
MONTREAL – ATLAS III Plenary
Tuesday, November 5, 2019 – 17:00 to 18:30 EDT
ICANN66 | Montréal, Canada

DAVID KOLB: Take your seats, if you will. Did anyone get any observations in the meeting that you were observing? I sat in on the meeting as well, and found it challenging, given the structure, to see real cultural interactions occurring. It was a good experiment, though. Did anybody observe anything that they wanted to mention?

SHREEDEEP RAYAMAJHI: Regarding the GAC Members, only the European people were speaking, none of the other people were speaking.

DAVID KOLB: Fascinating, okay. Other observations? Please.

SHREEDEEP RAYAMAJHI: Can you go to the slide where you classify [inaudible]?

DAVID KOLB: Maybe the observation sheet? Just back up one slide, there we go, Establish your observation sheet, okay.

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.

PASTOR PETERS: Pastor Peters for the record. My observation was based on what I observed with GAC and the notes using the talking points, so I made notes on Talking point number 4 and 5.

DAVID KOLB: Relationship to power and getting things done?

PASTOR PETERS: Yes, relationship to power, that is Hieratical versus Democratic. When the ICANN board -- it was stated the ICANN Board cannot interfere in the policy making process, in a bottom up process. They don't want to interfere, the policy decisions are made by the community, so they don't want to interfere in that process. That is a form of a very hieratical order versus the democratic one.

And the other one has to do with getting things done, where the EU commission with DPA plus the Board, the GAC position on the thought that actions are being taken and try to implement whatever activities, action was taken to minimize the DNS abuse under that, so I saw that as getting things done, that is a task, it was a very interesting presentation. And then, the last one was under [inaudible] firewalls. The Belgium government is presently concerned about that about, so that was why they're so concerned about why they, as a government, what is the GDPR process?

DAVID KOLB:

If I can comment on that too, it's the interesting overlap between global culture and organizational culture. In that the hierarchical structure of saying, "We're not going to interfere with this process," is allowing a democratic process to take place. We create culture within the community, within ICANN, that adapts from a lot of the cultures that we're dealing with. Great observations in terms of the organization culture and how it blends in. You had a comment, yes?

SHREEDEEP RAYAMAJHI:

Governments in ICANN act somewhat differently from member states and the United Nations in the sense that it is a little more flexible, but in spite of the fact, I'm struck by all these six points. When I see GAC interacting, it's not a negative comment, it might be the way governments work; in GAC, from my observations on interactions, if I have to rank relation subsets neither individual nor collective. Somewhat collective, but more of an absence of a relationship.

More of an absence of relations, it's not like, "We are here, we have a role, and we'll play that role and after that." Social context is low. Low is not negative but you have categorized it, titled it, "Low." It fits into the low social context. Relationship to time is linear, relationship to bar is hierarchical, getting things done is task, communication is direct. So, all on one extreme. If you talk about an informal group, or a less formal group or a private group or a group of friends, then that would be on the other extreme. What I am trying to say is that GAC interactions are so formal that I could use a negative word, it's stilted.

room, because that was the only ones who were airing apart from the GAC chair. Then, in social context low.

DAVID KOLB: What you hear is what it is?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes, exactly. It was very low. Relationship to time is liner. There was no room for other things apart from those that had been highlighted in the agenda. Then, relationship to power between the Board and the GAC, to me, it sounded hierarchical. That was the way it seems.

DAVID KOLB: There's structure there, for sure.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah, so it was more like that. Then, getting things done is more taxed, like, "This is it, this is it." Even when the CEO was talking to the European Union, like, "This will be done," and, "This will be done." Then communication was direct.

DAVID KOLB: Going to come here and here, and then I'll circle back.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible] for the record. I found it interesting that there was not only the culture aspect of this meeting, but also the individual preference. I was able to see a little bit of, even play, between some of the Board members. I saw a relationship, Becky that seems to be more task-oriented, and trying to get things done. Goran trying to soften the relationship and lowering the tension, even doing some jokes when the pressure was going a little bit higher.

So, I saw not only cultural, maybe it's related to culture, but also some game that allowed the conversation to flow. In some cases, Manal, the GAC Chair, seems to be coming from a culture that felt a little bit more respectful and oriented on collective versus individual, and relationship versus getting the things done, necessarily.

DAVID KOLB: On that note too, I should recognize that we have some Board members observing here, and I should probably tell them what was happening. We had a covert operation going on, essentially. What the operation was, we had talked about these different elements of culture, these different dimensions of culture, and what the group was asked to do was to observe the GAC Board meeting to see if they saw anything along some of these dimensions. That's what you're hearing comments on and so on. Maybe we should talk about that a little bit, when it's like, "I saw the Board do this, then I saw the GAC do this," what's that all about? That's what we're doing, observations on that. Please?

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Roberto, for the record. First of all, after the meeting I went to Chris Dispain and I complained, and I told him, “You are here, supposed to do an exercise about conflict and you are so quiet,” he said, “Yeah, I decided not to speak.” The general observation that I have is that the GAC members were speaking by and large slower than the Board Members.

Cherene was also speaking very slowly, but that seemed to be a habit for the GAC members, which is not surprising to me. Most of the discussion was very formal. It’s like if everybody was paying a lot of attention, not saying something, it was something like just playing it safe, to a point in which there was a comment, a question to the Board in saying, I think it was about the new gTLD programs and the answer was, “Oh, that’s decided by the community.” And, I’m sitting there and said, “Oh yeah, they’re only the board, so why should they take position?”

It’s this sort of a formal approach. Which is, not the ideal in order to get to point five, to get things done. Probably the most interesting point that was raised, in terms of proposal in order to get things done was the last comment by somebody in the audience, which is in our group, that was, “Why don’t we bring these discussions also down to the local communities and to the countries and so on? Instead of keeping that only at the high level.” So, generally speaking, those were the observations.

DAVID KOLB:

What's interesting about that to me as well is, as At-Large, you represent the end user. You've got registries and registrars, and you've got registrants that you're representing these end users in this. So, that's the perspective that you're coming in with. The Board is in a challenging position in that the decision-making model that's been adapted and adopted by ICANN is a consensus-driven, grass roots, multistakeholder model. That works sometimes, it's not pretty, let's put it that way.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

I just have an objection to this, because the ultimate decision stays with the Board. There have been cases where there was a consensus policy brought to the board, and the Board has taken a different decision, which is perfectly natural I would say, because the Board has a fiduciary responsibility for the organization. I've been six years on the Board, so I feel this, internalize this. The community, as a matter of fact, does not. I mean, if we bring, as a community, a policy that doesn't make sense, and that gets adopted by the board, they cannot say, "You as the community," they have to take the responsibility in their hands. So, the development of the policy is bottom-up, but at a certain point in time, the ultimate decision power stays with the Board, and it cannot be otherwise.

DAVID KOLB: Yes, good clarification. Comment here, and then I see another comment over here.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It's [inaudible.] again. On certain elements of the rigidity, I can compare it with the rigidity to a business lawyer who represents a business, so they can't deviate. When it comes to GAC, it's more like the total absence of spontaneity, and it's like what they speak is something that was decided six months in advance, by a team of people, which is what they come and- if we see this room, we see [inaudible] seated like this, and somebody else is seated with arms stretched, but in GAC it's like participants in government uniform seated very straight, always in a certain posture.

I mean, these are cultural elements, so what I'm trying to conclude is that creative solutions cannot arise from such formal amass fear or from such formal deliberations and all the creative solutions, or most of the creative solutions could only emerge from a process like this from At-Large and other informal constituents and they need to find a way to bridge the cultural extremes. Find a way to interact, and whatever I have talked about GAC is not in a negative way, but these are characteristics and very objective observations that maybe thought about.

DAVID KOLB: Okay, I'll take the two comments here and over here, and then one more and I need to move into coaching to get you to the next topic area, please.

ALBERTO SOTO: Alberto Soto. As a matter of fact, I watched two faces in the Board that were very concerned. I don't know their names, but I think they were Leto and Leon. But speaking seriously, I am just joking. I will repeat what I have said. Two people who were very concerned, members of the Board. I don't know the surnames, but I believe their names are Leto and Leon.

Now, talking seriously, I believe that we, the multistakeholders, have something in common. We have seen this in the GAC Board meeting. Tasks versus relationships. Some people want to move forward quickly, they suggest, "Let's do this, let's do that now." And some of the people don't say anything. But by not saying anything, they don't support what has to be done, because I don't do anything, and I don't do anything later on.

We ourselves, in our RALOs and in ALAC, we see there are people who want to move forward and say, "You have to do this, and do that." And so, people say, "Yes, but," or they don't say anything, but they don't move forward. That inertia is the one we have to counteract in order to move forward. Otherwise, we will not make progress. Some people want to communicate directly, some people don't want to communicate, not even indirectly.

DAVID KOLB: Thank you. Over here?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I'm going to speak in French, and to say what we have in GAC meeting is that everybody is there to give reports and make reports. Everybody is kind of afraid of the committees and the selection committees. You can understand that, because if you take into account the fact that you can have advice given to the Board, and the Advisory Committee plays a strong role, and must align and apply this advice. When we are at GAC meetings, it looks like an Advisory Committee that is trying to dominate ICANN and influence one way or another the decisions of the entire organization.

DAVID KOLB: Thank you, please?

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: Yes, this is Nadira. In fact, the discussion about the culture of ICANN organization, the GAC, we didn't give them their rights, because the session we attended, it was more of a delivery. But if the session was about the communique, and we could see the input and the contention between the different perspectives. On a single word, maybe the spent the whole session just trying to come to consensus for one word. That's something we didn't see, and there is a real interaction among themselves.

Another point which also, because, kind of respect of the GAC themselves, when the ALAC members, so, we didn't act like social as relaxed, we acted as their environment, so we have to respect in a hierarchy position, I don't think it's vertical; there is a hierarchy. Even in, I don't think it's a must, because usually we are an equal. They are a constituency and we are a constituency, but we acted like their formal setting. That's my point, thank you.

DAVID KOLB:

Thank you. I've really got to stop, because we've got to get into the coaching model. We're actually right at the time we were supposed to be in an exercise at this point. I've heard a lot of great participant comments here, and the coaches have comments too. Let's hold those or just interact with those as you will. Some great observations here.

I'm glad that you adapted the exercise from just culture to a more general observation of organizational culture or structure, within GAC, within Board, and there's some great comments about the formality of it, and we're seeing one element of that based on the structure, and there's probably other elements that happen behind the scenes in working groups and in other places where they're making decisions, like creating the communique, to your example. What I want to move into at this point, to give you time, because I love that you're jumping in with this, and that's a big piece of this, you have to balance it with a group of 46.

We want to spend some time on coaching. When I say the word, “Coaching,” what comes to mind for you? How do you define coaching? It’s a pretty popular term in the business forums these days, but what comes to mind for you? Please.

SHREEDEEP RAYAMAJHI: When coaching, when you say coaching, the first thing that comes to my mind is clarity; being clear about ideas, thoughts, so that you can help others.

DAVID KOLB: Okay, other thoughts, please?

PASTOR PETERS: Teacher, or teaching.

DAVID KOLB: How about yourself?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Patient.

DAVID KOLB: I like it, patient, okay. Other thoughts?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I'm thinking facilitator, someone who paves the ground for you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Peer support.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Guiding.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: For helping others to get the required knowledge for a task or an activity.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Personal development.

ALBERTO SOTO: More work.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Mentoring.

DAVID KOLB: I'll differentiate a little bit on that, too. So, coaching is kind of an interesting concept. A lot of people think sports teams; sports teams have coaches, and coaches get the players to do things. I like to think in terms of a coach like a carriage that moves people from one place

to another. You get into a coach, and you move to another place in this coach and it drops you off. The old definition of a coach.

I think that's what, it's a great way to think about what coaching should be and not that the sports metaphor is inappropriate, but I think it changes the mindset a bit when we think about the carriage metaphor. A coach should help you, to carry you along to somewhere else and then drop you off. You're getting there under your own power; the coach is just there to facilitate, to assist, to guide, all the things that you said. And demonstrate knowledge and demonstrate patience and things like that.

The coach is not necessarily there to tell you what to do, because you create, if you're trying to coach somebody just by telling them what to do and solve their problem for them, it creates more work for you. This is how it works; someone comes to you with a problem and says, "I want to get better at increasing my network within ICANN."

You say, "I've got ten things. Do this, this, this and this." And they say, "That's great," and they come back to you again and they say, "I tried this, this, this and this, and that really didn't work, what else have you got?" "Go out and try this." "I tried that before, actually. That won't work where I come from."

You have this continual. The problem remains, and you haven't really gotten to a solution because they haven't put anything into it themselves, there's not a commitment there. I'm not saying that you should not give advice; don't take that wrong. You will be giving

advice, you will be saying sometimes, “This is what you should do,” as a part of that relationship, but I want to get you focused more on questions, and asking good questions as a coach to help them own it and think about it themselves.

The quick story I’ll tell on my son; when he was ten years old, he came into my office and said, “Dad, I’m trying to figure out what to do on this.” I thought, “Perfect, this is great.” I said, “Tell me about your options.” He said, “I can do this, or I can do this, or I can do this.” I said, “Okay, let’s look at pros and cons on option one, what are the pros?” And he just stops me, and he goes, “Hey, don’t need a coach, just need a dad. Tell me what to do.” I said, “Oh yeah, option two, the other ones are really going to hurt. It’s just not worth it.”

So, coaching is really helping them come to a place that they can commit to. In the model, if you’ll advance one slide, the model I wanted to show to you is a very simple model on coaching, and one that you could actually, especially if you’re on the phone with somebody you can put it right in front of you and use it on the phone, I want you to think about this model with a flexible view of time, okay? This is not a linear model; you don’t start at G and then go to R and get to O and then finally you hit W.

Sometimes you might. Sometimes you might have a very linear process, but I like to think of this model as; all of these things are available to you as tools, and you’ve got to figure out what category to go into at a given time, because you might get down to the W and

you'll have to move back up to the G because the W didn't work, and that will make more sense to you in just a second.

The GROW model, a great acronym. My definition, an acronym should be a word. So, GROW, you start out with a G. The G stands for Goal. What's the goal? What's the outcome that they want to see happen? And getting clear about what that goal is, because a lot of times, the goal that's presented is not the actual goal that people are trying to work on, and they need to get more clarity. Somebody said when they think of coaching, they think of clarity, Goal helps you get to clarity.

You have some questions that you can use when you're trying to find out what the goal is. Question one; what's the ideal outcome? How valuable would that be to you? What would help? How does this goal fit with your overall development? How does this align with the other things that you're trying to accomplish? All those questions, and that's not a finite list, you may have others that you would add into that, but that's around Goal.

So, you start with Goal, and then you start to ask these R questions; Realities and Roadblocks. Is the goal realistic? What could prevent you from achieving this goal? What might get in the way? That's a roadblock question; what might get in the way so they can anticipate things that can get in the way? What are other barriers? What has been true? What has to be true for you to succeed? What things have to be in place for you to be successful with the goal that we're talking about here? Is your goal realistic? And sometimes it's not. I'd like to play in the Boston Symphony and play cello. I've never picked up a

cello in my life. That goal may not be realistic for me, it just might not work. So, is the goal realistic? Sometimes it's too much.

Options. What are your options here? In order to achieve your goal, what are your options? My son, option one, two, and three. What could you do to remove some of those barriers? These are options about the barriers. So, if this is going to get in your way, what could you do to remove that?

You can see where you would go from a roadblock question to an option question right away, without spending more time in roadblock and reality, but you might come back to that. What degrees of freedom do you have? How much flexibility do you have to get to this goal? Is it a narrow path to get there? Is it the eye in the needle, or do you have a wider path to walk?

Then finally, my favorite is this W, which stands for; Will and Wrap-Up. Are you willing to do this? And sometimes, the answer is no. It's just too much work, it's not going to work for me. Then, where do you go? Back to Goal. What's going to make it easier for you to do? What's going to make it more realistic for you? An R question, so when you get back to the W questions, the will questions, are you willing to do that? Yes. That seems like a better way to go. Instead of doing all of this, I'm just going to do this.

In my work, some people will say, "I'd like to get better at listening." I'll say, "Okay, that's a big umbrella, so how about if we break that down a little bit. Let's break it into your ability to connect, your ability

to ask questions, your ability to paraphrase. Of those things, what would be an appealing thing for you to work on this week? How about paraphrasing. Let's talk about that. What does that look like?"

So, maybe the goal becomes; in every conversation I'm going to paraphrase at least once. Guess what? They're going to get better at listening by doing that. But just saying, "I want to get better at listening," doesn't give you the specificity, it doesn't give you something specific to work on. Very simple model to use. What I like about it is it still puts the ownership for whatever it is with the other person on them; they're responsible for whatever it is their goal is going to be.

When someone comes to you with something, one of my favorite questions, I've gotten some pushback on these questions before, because sometimes it sounds like, "You're just playing with me." I'm really not; a lot of times, people will come in and say, "I want this, this, this and this." My question is, "How can I be helpful?" Because I don't know what's going to be helpful.

And rarely will they say, "If you could just give me the answer or do the work for me, that's exactly what I'd like you to do." Not quite going to say that. So, "How can I be helpful?" "It would be great if you could walk me through, it would be great if you could point me to somebody who knows a lot about that. It would be great if you could do these things."

Now I've got some actions that I can be more focused and be helpful. It's a great way to start to figure out what involvement do you really want from me? Sometimes it's just, "Can you just listen?" "How can I be helpful?" "Just hear me out, I need to bounce this off of somebody. I don't need a solution, but I need to get this out, let me vent." "Okay, we can do that. Should we get a drink first? Maybe I should get a drink first, before you vent."

Here's what I'd like you to do to play with this a little bit; think about something that you would like to get better at. Think about a goal; what is it that a questioning process like this would be helpful to you? I used an example of, "I'd like to get better at building my network at ICANN." That would be an interesting conversation to have with somebody.

And so, think about what would be helpful to you to get some real-time coaching on? Then, what I'd like you to do is get into groups of two or three, given the time that we have. No more than that. If it's a French, Spanish, English thing, get with some native speakers, just so you're comfortable conversing with that and you don't need the translation on that.

Then, the coaches, what I've asked them to do is just to stand with a group of two or a group of three, you don't have to stand with them; you can sit. Just to help keep the time and make some observations about things you could do more effectively with the model. Make the same kind of observations yourself, too. You've got two pieces to what I'll call, "A turn," so the turn would be, "I want to get more

helpful at building my network in ICANN, and you're going to be my coach on this." Then you would just start using the GROW Model with me.

Now, I'm going to start thinking on two levels. One is; I'm taking this in, I'm answering the questions, but I'm also thinking; what questions is she using that are really great questions? That are making me think differently. And, we didn't talk about this with our culture discussion, but after you ask a question, let the question sit so the person can actually answer the question. Don't fill in the gaps on the question. Because you're asking them some challenging questions here, so let them have time to think and process on that.

She's working with me on the Grow Model, we're moving through it, and then we may or may not get to Will, but I'm going to be thinking differently about it, because I'd say a turn, based on what we have here, probably a turn is like ten to fifteen minutes. If there's three of you, that's forty-five minutes, and that would put us up about 6:30 or so. All three of you get to be coach, and get to be the coach-ee, if I can make up a word. Then, the third person, if it's a group of three, is just an observer to say, "How did that go? What was effective? What worked? What didn't work? That's the exercise. Question?"

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Since the topic is about coaching and you are a coach, this appears to be an excellent model, and it's very well organized, but does it work? Does it work all the time? Let's say, let me simplify it, let's say you're

talking about four things to a person; smile, be polite and be pleasant in a conversation. So, it's easily understood these are very good steps, but what if the person, most people are, if the person is kind of disorganized and stressed and he is irritable, and he happens to be upset most of the time?

Then, knowing that I have to smile, knowing that I have to wear fine clothes, knowing that I have to be polite, knowing that I have to be pleasant, are you coaching that person to do all that? The steps is not probably helpful. Probably there is something basic that could make coaching complete. Maybe go to the root level and talk about meditation or whatever, or maybe recommend the person to go on-tackle the base-level problems to make all this work.

Otherwise, would it work knowing the superficial steps, or following the superficial- sorry, I don't mean disrespect, but following this model, it sounds more theoretical to me, so even before you talk about the exercise, I'm placing a question; will it work? Will coaching and will these models and understanding these models, will it work all the time?

DAVID KOLB:

Yes. Next question? No, so let me dig into a little bit with you. This is a good differentiation actually, and this is a question that comes up. With coaching, you're moving them from here to hear. That's trying to solve their problem right now that's in front of them. It's like, when

you were naming off these things, I see three different coaching goals; I'm unorganized, I'd like to get better at getting organized.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I'm not talking about goals here; I'm paraphrasing the four steps. I'm just trying, for discussion, I'm just saying the G says wear fine clothes and the R says smile.

DAVID KOLB: R doesn't say smile, does it?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I'm trying to simplify it.

DAVID KOLB: Okay. I don't know if smiling is in there, because it's a serious conversation. Also, what you're delving on in terms of meditation and pilgrimage as a solution, that might be a bit much in that, really, what you're getting to there is therapy. Because therapy goes to the past. Therapy goes to a root cause of something, and that's why you spend more time in that and it's a longer process. Because I want to find out why I'm doing this thing that I'm doing.

That's more of a therapeutic coaching model, which that exists, but with coaching, and it's a great frame and I'm glad you brought it up, is you don't want to do that therapeutic intervention, sometimes it's too much. It's overwhelming. However, if you can get them to take this

action, if they can commit to taking this action, that might help them understand more about what may be behind that, and that way you're not now involved in this larger process with them that you may find yourself lost in at some point in time.

So, this is just really a way to frame your questions to help someone figure out what their action is going to be, okay? So, let's play with this. You've had a big day, so it's time to play. Again, groups of two or three, I'm not going to attempt to organize you on this, you're going to do this yourself.

Try to find some people you don't know. Try to find some people that you haven't worked with out of your region, but again, get the language issues down, but find each other. We are a group of two, we are a group of three, and then take turns. About fifteen minutes each. I want to be coached on this, okay, I am going to coach you on this. Then, take turns. Ready? Go. [AUDIO BREAK]

Has everybody found someone to work with? If you haven't found someone to work with, raise your hand, because there's people milling around. I don't see hands. Okay, good. Have at it. [AUDIO BREAK]

Do you need five more minutes? I think a lot of you are done. I see ten. And, we're coaching, we're not playing chess, right? We're coaching. It looks like a five, then. [AUDIO BREAK]

Finish up your last round and come back to your seats. [AUDIO BREAK]

We'll finish up the day, I've got a couple of points to make and then we'll be on our way. [AUDIO BREAK]

Have a seat, have a seat. Let's finish up our day. [AUDIO BREAK]

Okay, so, how many of you got some good coaching there? How many of you have an action plan to work on your goal? And, will your coach follow up with you on that action plan? Nice, very nice. Very good. As I was walking around the room, I observed a few things that may or may not be helpful for you, but I'll throw these out here and we can talk about it.

In walking around, I heard something that I will call, "Tricky questions." Tricky questions are when you have a solution in your mind, and you're just going through the formality of the questions until you can give advice on your solution. The tricky question is like, you go through this whole questioning process, and at the end of it you say, "Have you tried taking a vacation?" That's a tricky question; it's basically your solution, you want them to take a vacation, but you say, "David, I made it a question."

Have you tried, if you find yourself doing that, it's a tricky question, you've got something in mind. One of the cautionary pieces is to be careful about trying to make your solution fit your coaching process. You find yourself asking these nice open questions, reality, options, but then you find yourself trying to funnel them into what you think is the right way to go.

Now, that might be what they're asking you, they might be asking you for advice on that, or give me a lot of options, but the caution is; when you start to give too much advice, you're owning their problem. And if they go out, and they fail, or they make it worse, it's your fault. Or, they will assume that it's your fault even though they're the ones that acted on it. So, just be careful about too much advice giving, or too much jumping to a solution.

Because a lot of times, when you're presented with a problem, a solution will present itself to you and it's elegant, and it's easy to implement, and it's wrong. Just back it off, ask. If you find yourself at a loss for words, ask a question. What you'll find over time, as a coach, or in a coaching situation, is that you're balancing advice giving with questioning.

One reason I wanted you to err on the side of questioning for this process is just to get used to asking good questions, and the Grow Model gives you a method to use that in. It's a handy thing to pull up as, "I'm kind of stuck here on my questions, I think maybe it's a reality question is where we need to go to. It just gives you a quick guide on one methodology of coaching.

There's so many methodologies of coaching, but this is a quick one that's easy to use in the moment. It's a great short-term situational thing. That's what to do to play with that. Careful with tricky questions, careful of jumping to solutions too quickly because your solution may not fit their problem. Even though it looks like it would, it might not. Just be careful about, you don't want to own the

problem, so suddenly you just have so many things going on in your head.

We're not even quite at 6:30 yet, so let's just sit here for another nine minutes. Any last questions for the day? I want to do a quick overview for tomorrow and what you can expect. Tomorrow, we start out at 8:30. Now, what that looks like physically is that 8:30, people are in their seats at 8:30, and they've got their coffee and they're feeling good, and they're ready to roll. That's the linear view of time. For the flexible view of time, I want you to pretend that it's 8:00, so that you're in your seats at 8:30, ready to go with your coffee and we can start playing. It's a task thing.

What we're going to cover tomorrow is, our morning session is around personal presence and presentations, using the pyramid principle. We'll play with that so you can get down what that model looks like, sounds like. You'll be in your breakouts, the ones you were in yesterday, not the ones you were in today, but the ones you were in yesterday.

So, you've got that point of view that we've assigned you, and your goal is going to be to create a presentation using the pyramid principle that you all agree on, on the breakout. It's like, this is what we want to present back. When you come back, this is great, because nobody gets off the hook. Everybody is going to get a chance to present. Not tediously like, "It's your turn, come to the front of the room and do your presentation."

We're not going to do that 46 times. What we're going to do is, we're going to get into small groups, kind of like our coaching groups, and you're going to take turns presenting to each other so that everybody gets the point of view coming in through the different tribes of the galaxy network.

Everybody will be presenting, so don't think it's like, "I can be a thought leader, but I don't have to be a change leader." I can bring that thinking to fruition in the presentation, but I don't have to really take action on it; you do. You'll be doing that in a small group with that. That's the beginning of our day, and our breakout is right after.

Then, toward the end of the day, we've got another session around time-management and delegation as well, and I don't know what the rest of your day looks like. Am I missing a session in there somewhere? I don't think so. I think we go from there to presentation- that was the other thing; our breakout is not after our plenary session in the morning, our breakout is not until 1:30 in the afternoon.

So, there's going to be a space between when you go to breakout, so we'll figure out which rooms you're in, if that's changed at all, and we'll give you those before you leave in the morning. Then you'll go into your breakouts and then come back in for presentation and then we'll wrap up with time management, delegation, and meeting facilitation. Housekeeping, please? They're doing conflict.

GISELLA GRUBER:

I won. I don't know what model that is, but we won't go down that road. I'm going to be sending out to the ATLAS III participants mailing list the program for tomorrow, because even if on the Wiki Page, tomorrow's session might not be necessarily in purple. Everyone is to attend it, and then I'm referring to the ALAC and Board meeting tomorrow afternoon, so note there is a 45-minute gap tomorrow afternoon.

Please use that time to network, to go into other sessions, etcetera, but in the schedule that I'm going to send you, it's very detailed on where and when to be. We've got the ATLAS III Plenary tomorrow morning at 8:30, as David said. We then have the ICANN Plenary on DNS Abuse at 10:30. During the lunch session, we do have the ICANN Academy Working group meeting if you wish to join. In the afternoon, as David said, we've got the breakouts, and on the program that I'm going to be sending around, I will add the breakout rooms.

Please note, on the Wiki Page, you already have the breakout rooms as you can see there. After that breakout session, 45-minutes later, the ALAC and the Board are meeting so please do attend that session. And the last session of the day is the 5-6:30, which is the last plenary.

Note that tomorrow evening at 6:30 we have the ATLAS III networking event, so if you do have anything, any piece of clothing of your region, the color, etcetera, it would be lovely. After that the Gems Jamming evening is being held at a pub close by. All the details are on the program, and on the Wiki Page, so again, another full day. If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to ask, thank you.

DAVID KOLB:

Thanks for playing, and we'll see you tomorrow morning at 8:30.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]