and the Spanish speakers to the table, as there will be topic discussions. This will allow you to discuss the topics amongst yourself in your language. Then it's free seating for the rest. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Thank you.

DAVID KOLB:

To give you a little overview of where we are and where we're going, yesterday we started with that piece on thought leadership and change leadership, and we had our panel. I want to come back to the concept of thought leadership and change leadership because we were running short on time. I didn't want to lose that thread. There were some good questions about what's the difference between the two. So we'll start

there this morning. Then we'll move into resistance, conflict, and influence as our topic areas.

When you go into your breakouts today, what's going to happen, just to give you the map of that, is we'll mix three of the breakouts up. There's the two translated breakouts that have translations: Breakout 1 and Breakout 2. They'll stay the same. So you'll be in the same room with the same people you were with yesterday.

As you saw in the pack of information, there's the different points of view from all of the seven tribes. So what we'll do in Breakouts 1 and 2 is we're going to assign individuals different points of view from the tribes to represent those points of view in the discussion.

Then, in the other three breakouts – Breakouts 3, 4, and 6, because 5 is combined – what I'll do with you is we'll all go to the back of the room. I'm going to count you off to split you up in the breakouts. Then you'll already have your different points of view that you were representing yesterday. So that's what you're coming in with.

The purpose of this breakout is twofold. For the content, it's observing for if there's conflict or tension around these varying points of view. Obviously on privacy and security you could be one way or the other or somewhere in the middle. So there's going to be some tension around that naturally. We want to see if you're practicing those skills that we'll talk about this morning on handling the resistance and handling the conflict. Also, as you're trying to influence each other to change the mindset and change the point of view, what are people doing that is

influential in the breakout. So those are the two things we're observing for content.

On the case side, our ultimate goal is for you to ... Yesterday, it was to look at that point of view and say, "Hmm. This is a different perspective maybe. I look at it through the lens or the filter of the GAC (or through the contracted parties)." So that's a different view than I may have in general. So, if I'm representing that point of view, it's good for me to know all these other points of view that you will get today. Tomorrow, when you're preparing presentations and structuring your final point of view on this, that information from today will lend itself to the information for tomorrow. So that's where we're headed with it, just to give you the big overview.

One of the things that was asked yesterday is ...In the background information (the points of view) there's links. Try as you will, if you keep touching that paper, it does not go to the link. I tried it myself. The link is not active on the paper. Man, what's up with that? How old and archaic is that? So we do have it available to you electronically. Michelle is going to tell you how to navigate to all of this electronically so, if you do want to open those links, there is a way. Michelle?

MICHELLE: [inaudible]

DAVID KOLB: Oh, gosh. I was like, "This was this segue." I was so excited. Okay, here we go.

MICHELLE: So exciting. I'm going to post the links in the chat. To go to the ATLAS III Summit home wiki page first ... one moment, please, and I'll post that in the chat for you if you don't already have it ... okay. Once you go to the ATLAS III Summit homepage, you'll scroll down to the key sources of information halfway down the page. You'll click on the ATLAS—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] on the screen.

MICHELLE: Oh, okay. Oh, it's in their chat. So I'm going to post it as well here in a moment. One moment here ... okay. One moment. I'll navigate as well. Sorry ... One moment ...okay. Slightly frozen, so bear with me for a moment ...

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: May I?

DAVID KOLB: Sebastien?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It should be active.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's on.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It'd be useful if we could know who is in the chat room. Maybe we should have that information by a show of hands. If people are not in the chatroom when you send the link, they will never get it. Then please first ask who is in the Zoom room now. The ones who are not ask to go to the Zoom room immediately because, if not, you will miss your point, Michelle. Thank you.

DAVID KOLB: Okay. Gisella?

GISELLA GRUBER: If I may, we can move ahead. Michelle, if you're able to get it to unfreeze – a little technical glitch – I'm going to send a quick e-mail and I'll put that link in there. It was in the welcome e-mail and we had all the links there. So, if you do have the welcome e-mail on hand, please use it. If not, I'll send a quick e-mail and we can proceed. Thank you.

DAVID KOLB: Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I just wanted to add that I'm going to go ahead and put them into some of the RALO lists. We'll send them to the RALO lists as well and also the At-Large community Skype chat. Thank you.

DAVID KOLB: How many do we have in remote participation this morning? With all the time zones?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Right now we have 36.

DAVID KOLB: Wow. Nice!

HEIDI ULLRICH: That are in the Zoom room.

DAVID KOLB: Okay.

HEIDI ULLRICH: So we need a few more people to sign in. Again, the Zoom room is listed on both the ATLAS III workspace, the web page, and the agendas. So there's lots of ways you can find that to get into that. There also was a blog sent out with all the links. So lots of ways to find that information. Thank you.

DAVID KOLB: Are there actually 26 remote participators or is it people in the room that are in the Zoom room.

HEIDI ULLRICH: In the Zoom room.

DAVID KOLB: Okay. In the Zoom room. So we have one remote participator somewhere and the rest of them are here in this room. I'm kidding. But whoever is remote, if you're remote, welcome. Here we begin.

The question came up yesterday around what's the difference between thought leadership and change leadership. One of the purposes we had for the panel yesterday was to talk about what their examples were and what their experience was being thought leaders and/or change leaders. This slide is just a definition that I'll read through to think about thought leadership, and then we'll talk about change leadership.

Thought leadership. Thought leaders are the informed opinion leaders in the go-to people in their fields of expertise. They are trusted sources who move and inspire people with innovative ideas, turn ideas into reality, and know and show how to replicate their success. I think their important – replicating their success – so they're not the only people that can do this. Over time, they create a dedicated group of followers to help them replicate and scale their ideas into sustainable change across an entire ecosystem. It's a long definition of it, but I think essentially thought leadership is being on the edge of that field, the piece of expertise or knowledge that you're trying to work with, and taking it to the next level.

The example I would use is I had a long relationship with McKinsey and company, which is strategy consulting firm. I think they would consider

themselves thought leaders in several industries. That's what the recruit for and that's what they train for. As to whether they're change leaders is a different story. In some cases yes, but part of their thought leadership is then, to this definition, how do we create a sustainable change? How do we replicate it? How do we create the followers within the organizations that we work with, both profit, non-profit, and government, or all three. Then that's where the change leadership comes in: how do we actually take action and create this change and make it something that's going to move forward?

If you to the next slide, in terms of becoming a thought leader, I think this progression is interesting in that you begin as a subject matter expert. You've got a passion. There's some piece of the Internet, with ICANN, for example, that you have signed up for, volunteered for, that's your passion, whether that's security and stability or if that's ALAC or GAC or whatever your tribe is, if I can use our case study examples. You're the expert on that particular thing, and that's one reason that you're here: to share your expertise and to learn more as well.

Then, as you make your way through – I'll use ICANN as the example – you become the go-to person. If I want to learn more about the privacy issues or the security issues, there is probably some names that come to mind for you of “This would be the go-to person. This is the person that I would go to for further information about privacy and/or security or what this issue is.”

Then, from that – I've got the expertise – you move into being an influencer. Social media is great using that term “influencer” these

days. People that have their YouTube channels on whatever that might be are called influencers. So it doesn't mean you have a new ICANN YouTube channel at this point, but you become an influencer where you're actually starting to change views and change mindsets on a particular area, a particular topic, where you began as the subject matter expert.

Finally, you move into that role as thought leader. People would come to you. You have this, by the definition, dedicated group of followers that really want to follow your thinking on that particular area or in that particular field to move forward.

I think that's an interesting progression of thought leadership. I don't think you can be a thought leader in several things at the same time. I think you can in a few things, but in terms of really getting to the front of that as a thought leaders, it's really a dedication and a passion for learning about what this is. And then we move into how do we start to change that. So I think thought leaders can take you to that intellectual place. That's why many things in academia start out as great theoretical research. But then how do we make it practical? That's where change leadership comes in.

If you move to the next slide. With change leadership, I want to break it down into a simple mode. The Center For Creative Leadership does a lot of work around change. I like their model because it all begins with C's for English: communicate, collaborate, and commit. I think it's a great way to think about change agents and change leadership. We talked yesterday about communication. Over-communication is fine

when it comes to change because people fill in those gaps of information if there's a void in the information somewhere. So communicate becomes very important.

Collaborate. If part of that thought leadership is having a dedicated group of followers, collaboration is what you need to be doing. With ICANN, what's fascinating about the organization and the community to me is that it is this bottom-up multi-stakeholder consensus decision model. Sometimes it's a messy process. Sometimes it's a conflicted process of where people want to go. But overall, trying to get to consensus, trying to get to a place where we can all live with this decision, is the basic need that we all have in trying to come up with solutions. Now, there's some variations on that that we'll talk about. Collaboration is an important piece.

Finally, committing. Commitment is just being persistent in the change that you want to enact and advocating for that, even when it's difficult to move forward. I think the commitment is challenging in that you have to do two things at the same time. You're committed to moving forward but you're also open to be influenced. Those two things sometimes are conflicting with each other. That's where you have to resolve what you're willing to do, what you're willing to compromise on, as well as what you're willing to just really stick to advocate: "This has got to be. This is a non-negotiable. I've got to have this."

Next slide. The tasks then of leadership that go into a change process or any task of leadership: you're setting the direction. I think a thought leader sets the direction, and then a change leader – could be the same

person but also could be different – is trying to align people with the direction and then motivating and inspiring people. That’s what moves us towards influence and how do we handle resistance and how do we handle conflict.

If you’ll fast forward to conflict – that’s probably six slides in thereabouts – we’re going to move into our topics for today. We’ve covered most of these before and – two more, I think. One more. There we go. Move to the next one. There we go. So, conflict. How many of you really enjoy conflict?

Yeah. There’s a cultural piece to that, too, in terms of how people take on conflict and what kind of conflict it is. It’s interesting. I’m not going to do it for sake of time – the exercise here – but there’s an exercise we do in the leadership program, where I have people line up and basically have them talk about their comfort with handling conflict. On one end of the scale, it’s “I’m very comfortable handling conflict.” On the other end of the scale, it’s “I’m not comfortable at all. I feel bad. I almost feel sick. I try to avoid it all costs.” Then we have people line up on the scale. Usually in the middle there’s people in conflict about where they call on the continuum, which is always fun to watch.

Once they’re lined up, I start to ask some questions. It doesn’t matter for gender. Even ethnicity is all over when we’re talking about professional conflict. But then I’ll say, “What if it’s personal? What if it’s a family member or a friend? Re-align yourselves.” You’ll have this fascinating movement on here. It’s funny. You’ll get both arguments. One is “I have so much more at stake. I have so much more to lose if it’s

a conflict with my family.” Or, the other view is, “I’ve got nothing to lose with my family because they’ll still love me at the end of the day. So, yeah, I’m totally comfortable with conflict with my family or friends.” I think there’s a cultural piece there too in terms of value toward family and value toward groups we belong to. When we get into cultural this afternoon, we’ll talk about that.

When I mention conflict here, I’m not talking necessarily about aggressive, in-your-face conflict. I remember having a group at one point and I said, “So, tell me about the conflicts you experience in your organization,” and one person said, “We don’t have conflict in my organization. We talk about everything.” It’s funny. It’s 20 people in the same organization, right? “So we don’t have conflict here.” On the other side, “Would throwing a chair at you warrant conflict?” “I’m thinking so.” “So it sounds like we’ve got a continuum here. We should talk about this.”

And there were some cultural elements that came into play with that organization in terms of how different offices handle conflict. A lot of times it was based on the leader of the office, and how he or she handled conflict was how it looked in the organization in terms of how safe people felt dealing with conflict or being open about advocating or being open about collaborating with others.

So conflict, I think, comes in some various forms. Where we start is we start with resistance. So it’s not necessarily conflict. It’s resistance. So I have an idea. I have a change that I want to do. I have a new way to think about something – privacy and security for the case, for example. First

you're going to meet with different kinds of resistance before it goes to conflict.

I want to take two questions here before I move farther here. Let's start over here.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

On your point about somebody saying, "We don't have conflicts in our organization," could it also be a reflection of the fact that the leadership's authority [inaudible] and then conflicts are not allowed to surface? Maybe there is a difference between visible and invisible conflicts and conflicts that have surfaced and conflicts that are surfaced and conflicts that are latent.

DAVID KOLB:

Good point because it could be, "It's not that we don't have them. We're not allowed to have them," if I can paraphrase that. Yeah, that could very well be.

Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you. I think that there is two types of conflicts. There is the conflicts of ideas and the conflicts of behavior, of mood, etc. When it is a conflict of ideas, it is very positive, and I think we are talking about that today.

DAVID KOLB: Mm-hmm.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: But when it is a conflict of mood or conflict of behavior, I don't like it.

DAVID KOLB: Because that's expressed in different ways. Sometimes it feels awkward and sometimes it feels comfortable. To your point, I think there's a great quote that goes with that. Carl Jung had a great quote that was, "Conflict is like fire. It both consumes and it illuminates." So it can really be fuel in the fire that burns or it can illuminate and really show a different way.

How many of you have been in a conflict with someone (and idea conflict) – it could have been a heated argument – where, at the end of it, you were in a much better place in both the relationship as well as the resolution? Anyone?

Yeah, exactly. So it's hard to go through that a lot of times, but you'll get to a better place.

Question over here. Please?

PASTOR PETERS: Just a contribution. Now, conflict of ideas, conflict of behavior, yes. Conflict of ideas, [inaudible] of behavior is [intolerable], but that is also dependent on the bias of the leaders. Somebody spoke about bias yesterday. So you could have a bias about a particular issue that is not

in line with the person who is also presenting his own idea. So, when a leader has a bias, he sees your idea, which is opposed to his own bias, as a conflict of behavior. So then what happens is a conflict, which is not personal. So that's also true [inaudible] influence thought leadership negatively. So that has to be balanced in this contest.

DAVID KOLB: Agreed, absolutely. Over here, please?

MARIE: I would also suggest that differences of opinion or not conflict. They're differences of opinion. Real conflict to me really comes in the emotional stream where it takes energy out the group and puts energy into resolving some kind of issue that is not necessarily just a difference of opinion. I see those as two very different things. So a difference of opinion wouldn't be conflict. It's something that people can work through by talking, which is what we should be doing here.

DAVID KOLB: And I'd say that your tolerance of what is a difference of opinion and what is a conflict is also an individually specific thing, too. Again, I go into culture. A heated exchange could be just a difference of opinion to me in my culture, while, in other cultures, this feels like full-blown conflict. So your tolerance for where you would define advocating for a position, a difference of ideas, a difference of opinion.

So for sake of our definition, conflict has a negative connotation a lot of times. We say it's a conflict because that's everything from a difference of opinion [or]. So there's a huge continuum of what's happening there. Let's settle on that differing ideas, differing goals, and different values could create some form of tension that we'll play with as conflict or, in some forms, resistance.

I saw Humberto?

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: I believe Javier was first.

DAVID KOLB: Do you guys want to fight over it? Get into a little conflict here?

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Thank you.

DAVID KOLB: So collaborative. Please, Javier.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: We Latin Americans don't like conflict.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: [inaudible]

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: I don't.

DAVID KOLB: I think he's playing with us. I'm not sure.

JAVIER RUA-JOVET: Yeah. Just adding to the conversation, as some of us know, in biology and psychology there's really two ways to face in nature stressful situations. It's either fight or flight. In many ways, the level of stress will vary depending on culture. What you define as conflict might just be difference of opinion. In a stressful situation, you either fight or find ways to deal with it. It's just really in many ways based in biology. So it's very interesting.

DAVID KOLB: Mm-hmm. I'll come back right around to that. Thank you for that. Humberto?

HUMBERTO CARRASCO: Thank you very much. I'm going to speak in Spanish. We are not conflicted. My best example is Sergio Salinas Porto, my mate here. We Latin people are extremely conflicted in the sense that we're so passionate with spreading our ideas, and probably other cultures will understand that we're all the time fighting instead of discussing at the end of the day. But I would like to tell you to look at something, a phenomenon, from the standpoint of the academics, that is. Conflict is necessary because, if we always agree with everyone and we are always

engaging in tradeoffs, there's a theory that says that consensus is bad from the academic standpoint. There's a thought currently that says that consensus is extremely poor because it does not support differentiating visions, especially ideas associated to the left. In some cultures. There are authors in the Netherlands and the U.K. that criticize consensus. They say that it prevents necessary changes in some organizations.

I don't mean I agree with them, but I say that sometimes conflicted personalities – it's not that I like them. I just oppose completely conflict. Sergio Salinas Porto calls me Center Korea. You can imagine why. But I would like to say that sometimes a certain degree of conflict with respect might be quite useful to achieve necessary changes in institutions.

David, [inaudible].

[RICARDO HOLMQUIST]:

In the slides yesterday and today – this part of what Humberto said – sometimes it's difficult when we come from cultures like ours: Latin people. Sometimes we agree but our face reflects otherwise because we're passionate. Someone from the north of Europe or North America doesn't understand that we may be in agreement because we're passionate. So it is hard to be quiet and listen because we are not quiet and we don't have patience. Sometimes it is hard, especially here, because cultures are so [inaudible] it is difficult to understand. Yesterday it was on a slide: Latin people can't take it easy and wait for things to happen as if we were Swiss. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Is that – hang on one sec. The only great cultural joke I know – there’s a few there; we have the passionate (the Latin, the Italian) -- is, did you hear about the man from Norway that loved his wife so much he almost told her? So how we perceive each other is fascinating.

Go ahead.

SHREEDEEP RAYAMAJHI: This is Shreedeeep Rayamajhi from Nepal. I seriously think conflict is part of the leadership process because leaders are passionate. They are supposed to change. So, when you talk about change, you’re fighting with people who are rigid. The consensus-making process is something like, “That’s more feasible.” But when you come to the real ground, when young people step in, when new voices come in, then conflict is just part of the range of conflict that happens. But it’s more about the heated conversation where you want to make change when you are clear, having that clarity in your mind, to stand up for change and what you want on the table and what kind of values and culture, especially if you look at South Asian perspective. Then it’s more like the bigger voices rule out. So it’s quite hard at times.

So I think I agree with the point that the severity might be different, but conflict is certainly a part of the leadership-making process. Thank you.

DAVID KOLB:

I wish you could be more passionate in your delivery, though. I want to come back here and I'll come back up. So, please. She had her sign up and the suddenly five people around her started pointing to her. So I felt compelled to come back to you. Please?

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA:

Thank you very much. I'm going to speak in French. I am Fatimata. I am the Vice-Chair of AFRALO. I would like to stress what you said about the cultural and ethnic side of things as far as conflict. In certain ethnicities at home, when conflict come from people of a certain age, for example, the approach is different. You have very passionate debates but the communication is a little bit more reasoned. The communication aspect that you mentioned is an extremely important part of it because we are not going to be in an opposition strategy but we will have actually a strategic approach to express our opinion to go against the idea that has been expressed.

I wanted to add this because I think it's important that we understand each other. It's important to understand that, if we truly want to resist an idea, we can do it without having a true conflict, a true fight. It is a fight, yes, but with a communicative strategy that is convincing. In the end, you get to a point where you get the buy-in of others. That's something I wanted to mention for Africa. That's what occurs in certain ethnicities in Africa. You can have very open, very hard discussions or arguments, but it's about the approach. It's about the way that you tackle the issue to get to the result. Thank you.

DAVID KOLB: Thank you for that. I'm going to take two more questions but then I really need to move forward in the content so you can discuss in breakouts. Here and here and then we'll move on.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I am a Latin person. I will speak Spanish. In my previous papers and work, I had a German boss. He could not understand how there could be two talents in the team that were all the time fighting violently in work arguments and, half-an-hour later, we were having a drink together at the bar and talking around. Just to say that there are two different approaches to conflict. It can be conflict over something specific on an item where we will argue because we do not agree on the idea, and then there is a different kind of conflict. It's a personal conflict. In this conflict, it doesn't matter what the other one says. It will be a conflict anyway. These are quite dangerous for a group of people, but in Latin and Italian culture, conflict for a difference of opinion for something specific is not a problem. It is the way that we sort it out.

DAVID KOLB: [inaudible] that point. To your point, it's when it becomes personal that we have a response that we'll talk about. Last question and then we'll move on.

JOSE ARCE: I will speak Spanish. I wanted to make short comment in relation to what has been said. I'm quite interested in [demystifying] from my standpoint first supporting what Humberto said about consensus. I

have never seen it work, actually. There are other mechanisms such as convergence decision-making systems that work very well in different organizations because consensus doesn't take you anywhere. The mystifying thing is the cultural standpoint, from my thoughts because, even when culture is something that is rooted in such people, at the time I approach a conflict, it should be negotiation that we need to engage with ourselves and then others in the sense that I need to go to that negotiation table with a different idea, being aware that I will not win at all or lose at all. It's not a win-lose. It needs to be a win-win or beyond a win-win and there's no deal. It means that I'm not going to that discussion. I will not waste my time if I don't know that there will be a good outcome. That is optimization of your timing.

In having a negotiation with yourself with the goal of standing up and looking at the other one as somebody else and accepting the other one, you need to wear somebody else's shoes. I don't think that empathy is that because, if I take somebody else's shoes, I cancel the otherness of the person. Understanding the other person as somebody else means I accept the difference. Accepting the difference means that negotiation is not win-lose. It's that I need to go there with a win-win mentality.

This cultural thing, that we are Latin, I had this experience with where different cultures clashed strongly here at ICANN in a meeting, where I was able to learn to accept the other one and resign part of my culture because that's the way to go to arrive at consensus and move on. But all that can be achieved, I believe, with agreements that are clear prior to the time of sitting at the table. Thank you.

DAVID KOLB: At the break, you can respond to each other as well. One thing is, with all of this, is please slow down in how you're responding because the translators are trying to catch up with things. And—

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

DAVID KOLB: Okay. So we have two remote comments and then I'm going to move on from there. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay. Our first comment comes from [Rehtmi Satarial]. "As part of Latin America, conflict, compared to German culture where conflict as a highly productive, is a factor that motivates the group to change its vision.

Our second comment comes from Harold Arcos. "A conflict is a stage, a necessary space, to move towards a new state of being, whether institutional or personal. At the beginning of the path of change, we approach the necessary point of conflict, where the differences will be found. The contradiction will be sharpened and then the leadership is needed. The energy needed to finish leaving behind what will be changed and to specify what will be born again. The current times of evolution leadership is required to have the energy to advance the

necessary changes, especially based on the diagnosis expressed in the recent At-Large review.

DAVID KOLB:

Great. Thank you for all of that. This blends very well into where we're moving with this. On resistance, if we begin with "I have this idea. It's a different idea. It's a difference of opinion," and then we start to experience something from the other person ... To Javier's point, there is this brain thing that's going on that I want to talk about a little but further when we have this response.

But the first thing to think about with resistance is to respond in good faith because it might not be resistance. It might just be you in terms of how you're thinking about it, how you're understanding it, if you're not clear on it exactly. So you respond at first with, "Tell me more about that. Let me make sure I'm understanding what your point of view is because maybe I'm not understanding that point of view."

Then observe and identify what type of resistance is being displayed and don't personalize it. It's like, "Huh." There's different forms of resistance. One form of resistance is that basically – how should I put it? "I'm resisting to your idea because we're already doing what you're saying that we're doing," even though we're not doing what you're saying that we're doing. It's just basically being in denial that this is a viable idea and it's basically trying to get you to go away.

Another form of resistance is distracting, where you come to me with an idea and I just take you somewhere else in the conversation and,

when you walk away, you think, “Wow. We really accomplished nothing. Hmm. How did that happen?” So you’re totally distracted onto something else.

Another form of resistance could be detailing, where it’s so far down in the details, in the numbers, in the analytics of it that it’s almost another form of distraction because you lose what the concept is where you’re trying to move forward with that. So there’s lots of different forms of resistance.

One of the things you can do is to name the resistance in a neutrally discussable way. So you don’t make it persona. You don’t say, “Hey. You’re asking detailed questions just to get me off track here,” where it’s this accusation or this judgment. It’s like, “Wow. You’re asking a lot of questions that are really a lot of detail-driven questions and I feel like we need to address these things before we can get to those things. So it’s something that’s neutrally discussable. I think that translates across cultures in terms of being able to ask a question that way.

Then the final piece of it is to be quiet and listen. Maybe you’re so committed to your point of view that, right now, you’re not open to hearing their point of view. To your point, maybe we need to put on their shoes and take on that point of view. One of the reasons we did the case study as we did is we want you to take on those shoes. We want you to take on those other perspectives of the other tribes to understand better where they’re coming from and to even advocate that to see where you fall ...

In term of conflict responses – this was starting to come up at the bottom of the slide – there’s fight or flight. And there’s also freeze. Those are the three things that your brain does when it’s faced with some form of a conflict. We can resist, as we’ve talked about. We can aggress. We can be aggressive. We can also just be in denial and pretend that the conflict just doesn’t exist. So that helps set us up for what kinds of conflict we’re experiencing and then starts to set us up for how to deal with that.

If we go to the next slide, what happens in your brain when there’s conflict? I think brain chemistry is the same worldwide, but what’s going to make you have a reaction will depend on your culture and your family and your education and all these lens of filters that we look through and feel through.

What happens in the brain that I think is fascinating is we’ve got this little piece of the brain called the amygdala. It’s about the size an almond, right at the base of the brain. That’s also called the lizard brain. It’s the primitive brain. That’s the piece that dictates fight, flight, or freeze in a response to something that you feel is threatening or something that you feel is conflicting in some way. The size of that response will vary but not much.

I have a picture one of the favorite animals: the mountain lion (the cougar). You could probably translate that to some large cat or some large predator. In my reaction to a predator like this that could hurt me or kill me, the same chemical release in my brain occurs to this predator as it does to an e-mail that’s really upsetting to me. My brain will release

the same amount of adrenaline that causes cortisol and other hormones to be released into my system to create this conflict response. I can't control that. It's equal responses to these threats that are definitely different threats. But that's what our brain does.

What's interesting is that, if you're in a constant state of stress and conflict, you have these hormones flowing through you – cortisol is the main one – that're just not great for your health. So this is where you really got to figure out, how do I manage this in a way? How do I manage my conflict? How do I manage my stress so I don't continually have all this flowing through my body?

Another good takeaway from this is that the adrenaline flow when you have what I'm calling the primal response – that's my primate brain that's having a response to this – it takes 90 seconds for that adrenaline to get through my body. So, if you've ever been in an argument with somebody, in that first minute or so, no matter what you say or do, it doesn't matter because they're just continuing to be angry and yell. Has anybody had that experience?

Yeah. So many, many. In a previous life, I used to work in a school system and I would get angry parents calling me. At the end of the call – or at the end of what I'll say is the rant – where they were just really venting about whatever it was they were upset about, sometimes – don't do this all the time, but it works sometimes – is I'd say, "Can you tell me that again? I want to make sure I understand." What was great about it is I would get it now in three bullet points versus five minutes of yelling and screaming about what was going on because the

adrenaline had dissipated from them and now they could actually talk about it.

What I wouldn't recommend, especially with family and friends when they're really upset about something and they're really coming at you with something, is saying something like, "When you can be a bit more rational, we should talk about it." That's effective, right? Yeah, welcome to primal response again.

If we look at Jung's quote of "Conflict is like fire. It both consumes and illuminates," one of the things you don't want to do is just add more fuel to the fire. You want to try to go for the illumination when you can. So how do I create more light than fire with this? So don't defend. Don't argue. Paraphrase. Make sure that you understand what that point of view is. That doesn't mean you agree with it. You're just acknowledging that it's there. You're taking on the other's perspective. You're taking on their shoes, if you will. That way, the hope is that they're willing more to take on yours.

Next slide. Go one more. I've already talked about that. Actually, go back one. The tip on this slide that I like is the way to move away from primal response. If you keep having this response, it's to think about how you're feeling. Now, that might sound strange, but what that does physiologically in your brain is it moves the blood flow to the front of your brain. So instead of the amygdala, that little almond reptile brain, it moves the blood to the front where you think and feel. So, if you think about how you're feeling – I'm feeling really upset, I'm feeling really frustrated, I'm feeling really overwhelmed (just internally; you don't

have to look at the other person and say, “I’m feeling really overwhelmed”; that might set them off again – you’ll start to change the blood flow, which brings you more toward a human interaction.

Next slide. Go to the next one. One more. One more. Sorry. I want to talk about different kinds of conflict and then I want to talk about your response to the different kinds of conflicts. You have aggressive conflict. The acknowledgement of the issues is high. The cooperation between the parties is low. It’s aggressive conflict. It’s: one party wants to do this. They’re advocating for it. You don’t agree with it. You can see that kind of conflict. It’s overt.

If both are high – the cooperation is high and the acknowledgement of the issue is high – we’ll call that assertive. Both of you can assert your positions. You might agree to disagree. You might agree on a different solution. You might agree to a compromise. But you’re more assertive in it.

But then these other categories on the left are fascinating. If the cooperation is high but the acknowledgement of the issues is low, it’s more of a passive conflict. This is the person that says, “Whatever you want to do is fine. Just go ahead and do it.” Sometimes we say that they play the victim with that. “Yeah, I’m fine. Just go ahead and do that thing. This is how I live my life.”

But one of my favorite categories – not personally, but we’ve all dealt with this – is the passive-aggressive box. The passive aggressive box is that the acknowledgement of the issues is low and the cooperation is low. I would submit, in organizations settings, no matter where you are

– in ICANN, I’ve definitely seen it; I’ve seen it with all the clients I work with, and I’m sure you’ve seen it as well – is that the passive-aggressive response is that you’re not really acknowledging the conflict but you do sometimes. So you’re in this meeting and you say, “I agree. We should move forward this way,” and you go out of the meeting and say, “I so don’t agree with that. Why should we move the meeting that way. Could you believe what he said in that meeting?” You start building your alliance – building your tribe, if you will – around your point of view on something. So the passive aggressive response is fascinating. The best way to think about it is it’s an immature response to conflict. There’s two versions of it.

One is, “I don’t really want to be aggressive about this because that would be silly and not mature, but I do feel like there’s an issue here and I want to make sure they know in some way.” The other version of it is passive-aggressive with intention, as I’ll call it. “I’m doing this for a reason. I want to get my way.”

What I see in the ICANN environment is that – I don’t have an answer for this; I wish I did but I don’t – some people come to these meetings and they’re paid to have a position and they can’t move on that position. That’s why they’re here. My question is always, “So what negotiation room do you actually have?” Sometimes with good intent it’s a negotiation. With bad intent, it’s a manipulation. So I’ll get involved with PDP and I know that I don’t have to agree with it here or I can feign, I can pretend, I agree with it here. But later in the process I can come back around and totally derail what’s happened up to here and I will

leverage that because I know how to manipulate the process, which to me is a larger form of a passive-aggressive response, if you will.

I'll take a comment and I'll move forward.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

In such situations where people are paid to take a certain position, is it possible that, apart from dealing with the person in the room or the particular [fact] or a rule, you go the core or go to where he comes from – an organization – and deal with the people on that level with all the strengths of ICANN and its allies and change the mindset at the parental level? That would be [one way] to resolve this problem.

DAVID KOLB:

In an ideal world, that would be a great way to go. You could try but two things could happen. I'm not saying don't do that. One, you may not have that relationship past this person to go into the organization that they're coming from. Two is you create – there's lots of expressions for it – a burning of the bridge if you go around that person.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

I'm not talking about going around that person but doing it simultaneously.

DAVID KOLB:

Great. So working with to help them change the mindset in the organization. Thank you. Because there's different approaches that we have to handling this.

Can we go to the next slide, please? We do have some choices in how we approach conflict. We can in fact avoid it. It's okay. It's not meaning you're ignoring it because, if it isn't really important to the relationship and it's an issue that's not important to you, you don't have to do that. You don't have to get into a conflict with someone that you really don't have a relationship with and the issue is not that important.

Also, if the relationship is important and the issue is not that important, accommodate. It's okay to give in. It's okay to give something up. The expression that I like to use sometimes is, "This is not the ditch I want to die in." "It's okay. You win. You got it. Whatever you want. Go with that. I don't feel strongly about. You do, but I don't have as much at stake in this." So accommodate.

If the issue is important but the relationship – and you may take a chance on damaging the relationship, advocate. Just persist on that position because that issue is that's important to you.

So the big takeaway here – obviously collaborate and then compromise in the middle – is you have choices as to how to respond to a conflict. However, it's situational, too, because it depends on the relationship that's in front of you and depends on the issue you're talking about.

Next slide. What you're going to be practicing in breakouts when it comes to handling conflict is this model, the model I want you to think

about or have in front of you as you're having a discussion. I don't know if there is going to be any conflict in the breakout. It could just be a difference of opinion, a difference of ideas. That's for sure. But how people handle it culturally based on the responses that we've had in the room, I think it's going to be interesting, lively discussion in all the breakout rooms. Think about doing these things. This goes to some of the positions or some of the comments that were made, too.

Step 1: Listen carefully, deflect aggression, and diffuse emotion. Deflecting aggression is, just because this person feels like they're being aggressive, one, it could be the passion of the culture that you're experiencing. Two, they may be aggressive but it doesn't mean you've got to take that in. It doesn't mean that you've got to respond in kind with other aggression because your brain sets off that response. Let it go around you. This does not have to go to you. So deflect the aggression. I'm deflecting the aggression.

Diffuse the emotion. When it becomes this emotional ... Get clarity on what's being talked about. Paraphrase. Listen well and just diffuse the emotional situation. Sometimes, if you have a good sense of humor, being able to not make fun of it but make a comment that diffuses the situation in a way that's respectful, so it isn't an attack or sarcasm on the other person. You can diffuse the emotion of making, I'll say, a funny comment or a humorous comment, just as a way to bring it down a level.

Also, you can model that, too. If you model being calm, being collected, not being, "I'm in control of this," but just being stable and consistent

in the way that you're communicating, then that helps the other party come down a bit if they're highly emotional.

Step 2: Go to the balcony. What this expression means ... It's synonymous with wearing their shoes. Picture a dance floor. There's a lot of dancing going on and you're in the dance. You're going to an ICANN meeting. You've got 25,000 people here in Montreal dancing. It's like, "Gosh, I need some perspective on this," because, if I'm in the dance, all I see is this: I see what's around me. With the balcony, if I can get up to another level and look down on the dance, I can see what's going on and I can observe some of those relationships. I can observe those interactions. So that's what "go to the balcony" means.

Then step to the other side. Get in their shoes and take a walk. With our case, you're assigned to a group. Take a walk in those shoes. So how does the GAC feel about privacy and security? How does the SSAC feel about privacy and security? It might not be the view that I have, but it's interesting to take a walk in their shoes and see what that is.

Then surface the issue. Surfacing the issue is really finding out what is it that we're really talking about here because we come in with positions. When you think about negotiation, you come in with a position. But what's the issue that you're trying to negotiate. Talk about the issue versus the position. That way, you can move forward on what needs and wants that you have around that issue are and you actually are in a negotiation there.

Step 3: Reframe, focus on the issue, and clarify agreements. Reframing is just basically taking that issue or that position and saying it again,

paraphrasing it, or summarizing it in a way that you can both talk about it now. You want funding for this project. I want funding for this project. So the issue that we can talk about is funding. It's not your funding and my funding. It's just funding. That's what we're looking at. We're looking at budget. We're looking at funding. So reframe it in a way that we can both talk about it and keep the focus on the issue. So bring it back. If you go down different trails, bring it back to the issue to talk about that.

Then clarify agreements at the end of it. This is where things get lost a lot of times with the conflict. We both walk away, we feel good about it, and we go have a drink, but there's no follow-on. What did we commit to? When is that going to happen? So clarify what the agreements are as you come out of a conflict, too.

I'm not expecting you to memorize all of that, but that's a basic model where you can take pieces of it to try to think about handling the conflict a different way. I think this translates across cultures with variations. I'm not saying this is the way to do but think about it within your cultures about what would work, what would fit, and what would that discussion looked like if you reframed the issue or you took on the other side of whatever that might be.

Next slide. Go one more past that. One more. Good. So that move us into influence. I want to drop into influence a bit, but one of the things I want to do before we drop into influence, to get you engaged a bit more – I think ... yeah I've got time for this – is to just have a quick discussion with the people around you and talk about two things.

Talk about, one, makes you defensive. What gets you into a conflicted mindset? So that's Question #1. What's that trigger that suddenly makes you think, "I'm not defensive. I'm now in a conflict"? The second thing is, just for fun, what's the funniest thing that you've ever done to avoid a conflict? So those two things. So what's the trigger that puts you into this, and then what's the funniest thing you've ever done to avoid a conflict. So just around twos or threes for a quick discussion, and then I'll take you into influence. Go.

Okay, come back. I want to go through influence and then get you on a break and then get you into breakouts.

Looked like pretty lively discussion. There were some funny things that were going on. Discussion is still going on.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Two more minutes?

DAVID KOLB: Two more minutes?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, two more minutes.

DAVID KOLB: One. One minute, 30 seconds. Go. I'm going giving you one minute and 30 seconds because there's a group that needs one minute and 30

seconds. They were going for two, I went for one, and we settled at one and 30. Tick tock.

Okay, let's keep going so we can get you on a break and get you into breakouts. If conflict is the primal response, what we want to move towards is what I would call the human interaction. How do we get to a place where we can actually discuss and have a conversation about it. Not that we're not being respectful before, but how do we move forward on this. That takes us into a place of trying to influence in some way because, especially, I think, in the environment. Unless you're with people that totally agree with you on everything, you're always going to be in a place where you've got some differing ideas. So thus our case – privacy and security. They're differing ideas. How do we make them live together and coexist? Because we've got to. You've got to have both. You can't just have one. So what is the resolution to that?

With this model on influencing, I'm using the acronym because it is ICANN and I think I should use an acronym, right? Everybody, are you all familiar with ASAP? As Soon As Possible. We all know that acronym. I think that translates at this point, at least in the professional world. So I created this influence model of "Do ASAP." So you want to do it as soon as possible, if you just look at the acronym.

However, I've put a different spin on it. Then "Do" is Define the desired outcome." The "AS" is Ask and Assess Stakeholders. The "AP" is to Assert with Power. We're going to look at each of those individually about how do we utilize this model.

Next slide, please. When we think about this defined desired outcome, one is I've seen situations where people are trying to influence and they don't know what the outcome should be. They don't have an outcome in mind other than coming into their way of thinking. So what's the walkaway? What do you want to walk away with from this? So define your desired outcome. Begin with the end in mind. And be willing to go with an 80% solution. It doesn't have to be 100% your way. You're not looking for total perfection. In order to influence effectively, you've got to be open to being influenced yourself in some way. So what kind of range do you have? When you think about a win-win negotiation, there's a range there for both parties. Where our ranges overlap is where we can come to agreement on something and create the win-win. Then be open to the collaboration. So 80% solution, open to collaboration, and begin with the end in mind. That's the "Do" part of this.

I'll take your comment and then I'll go through the [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

On the last part – assert with power – in the ICANN context, if one of the participants or constituents feels not powerful enough, not influential enough, would it be a good strategy to go ahead and act with power, assert with power, and power as a result comes to you automatically?

DAVID KOLB:

I'm going to put a different spin on power. So wait until I get to that. I think it'll answer your question.

Go to the next slide. The “AS” is Ask and Assess. Ask great questions. We talked about that yesterday. Ask the right kind of questions that move the process forward. They’re more solution-focused, more future-focused, versus just in the past.

Then assess using a stakeholder analysis. Go to the next slide. A stakeholder analysis is a really simple two-by-two matrix here. You’re looking at the degree of influence and the level of responsibility because, in this environment, there’s a lot of people that are really passionate about something but they don’t have a lot of influence to actually make that happen. So if their influence is low and they really have a low responsibility too, you want to keep them informed. You don’t want to lose them where they become resistant to the whole thing or it becomes personal in some way. So you keep them informed.

If their responsibility for that outcome that you’re after is high but their influence is low, communicate with them. You might get some great ideas about that, but they still won’t have the influence that you need to enact the change.

If it’s high on both, engage with that person more. You want to build that relationship, build that network, because that’s going to push it more toward the outcome that you’re both after, my hope is.

If then influence is high but the responsibility is low, you can accommodate. Again, be willing to be influenced yourself.

With this stakeholder analysis, one way to use it is to keep these labels without the words under them and put the names in of the people that you're dealing with. Who are the stakeholders that are involved in this project, this working group, that I'm working with? Who are the stakeholders that we're trying to influence here? Assess where they are on this analysis.

Don't take this the wrong way, that I'm trying to manipulate the situation or I have a bad intention. My intention is to influence in a good way. It's not to deceive them or take them in a wrong direction. It's what I really believe is the right direction. Try to figure out what that resolution is.

Next slide. This is the Assert with Power – actually, do one more because we've talked about that. The Assert with Power piece is to be clear, concise, and compelling. We talked about that with asserting yesterday. Be courageous. Be willing to step up. When we talk about personal presence tomorrow, there's a piece of courage and gravitas there that we'll talk about.

Then know your power. Go to the next slide. Here's the different source of power. Now, there's probably more. Power doesn't mean I control you in some way or I'm more powerful than you are. All of you, even in a volunteer situation, have power that you bring to the situation. The power might be as a leader with ALAC, as a Board member. That would give you authority. That would give you role power within the ICANN community.

Expertise. You're coming in with this body of knowledge. It might intellectual property. It might security and stability. There might be a technical aspect. You've got this expertise. That's your source for power.

Presence. We'll talk about that tomorrow.

Your network is huge in terms of, how do I build an effective network here and how do I maintain that network over time? That could be a power source, too. It's who I know in this environment.

Resourcefulness. Knowing how to work through the ICANN community PDP/EPDP? Oh, my gosh. That's an incredible tool for you to have in terms of being resourceful and navigating this monster that we call ICANN. And I mean "monster" in the most affectionate of terms.

Insight, integrity, reputation, strength. All those I think are pretty straightforward.

I think a takeaway for me with this to know what your power is. What do you bring to the situation? If you're in a working group, you may bring the entire working group's frame of reference or mindset or a decision. You've got this alliance of people that you're presenting for as well. That's another source of power, which is a piece of network but is also a group source of power.

So Assert with Power is just knowing what your power source is and asserting well, being clear, concise and compelling.

That's where I really wanted to go on just being mindful on how you influence.

I had a comment. Was there another comment? I took yours before?

Yes, I know there was another comment. Hadia?

Microphone. Two microphones? I like it.

HADIA ELMINIAWI:

Thank you. Sometimes people use this within the system but actually in a bad way. They start influencing others by contaminating the environment. Instead of being objective, they're trying to poison the well and then attacking the opponent and thus targeting his source of power. That source of power could be the integrity of that person or the reputation of that person. So, by attacking the person and attacking his sources of power, you basically win because you have influenced the situation and you have taken the sources of power of your opponent.

So these exact steps could be used to benefit the whole situation or could be used to just contaminate or destruct the whole process.

DAVID KOLB:

That's the advanced program. So I'd say it comes down to two things. Examine your intentions when you're trying to influence. What's my intention here? Is it a good intent in trying to influence, trying to have them see a different point of view and for me to understand a different point of view? That's the ideal world.

There's definitely bad intent out there. In my experience in the ICANN community, a lot of those that are working with bad intention we know. We know people that use all of this in a negative way. They don't use their superpowers for good. So we know who those suspects are. I think what happens with that is, over time, they become more alienated from the community because at some point they've crossed everybody and they either exit or they're not taken seriously. They lose their credibility after a while. But there's definitely some powerful folks in the community that don't have great intention in terms of how they move around.

I think, for you, at the end of the day, you've got to live with yourself and you've got to feel like, "I did the right thing today." So you got to stay on your track of integrity here, that this is not the grail. It's just trying to get to a solution here.

But to your point, absolutely. Other sources of influence are manipulation, coercion, and intimidation. All of those are ways that people influence. What I would add is it works usually once or twice, but it doesn't build relationships. It doesn't build commitment. It might build compliance or you tricked me and it worked once on me but it's not going to work all the time on me. So it doesn't build a relationship and it doesn't build commitment around a solution on something.

I don't know if that helps because there's no easy answer to that. Comment here then I'll go here. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: My name I [inaudible]. My question is on this issue on sources of power. In a situation where, as a person, your source of power is being attacked, how do you manage the situation such that you don't shut down on the situation at hand? So how do you manage such an event that your source of power is being attacked?

DAVID KOLB: The first thing that comes to mind, which was a great expression in the U.S. last year about Elizabeth Warren, was, "And yet she persisted." I think a piece of it is to persist in your source of power. Your source of power is being attacked. Many times, if I'm doing something that you don't want to have happen, the first thing that you're going to do behaviorally is you're going to intensify your position and you're going to attack me. The hope is that I will move back into the position I was in before so now we have this communication. But I've changed this position, you should expect some sort of intensification, some sort of reaction from them – the primal response.

But, if you stay here, in order for the communication to work they've got to settle into a new space. And it's hard to change. But that's the first reaction, unconscious a lot of times: this, "I'm going to intensify. I'm going to attack." Then they have to move a bit in order for us to communicate again. So persist. Stay in the place because, even though they attacked your power, that doesn't mean that that's true. It's not.

Comment over here?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: A moment ago, you were almost touching upon good versus evil. I used to think that it would be ideal if ICANN was led by all good people, but then with time and understanding, I'm asking you if it's to think that both sides have to coexist and that the other side is a necessary side and that, without either sides, there would be no progress. So there must be a balance, that both have to coexist, and rather than complaining about, "This is bad. This is evil," we will have to work together to progress. Just a thought.

DAVID KOLB: I like "good." "Evil" feels strong. But there is a yin and yang. There is this balance of intended/not well-intended.

I'm going to take this comment and then I'll come to Holly. So first him. Sorry.

PASTOR PETERS: I just wanted to ask, what's the definition of good and what is the definition of evil?

DAVID KOLB: This is an existential crisis.

PASTOR PETERS: Number two is that, if I want to [inaudible] the definition. So do we say those are pro-establishment, those who are prepared to do as the establishment wants – they are ready to say yes to that – are the good

ones? And those who have an opposite view to the establishment are regarded as – in different times they called them [inaudible], they called them dissidents, or whatever. So are they the bad ones?

DAVID KOLB:

That's a larger discussion than probably here in that. I think it's all in our perspective, too: what's good and evil. If it's not my view, it is then evil? So if we try to truly collaborate, it's trying to take on that other perspective and not judge it as something.

Let me take Holly and then Cheryl because I know you're standing there. Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE:

The reason it's a multi-stakeholder model is that everybody has got legitimate views. In fact, if you don't acknowledge that, then you're never going to get anywhere. In fact, you have to listen to people. Where are they coming from? Understand where they're coming from, help them get there, and recognize that in fact what they want and you want don't necessarily conflict. If you start with there and stop thinking about good and evil, you're probably going to achieve something.

DAVID KOLB:

Thank you. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks. One other thing you might want to contemplate while you're talking about sources of power and the interactions and what people do or don't do with each other in this dynamic is that it doesn't always come down to even whether you're agreeing or disagreeing with what is being put forward as a position. You may feel comforted or discomforted by the way that is being presented. So, if you see somebody taking advantage of a less resilient individual, it is perfectly reasonable as a kind, caring peer to give support to help that less resilient individual develop that resilience and strength and get their sources of power back. That doesn't mean you're selling out to a different idea or concept. It means you're being a human. We can all do better at that.

So you are building your own resilience in these exercises, but don't forget: that does not have to be at the cost of others. It is also possible, ladies and gentlemen, to hold back on natural tendencies. You don't have to be your true self to be a successful one. Thanks.

DAVID KOLB: Thanks, Cheryl. I'm going to take one more moment, then I want to get you ready for your break. Go ahead.

SHREEDEEP RAYAMAJHI: Basically, I think, when there is an attack, probably you take a step back. You hold your ground and you start working on your sources of power as well. You want to expand with those. Instead of attacking, it's probably a better solution because you are being acknowledged at

[inaudible] with the other groups that are there. So you build you own alliance. So that's probably a good solution rather than attacking back again.

DAVID KOLB:

A lot of times, if I can build on that a little bit, a real influential method is modeling. People watch you as you handle conflict and people watch you as you influence. If you do that with integrity and if you do that with good intention, then you're building those sources of power and you're building your network and how you're being viewed. Again, that would work positively and negatively as well. You can't help but model all the time.

The expression I like to use is that, if you're in a group at some point and you're leading that group or interacting in that group, you are dinner conversation at somebody's table that's not yours. They're talking about how that all went. So good or bad at the end of the day.

Here's what I want to do. I want to divide you up for your breakouts. Again, with Breakout 1 and Breakout 2, you're going to be in the same places that you were yesterday. For 3, 4, and 6, I need to divide you up so we have a multi-stakeholder breakout. So you'll be representing the point of view of the breakout that you were in yesterday. So if your point of view was GAC or if your point of view was SSAC and – what was it? – SSAC and non-contracted parties?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [Yeah].

DAVID KOLB:

You know who you are. So that's the point of view that you're still working with on the case.

What you'll need to take with you when you go into your breakouts would be your case study and your points of view. You may want to take your slide deck for that conflict model, just to have it handy as a reminder of what you're doing in terms of what's happening on another level. Probably that's about it. Something to write with.

There's going to be a group in here, so if you want to leave things in here, you're fine. We'll get you divided up. What I'd like you to do is go with your staff member and your coaches to your breakout room and then take your break so you know where you're going and you don't just get lost in the shuffle somewhere.

The staff will go to the back with their signs, and then 1 and 2 obviously are here. You can just stay where you are if you're 1's. But the 3's, 4's, and 6's I just need to see in the back so I can get you divided up. Okay? Take your name tents with you as well so people know who you are.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]