PANAMA – Fellowship Daily Session
Wednesday, June 27, 2018 – 12:00 to 14:00 EST
ICANN62 | Panama City, Panama

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:  We listen Bruno, we listen.  [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:  Slide it up.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN:  Hello, everyone.  Welcome to Fellowship Daily Session, not the last one, but we still have one day to go.  Today we have a bit of unusual session.  It's a working, training, capacity development session, which will be run by my colleagues.

The director, head of public responsibility support department, which is also coordinating the Fellowship Program, Ergys Ramaj and Betsy Andrews who you probably know well.  She is leading our ICANN-Learn portal and everything that relates to ICANN-Learn.  So please welcome them.  Thank you for coming and thank you for your time and they will be -- I think they will be talking about a very interesting topic.  But the floor is yours.  Betsy, Ergys?

BETSY ANDREWS:     Hello?  Oh, it works!  Hello everybody.  If you'd like to come closer to the front, feel free to get up and do so.  This is going to be a less formal session than what you have previously listened to.  We're going to talk about conflict resolution skills and how in an environment where you're trying to build consensus, everyone doesn't always agree with each other.  So, what are some of the methods that we can employ to help get everybody on the same page?

My name, as Siranush said, is Betsy Andrews and this Ergys Ramaj and we all work together in the Public Responsibility Department.   So, we're going to take you through an introduction to conflict, then I'm going to talk a little bit about the how people approach it.  Ergys is going to talk a little bit about the practice -- how do you apply that theory -- is there water dripping from the ceiling?  Okay, just checking.

Alright, so, after that we'll talk about how to apply that theory and practice to an ICANN situation and then we'll have a little role-play where Ergys and I will pick a little fight with one another and you will help us determine what are some ways that we can resolve that conflict.  And, finally we'll break into four groups and we'll give each of your groups a scenario and you will determine as a group, what's a way to meet that challenge,

drawing upon some of the theories and practices that we've gone over.

So, that's the structure of the program that we're going to through today. If we finish a little early, we will have time for a Q and A session. We will try to keep you apprised of the scores in the Brazil game, when that starts to happen. But we appreciate your paying attention, we appreciate your paying attention. We have our excellent interpreters in the back in Spanish and French and so if you'd like to ask questions, you're welcome to do that -- it's not working?

Ooh, can we some help with that? They're no hearing the interpretation. And I have a really funny accent. Give us just two seconds for them to map out what's going on.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     [Inaudible].

BETSY ANDREWS:     That one. It's dripping on the screen. So, in theory, you'll be able to ask questions in Spanish or French. In practice, we'll work that out and, in the meantime, Ergys and I will articulate as clearly as we can. Okay. I've already practiced counting to four in Spanish, so I can break you into groups.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     We're good.

BETSY ANDREWS:     We're good to go?  Thanks, guys.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:     [inaudible].

BETSY ANDREWS:     If you have a headset, you need to be sure you have the right language headset?  Okay.  Right so the channel needs to match what you're seeing in the Adobe Connect room.  Oh, the channel -- okay, so English is one, French is two, and Espanol is three -- uno, dos, tres.  Are we good?  Okay, let us know if you have any challenges.  No, no good?  No Bueno?  Okay.  They're not able to hear it.  Have we -- have you tried an additional headset?  Maybe that headset needs a new life.  [CROSSTALK]

BETSY ANDREWS:     It doesn't.

ERGYS RAMAJ:           Is it working for anyone?  Okay, so it's not working for anyone. Not everyone is pry making a mistake.  And can you hear now? Is this being translated?  No?  Esteban says no.  See how fun it is when you have technical difficulties?  Just another minute, I'm sure we'll figure this out.  No worries, Betsy and I are quite quick. We'll go a little faster. We'll skip a few things.

BETSY ANDREWS:         We'll teach you everything you need to know --

ERGYS RAMAJ:           To make the whole thing complete.

BETSY ANDREWS:         We can sing a duet in the meantime.  Karaoke, anybody?

ERGYS RAMAJ:           No, no, I'm in the right line of work.  I don't know if --

BETSY ANDREWS:         Great screen for karaoke.  My two rules of karaoke are you either sound good or you have a really good time doing it.  I tend to err on the side of the second.  It's really loud out there and the door won't stay shut.  Bear with us for just a few more minutes.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:      Yes.


BETSY ANDREWS:        It's back?


ERGYS RAMAJ:          Yay, thank you!


BETSY ANDREWS:        Fantastic!  Good.


ERGYS RAMAJ:          Thank you very much.


BETSY ANDREWS:        Let's give it up for the wicked smart gentlemen in the back of the room.  Okay, so back to conflict resolution.  We're going to start with an introduction.  Ergys, take it away.


ERGYS RAMAJ:          Good morning -- or good afternoon everyone.  For the third time I'll introduce myself.  My name is Ergys Ramaj and I work in the Public Responsibility Department.   I have the pleasure of

working with these two great ladies, Siranush and Betsy. Did everybody have a chance to have food? Okay, because we don't want anyone hungry or angry, which makes hungry people and since we're talking about conflict resolution I want to avoid any conflict.

So, when we think about conflict, most of what we think about is probably something or someone who is yelling at you or there is a physical altercation of something along those lines. That's probably the first thing that comes to mind. The way conflict is defined, however, is broader, more broader than that. Essentially, it's any disagreement that you may have with someone and the bottom line is that everyone experiences conflict on a daily basis. There's also such thing called as inner-conflict. You know, such a thing as, you are thinking about something and you're telling yourself I really don't want to do that. That by definition, is conflict.

So, it doesn't necessarily have to be something that is blown out of proportion, it doesn't have to be a physical altercation, it could be simply a disagreement with someone or a group of people. So, why does conflict occur? Again, if you think about it, probably you're having a disagreement with somebody, you don't see eye-to-eye, you have a different point of view, you come from different culture, you don't understand their point of

view, you don't understand why they're doing certain things a certain way -- again, none of this is bad, it just is.  And oftentimes what we need to do collectively is realize it -- and   we'll go through the different steps -- that there is a conflict and then take the appropriate steps to resolve that conflict.

If we can go to the next slide, please.  Okay, so some expressions of resistance or conflict.  Have you ever known someone that really gives way too many details?  So, you can say, "Hey, what did you have for breakfast?" –"So, I woke up in the morning, I took out a plate, I took my spoon, I poured some cereal" -- okay, just tell me what you had, right?  Or someone who's saying too little.  My wife always asks me, "How was your day at work?" – "Good."  Okay, how was it good.

So, these are some of the details.  Time -- you just don't have enough time to address an issue or anything.   You're just running all over the place.  It's not practical, it just would not work in this case, I'm sorry, skip it.   Solutioning, which is something I always do and that is, I discuss an issue and ultimately as soon as I hear the problem, I just want to have a solution, quick, let's do it.  It's –

BETSY ANDREWS:         He's telling the truth.

ERGYS RAMAJ:    It's not necessarily bad, but sometimes if you think things through, you may come to regret it later because you didn't think through all of the possible scenarios that may arise. Sounding like a broken record -- you know that uncle -- that aunt, who always says the same thing at every birthday party? Overt versus covert.   Again, something that you can see, something that you could feel, versus someone who's doing something in the hidden, in the background -- it's not visible. Another one is confusion.   Again, even though you keep explaining it to me, I'm not getting it.  Silence – "Are you upset? Tell me, are you upset?" Intellectualizing.  Betsy's guilty of this.

BETSY ANDREWS:    Guilty as charged.

ERGYS RAMAJ:    Every little thing has to be analyzed.  What are the pros?  What are the cons?   Whether it's a big thing or a small thing. Moralizing -- again, we take the moral high ground.  We know what's the right thing to do, we know how it should be done. Methodology -- did you think about this step when you made this decision.  Well let me tell you how you should've thought about it.  And the last one is outdated.

Think about it when you speak with your parents or elderly people -- someone who's of a different generation, and oftentimes you're like, well yeah but that worked in your time. These are different times. So how is this useful at ICANN? Which is actually something that we will need to think about more actively. If you think about the multi-stake holder model and the differences of opinion, the different cultures that come together. ICANN's policies are consensus driven and they're doable.

So, you have a multitude of people, cultures, languages, coming together to agree on an outcome. So inherently the multi-stake holder model has a lot of conflict in it and as I mentioned earlier, conflict is not negative -- it does not have to be negative. It can be negative but it's not negative in and of itself. It is just a disagreement.

And so, within ICANN, you, as alumni of the fellowship program, and I assume most of you have been here at least twice, have seen in the specific sessions and working groups, or whatever environment you've been involved in and observed, that people disagree with one another and that's core to actually getting things done.

So, at ICANN even if you're someone that's shy, or does not necessarily feel comfortable being at the frontlines, it is

something that you have to get used to, learn how to deal with, and actually have your voice heard.  It is critical to how ICANN operates as an organization.  The very foundation of the multi-stake holder model is based on participation from individuals from all over the world, who bring to the table their ideas, their thoughts, and their solutions.

Inherent in that is disagreements.  What you think might be the right thing to do is not my way of doing it and therefore we have to see eye-to-eye at some point if we want to reach a resolution.  And ICANN has historically been quite successful in coming up with policies that are consensus driven and further its mission.  Next slide please.

BETSY ANDREWS:    Now that we've talked about what conflict is.  Let's dive a little deeper behind the curtain and talk about the theories of what's behind conflict -- what's bringing us into these conflicting situations and just like Ergys was explaining, you know, this long list of what conflict can look like -- that list is not exhaustive.  Conflict can look like a multitude of different things.  The same is true for the theory behind conflict.  But what we're going to talk about now are just a few ideas that help us wrap our brains around what are some methods that we can employ to resolve

conflict.  So initially on the slide here that you'll see that we can divide conflict into two different areas.

So, there's you and then there's others.  And managing conflict -- when I said divide conflict, I mean we can divide conflict resolution into two areas.   So, when you manage conflict yourself when you're seeking to resolve it, that's assertive.  And when you manage conflict with others, that's cooperative.  So ideally in a multi-stake holder situation ICANN will cooperatively resolving conflict.   But as you will have observed, that's not always the case.

So, it's nice to have some tools in your kit, so if you're the one who needs to resolve conflict, you know how to get that started -- get that process started.  The most important thing that we're going to tell you today and you will hear Ergys say this and you will hear me say this, but everyone is different.  The key to conflict resolution is being self-aware.  And this is particularly useful in situations that bring people from around the world together and ICANN is a great example of that.

So, the people that you're involved with are all different from each other, they all approach situations differently, and they're going to resolve conflict differently, and importantly they're going to respond to different methods of resolving conflict differently.  So, this is the -- if you remember only one thing,

along with the score of the football game -- this is what you need to remember from this session today. So now let's talk about approaches. I really like this graphic because if gives you an image of what it feels like to be involved in conflict right?

So, we have an iceberg at the left and at the top of the iceberg, the part that you can see above the water, those are our positions. So those are obvious, those are things that we can see across the room or across the panel, or in the email list or on the conference call in Adobe Connect. We can see the positions that are going on. Just below the positions, those visible behaviors, just below the surface of the water, these are our interests. These are the things that we're trying to protect. These are the voices of the end users that we're representing or the regions that we're representing.

Our interests are very important to us, but the people around us may not see our interests because they're below the surface of the water, so to speak. And then deep, deep down at the bottom of that iceberg, where the water is very, very dark -- those are our needs. Nobody sees our needs, nobody knows our needs. Sometimes we don't know our needs. So, the iceberg is a really useful thing to look about -- to look at when we're thinking about conflict because we have the visible positions, the

interests that are right under the surface and then the hidden and the subconscious needs at the bottom.

So, consider, and when you get to conflict, that there are opinions and their facts --- those are not the same thing, often we consider our own opinions to be fact and that is not the case. And consider there are perspectives versus truths and when you combine that with the position, needs and interests, you realize why this gets so complicated, because that's all of us. We all have all that going on and we need to interact with one another, so how do we do that? There are four key conflict resolution styles that we're going to talk about today. And Ergys will list them out for you and then we'll put them into practice later.

ERGYS RAMAJ: Yeah, I'll quickly go through them. Advocate is one of them. You can accommodate someone or group. You could just avoid them flat out, or you can compromise. So, knowing your style. This is quite interesting because as Betsy mentioned earlier, if there's one thing that you take away out of this, is knowing yourself, being self-aware.

And I'll give you a quick example of one of the ways in which I became self-aware of something I do. Several years back, I was in a conference call with a colleague and at the time I was

working overseas, I was not in the US.  It was late evening and I was at home and I was having a disagreement with a colleague of mine over the phone.

And to make a very long story short, I expressed my view and I said please let's get this done and I hung up the phone.  My wife approaches me and says "You know your approach was not right.  It was not the right one, but the other person is probably intimidated, and they will just take whatever you said and do it but that's not the way to go about this issue."  And it dawned on me and I said, "What do you mean they're intimidated by me?"  And she said, "Well, it's the way well maybe you look the way you carry yourself." And I said, "Well the way I look yeah, but the way I carry myself, what do you mean?"

The moral of the story is you become self-aware sometimes by other people pointing it out to you.  It's not always a process where all of a sudden you are walking in the middle of wherever you are and you're like, "Aha!  I am this way!"  That may happen, but more often than not people that you trust point it out to you and say, "Hey listen, maybe you need to adjust, maybe you need to do it this way."

So, knowing how you're perceived is quite important because that changes your perspective.  So, the next time I interacted with that colleague of mine I was listening a lot more then I was

talking because I said well if I don't understand their perspective, if I'm using my position to get my things done, it's really not the right way and I don't want my colleagues to feel intimidated. I want this to be a collaborative effort, so that's self-awareness helped me and to this day I carry it with me because it's so important that you not only realize but also do something about it because otherwise it defeats the purpose of finding out in the first place.

BETSY ANDREWS: Building on Ergys' example of self-awareness and how important it is, I can add another example to that which is that Ergys and I work together quite a lot. We're solving problems together frequently and sometimes we find ourselves in a situation where we play good cop, bad cop -- can you guess which one of us is the good cop and which one of us is the bad cop?

Yeah so, I'm making that joke that very often Ergys comes across as the bad cop and I come across is the good cop. That tends to be because of how we look -- I'm female, I come across as a bit more gentle, a bit more warm than Ergys does and Ergys comes across as quite authoritative and incredibly smart. But beneath the surface I'm actually really smart too and I have ideas about how things should be resolved and I'm pretty feisty about my

opinions so when it comes to conflict -- oh, and the rest of that story is that as you all know is that underneath Ergys is just a big teddy bear.

So, the appearance of good cops and bad parts can be deceiving but it's very helpful to both of us and to us collectively as a team to know how we're perceived, to know what kind of image is popping into someone's head when they observe us when we're leading a group. So, self-awareness is key and these styles that were going to go through some of them are going to start to resonate with you and you're going to say oh yeah, I do that or no I never do that, or I would like to learn how to do that.

So, these are some key reasons why we're presenting this information. Let's talk about the practice of conflict. There are multiple steps in a collaboration, but these steps are the ones that particularly resonated with us when we were thinking about the experience of a fellow and that situations that you're going to find yourself confronted with as a participant in multi-stake holders' system.

So, listen and ask is always helpful regardless of what position you're in. We are all guilty of finding ourselves in sessions where someone makes a key point and we're just thinking about what we're going to say or we're in the que waiting to speak at a public forum and some of the other meetings and we're kind of

tuning everybody out. We might get the highlights but we're really thinking about our agenda. But if you learn to listen actively and you see what's going on a lot of times you can make connections that other people haven't been able to make so it's of prime importance that you listen and ask questions when you don't understand.

Step two, deflect aggression and diffuse emotion. When Ergys opened the session talking about how initially when we think of conflict we think of fighting, right? That's really important to recognize when emotions are getting escalated to the point that resolutions not going to be possible because all we're doing is seeing red.

The third step in this flow, in this process you know after motion and aggression has been deflected so we're actually in problem solving mode that we need to surface the real need and name the resistance and it's incredible how easy this is to do but how seldom we do it. We are in this room to solve this problem and this is what's getting in the way of our problem and once we've said it everybody's on the same page and we may recognize that we actually all have the same goal. And after that it becomes a lot more straightforward to focus on the resolution.

And finally, you listen again to assert your views in an appropriate manner. So, the key here is that listen is what's

going to get you through. And this process is said that you'll be able to take these slides away with you and remind yourself of this process because works every time. Now let's talk about how to apply this to ICANN.

ERGYS RAMAJ: How many of you in your local languages have this saying that goes along the following lines, you have two ears and one mouth, listen more and talk less. Pretty much universal --

BETSY ANDREWS: I haven't heard that, but I think it's fantastic.

ERGYS RAMAJ: And therefore, this is the message that Betsy was trying to convey. Okay, to our scenario.

BETSY ANDREWS: Right. So, we're going to give you a scenario that's realistic and then we're going to talk about these four conflict resolution styles of compromise, avoid, accommodate, and advocate. And we'll break you into groups and each one of you will get one of those styles and you'll come up with a solution for our scenario

to be able to tell us how to tackle that style.  So, the participants in this activity are Ergys, me, and you.

Okay, so the scenario is Ergys and I are in a Public Responsibility -- a Public Interest session.  This has happened.  So, we're in a Public Interest session -- we are about 50 minutes into an hour-long session and I have been going on and on and on about how important it is to define public interest, we can't even have this discussion until we know how to define what public interest is.  If you've been following the public interest discussions you will know that this is a very real, very valid argument.

Ergys, on the other hand, feels like we're 50 minutes in, we haven't identified what a definition for the public interest is, we have 10 minutes left and there's a very important agenda that we want to press forward, that we want to press through with.  So, we have a conflict between us and there's 10 minutes to go in the situation.  Is there anything you want to add before we go on?

ERGYS RAMAJ:    No, just that I'm very, very upset that we only have 10 minutes, three more agenda items to cover and yet here we are arguing –

BETSY ANDREWS:        I just can't stop talking.

ERGYS RAMAJ:          She can't stop.

BETSY ANDREWS:        Yeah, so we have this conflict and there are ways to approach this conflict through compromise, there are ways to approach it by avoiding it, there are ways to approach it by accommodating it, and there are ways to approach it by advocating it. Do you want to go through these or you want me to?

ERGYS RAMAJ:          Go ahead.

BETSY ANDREWS:        Okay. So, compromise means that both sides are giving a little bit, right? So, if we were to compromise in this situation just think about how maybe we could get onto the same page. If we were to accommodate, that means that one or both of us is accommodating the needs of the other person. If we were to avoid that one's fairly transparent with avoidance but what would that look like if I was avoiding the situation or Ergys' character in this scenario was avoiding the situation.

And finally, advocate.  And this one's a little bit more interesting to me because it's not only being aware of yourself and your position in a conflict but it's also being very aware of what the other position is and if you can advocate for your own or advocate for the other, then you end up with a successful conclusion.

And you can see how these overlap.  Oftentimes advocating is going to look like a compromise and sometimes a compromise will look like accommodation.  But let's go ahead and break into four groups and you'll stay in these four groups for the next exercise and you can come up with a solution and then present your solution to the group.

ERGYS RAMAJ:     So, we're going to put you to work, okay.  We're going to -- oh, we have a question.

LUIS GONZALEZ:     Hi, I'm Jose Luis Gonzalez from Mexico.  Can you redefine advocate, please?

BETSY ANDREWS:     So, when you're advocating you are making an argument for your position, so you have to know your position to advocate.

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

Advocate in English is related to the word for lawyer, basically. So, it's like someone who is presenting a side of the argument. And when you're advocating your position in a session it may be your advocating for your views or it may be that you're advocating for the views of a group that you represent. But you're presenting what these views are in a way that's comprehensible to the rest of the group.

So, if I'm advocating for someone else's position, I might restate what their argument looks like in a way that's more applicable to the other people in the group. So let's say in this discussion Ergys is an outside expert speaker who has come into a public interest discussion, he doesn't really know what ICANN's like, and I've been around at ICANN for years and years and years and I know the personalities and I know the different groups and I realize that Ergys is making a particular argument that's applicable to our situation but people aren't really getting it because he's using these big lawyer words or he's, you know, presenting something only exclusively from a business perspective and I know 60 percent of this group is civil society.

So perhaps advocating for someone else's position in that scenario is my parsing -- that's not a good word to use -- is my taking Ergys' argument and putting it into words that make sense in an ICANN scenario. And I would like to flip that to sort

of the other side and some of you, I mean all of you have been newcomers, but you interact with newcomers if you no longer consider yourself to be one -- and often times the other side of, you know, someone asking for you to advocate for them becomes very important too.

So, becoming aware of this style of conflict resolution, to advocate -- to put someone's argument into a different scenario can be very helpful. Did that help? Okay, so let's break into groups. Should I -- okay. So uno, dos, tres , cuatro -- remember your number okay? Because then you're going to break up, okay? uno, dos, tres , cuatro, uno, dos, tres , cuatro, uno, dos, tres , cuatro, uno, dos, tres , cuatro, uno, dos, tres , cuatro -- alright this section, I'm doing really well the Spanish, right? Okay, uno, dos, tres --

INTERPRETER:          One, two, three, four, One, two, three, four --

BETSY ANDREWS:      Uno, dos, tres --

ERGYS RAMAJ:         If you're a one, in this corner please.

BETSY ANDREWS:     Cuatro, cuatro – I need a new number -- uno, dos --

ERGYS RAMAJ:     If you're a two, in that corner -- three, over there.

BETSY ANDREWS:     Okay, there you go.  So, form your groups.  Ergys is pointing out where to go if you are ones, twos, threes, or fours.

ERGYS RAMAJ:     Group number two -- group number three to the left and group number four over here to the right.  This is going to be a very short exercise, about 10 minutes.  Please take some time to discuss the scenario -- two over there to the left.  So, group number one has been assigned, compromise.  Group number one, please acknowledge, you are doing compromise.  Everyone good with that?

Okay.  Group number two, you are accommodating.  Group number two you are accommodating.  Group number three to the left here, you are avoiding.  And group number four you are advocating.  Group number four, you are advocating.  So, 10 minutes and then we'll regroup.  Go for it.  [AUDIO BREAK]

ERGYS RAMAJ:    Time check, one minute, one minute.  [AUDIO BREAK]

ERGYS RAMAJ:    Okay everyone, please let's take our seats.  We have to carry on with the program and we are eagerly anticipating -- they don't, I stand corrected, I apologize.  You do not have to take your seats unless you're tired.  Okay, so why don't we start -- okay so group number one is still debating, this is good.  This is very good.  Are you guys ready to share?  Have you chosen a spokesperson?  [CROSSTALK]

ERGYS RAMAJ:    Lawrence, you have been voluntold.  You are the spokesperson for group number one.  Why don't you go ahead and tell us what is -- what does this look like in practice?  How did you guys approach it?

BETSY ANDREWS:    And Lawrence, remember that we're interpreting the session so speak slowly and clearly so if you guys want to get your headsets, feel free.

ICANN 62
POLICY FORUM
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

LAWRENCE OLAWARE:    So, I think to summarize what we came up with in the scenario that was painted.  Compromise would mean, yes, we could have a longer list of things we want to, but we have a very short time left to do it, still doesn't mean that we must complete it here at the end.  So in a situation where you have someone who has taken over the microphone and is devoting so much time to expressing his views, even when you feel those views are not necessary, a compromise there are the three items left on the list, prioritizing it on one so that you can actually reach a decision on there and then, and if you can't touch on the other two items left, you'll have to look for other avenues or opportunities to be able to deal with such issues.

So, compromise basically also we discussed that compromise could mean not taking care of everybody's interest but at least taking care of the interest of the majority, so you might have to reach a consensus -- that doesn't mean that everybody must be happy with the decision but its showing that, yes in the roll of consensus you have majority backing up that point.

ERGYS RAMAJ:    Thank you Lawrence.  I've got a quick question.  Great job.  How did you reach compromise on who will be the spokesperson?  I only saw a bunch of fingers pointing your direction.

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

LAWRENCE OLAWARE:    Yeah, I was wondering.


ERGYS RAMAJ:    Okay, why don't we go to group two.  Who is the spokesperson here?  Oh, we've got a volunteer.


UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    Hi.  In this scenario, if we accommodate the situation basically the person talking, that has been talking for pretty much of the session, should stop speaking and give the floor to the other party so the other party can express their points.


ERGYS RAMAJ:    Alright, let's do a round of applause for group number two.  That was very clear and succinct.  Group number three.  Betsy take it away.


BETSY ANDREWS:    Do you guys have a spokesperson to tell us about avoidance? Clare?

CLARE: Okay it sounded like what we came up with accommodation. We saw this as the chair, so we're the third person, so we decide that if the person was talking and we still have to complete the agenda then we just say we move on -- enough and we move on with the agenda. So, we avoid any conflict on either side and just move on.

ERGYS RAMAJ: And as Betsy said earlier there are a lot of overlaps between all of this and hence the confusion but let's move on to group number four.

BETSY ANDREWS: Speaking of overlap. Group number four had a lively conversation about how advocate and compromise are intricately connected to one another. So, who's going to be the spokesperson?

ERGYS RAMAJ: Esteban has been voluntold.

ESTEBAN LESCANO: What's difficult to understand what does advocate means in a specific situation like the case and our conclusion is that

sometimes the procedure is also important and its very important if the procedure has a time limitation, the advocate is, in order to comply with this time limitation to avoid the misunderstanding -- you know, the conflict in order comply with the procedure and to reach the point of consensus, no? Then maybe the avocation is not for one portion of the other but would be from another perspective and that would be the perspective of the procedure.

ERGYS RAMAJ: So, what I'm hearing is, respect the process? Okay, excellent. Let's do another round of applause for group number four. And I understand you're all going to stay there and we're going to go over some feedback.

So, what worked for you guys in this scenario -- or in your groups what did you feel that worked well in the way at which you were discussing this? What communication style worked? Did you see any of those four being represented by any one individual? Did you see anyone in the group who was just avoiding this altogether? Did you see people who were eager to pick one situation over the other? What worked? Did anything work?

BETSY ANDREWS: We've got a comment over here from Naveed.

RAO NAVEED BIN RAIS:    Yeah, what I saw is like by putting us into the situation, like each of the group had to go through all four of them within the group while discussing.  So, some of us were avoiding, some of us were accommodating others, some of us were actually advocating for a particular point and some of us, like me, were compromising. So that's about it.  Like even though the objective for us, for example, was to accommodate, but actually we were practicing all four of them.  So that's what I liked about it you know?

ERGYS RAMAJ:    I think you hit the nail on the head there because the whole point is to have a 360 view of what's happening and not necessarily not just what you're coming in with but understanding, as Betsy said earlier, be self-aware and understand what the others are doing as well and what they're feeling on a particular issue.  What didn't work?

BETSY ANDREWS:    They all get along with each other very well.

ERGYS RAMAJ:    Esteban has a comment I think.

ESTEBAN LESCANO:    In our case what worked was to listen to the different opinions, for example -- about the time or the day of advocate because what is advocate.  The difference of opinion.  I think that the conclusion is to listen to each other.  Not to.


ERGYS RAMAJ:    For the record, Esteban and I's voices are gone because we watched Argentina yesterday and we were both screaming -- just for the record.  I want to make sure that it's clear.  Please, Susana.


SUSANA CHAVES:    I also think that understand, what are we doing and what are we doing it for helps a lot because you have to be clear -- the point of it and to understand, and to listen, and to give everyone the opportunity to talk about, you know, what they think and different point of views because we have experts and newcomers and people have been around for a while, so listen to every one of them, was the key.  And understand what I want to accomplish, that's magnificent so.

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

ERGYS RAMAJ:             Oh, I think we have another -- thank you very much.  We have another comment here.  Please.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:         I think what didn't work was assuming that we all knew what we were about, so we started off trying to understand what the problem was, and each person was identifying what they thought it was and then we asked is this what we think it is.  So, once we -- because we all came in with different assumptions and if we had gone along that way, I don't think it would have worked.

ERGYS RAMAJ:             Thank you.  So, define the problem and define the goal.  What is it we are trying to accomplish here?   We've got another comment here, the back of the room.  Please.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:         Hi, I just want to endorse what she just said because most times when we don't listen, and we think we know, that's the source of conflict in everyday life.

BETSY ANDREWS:           We have a comment over here as well from Lawrence.

ICANN POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

ERGYS RAMAJ:    Take it away.

LAWRENCE OLAWARE:    Also, what didn't work is you will always not have your way. I mean you will not always have your way, if that's a clearer way to put it. At least, I wasn't thinking I would be the one to speak so, and it also happened in the point of the discussion in the community that you might have some -- might have everything set out as a way to get everything done by the end of the day. We might have also made plans when it comes to the policy and process it might take x, y, z and eventually it doesn't so, that's one thing that I would say I'll chip in here.

ERGYS RAMAJ:    That's a very good point because, think about it, you're in a working group and you're expected to speak -- you don't want to speak, you don't have anything to contribute, but you are a member of that working group and all of a sudden the chair says, "Hey Lawrence, I want to hear from you. You've been quiet, and I want to know what you think." The lesson is always 'be prepared'.

ICANN 62
POLICY FORUM
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

BETSY ANDREWS:     For the record, that's how Ergys runs his departmental meetings.

ERGYS RAMAJ:     Yes, I am like that the teacher that when I don't hear someone speak I say, "Well, what do you think about it?" Because the point in that is to ensure that everyone is a part of the process. Everyone feels like they have a voice and we're listening and we want to hear what they have to say. It's not that I want to put people on the spot, but if you are --

BETSY ANDREWS:     Except he kind of does also --

ERGYS RAMAJ:     I do it all the time. I do take pleasure in it, but the point is again just be ready. If you are in a situation -- in a professional situation, even though you do not expect to be active, or speak, or share your views, you should. So why don't we move on to the next thing.

BETSY ANDREWS:     Let's move on but also to add to what Ergys was just saying, oftentimes you're representing people, so you might be

disinclined to say something in a group that's continuous, but your view that you're there to represent is not just your view, its other people who are relying on you to articulate the position, so there is ownness on you to participate and articulate your own views.

So, stay in your groups, we're going to go into a group role-play. You're welcome to move into the chairs so it's a bit more comfortable if that's what you would like to do. So, we divided you into four groups and I'll read to you the scenarios so just be sure you're somewhere that you can see the screen or listen very carefully to me.

So, group one, there's an argument on a mailing list and many individuals appeared to be taking a hostile tone towards one particular person. What do you do? So, that's the scenario for group one. You can draw on any of the styles because this is where you'll see that it doesn't matter if there's a style overlap because you're going to come up with a solution. So, you're on a mailing list a lot of individuals or taking a hostile towards one person what do you do? What is the email that you're going to write this mailing list and hint it's not going to be in all caps.

Group number two, on a conference call with only a few participants, another participant dismisses your recommendation saying that you do not understand and do not

have enough experience in this field. So that's a direct confrontation to you. How do you handle this confrontation? So, within group number two, talk about this scenario and what would you do -- what would you do to advocate your position?

Group number three, in a small group session, at an ICANN meeting, a participant consistently gives too detail each time he or she speaks -- and this is not about me -- but somebody has been giving too much detail. What would you do to keep the conversation on track and productive? And this could be something that could take place earlier in the public interest session to keep thinks on track. So that's your scenario group number three.

Group number four, an individual in your small group consistently tells stories and jokes with examples that are not relatable to many cultures apart from her own as a result the group discussion stagnates, what do you do? Does everybody understand their scenarios -- everybody can see the screen? Alright, so let's break into groups for 20 minutes, come up with a solution and then we'll share it with the group.

**EN**

ERGYS RAMAJ: If I may revise that, we've got 28 minutes to go, let's do it for 15 minutes and then we will go through your presentations. Ready, set, go. [AUDIO BREAK]

BETSY ANDREWS: By the way a little public service announcement, Switzerland has scored. So, it's Switzerland one, Costa Rica none. [AUDIO BREAK]

ERGYS RAMAJ: A quick score update, Brazil is up one-nothing. [AUDIO BREAK]

ERGYS RAMAJ: One-minute warning. One-minute warning. [AUDIO BREAK]

ERGYS RAMAJ: Okay everyone, twenty seconds.

BETSY ANDREWS: Remember to pick someone to speak for your group.

ERGYS RAMAJ: No fighting.

ICANN 62
POLICY FORUM
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

BETSY ANDREWS:            Resolve those conflicts.

ERGYS RAMAJ:              Okay.  Is everyone ready or at least group one?  I'm going to reread the scenario so that it's fresh for everyone.

BETSY ANDREWS:            Alright, let's -- you can come and sit down so that we can listen to everyone's solution.

ERGYS RAMAJ:              Everyone can take a seat.

BETSY ANDREWS:            If you're a speaker for your group it might be helpful to sit on the front row.

ERGYS RAMAJ:              Yes, please --

BETSY ANDREWS:            Have a seat --

ERGYS RAMAJ: Do take a seat. Unless you are the designated speaker for your group. Okay, scenario number one -- group number one, there is an argument on the mailing list and many individuals appear to be taking a hostile tone towards one particular individual. What would you do? Who is the spokesperson for group one? Here we go, [inaudible] please do tell us what would you do?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, as a team -- I'm representing the team. So, what we would do is special for the procedures. So, we would look at following the procedures in addressing such an issue. The next thing is looking at communication -- good communication is key so if you able to communicate right we'll be able to end the hostile situation going on. And then also respects. In a team, they should be respect for one another so that is also one important that we would push out so that we would get the stint to put an end to.

ERGYS RAMAJ: Thank you.

BETSY ANDREWS: Thank you group number one.

ERGYS RAMAJ:   I've got a quick question, is there anything in that scenario that is not clear -- any other information that you would think would make your process of thinking about an answer a lot easier?  So for example when we say taking a hostile tone -- well, what does that mean?  Would that have helped you if that were clear or did you understand by hostile, someone was just being mean or saying things that are untrue or speaking about one's character.  How did you guys define hostile or did you even think about it?

BETSY ANDREWS:   This is not a test.  We're thinking about a presentation --

ERGYS RAMAJ:   No, no, we're wondering how to improve this in future runs, but if you don't have an answer now, that's fine.  Okay.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:   Old style situation, I think the first thing that we are expected to do as probably not as a group but as an individual is that you try to reach ouT personal [inaudible] before you start saying what you do.  [CROSSTALK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, for a good number of us, taking a hostile tone means, trying to enforce a particular position -- you might -- this person might have a particular view that the generality that those on the mailing list think is not true or for some reason you are against that particular line of thinking, but this person keeps impressing his views or have views that should be taking or the reality on ground. And seeing this majority could make you think there is something untrue about that view, by the fact that you continue to push the position. The pushback that is received by this person includes trying to be hostile.

ERGYS RAMAJ: Thank you under the purpose of that question was just to make sure that in future iterations of this, the groups actually understand what it is that we're referring to. Group two, I'm going to reread the scenario then I'm going to hand the microphone to the speaker of that group. On a conference call with only a few participants another participant dismisses your recommendations saying that you do not understand and will not have enough experience in this field -- that never happens at ICANN by the way -- so how do you handle this confrontation?

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    I think first what we recognize that in -- within the ICANN context that it's an environment that encourages and seeks to foster multi-stakeholderism.    Therefore, one should at least be accommodating of diverse views whether not it ends up being accepted final analysis is another situation, but at least one ought to be accommodating of other views.  so, I think our posture was to be assertive and that at the very least we could not -- for someone who was just going to be dismissing a person's views because they are too young and don't seem to understand the situation.

That at the very least what we would seek to ask is that, you know, don't dismiss what we are saying because of what might be a sort of personal slot that they might have but refute the issue that we are trying to -- that we have tabled so that if we have made a point that you don't agree with then address the point and not necessarily just dismiss what we are saying out of hand.

ERGYS RAMAJ:    That is a very constructive way to deal with the problem.  Thank you very much.  I think we have group number three.  I will reread -- a comment please go ahead.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    I think that the scenario for group one and two is exactly the same, because this is the hostile comment that was made in group two, that your opinion is not really experienced and is dismissed -- this is the hostile comment.  The only difference is that in group one others are defending or trying to handle the situation and in group two the person who is offended with, is handling the situation.

ERGYS RAMAJ:    And what I would like to add to that is the medium.  Mailing list and conference call are two different mediums of communication at ICANN and they're quite different because you're not necessarily engaging in speaking on a mailing list.  You're typing, you're sending something over email.  Whereas on a mailing list -- on a phone call, you're live and you're expected to actually speak, you don't have time to think, you can't just go back and say, "I'll just come back on the conference call."  So, the scenario says right now, how do you deal with this?  I think -- you have a comment?  Please, go ahead.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:    Just going back to having these two different scenarios and I think -- and maybe in the ICANN setting where you have people who speak different language, and yes maybe some of the

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

communication might be less in English. But how people compose their, you know, their responses would be different. So, for example for me a native English speaker but if I was going to look at somebody's email and think that its hostile then I'm looking at very short sentences, they're using all caps, or bold or something.

So, you're so it can be subjective but oftentimes it may be a situation where the person for whom your reading -- who sent this message English is not they're first language and they just sort of put together as quickly as possible or as inky as possible a response, but it comes across as being very abrupt which I guess can be like the hostile tone that one might --

ERGYS RAMAJ:              Thank you. Yeah, yeah and email etiquette is not a universal thing. Not everyone subscribes to the same way of writing an email. Some people share too much detail, others just one liners. So that's something that I think is important to keep in mind as well.

BETSY ANDREWS:          Between the two of us, can you guess who shares too much detail and who sends one-line emails?

ERGYS RAMAJ:              Speaking of Betsy, I apologize.  So, group three, in a small group session at an ICANN meeting, a person consistently gives too much detail each time he or she speaks.  What would you do to keep the conversation on track and productive?  Who is the spokesperson for group number three?

FRANCO GLANDANA:          Franco.

ERGYS RAMAJ:              Franco, please go ahead.

FRANCO GLANDANA:          Thank you.  I would try to set up specific guidelines in order to measure the time that every speaker has to make their point in order for other speakers also to be able to communicate and to express themselves.  That was pretty much the solution that we arrived.

ERGYS RAMAJ:              Thank you.  Have you guys seen at the public forum the two-minute warning?  That's essentially the solution.

FRANCO GLANDANA: Oh, sorry. I just want to add one more thing. One person in the group said at first it would be nice to say, "Okay, your time already passed" just as kind of a warning and then if that person keeps on speaking, then, maybe stopping the communication or the mic, would be the decision.

ERGYS RAMAJ: Now that is one way to start the conflict. And again, there are a multitude of and answers and approaches to resolving a potential conflict. What we don't want to do -- we don't want to be the people to start the conflict so the way in which you approach it should be somewhat diplomatic recognizing how the other person feels and what they want to convey, but at the same time ensuring that there's other people here and they need to be aware of other people's existence. Do we have any more comments or questions on group number three? Alfredo would like to take the mic, please.

ALFREDO: This is Alfredo talking. As a matter of fact, and I think I told somebody my experience in the RALO which I am a member of, at one point the new chair appointed me to a committee as chair of a committee. That was my first time I was in charge of a

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

committee.  So, I was in group two, you know, a group two situation.  I felt that I wasn't the expert so what I actually did was I recognized that all the volunteers in that group were experts and I was there to hear them to gather and to accommodate all their opinions to get to a consensus and agree upon something.

Now, going on to number three which is also a situation which I was in -- involved in.  Basically, you have to recognize that we all have experience in that issue and at some point, that person that is talking too much, look we want, like he said, we want to hear everybody talk about their ideas so let's limit the time to two minutes.  And that usually solves the issue.

ERGYS RAMAJ:          Thank you very much, Alfredo.  So, let's move on to group number four and I'll reread the scenario here just to refresh everyone's memories.  Would you like to make a comment, Trace, or are you the spokesperson for four?

TRACE:          I'm the spokesperson.

ERGYS RAMAJ:          Okay, sounds good.  I'll reread the scenario.  An individual in your small group consistently tell stories and jokes with

examples that are not relatable to many cultures apart from their own.  As a result, group discussion stagnates.  What do you do?

TRACE:  Alright, so this scenario we looked at it as a positive thing, well trying to address it positively obviously.  We also Identified that there might be a chair or some leader of the discussion.  So that you would be the chair.  So that's the context.  So, there are two, maybe two approaches to this.  One is very positive so that you are the encourage telling jokes and stories, right?  Encourage other members of the group to also perhaps tell jokes and stories, well they won't tell -- as a chair so kind of keep the conversation light but also to send a very implied signal to the individual that maybe, what he is talking about or what he isn't talking about is not fully readable to everybody else but that's, as we said, that's why we're telling jokes and stories at a meeting.

So, the other approach would be for the chair to kind of redirect the conversation perhaps away from jokes and stories back to the meat of the meeting.  And again, sending an implied message back to the individual who is consistently telling stories that we are trying to do business here so let's focus on that and perhaps park these discussions of jokes and stories to the end of

the meeting where you can do that. Maybe that's two positives dealing with it. Thanks.


ERGYS RAMAJ: Thank you very much. Thank you. Can we have a round of applause for everyone please? So, these are all things that you will continue to face in an ICANN setting. But we do have another -- two comments. Betsy could you please pass the mic?


BETSY ANDREWS: Gladly.


UNKNOWN SPEAKER: As earlier you were taking comments on the presentation in general, I think it's interesting that group one and two has no gender, three has 'he and she' and four has 'her'. And yeah, I just wanted to point that out.


ERGYS RAMAJ: That's a typo and when I reread the scenario I said, "They."


BETSY ANDREWS: We'll make them all consistent in the future. Another comment?

LUCIA:                          Well, this is Lucia from Mexico and analyzing all four scenarios, I came to the conclusion that all of them have a thing in common. That is politeness.  So, it is important for everybody that is in the conflict to analyze the situation and maybe being polite so that others understand them.  So, I think that is really important in a conflict because being polite can help you to address the conflict easier.  So, that's my thoughts right now.

ERGYS RAMAJ:                    Thank you and that's the approach that most diplomats take and that is do not escalate the situation, no matter where you stand on a particular issue.  Be polite, be respectful, you can agree to disagree.  But that does not mean that you cannot push forward your agenda.  So, in conclusion and in interest of time, we would like to thank you very much for your attention and participation, but before we let you go, we would like to get your thoughts on this session itself.

This is the very first iteration of this and Siranush this was born out of your idea of the leadership program which I manage with my department.  And some fellows who participated in that program essentially said we need to have something like this or, you know, some sort of a conflict resolution discussion for the fellows because this is a realistic thing.

So, one question is, is this something that you guys find interesting, you find valuable? Do you think we should continue to do this for future fellows, both newcomers and those who are returning? And I see a lot of hands so -- I believe you were the first and then Betsy if we could go around the room quickly, please.

JOSE RODRIGUEZ:        Jose Rodriguez from Mexico. I have a question. Historically or statistically, how are ICANN conflicts resolved? In which one of these four scenarios?

ERGYS RAMAJ:        Yeah, I think that is a difficult question to answer because it really depends. It's on a case by case basis. There are times where somebody's conflicts are escalated, make no mistake about it. There are times where individuals who have clearer minds prevail and there are times they are completely deescalated.

Again, the higher the stakes, the more likely it is that you're going to get some sort of a conflict that is to last a little longer, right? But in terms of averaging, I think that's somewhat difficult to assess. Betsy you are with someone who would like to comment and then I am coming to you right after.

ALEXIS ANTELIZ:

Hello.  I speak in Spanish please?  Answering your question, I am Alexis Anteliz and a fellow and there is a common denominator in these four approaches we have been talking about.  They are the value of the ICANN community because as a fellow was saying, we as fellows and in the working groups and all the different scenarios in which we find ourselves in the working meetings, we realize that beyond our personalities, beyond our background, we realize there is common value of which the common goal is we must overcome conflict and the goal of ICANN is to be able to meet the timelines.

This is a conflict I've seen all meetings.  We'll be able to overcome conflict successfully.  I just want to tell you there is full agreement in our Latin American culture with a Mexican author who wrote something about the Toltec wisdom and I would like to share with you.  He would say the following, "There were four agreements which can be useful to come to a conclusion.  Use your words to the full extent, but we must be careful not to hurt anybody with our words because words are powerful.  Don't take anything personally.  Sometimes in the emailing lists we use our own point of view prejudices.  Don't make any assumptions.  Don't take anything for granted and finally do your best all times."

And this comes from a Toltec Mexican culture from 2000 years ago. So, we may use the heritage and the culture for the people of the world who come here to go over conflict. Thank you very much.

ERGYS RAMAJ: Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, thank you for this opportunity in sharing what you guys have been doing. Now it's just a suggestion that apart from the fellowship, if you could please extend this to some of the constituencies, specifically, the constituency that I belong to, which I'm not going to mention, but don't ask me, it's not here. And because I see this at the point where while I was writing public comments, and I'm sorry I was making inputs in public comments in my own constituency and we would go back and forth, and I had to learn how to compromise by saying, "Okay good. Have your way, but this is the way I think." And then I back off.

Now please it will be nice if you can take it as part of the onboarding process as well. So, if you can move it away from the fellowship, ask for a session with some of the constituencies, because if you look at it, most of us move away from this place

and we go to those constituencies without having this background information.  I think this would be my first to ICANN fellowship and I'm having a good time now learning how to deal with singular issues in my constituency.  So, it's just a request.

ERGYS RAMAJ:          Thank you very much.  Thank you and I -- basically you want us to get kicked out of ICANN.  No, but we will certainly try to make every attempt.  I believe Tracy was next, right here.

TRACY HACKSHAW:    Yeah, I'd like to extend that point because that's a good point. I'd like to extend it also, and I know it'll be controversial to the ICANN leadership.  The recent GDPR is who I think has been, I've been to a few ICANN meetings.  They have been troughs between ICANN leadership and the community, but I think in this particular sessions we've been having some problems and I think the ICANN leadership needs to also join into this conflict resolution because I think they're being a little bit challenged with their timelines and their speaking a little bit abruptly.

I won't call specifically who, but I think it is something you may want to encourage because it doesn't set a good example for the community.  And then when you go back down to the meeting list and so on, that's seeing energy -- negative energy proving its

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

back to the meeting lists and so on.  And so, I think while you might do it here, its not being done elsewhere.  It's challenged.  Thank you.

ERGYS RAMAJ:          Thank you and I just want to reiterate that this is a pilot.  This is the very time we are doing this, and this came as originally as a result of some feedback that was received in another program.  So, I'm glad to hear that there is some positive feedback.  Can I just see all of the hands that would like to make a comment or ask a question and then we will close the queue in the spirit of collaboration.  Okay, one, two, three, four, five, six, and then we close.  Okay? Alright, thank you.

ALBERT DANIELS:      Albert Daniels.  ICANN fellow 2007.  Wait I'm not finished yet.  ICANN mentor, ICANN coach, and now ICANN old staff member with global stake-holder engagement for the Eastern -- for the Caribbean as part of the Latin American/Caribbean team.  Now I say all of this just to make the point that I've been around for a little while and I've seen a bit.  And I don't know whose idea it was to have this program, but it was pure genius.

The fellowship program is the entry point for many persons, it's the place, we say, that's the best place to learn about ICANN,

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

and I agree wholeheartedly. We should really be making this a standard part of the fellowship program and as our friend over there said, extend it across the community. As part of the Latin American/Caribbean global stake-holder engagement team, we are coming out in answer to the question, you know, how do we handle conflict in ICANN?

We're coming out with -- well we're close to the end, hopefully of a conflict resolution process that has take over a year. Literally over a year and has cost thousands of dollars, okay? And I can't help but reflect that if we had been doing this kind of session a lot earlier, particularly with newcomers coming in -- and I see some smiles, because some of you are quite familiar with what I'm talking about. Jason knows what I'm talking about.

If we had done this kind of thing earlier and more broadly across the community, we would not have been in that situation and so again whose idea it was -- pure genius, see me afterwards I'll buy you a case of beer, whatever you want. Take you shopping, whatever. No, this is a fantastic idea, I think it should be continued.

ERGYS RAMAJ:                    Thank you very much Albert. Very kind words. I'm going to go over here, this side of the room.

ICANN 62
POLICY FORUM
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So sorry, I'm coming back again. So, this item is really good for the EPDP and what I want to suggest actually is that we should have this on the ICANN Learn. Specifically having videos that we demonstrated, like a conflict and then you say, "You can speak." No, I'll speak. Some of those things can be -- you demonstrate them truly ICANN Learn, and people could -- the ICANN community could go there to learn and even if they don't get the opportunity in any of their meetings to talk about this. Yeah.

ERGYS RAMAJ: Thank you very much. Okay.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Alright. I also say, plus one for recommendations. And what I want to add to it, after the role-play we have a real-life scenario that we are going to have. So, in subsequent presentations we could you know have the real-life situations there. So --

ERGYS RAMAJ: Yup. Thank you very much. So real-life situations, that's another take away. We have three more comments and/or questions. Please go ahead.

WISDOM DONKOR: Yes, my name is Wisdom Donkor from Ghana. I just want to share my experience recently. I posted a comment on one of the platforms and the response that I got was very hostile towards me and I also responded, you know, accordingly. And then, yes, I responded accordingly, and this occurred, and the lady came in and tried to make reference to the bylaws and the bylaw that -- and I responded accordingly to the bylaws.

So, the person went back and then came back with another response. But this time was very polite, and I also responded politely. Yeah, so. And I tell you this trying to explain to me what went into that decision and all that. So, everything, went down.

ERGYS RAMAJ: Thank you. So, an eye for an eye works.

BETSY ANDREWS: No, that was not the take away. That was not the key take away. It was a good example though, Wisdom, thank you.

ERGYS RAMAJ: Go ahead.

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

| AMIR QAYYUM: | Okay, this is Amir.  I think that is very relevant.  This type of exercise and this is very relevant to the ICANN scenarios.  More and more we get involved with the ICANN work, we understand that the community from all parts of the world they come here, and they work together.  So, it is very natural to see the conflicts, we come with our own culture, our own hearts, our own needs and our own trusts. |
|---|---|

However, at the fellowship program it is very good to see that right at the beginning while we are in fact as a fellow as we are entering into the ICANN, let them know that we have multiple options to handle these situations.  We can keep the ball rolling by advocating, sometimes compromising, sometimes avoiding.  So, we have multiple options to go.  Don't get stuck in our own way.

So, it is a kind of guidance to the fellows when they get involved into the work, it is very relevant to see different options.  It is just a reminder, maybe some of us know this already but it's a reminder to work together.  I attended one of the multicultural awareness workshop in Abu Dhabi, and it was the same thing.

The people when they come from all across the globe with different cultures, they perceive the things differently and they try to handle the things differently.  Our job and the best way to is to handle it and move forward rather than get stuck in our

**EN**

own opinions or some situations.  So, this is a very good exercise and I'm really happy to participate in it and keep it going.  Thank you.

ERGYS RAMAJ:

Thank you very much.  And how many of you when we were talking about this stuff were just thinking in your heads, "Oh yeah, that's common sense?"  Right, of course.  But the point is to create muscle memory.  The more you reinforce it, the more you know that there are options, then ultimately, you'll get to a point where you are in one of the situations, you will know right away that you have options.  You have different avenues to choose from.  That's the whole point of it and I think this is the last question or comment, and I apologize, we've gone over a little bit, but I hope you'll indulge us.

THATO MFIKWE:

Thanks, I'm Thato Mfikwe.  I think this was a good exercise because ICANN there's a lot of positive allotment that happens and processes of positive allotment, you will be challenged especially in your meeting list.  You might find that the language that is used, it prevents newcomers from participating in this kind of challenges, they may it difficult for newcomers to participate.

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

So, it's very important for one to actually do their research, and so it's easy for one to actually, like, participate. But now to avoid using avoiding and compromise as part of a complete decision, I think it would be more acceptable if there is some sort of common understanding but I think in most of these examples that you've just shown, I think advocacy would be more appropriate, whereby you could mobilize the people that are a part of a mailing list or maybe attending a meeting online. Because some of the members might be there, not necessarily being able to express themselves but once you are able to, you know, like, express yourself then you might find that whatever it is that you're dealing with, many people are dealing with things.

ERGYS RAMAJ:     Thank you very much and another very good made point. So, Siranush will be sharing this presentation with you over email. If any of you would like to get in touch with myself or Betsy or both of us, she may also share our contact information.

So please feel to reach out to us with any questions you might have -- not just about conflict resolution but anything related to ICANN. It doesn't have to be about the Fellowship program, anything ICANN related please, we are a resource. This is what we're here to do and with that thank you so much for your time

and participation and I hope you have a great day and you enjoy the rest of the meeting.  Thank you so much.


BETSY ANDREWS:          Thanks everybody.


SIRANUSH VARDANYAN:    Thank you very much.  Thank you, Ergys and Betsy, and also thanks to our interpreters -- the interpreters and our tech team for your support during this session.  With this our meeting is adjourned.  Thank you very much.  Enjoy the rest of the day and see you tomorrow.  One thing, I have here ccNSO Quick Guide chaired by ccNSO on boarding staff, so those who are interested in ccNSO you can take a copy, I have about 10 copies.  One more.


**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**