
BUENOS AIRES – Academy Working Group Session
Wednesday, November 20, 2013 – 09:00 to 10:30
ICANN – Buenos Aires, Argentina

CHAIR:

Ladies and gentlemen please take your seats. We're going to start in a minute. Okay, welcome everybody. It's 9:15 on Wednesday. I'm really happy that some of you could make it. I know the Agenda is challenging. We are going to discuss... Or I think we don't have to discuss if we are going to proceed with this Program, because the overall feedback during this week was rather positive. We have to discuss how we're going to proceed with this Program and what the next steps are for this Working Group.

We have answers from 16 participants who've filled in the survey, and I would propose we quickly go through these questions to give you an indicator of the general trend and the general feedback. Then I would invite everybody who's here to give us some more in-depth feedback on their experiences, especially those who participated in this course. Then I invite everybody to brainstorm how we proceed. Matt, you're running the... Okay. Is it too loud, or...?

Matt is running the slides. The first question was indicating if they are an experienced and newly elected leader. We see it was a rather balanced group between newly elected leaders, which are not necessarily newcomers to ICANN, but maybe are assigned for a second term or changing constituency. So there was at least a new challenge ahead and a little bit more of experienced leaders.

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.

The next slide was how do you rate it over our Program. I think this is a good indicator that 'very good' and 'good' was the majority. There was only a very small amount that called it 'sufficient'. Nobody said it was... This is the overall trend. No other comment on that. The next question was, "How do you rate the bridging event?" I think there is space for improvement, because more than 40% of the people were not amused about the way this was organized.

I've had some oral feedback already and we can discuss this later in detail. I think we definitely have to find another format for a bridging event/social event. We should look into that. Maybe we don't need a bridging event in the future? Also, the online learning platform needs some more work. The overall trend is a good thing, but I think the quality of the online learning platform still needs to be improved, and more than 40% of the participants realized that as well and are giving that answer.

Overall I think it's a tool which the community would value and they would actually think it would be something needed. I think this is also very important for the launch of today. Usability and structure are overall good, but there's still space for improvement. This was a question we were interested in, because usually you [all come on? 00:13:15].

I've been with ICANN so long that I know everything. We asked a specifically experienced leader, "Did you get any new information from the online learning platform?" and I'm very delighted that this is really the case. Even experienced leaders who think, "I know ICANN by heart,"

there is always something you don't know and I think this is also an outcome of this Program.

The implementation of the online learning platform overall was seen as good, but there's still space for improvement. The facilitation skills training. Before we set up this facilitation skills training, I felt there were very big constraints in the community about, "Okay, I don't have to be told how to play with other children, I don't need that stuff," and so on and so forth.

But I think participants were generally very pleased about it, and for me it was also a great experience. I was a participant in this part of the Program as well and I took out a lot from it, and the data says, from these 16 participants who answered the survey, that others did as well. So I think this is something interesting. Do you think these questions are only about the facilitations skills training? "Do you think ICANN leaders should generally participate in such a Program?"

Yes. Over 90%, that's remarkable I think. Regarding facilitation skills still, "How do you rate the format of this Program in terms of quality of the facilitators?" Overall – very good feedback. Regarding the length, too short, okay, but at least not too long. I think that's important. We don't want to waste people's time.

"How do you rate the format in terms of activity?" No question, this was a really interactive part. We had lots of fun and ice-breaking exercises there, and in terms of the networking aspect – and just to remind you, this was one of the key elements of our Academy set up, that the networking aspect should be [fostered? 00:16:00] and so this worked out as well.

Now it's about the orientation course. The orientation course is the part of the Program that the Academy Working Group took responsibility for. "What is your general impression from this Program?" Overall good feedback. "Do you think ICANN leaders should generally participate in such a Program?" No question, they should. "How do you rate the format of this Program in terms of quality of session facilitators?"

For those who did not participate in this course, we did not assign trainers for this Program, but we asked some of the experienced leaders to facilitate a session on a particular topic they had a good expertise on. So the quality of the facilitators was rated as a good thing. I think this worked out and now this is really an effort from the community, for the community.

There are no external trainers, no staff teaching us... We had some discussions about this in the last couple of months, but finally this was a rather good solution and it also saved the budget because we could invite more participants and save on the trainers. "How do you rate it in terms of the length?" It was okay, two days. "Quality of interactivity?" Here we see space for improvement compared to the facilitation skills training, which was very interactive.

In the orientation course there is space for improvement, and I think the facilitation skills training was an ice-breaking exercise before we could enter into the orientation course, and I think this was a rather good thing. "How do you rate the format of this Program in terms of the quality of the learning curve?" High and average. That's what we wanted. We wanted to bring them up to speed – especially incoming leaders.

“How do you rate the format of this Program in terms of combining expertise and newly incoming leaders?” This was also under criticism before we set up the Program, and finally, obviously it worked out. The majority of people said this was a good combination and we should keep it. This is something we should keep in mind. Those were the questions. That’s it. I’m very pleased with the outcome and I’m also very pleased that so many filled out this survey.

I’d like to ask if there are any comments or question about this survey or... Mikey?

MIKEY O’CONNOR:

I’ll wrap the whole thing into one comment and then probably have to go. I think the bridging event feedback... I think the idea of a bridging event was really good, and I wouldn’t lose the event. What I would do is set some tighter ground rules on how the presenters do their thing. It was, with all due respect to the senior people who were up in front of the room, it was very self-congratulatory monologue after self-congratulatory monologue, and it got pretty wearing after a while to sit through it.

So I think if we could encourage... The right people were there. Those are the kinds of people that you want in a bridging event like that, but I think you should just wire them down to a shorter pitch and you’d have much better feedback. I was in a grumpy feedback on that, and if I was then I can imagine that there were lots more.

In terms of the second half, the orientation piece, I think that’s the same sort of thing. I found our presentations very uneven. Some were very

good, I thought, and some were not terribly well prepared and quite frankly not very interesting. I think that as one of the presenters I would have benefited from a bit more ground rule setting in advance, because in my case I hijacked the topic and went off in another direction.

I was supposed to talk about one thing, and I kind of did, but mostly I was making a pitch about something else. That's because I was given a pretty considerable latitude in terms of what I could do, and so I ran with that. So I think that in both of those cases, what the feedback is is generally really positive, but a little but more structure, stage-setting for the presenters, and you'd see a pretty dramatic improvement.

CHAIR: Thank you Mikey. Fatimata?

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: Thank you Sandra. I would like to congratulate you for the work you did. I didn't participate but I have a question about the evaluation. Was it an overall evaluation, or was every trainer evaluated? That would allow, if you were not very well rated, to improve yourself and do it better next time.

CHAIR: There was no sort of evaluation, and at the moment I have mixed feelings on whether this is something we should invent for the future, because people don't want to be evaluated in those circumstances. We can look at it but I have mixed feelings. I have a queue in operation now. It's Cheryl, it's Avri, it's Glenn and then it's Raf and Heather.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much. Just a very brief comment and an apology. I also need to escape but I did want to have on the record here how much I appreciated being engaged in the part of the course that I was involved in. I have been a supporter of this concept, as you all know, but I did wonder what I would get out of it as a participant.

I knew what I'd get out of it as a presenter, because I always get great value out of those sorts of interactions, but as a participant I want to say that it exceeded my expectations and I'd like that to be noted. I think it went very, very well indeed. Can we build a better mode? Absolutely. The OLP, the data says it's clearly a useful tool, but we are individually and corporally in charge now of getting the right content up there.

I did want to make a point on the survey specific tool, and that is there was no 'not applicable' and a 'not applicable' is a very valuable thing when we're trying to look at some of this data, because I answered some of these things not based on personal experience but the particular hearsay and conversations I had about the topic. You didn't give me a chance to say, "I wasn't there for that."

So what I thought I would do was give you the feedback and perhaps bias and skew the results, which is not something I'm going to apologize for. To basically say, "This is what I've heard." So always the usefulness of an 'not applicable' is really good. I did want to ask a question though on the number of participants. I realize this is not necessarily closed yet. Of the number of participants, do you have a percentage of how many have given you the feedback on this survey form yet?

CHAIR: From around overall 22-23 participants, 16 filled out the survey. That's not too bad. Next on my list is Avri.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you. First of all on the online training, I'm one of those that, as I said, if I had a rank lower than 'not sufficient' I would have picked it. Because it wasn't training, it was a coordinated set of thingies that, yes, it made the references easy to find but there was nothing instructional about it. There was not text explaining it to people.

I think if we want to do something like that, I'd suggest looking at some of the work that DIPLO does, where it has bits of explanatory text that then points you off to stuff. I think the bridging event should be killed, but my view of the whole Program is that there's a major piece of revamping that needs to happen, because it also ties into the dynamic of the first two days and the passive, receptive nature of the second two days.

I really would like to see an integrated Program, where you've got some of one and some of the other. Where we take things like, instead of having almost-real situations in the exercises, we have actual situations, and so we're both educating people on what discussions went on, and we're giving the people a chance to learn the stuff – both at the same time.

If we were to recast it as a blended thing, there may be a good reason for a middle-night session of some sort, that's special, but it wouldn't be bridging something it would just be something special. I don't know

what. The idea of an evening-something-special is a good idea, but I'd say rethink that one. In terms of grading or evaluating those who gave it... If we keep this style of having participant leaders of particular discussions, first of all we have to give them far more lead-time.

As others said, we have to give them some expectation. Do you want slides? Do you not want slides? Do you want people to just put a question on the table and open it up to discussion, or do you want to spend at least a certain amount of time getting into the details? Because that was also... There was not only unevenness in quality, it was an unevenness in approach. That made it sort of difficult for people; "What do you want from me now?"

In terms of evaluating them, if we were using the same trainers over and over again, I would say yes of course. If we're using participant trainers then I don't see the value, other than perhaps self-evaluation: "Am I good at doing this or not?" but it serves the Program no use. One thing we could do though is perhaps ask more specific questions about, "What do you expect from a person being a participant trainer?"

"Do you like having a lecture followed by this?" "Do you like having an open discussion?" "Do you like having feed questions?" So we could ask questions about approaches to the training that people have taken, without getting specific about, "Was so-and-so a bore?" "Was so-and-so insufficient in doing that?" But look at the approaches they used. Even if we haven't predetermined what approaches, we could say that we had several different kinds of approach in this.

People did things. "I walked through a document, Mikey did slides, some people said, 'here I am, this is what I do, ask me questions'."

Radically different approaches. Which one worked for people? Which one didn't work for people? Then we can have progression in our methodology. Thanks.

CHAIR: I think Cheryl was going to respond to Avri, or did you...? In the queue, okay. Sebastian please.

SEBASTIAN BACHOLLET: Avri, I get your point, the last one about the trainers and... But I think that diversity is also important, because one size doesn't fit all, both on the presenter's side and the trainee's side. I would caution on doing just the same thing – everybody with slides and the same type of input. I think the diversity was also something very important, and you take some of the personality of the presenters because of that too. Except that I fully agree with your comments at the beginning. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA: I did not mean that there should not be diversity. What I meant was I'd like those that were there to judge the diversity: "Which style really worked for me?" "Which style didn't?" Then that's just background information that people can use when they decide what they're going to do. I totally agree with you. Various types of presentation we should not restrict. It's just that some work and some don't, and we should know that.

CHAIR: Next in the queue is Glenn.

GLENN MCKNIGHT:

A number of things, but let me start with that Avri and Cheryl's comments are really spot-on. I've been a big supporter of the Academy and I'd like to point back to the original a few years ago. Steven and I advocated for a Moodle and the online tool was to be integrated with the training. It sounds to me that it wasn't integrated.

I suggest to the community to go back to our original concepts that Steve and I were talking about. It was a tool to be used effectively because some of the people may know this material, that's fine, while some of the people are complete novices, and the whole idea was to integrate it into the individual needs of the learner. That's disappointing, because the whole intention of a Moodle/portal was to provide the necessary added value.

Second point is – and I think Cheryl was alluding to it – that this survey seems to be quite focused on the end-user. I'd be interested in the survey asking... Getting the feedback from the facilitators, the presenters, the people that organized the social or bridging event, and I don't see that in the survey. The quality of the stuff that Avri was saying – the depth of feedback – should maybe be done to people who were extremely positive.

I know you're not being critical. I think it's very constructive feedback, but I think people who really got an incredible delight, to allow them the opportunity for a one-on-one discussion would be good.

CHAIR: Thank you. Just a quick comment: in the afternoon we have the online learning platform official launch, so I think any feedback, especially from your point, because you were heading to this for quite long, is welcome. We have a queue in operation. Next up is Raf, Heather, Sebastian, Cheryl, Hong and Mikey.

RAF FATANI: Thank you. With regards to the evaluation section, I completely understand what Avri was saying with regards to if the people were speakers that were going to come in year on year. If people were coming in year on year then perhaps it's worth evaluating, but I have a slight disagreement because I think it's also that we're evaluating the person or the content.

We're evaluating what topic and what styles worked. So I'm not just evaluating how Avri did in her thing, but the overall. So that's the specific section on.... Another thing... I do agree with her that I think different sections should be evaluated separately – the online platform, etc., etc.

With regards to the bridging event, I think everyone's opinions were heard in the survey, but I think we should take a look at it from a different perspective. I think that this was raised on the day – if we merged some of these things together then there wouldn't need to be a bridging event because actually the facilitation skills and the core skills were put together, so therefore we wouldn't need the bridging skills. That's that.

The third section, with regards to the third section on the training, I'd be interested to know what kind of guidelines were given to the different speakers. Did they have complete reign over the topics, or was it specified in advance, depending on the person that was there? On that, what was their target market? I was a newcomer. There were people that had been there for a while.

Some of the things that were discussed, overall it was all very, very beneficial for me, but it seemed like some things were targeted to people like myself, that were newbies, and there were some things that were... there was a lot of depth there, and I had to grapple with a lot of the big, institutional things in order for me to understand them. I think that came from the guidelines – what sort of reign was given to the speaker? They're my points.

CHAIR:

Just to answer, as I consider this as a question, the online learning platform was supposed to give you the basic knowledge about the issues going to be discussed during the course, and the facilitators were asked to foster a dialogue among participants where veterans could obviously contribute in a different way, but newbies can still learn from it and bring in new ideas, new knowledge and new views about a topic.

So this was actually the idea. But yes, I take it as a point that facilitators need more ground rule setting, and the evaluation of different styles and feedback and so on, I think is something we should... I note that down. Next in the queue is Heather please?

HEATHER DRYDEN:

Thank you. The first thing I need to say is that despite best efforts I never did get the link to the survey. I'm not sure technically how that fell apart, but in any event I apologize because I would have certainly submitted by comments had I had it. I have a few points, but I'd like to start off by saying that I would like to confirm and say I still support all of the comments that I made at the end of our session.

To recap, I really do think the very best thing about the four days was the opportunity to meet others in other constituencies. I think it's been fantastic as you pass people in the hallway and have conversations with people that you wouldn't have otherwise had. I think that well and truly is the best thing, for me. I'll reinforce my comment that I think what needs the most improvement is that US-centric focus of the corporate leadership training.

I'd like to make some personal comments and then a few as well from my constituency. The first comment from the constituency that comes back is there's been a fair bit of discussion that the call for participants came out in very short notice and not very long before the meeting there was a tremendous scramble in our constituency.

In fact, just prior to the Buenos Aires meeting – during the week we had our training – there was another international meeting of the International Trademark Association, and it was almost impossible. I think that explains in large part – not to say that I wasn't a first choice – but I wasn't going to that meeting so I was able to come here.

The constituency has asked, "Please, for next time can we have the call go out no later than the end of the previous meeting, so that there's plenty of time to work on that?" The other thing the constituency made

a point in saying – and I have to say that I’m sensitive to it given that I work for a university and not a major corporation that’s happy to send me around the world – travel support, if it can happen, is going to make things easier. That was a comment from the constituency as well.

I’ll make a personal comment now that’s also a constituency comment. I personally was uncomfortable... I sent a summary to the constituency, to the IPC, to say, “Here’s what I learnt in the course of the four days, here’s what I thought was interesting, here’s what happened,” and some of the presentations I sent around as well, because we do have new members in the constituency and I thought that would be valuable.

The one comment that came up out of my summary was the one point that I was uncomfortable with. I was very uncomfortable with the session on rights protection and balancing rights. It had a very IP-focus. I was pretty confused, and this isn’t me pushing a barrel, but you had two members of the IPC who were involved in the Program, and there was absolutely no knowledge that that session would happen and this sort of thing.

The session had a distinctly legal flair to it, without a lawyer facilitating it, and that was awkward, let’s say, and imbalanced, if you like. I’m not suggesting in any way, shape or form – and please let me make this clear that this is not the IPC and certainly not me saying we own this issue exclusively – but it was imbalanced.

Two personal comments from me. The online platform, I understand there’s a need to balance efficiency, which is to say using existing content with generating new content. I spoke to Heidi about this briefly at some point in the week. Using existing content is great, and it is

efficient, however when the content says things like, “Here today in Dakar we did X, Y, Z,” that’s just poor and it’s confusing, because someone shows up to this meeting and says, “What do you mean?”

For a new person, I think the challenge we have as an organization – and I mentioned this as well and followed it up with Fadi this week, I have to say, personally – is that having done a PHD on ICANN and its processes, I can assure you that I’m acutely aware of the fact that finding information about ICANN is difficult.

Maybe I’m the only one in the room who was not happy to hear about this new website launch because it tells me that all of my URLs are now wrong again for the fifth time in three years. So I personally feel this problem and it’s painful. I don’t know how we deal with it. [applause]

CHAIR: Maybe we should bring that forward? I heard from many parts of the ICANN community that this is an issue.

HEATHER DRYDEN: It’s a problem, and I understand I had the good fortune to be involved in the first inter-sessional involving non-contracted parties back in January, and at that I was told, in response to this exact issue, that ICANN has appointed an archivist. Fadi asked me this week if I’d spoken to the archivist with my ideas, and I’ll follow up on that. It’s a comment that I’m tossing around in my mind about making tomorrow.

I do not greet this new website with great joy, for all sorts of reasons, and I think the reason I raise it here is we need to tackle this issue

holistically. This isn't just something for the ICANN Academy, it's something for the organization and how we use the existing information we have. I well and truly think there are two great barriers to entry into ICANN. One is simply knowledge, and the other is networking and meeting people.

I think this Program very effectively handled the meeting people, but did not really bridge the knowledge gap for me. Finally I'd like to say that I'd strongly support this notion of a social bridging event. If I think about those two gaps or barriers of entry, I think that would be a very positive change. Thank you.

CHAIR:

Thank you Heather. This was really very helpful. Next in the queue is Sebastian, then Cheryl, Hong, Mikey, Cintra. Anyone else, please raise your hand.

SEBASTIAN BACHOLLET:

Thank you. I appreciate your comment about the website. I have a meeting on that subject, to allow the expense from the CEO about this subject. I will bring that up later today. I really think that it was a fantastic four days with better things than others, but globally it was very good and I would like to hope that both new leaders of the SO/ACs and constituencies will be able to have that each year – that this Program will be set up each year for the new.

I really hope that the Board Members will be participating, because my impression today is that they are reluctant to be here and they don't want to... They want their own program because we're different for the

others. I think that's a wrong assumption. Even if they are different, it's because everyone else is different, not because they are different. We need really to outreach to the Board Members to have the opportunity to explain and share your concerns, and they need to be involved.

Then there is a question of budget, of course, and I think it's important to put that in the budget as a global project – not when it will come under SO/ACs, because it's not an SO/AC project, even if you run it. It's a global project for the organization. It's really to meant to be cross-organization.

I want to share an idea and I'm not sure that you'll agree with me, but maybe it could also be interesting to have some... I don't know if it was a goal, sorry, but we maybe could also have some newbies at the staff level to come, participate and to be trained? I remember by induction day within the Board, and it was quite funny because it was Bertrand and myself who were in a room with some knowledge of ICANN in 2010.

The staff who were supposed to train us were quite new, and it ended up with us training them. I think including some staff could be a good idea in the future, in a bridging event. But really, as much as we can organize during those four days, activities will allow people to get together and I'm all for that. Once again, thank you very much for the preparation and for the participation from all of you. I really appreciate that. Thank you.

MAGUY CERRARD:

Thank you Sebastian. Just a small comment regarding the budget – this was really the challenge this year because we had the budget approved

only in August, and this was the point where we could actually start inviting people and planning, and so on and so forth. Our notice was late, but I really hope that next year we'll have an earlier budget approval or could maybe get clarification on this issue earlier, so even if the budget is not approved, we know it's going to be approved.

Then by the end of the meeting we could start promoting it and having some outreach. I think this is something we have to work out with staff. Next in the queue is Cheryl and then Hong.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you. I wanted to just make a point specific to the online learning program. I'll declare that as I'm easily bored and difficult to entertain, when I went through the requested requirements of going through, and found there was no checkbox next to the list of things we were supposed to do, I've now gone through every single node that exists on that platform and I want to come in behind what Heather's said.

It's inexcusable to put in a new platform links to material that is not the latest link. I am not, however – and this is a response to you specifically, Heather – going to come into the camp that I'm against the concept of the new website, because I'm for a website that actually works, is accessible and does the job we need it to do.

I'm absolutely – and my heart sits in history as well – against this constant loss of corporate knowledge, history and data, and we have to protect our links, we have to protect where things are, and I can bore you for hours on how much we lost when we moved from Social Text to Confluence as a Wiki. It borders on criminal. So what we need to do is

make sure that this next change is in fact done properly, but we can't lose access, and links have to be to the most recent.

I did write a whole bunch of, "This doesn't work," and, "Why isn't this right?" but I wanted to have a very brief word, because I may not be in the meetings later where you focus on the online learning platform. Please decide what the purposes of your quiz are. If they are an exercise in one's expertise in spelling in the English language, just say that, because there's a great benefit for 'true' or 'false', where people can use the quizzes... Stop it Mikey, you enjoy my sense of humor far too much.

The quizzes are an excellent tool to reinforce the key points out of the learnings that we hope people have read and understood, but that in some cases does not include whether you've put the 's' on the end of a word to give you a pass or fail, and that's what happens in those quizzes – not your quizzes, the quizzes on all the units.

MAGUY CERRARD:

Sorry, Cheryl, what are the quizzes?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

In all the other online learning sections there are pop quizzes, tests. Design your tests, when you do tests – I'm happy for you to do tests – but do it wisely. The presence or absence of an 's' on an English word is probably not the right thing to be testing, and unless you're now going to make a multilingual, multi-platformed online learning program, be smart about what you try and test.

HONG XUE:

I understand this is a feedback session for participants, and as a member of a Working Group who haven't participated we are supposed to listen. That's what I've done for the past 56 minutes, but I'm leaving in four minutes so I want to make one comment to cover everything I want to talk about. First of all, this is a great success, absolutely, there's no need to repeat that.

I have two requests. One is please will you circulate the survey results to the mailing lists so we can report back to our constituency? Secondly, I heard there was very interesting teaching and interaction especially in the orientation part. Is there any recording or video recording, so that some leaders who were not able to participate can watch them later on and learn later and self-learn? Is that not possible? That is unfortunate.

Also, if they're available, have some video or audio material so that Working Group Members who haven't participated can assess the quality and do some more research to improve the curriculum and format. Well, and lastly I want to comment on the future of this Working Group. This is a cross-constituency Working Group.

When we think about what we want to do I'm so impressed that Sebastian mentioned that it could be a yearly event. The leadership is no longer a pilot, it will be a regular event and that's very, very exciting. I assume that if this is the go, we should presume this. Let's think about the last time at the Working Group meeting I proposed that we do a kind of matrix to learn about the different capacity building programs available in the ICANN community.

Now it seems that through the regional strategy this will clear, for this leadership pilot is primarily to train ICANN leaders and different

constituencies. That's great. For community members they could be trained at the regional level, as the European Summer School was so successful, and maybe there could be some regional initiatives.

If the Working Group can coordinate a regional initiative to train the community members we will actually expand the availability of the capacity building program, and we'll have a more useful future for the whole community. Thank you.

MAGUY CERRARD:

Thank you Hong. Just to respond to that – regarding video recording, I think many of the participants would have felt uncomfortable knowing that they were being recorded, so I think this is not an option, because we were very interactive; doing role-play stuff and some things were really funny and I think this is not something that someone would wish to be recorded.

Regarding the elements you mentioned for the future planning, this is something that the Academy should actually be, a moduled system of many different programs, and we're discussing just one module. We have to keep that in mind. The leadership training Program is just one module of an overall ICANN Academy, and this is just the start.

There is a lot of work ahead, so please stay committed and contribute with your ideas in the future. I have Mikey and then Cintra. Mikey, you have the floor.

MIKEY O'CONNOR:

Thanks. I'm going to return to the online learning platform and throw a grenade underneath it. Such a surprising thing. I think that the thing that I would ask the people who are guiding the development of that platform... I'm going to build on the earlier comments of breaking links and amending the underlying structure.

Rather than building an entire system, build a front-end to the information we already have, so that instead of requiring the information be ported into it, and thus we run into the problem of the latest link, make it a roadmap so that a new person can take a path through the roadmap, and an experienced person is using the exact same information to do their work.

So instead of a whole new repository, have it be a very light layer on top of the existing repositories. Because as we all know, each constituency and stakeholder organization has a slightly different set of tools that they use, and rather than build yet another tool with more information in it, build an infinitely expandable set of roadmaps that touch those existing tools, which will then solve a bunch of the problems that Cheryl, Heather and I and everybody was giving thumbs-up about.

But it also means that when a new person is being trained, they're not being trained on a system they'll never use again. The trouble with the online learning platform is that I'm not going to use that, typically, in a day-to-day way.

It's just like the ICANN Labs baloney, where they've got people getting paid vast amount of money to reinvent social media tools that are available for free, and they're all breathless in their discoveries of, "Oh, look at this learning!" and it's like, "No, you're not doing it right." I

worry that the online learning platform is doing precisely the same thing. So there's a rant and a grenade and the end.

MAGUY CERRARD: Cintra, you're next and then Heather.

CINTRA SOOKNANAN: Thank you. I take Mikey's point, but I think we really need to decide what the purpose is of the ICANN Academy. Is it a closed loop where we actually get feedback? This is an evolving space. Is it a mechanism to get feedback from participants, or is it that we just want to disseminate information?

Based on that objective I think you could decide whether you just want to do a portal, or you want to do something more substantive, like maybe have the information on a Wiki that's constantly updated and receiving comments and feedback. I have a couple of other comments. I thought the duration of the session was fine, but the timing needs to be better.

I don't think that this training should come at the start of a meeting – I think it's more appropriate at the end of a meeting. I think that if you don't want to record the sessions then at least you should allow for observers to be present, because I think they can also benefit.

MAGUY CERRARD: I think this has a budget impact, and we had a discussion with Heidi about whom to allow and inviting the community and so on, in terms of

space, food and all these things. This probably makes it a bit difficult. Heather, you're next.

HEATHER DRYDEN:

Just a very brief reply to Mikey, to follow up. I actually think this is what the attempt is – I think that the use of the existing documents in the online platform is... I understood it, when I was in it, as an attempt to create a front-end and use the existing back-end. The unfortunate thing is I think it was sold to us as, "This is new," so there's a disconnect in the message, I think.

But I do think that what you're proposing is actually what has occurred. Whether that's intentional I don't know but I do think that's what's happened. Perhaps the confusion I have about, "Why is this referring to 'here today in Dakar we did X'," can be ameliorated by at least clearer understanding of what 'it' is.

MIKEY O'CONNOR:

Part of the problem I had is that I went into the OLP early enough that it was basically empty. I went in and sort of found an empty restaurant. So I couldn't tell what was going on, so this is a more generic reaction to the current senior staff regime, which is, "Oh, let's reinvent the wheel and spend tones of money on stuff." The thing I saw was that they'd reinvented a wheel and then filled it with air, so if in fact that's the goal then I applaud that goal.

MAGUY CERRARD:

Marc, you're next.

MARC SIDEN:

It was great to attend this training. It was one of the best things that has ever happened to me at any ICANN meeting, but just a few detailed tiny little comments. One is that I think you overfed us. We could have had quite a bit less food. There was always leftover food, and that also meant we were low energy after the lunchtimes. We could have walked around some more. I think that comment was made by someone.

It would have been nice if we'd had even a single outdoor moment to enjoy the sunshine outside, as a group meeting or breaking up as groups. I know that that means we wouldn't have whiteboards or things to write on, but we could still possibly do some exercises outside. It would have been nice to know, ahead of time, just what the business deal was in terms of stipend and exact dates and times and who was paying for what.

There is still a bit of confusion about that, I think. I discovered, when I got my per diem payment in and it wasn't explained what it was, and how it was calculated, so I had to ask about that. For some reason the hotel charged me. I don't know whether that was correct or not. Should it have been direct billed to ICANN, I gather? Maybe they were confused too.

The bridging event was my biggest disappointment because it was a completely different format and style than we'd become accustomed to with a lot of intimate communication, which by the way is exactly the reason why not to videotape that thing, but if you want to videotape something for future playback, you could stage such an event under different ground rules and try reusing the content. I really don't think

that would provide the personal interaction like the in-person event that we had though.

HEATHER DRYDEN:

I'll make a follow up to Marc. As soon as you said, "Go outside," it made me think of this: I think the very best thing that happened for me, at the Durban meeting, was that impromptu opportunity to go out and paint the school. I thought that was absolutely fantastic, and I think there's a real untapped opportunity here. If you actually built something like that into this Program that would set the expectation that this is part of what ICANN does.

When you introduce new people and you say... you could actually build a culture from this, and say, "This is part of what we do. We want to encourage this." It handles the 'go outside', it handles the 'go out and interact with the local community', which was a point that was raised over the weekend, and it also handles that broader ethic, which up to Durban had not been brought into an ICANN meeting, which is we've got a bunch of brains in the room but we're really only using those brains in our own little circles. So I think that ticks all the boxes.

MAGUY CERRARD:

Instead of a social event, doing some school painting in the country where we are?

HEATHER DRYDEN:

Anything, something that gets them out and can be tailored to a local community. We just happened to be South Africa for Nelson Mandela's

birthday, but let's not treat that as a one-off. This is a great... Go out and do something useful in the community. Talk to schoolchildren.

A number of us hung around and just talked to the kids afterwards about what the Internet is, how it works, what it does. I asked questions about what kangaroos are really like. There's tremendous value in that, and if we inculcate that in this Program, we'll all turn around in three years time and this will just be baked in. That would be fantastic.

MAGUY CERRARD: Very interesting. Good point. Any other comments? I see there are at least two participants who did participate, but didn't say anything so far. May I please invite you to give us your feedback, Leon and [Tampani? 01:05:26]?

LEON SANCHEZ: Yes, Sandra, thank you. The reason why I haven't participated is that my training points have already been made, but just to add to what Marc was saying, I think it's a great experience because from my personal point of view I would have never reached out to, for example, the SSAC. It's just not in my radar as a lawyer to go and reach out to SSAC people. Having this mixture of people with different disciplines and views, I think that was the most enriching experience for me.

CHAIR: Thank you. [Tampani?]?

[TAMPANI]:

I also found that most everything I wanted to say has been said – but a few points. Regarding recording the sessions, especially in the roleplaying sessions, I don't care if somebody sees that I've been acting like a fool, but in many cases, when the issues get real, in a couple of sessions with people I explicitly stated that, "This is actually some real stuff – please don't spread it out, it's confidential." We want more of that. Several people have said that these orientation sessions should also be more interactive and so forth, and [inaudible 01:06:50] becomes more confidential in a way.

Perhaps a general observation that the rhythm of the course was a bit bad. The two very great days – the interactive days – and then two listen-only days. That was a starting high and dropping down feeling that doesn't really work well. I must also finally observe that the OLP technically did not work as well as it should have. I did not have any of these tick-boxes that were supposed to be there and so forth. They didn't work for me for whatever reason.

MAGUY CERRARD:

I agree with the points. Just to mention I also felt that at some point it really got confidential, and this was actually one of the strengths of the Program, to get very close to each other. If this is going to be recorded I think we'll lose that element. I understand the desire within ICANN to report and record and transcribe everything, but I think on some points we have to...

It's a closed meeting or a face-to-face meeting. You cannot put everything online and with remote participation it simply doesn't work. That's my experience here as well. We have two new people in the

room. I'd firstly like to introduce Thomas Rickert, he's just arrived. He was participating in this course. Maybe you want to give us your view?

[David Colp] was the facilitator of the facilitation skills training. Maybe you'd like to reflect on your experience a little bit, because you're listening? Then I'd invite Thomas to say a few words.

[DAVID COLP]:

I'm on then? Okay. I thought it was an excellent pilot. We certainly learnt a lot in terms of design, going forward. One of the things that I'd commit to ICANN going forward is you'll have non-American facilitators facilitating the program, and that will be... That's easy enough to fulfill. I definitely heard that loud and clear. I apologize for being late coming into this.

One of the comments I'm hearing is about the recording and video. Sometimes with other groups we work with, sometimes the plenary sessions are a recorded session or could be videotaped and the breakout sessions aren't – just like in an ICANN meeting where if a group breaks up to do an activity it's no longer on the transcript because it's just impossible to mic all that. So there may be some hybrid solutions here and there.

But people would know the secret of the spy exercise if we recorded that, and of course we know that and you don't. So... But all in all, I thought it was a great two days. There is some good energy around how we integrate, so it isn't a high-energy, low-energy experience. How could we incorporate things to really start to make linkages there?

I loved Heather's idea of maybe a service evening as a bridging event, that just... If there's a bridging event to be done, or there is some service activity. So there are lots of great elements that we could put into the Program.

THOMAS RICKERT:

Thanks very much Sandra. I apologize for being late, but nonetheless I wanted to at least spend the time that I could with you. I have been participating in part of the course, and I was particularly interested in how the whole course would go, but unfortunately for reasons of agenda I could not attend the first part of the facilitation training. To start with I looked at the OLP, which didn't work perfectly and I think there's definitely room for improvement there.

Nonetheless, for those that are criticizing the online courses, rest assured that when I went on the gNSO Council two years back – I've just been reappointed, which qualifies me to be a participant of the Academy – I would have loved to have a single resource of all the documents that you need to know and all the places on the ICANN website where you find valid or relevant information.

So when I started out making up my mind as to what I would expect or what I thought was useful to know about ICANN, I found everything referred to in the course. So I think it's all there, but maybe it needs a little bit of tweaking to make the course more attractive and more interactive, but that's an excellent start.

Again, facilitation training I cannot speak to. I was there on the bridging event, which I found extremely interesting, but I had not been there all

day, so I think it's difficult for those that have been sitting and working and learning all day, to then sit down and primarily listen to a panel discussion. But having been in this environment for quite some time, I always enjoy listening to people that have a lot to say, and just follow them exchanging their thoughts.

I would have loved to chime in and continue the discussion for another two hours. I would not have minded, but I thought this was excellent because you get so much history to what we now have, and this history is neither with most of the current ICANN leaders, nor with ICANN staff. ICANN has grown so quickly that also staff doesn't have that much of history to tell you, and having the likes of Marilyn and Wolf to speak to those issues is extraordinary. It's a privilege to have them in one place and exchange thoughts about the work that took place before ICANN started and all that.

Then this very day I think I might not be too neutral because I was facilitating one of the sessions, as you'll remember, so I think it's more up to you to criticize that or point out to me or others what we could do better. But I think that we need to rearrange the agenda slightly. I think there was not enough room to present the various SOs and ACs, because there were more questions so we didn't really have time to enter into debate.

It might be worthwhile just... Like with an elevator pitch or maybe a little bit longer – just give 5-10 minutes to every group to speak to what their groups do and not allow questions. Get that off the table and then maybe have someone facilitating a discussion by making some remarks as to how he sees they do collaborate or do not collaborate.

I tried to integrate some of the friction or the alliances into my talk, but I guess that's something that you don't learn by looking at the website, to see what the issues are and why someone claimed that the gNSO is broke, for example. All this I think is background knowledge that people should get in such a course. In terms of substance, I thought that this was an excellent opportunity to break out the silos.

This is certainly a term we'll be using inflationary, and I'm not really that much opposed to silos, but just for the sake of making it transparent, having the SSAC people there was great, because as a gNSO Council we get updates from the SSAC and you read their papers, but nonetheless, learning how what we produce at times is perceived by the technical community.

Listening to your questions regarding the RAA certainly tells the story that we need to do a better job bringing the whole community up to speed with current developments, and fostering the mutual understanding. I learnt an awful lot. I thought that Sebastian was great. I should not single out individuals, but... Everybody who was there had contributions to make that I did not know about.

I think that unless you have such a private circle of people talking to each other, you wouldn't get that quality of exchange of thoughts. So I think this was very much a part of that. One final thing. The polling tool did not work on me properly as well, but I have to say that I sent an email to staff and it was fixed in five minutes and I could continue, so that was excellent. That was great.

Also I'd like to applaud Sandra and Heidi and all the others that have been working so hard to make this happen. I guess this is an excellent

starting point and we should not be deceived by those that might propose us to improve. I think this in itself has been great. Period.

CHAIR:

Thank you. I will give that to the Working Group. Are there any other feedback comments, because if this is not the case we have 12 minutes left and I'd simply like to wrap-up so as to not go over time. I made quite a few notes already during that course, where I realized that the Program was not working out in terms of times and stuff like that. We will definitely adjust this.

We already have had a quick discussion with [David Colp] on how to merge those two elements so that we can actually catch up with many of the comments made here – not losing the dynamics, a bridging event will not be necessary anymore because you don't have to bridge anything. The idea of going out and doing more social things, I think is a great idea. We should definitely work on that.

Even doing some exercises is probably better than getting more food, so we could definitely save some budget there. Leon, yes?

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thanks. Remember, breaking up the survey into sections? That's something we recommended too.

MAGUY CERRAD:

Yes, this is indeed something on my list. There are many details on my list that we have to work on. The Academy Group will hopefully stay committed. If you, as a participant of this experience, are interested in

participating in the ICANN Academy Working Group, I would really welcome you because your expertise and knowledge and the possibility to act as an ambassador would be very valuable to bring this Program forward.

If you want to just subscribe to the Academy Working Group list, then if you follow the threads then you might be able, at some point, to contribute to the discussion, because there were only three or four people on the Academy list who participated in this Program, so we should somehow keep that knowledge. I'd really appreciate it if you could send me your interest on that so I can put you on.

We'll definitely send out the survey. We have 16 answers so far. It still remains open. We'll send it to the Academy list and also the mailing list that was set up for this year's participants. Heidi, or her staff, have already sent out the notification that this mailing list has been set up. Finally, we asked four participants for short video snaps. Videos are going to be recorded today that can also be used as a sort of promotion tool and they should help us to promote this project further in our communities. Yes?

[DAVID COLP]:

One other thing – as Sandra had an appeal for the Working Group participation, my hat's off to the ICANN staff breakout facilitators that helped with the facilitation skills. They'd gone through the pilot program and we'd spend three hours the day before the facilitation skills program with them, talking about the mechanics of running the breakout sessions.

That said, we'd love to have members from the community be the breakout facilitators for the community going forward, because you know it intimately as well. If that's an interest, get in touch and we'll make sure that that happens for the folks that are interested in doing that.

MAGUY CERRARD: Great point David. I'd just underline that we will also try to keep you involved, maybe as a facilitator, not for the skills training but also for the content part, so that we can build up a faculty or something like this and build up ground rules and so on and so forth. Avri, did you have a question?

AVRI DORIA: Yes, I was just going to comment that that mix as well, especially if we go into a blended mode where the facilitators are also the senior leaders giving talks, and that those roles get combined and that becomes... If we go with the blended approach you actually blend the roles of past participants, etc.

MAGUY CERRARD: One point I think is of great importance – at least to me, and I think this is something that should be improved – is that we should mix staff and community more, because I think staff is a stakeholder group. We had Nigel participating in the second part, more or less fulltime. We had staff facilitators in the facilitation skills training, and I saw that they benefited from the discussion as well.

This is something we should improve, which also brings in the community and which also bridges the gap between staff and community. Raf, you have a comment?

RAF FATANI:

What you just said about... I somewhat felt disconnected with some of the staff that came in very briefly to say their small piece and then left. I felt if they were there throughout the whole process with us then we would have felt more at one in understanding some of the issues. Especially as – this was an earlier comment – some of the staff were new. That would have benefited some of them as well.

MAGUY CERRARD:

Good point, indeed. I invite Avri... Avri, you have to leave? Okay. I invite David, Tijani and Heidi to stay here for some quick wrap-up, if you have the time? Because we are here now and we won't have the opportunity to meet face-to-face again, to discuss the further planning. I'd like to thank all the participants for their feedback and the Working Group Members to stay committed.

I'll close this session three minutes before the hour. I'm German – I always stick to the time. I did that before already. Now I'm even three minutes before the time. This is the outcome of the facilitation!

[END OF SESSION]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you ladies and gentlemen. This is now starting to be the Nominating Committee Open Meeting. You are more than welcome to stay for the Nominating Committee Open Meeting, but I would ask the Nominating Committee current and future to take their seats at the table.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]