

---

LONDON – ATLAS II Thematic Group 1: The Future of Multistakeholderism - Session 3

Sunday, June 22, 2014 – 11:00 to 13:00

ICANN – London, England

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: ...In order for the questions. For each question I will go in order. Latin America, Asia Pacific, Africa and Europe, for each question in turn. I hope you've designated somebody just to tell me the number that you've come up with. Again, this is a [Likert 00:00:19] scale, so this will be zero, one, for nothing, and five for totally or completely. Okay, so for question one, about governments including outside groups for Latin America. Who's speaking?

SPEAKER: Carlos Aguirre was supposed to speak, but he hasn't... Yes. I think Alberto Soto can brief us with that information.

ALBERTO SOTO: Only the first question first, or all questions?

SPEAKER: Question one, question two, and the numbers.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Question one.

ALBERTO SOTO: Two.

---

*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.*

---

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Asia Pacific. Question one?

NARELLE CLARK: Okay. We found it really difficult to come up with anything but a low average, because of the huge variety of countries, geographies and entities that we have. You have everything from a tiny little place like Norfolk Island or Cocos and Keeling Islands, with a bunch of dubious practices, arguably, right through to highly sophisticated populations. Usually you use Australia and New Zealand, and China in its own way is also highly sophisticated in what it does. The huge variety made it all very challenging.

To get down to [unclear 00:02:06]... Sorry, Narelle Clark for the record. I apologize for being late. Government, we got a two for the engagement in discussion. A one for decision-making, with a glimmer of hope. We also ranked industry. We gave them a one for discussion, a one for decision-making. CcTLDs again, we saw this huge variety of models and approaches, which reached an average of around about two. Decision-making, one. The RIR, we all hold APNIC in quite high esteem.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry, question three... I guess we're going to do this differently. I'm going to go to each region and ask them all questions. I'll come back to you, Alberto, about the other answers. Narelle, I just want to confirm – questions one and two were about governments. The first one was

---

about discussion. The second one was about decision-making. You gave me a two and a one. The third and fourth questions were about ccTLDs and RIRs. We lumped them together in the question. The first one again was discussion. The second one was decision-making.

NARELLE CLARK: We rated the ccTLDs separately to APNIC, because they're quite distinct entities, and the variety of responses, as far as the ccTLDs... You have some hundred odd entities, easily, compared with one RIR. It's an absurd... We did it very elegantly, in a table.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: And?

NARELLE CLARK: The answer was the ccTLDs averaged out at a two because of a huge variety. The decision-making area came to a one. For the RIR we gave them a three for engagement in discussion and so forth, and a one for decision-making. I wanted to give them credit for processes with APRICOT and policy personnel. Done.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. That last one was a one plus. For the final question, the one about the silo?

---

NARELLE CLARK: Again, silo, we rated that separately for all the four categories that we ended up with. The government is very siloed, and you need to draw distinctions between legislators versus bureaucrats.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry, Narelle, I have to stop you. We're not at that level of detail. We're trying to do the same thing. I can't break it down for one region, if the others aren't doing the same thing. I'm going to ask you to do something you didn't want to do, which is give me some aggregates.

NARELLE CLARK: I'll give the lot a one.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. Alberto, I'm going to go back to you. If you could give me now all five answers?

ALBERTO SOTO: Question one, the answer is two. Question two, answer two. Question three, answer three. Question four, answer three. Question five, answer three. Thank you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thank you. [Applause] I have to say, Alberto, I very much appreciate the efficiency of that. Okay, for Africa, who will be speaking?

---

SPEAKER: My name is [unclear 00:06:01]. For Africa, question number one we have three. Question number two we have one. Question number three we have five. Question number four we have one. Question number five we have one.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Excellent. Thank you. Europe?

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: We actually tend to say three for all of them, but then we started a discussion and went into more detail. I have for question number one it's a three. Question number two it's a three. Question number three it's a two. Question number... ccTLDs? I have a different number in here. Question number four it's a two. Question number five it's a four. Question number six it's a four. Yes, we do operate and separate at stakeholder groups.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. Just as a matter of disclosure, for what North America came up with was, for question one, we came up with three. Question two we came up with two. For questions three and four we came up with three. For silos we came up with five, that it's very siloed. Okay, so we'll try and put this together into a chart.

SPEAKER: Evan, there's a question five and six for the RIRs, separately, and you didn't state that for North America.

---

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I guess we missed it in splitting up five and six. We'll do that after this break. We'll convene and figure that out. Okay, having done the table and the rounds of that, I'll hand the floor back to Leon for the rest of the session.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks Evan. Thank you all for your quick responses. The next topic we have on the Agenda is a discussion about the multistakeholder model within ICANN. I guess this takes us to what Sergio [Brunting 00:08:39] was telling us earlier, and other people have great concerns about how the multistakeholder model is working with ICANN. Is it really working? Is it broken? Do we have anything to fix? How can we fix it? Which are the stakeholders that aren't being taken into account?

These are basic questions and of course we open the floor to listen to your comments. We'll have Bill Drake coming in to talk about the multistakeholder model within ICANN in a few minutes. Before that, I'd like to begin the discussion. Maybe we can have a set of questions for when Bill comes in. We can have him give us his points on those questions. We'll begin the queue with Eduardo Diaz.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Could you repeat the question again? I missed it at the beginning. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you Eduardo. There are several questions. The topic is the multistakeholder within ICANN. We're narrowing it down. We began the discussion taking a broader look at the multistakeholder model, but now we're narrowing it down to within the ICANN community.

What we should have as output here is at least a set of points that we think are working – a set of points that we think are not working within ICANN, and of course a set of suggestions to improve the multistakeholder within ICANN. The floor is open for participation. The first in queue is Alberto Soto.

ALBERTO SOTO:

Yes, [Serge 00:10:45], I gave an example on how our RALOs view the acceptance, or not, of those organizations that intend to certify as ALSes. The RALOs discuss internally, based on consensus or not, towards ALAC. The actual decision or determination is made by ALAC, although we make the research, our opinion is not binding. On the other hand, seat 15, which represents the end user, is voted for by the RALOs and the Board. In the Board.

It's not binding, it's not mandatory, with respect to the RALOs' opinions. In my opinion, for the end user, and with these two examples, I think that the multistakeholder model is not working. It should be changed. Why? Because for instance in the relationship with governments, although it is conflictive, it is handled through the GAC. There is a relationship.

The question with the end user is internal, within ICANN. We have to increase participation with the ALSes, but with opinions that should be

---

taken into account. I even believe that a second seat for the end user would be perfect. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Next in queue is Alejandro Pisanty.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY:

Thank you Leon. We'll take a few seconds to go back to the conflicts of stakeholderism, and then address things like Alberto has said. In the 1980s, approximately, enterprise theory, the theory of the firm, the theory of how businesses have to work, was shifting from identifying stockholder value. The mission of the companies was to make value for their owners. This value was seen mostly as business; as profit.

The theory shifted to asking companies to plan for stakeholder value. It was not only making a profit for their owners, for the shareholders, but also making sure that they added value for their workers, for their clients, for the government that was regulating them, and that they were not spoiling the environment by making more of a profit but throwing out a lot more waste. The name "stakeholder" came into use first in the enterprise.

Then it came into use for regulator environments and so forth. When the idea of building something that became ICANN started, the vision was to involve all stakeholders in this sense, but it wasn't anymore the stakeholders of one company. It was the stakeholders of the Internet, or more specifically of the domain name system and the IP address



---

allocation system, as well as the IETF part of keeping a protocol parameter database.

The idea for ICANN was formulated around the participation of all stakeholders, including final users of the Internet and so forth. The definition of who the stakeholders were, on the user side, what we're now seeing as the At-Large, in part, the definition of stakeholders was discussed between the idea that the stakeholders were only the direct users of the DNS – people who are domain name registrants or domain name holders, or all users of the Internet.

Of course, you also have something at stake in a well-functioning DNS. If domain names don't [resolve you 00:15:00] as a user are also in a bad condition, but [your influence 00:15:04] you need are expected to have on the management of the domain name system is very different from the ones that are clients, on the domain name system.

On it went, and in 2003/2005, in the World Summit for the Information Society, government representatives started to ask for a place at the table. That's where the equal participation of all stakeholders began to come into the language. This small bit of history is to tell you that ICANN was the first large-scale global structure of a multistakeholder organization, before the name was coined. To use the French phrase, it was multistakeholder, [unclear 00:16:00], before it was written.

Equal participation of all stakeholders. Equal footing and so forth. Then the word multistakeholder for Internet governance actually appeared several years after ICANN was actually starting to function. It had already been restructured in 2003. Number one is, as you know, ICANN

---

is not perfect, but it is one of the most advanced experiments in multistakeholder governance certainly, for the Internet.

One of the things that I've mentioned here is that since it makes decisions that may affect money interests as well as political, civil society and life, and so forth, it has also had [in-situ 00:16:44] mechanisms to review the decisions and to revert them. What we're looking at now is at an advanced stage of multistakeholder participation and decision-making. We're not looking at the invention of it.

For the paper and the review that this session is starting, I think that's the starting point. We've already built a multistakeholder organization that has a lot of design processes that have been tested, improved upon, taken away, and so forth. Coming specifically to the users of the Internet through the At-Large, I think that Alberto Soto has put forward an important point for discussion, if not for conclusions. That is, what is the At-Large part of ICANN actually doing for the users of the Internet?

I think that there we have to begin to look at what he said – the connection between governments, which is indirect for the users. The discussion we had yesterday, where the governments can actually say, "We are the elected representatives," or, "The people who were the legally recognized representatives for the people. What else do you want?"

I know we already discussed it yesterday, but the point is that the At-Large organizations now have to look at ourselves, before someone else does. How effectively are we representing the users, or benefiting the users, if we're not constituted as representatives, if we're not labor

---

unions or trade associations of Europe? We're spontaneous organizations that do something else and are sensitive to the users.

We can say this of most of the At-Large organizations. I think that one of the next steps we have to do is a self-review of the At-Large organizations; how we're functioning, what we can propose among ourselves, so that each of our organizations can improve the way it accesses user opinions, user sensitivities, user needs, and transmits them. Also, to have some accountability of how this is happening, before this is demanded of us, from anyone else. I'll finish there, for the moment.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much. Next in queue is Adam Peake and then Carlos Aguirre.

ADAM PEAKE:

Adam speaking. I've two points to make – one following on from Alejandro's reference to stakeholders in the corporate environment, where we think of stakeholders as shareholders, and the rights that they have within that organization, as a result of being a shareholder or a stakeholder, particularly with regard to decision-making and the Board. They elect and select Board Members, and they also have the right to question and often de-select, to remove Board Members.

It's a question of is that something that could be added, or is that something that's missing from ICANN's model, in that we as stakeholders do not have the power to remove a Board, if we think that

---

that Board is acting inappropriately? In many cases, I think it's not just the Board – if we think of it as the Board of Directors – but it's also the leadership or organizations generally. I'm not so sure that many Charters – I'd have to check this...

Can constituency remove gNSO Councilors in the way that a Board of Directors or leadership of a corporation could often be removed? That would be something to ask about the structuring of the model. The other is to think about the silo model itself. Is that a problem – the fact that we live in constituencies, we live in different gNSOs, ccNSOs, ALACs, etcetera. Does that tend to build us in entrenched positions where we develop these positions within our little silo?

Then do we feel that position so strongly that when we try to compromise, it's very difficult to actually listen to other people and reach compromise. Is the siloed environment the right one? I think we've heard from people like the ccNSO community that we need more cross-community working, because the silo model might not be working so well.

I suppose that's relevant to our discussion. Is the siloed approach within ICANN a good method for completing our multistakeholder working? Thanks.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you Adam. Next in queue is Carlos Aguirre and then [Sergio ? 00:21:23] and then back again to Alberto Soto.

CARLOS AGUIRRE:

Thank you Leon. I will go back to [Alex's 00:21:42]. He says that ALSes should get reorganized. I don't know if that comes first? Okay. If it doesn't come first, I agree with you. ALSes should be reorganized. That is not our case. I will speak for my organization, [AGLA 00:22:05]. These are open organizations and with this participation they have access to capacity building, which we do on a daily basis – at universities, at our spaces of [involvement 00:22:24], on an ongoing basis.

I take the comment as a general one, but not directed to us. However, I do believe we have to review the model within ICANN. I said this yesterday, at the beginning, and I repeat it now. I believe the model is overall good, but as I also said yesterday, and as I always teach in my classes, the multistakeholder model is a good model. It's a really good model with some remarkable aspects, but also, within ICANN, there are areas for improvement. If I may, let me make a couple of comments that come to mind.

I know there are many others, but let's say the acceptance of ALSes, as Alberto said. The election of the Board Member by ALAC, and his representation or non-representation, because when he gets to the Board he's now a Board Member and no longer an ALAC Member. I think we have to see that. I remember when I was at the gNSO. I remember a well-know publication, a journal, and there was an article about the NomCom corruption.

That was forgotten so quickly. There was no analysis made of that. I still have many questions about that. I'm not going to extend my views to

---

anyone. I don't know if it's corruption, but I do know there are many influences. I know many of us have been working for many years together, that there are people who talk to each other, and that sometimes has an influence on decisions.

Another review we should make for a change is that in gNSO it may be that seven votes win over 14. The division into houses in gNSO I think is not the fairest. On the other hand, a contracted party has Parties House. They have votes that are cast all together and then the non-contracted – where you have business, intellectual property, ISPs, the non-commercial user constituencies, all of them from different breeds.

When that unity is broken in the non-contracted house, seven win over 14. It doesn't sound like that's too democratic. There are others. There are other examples. That's why I say that the process should always be subjected to reviews. However, again I'll say that the model is good. However, there are specific areas that we should review.

Perhaps that is the message we should put on our statement – that we should go into a deeper analysis of our model. It has to be modernized and streamlined. However, the model, if good, we stick to it. However, let's see what's not working very well. Thank you very much.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you Carlos. Those are exactly the kinds of questions that we're trying to address within this discussion, which are the actual deficiencies that the model within ICANN has shown, and how we can improve them, or at least correct them. Next in queue we have [Sergio ? 00:26:01].

SERGIO [?]:

This is Sergio [unclear 00:26:13] for the record. Thank you for giving me the floor, Leon. I think that we're reaching a turning point in ICANN, and we need to speed up this turning point so that we can get into a new model able to resolve the issues. Since I was listening to my colleagues, they have plenty of experience in the organization and they have spoken their views.

We can detect that we need to list the problems that the different ALSes and colleagues that are in the organization in real-life... We need to detect the concrete and actual problems – that is to say to create a Working Group so that we can identify and list the problems. We need to verify their scope and try to solve them. This would be one topic.

The other aspect we need to review is who the multistakeholders are, and what their importance is. That is another task that we need to take into account. What is the importance that they have in decision-making? I insist, governance has to do with decision-making, when we agree there's no need to make a decision, because we agree. In this case though, we're discussing about topics that require a decision to be made.

Who will be the decision-makers? Who will be consulted, and who will be making the decisions? That is another aspect we need to take into account. That is a sub-topic within the main topic. I agree with Carlos and with Alejandro in terms of we need to walk together and work together, so as to change this. Review ourselves also. That is another topic.

---

In LACRALO we started to create an agenda related to questioning – in the better sense of the word – who is who in terms of commitment and in terms of commitment to the users. These are the two indicators that the organization should take into account to allow ALSes to be recognized. I don't understand why regions don't decide who will incorporate. It's difficult for me to understand that the region is not mature enough, or doesn't have enough experience, so as to recognize an ALS that wants to be part of the organization. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: We have Alberto Soto and then Eduardo Diaz. Please, Alberto, could you take the floor?

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you. Perhaps I didn't express myself correctly. I was not saying that we need to remove a Board Member. When I said that their opinion is a non-binding opinion, in terms of our opinion, that is written like that. That is what I mean. I'm not saying that we need to remove a Board Member because a person is not performing well.

There are many candidates for that position who said, "Despite the fact that I'm not obliged, and that this is not mine, I will take into account the opinion of end users that come through the different RALOs. That is to say, this is a promise." I don't know if then, for one reason or another, this is done or not. We're in the middle of the process, someone said, in my country.



---

I still don't have the pictures on the wall, and you're asking me to show the pictures. My administration is starting, or my management is starting, and the Members are still in the process of learning, because we're in the process of producing that strategy. What we will have is state policies, so that once the policies are approved by an assembly, the rest of the positions and the mandates will be fulfilled.

We are changing the RALO, and that is a positive thing. Our assembly will deal with important topics. Of course, there will be other topics that will be pending, but this is important, because we had an analysis before giving our opinion about the multistakeholder model within ICANN. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Eduardo Diaz?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you Mr. Chair. I think one of the things that I understand we're talking about is the implementation of the model – how conversations go from bottom up. I asked this question a long time ago and I was told that in terms of ICANN, ALAC is the recognized organization that makes the decisions. Even now, the information comes from the bottom-up, from the RALOs. It's ALAC who provide that. I think that's something that we might be able to revise. I don't know.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you Eduardo. Martin, you have the floor.

---

MARTIN: [00:32:32]. I will repeat Sandra, because she [put everything 00:32:34]. I think, just to connect it to the previous session, if [he] would compare this course for ICANN, for sure I would go for four out of five, as compared to the threes, twos and ones that we had for the other constituencies. Just to note, not a five, because there's still clear opportunity for improvement, but I think if you compare it to the world, it's worthwhile recognizing that the intent is here and is probably better here than anywhere else.

LEON SANCHEZ: I see Alejandro Pisanty raising his hand.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Just very quickly to Martin, I have made a private exercise called the WSIS-ometer. It's an Excel table in which you can grade the organizations for how much they fulfilled the WSIS criteria of Internet governance, being democratic, people-centered, equal participation of all stakeholders, and so forth. You're right.

LEON SANCHEZ: Next in queue we have Sandra Hoferichter.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you Leon. I very much agree with what's just been said by Alejandro and Martin – that it's actually the only model or the best model around, but it needs to be improved. I was wondering - we had

---

this discussion in our small group yesterday – is there any other multistakeholder model out there, which is actually working or practiced, in any other fora? Or are we Internet people the only community who's performing this way of new governance?

This is a question I just ask here. Maybe somebody has an answer on that? You could talk to me privately or share it with all of us. What I just want to share with you is the thought that it's good that we're having the discussion here, but the discussion is from a very specific point of view; from the ALAC end user, At-Large perspective. I know, because I'm quite well connected to other communities as well, that the business sector is dealing with the same problems.

They have problems to organize themselves sometimes. There are some big companies that are running the shows, but the small business have real problems organizing themselves and getting their voice through, and having a weight against the big companies, the big shows. Also, what I experienced from new gTLD applicants, they felt also that their voices weren't heard enough during the application process.

I just want to remind us that our community is not the only one within ICANN that sees that the multistakeholder model is not working out perfectly and needs to be improved. It's not only that the poor civil society is not being heard, but there are other communities, and some of you probably won't believe that. Yes, the GAC. They're complaining about the same.

I think this discussion would be good, if we're doing our homework here, in this fora, but it would be better if we put that onto a cross-community

---

discussion and deliver that input to that discussion – the input we just discussed here during our session. Thank you very much.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you Sandra. That might be something worthy of including in the final report, so that's a great point. Thank you. Evan Leibovitch, you've also raised your hand?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I just wanted to address Sandra's question from earlier, about the ICANN model of multistakeholder and what else exists. We talked a little bit yesterday about two other approaches, that are similar but have significant differences to the ICANN model. One was the one used at Net Mundial, which was also a format. It's not exactly like ICANN's. You're talking about non-Internet approaches to multistakeholder? Okay. Sorry. I misread your question. Sorry.

LEON SANCHEZ: Martin?

MARTIN: I did some research on that, as such, because global governance, as such, is an issue of course, and I haven't found another multistakeholder approach that is more extensive than the Internet one. I say Internet one, because for me it also includes IGF and something like Net Mundial, where you see that there's clear recognition that no stakeholder can do it alone, even if they'd want to do it alone. It's exercised. If you look to

---

global civil society, there are many things being subject to global conferences, and it's not really multistakeholder either. I would really think that this is still a shining example, and we can polish it much better than it has been polished today.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks Martin. Adam Peake?

ADAM PEAKE: Thank you. Just to follow on from that, and particularly Alejandro's point about the WSIS test, of course Net Mundial came up with this set of principles as part of its outcome document, and within that we have Internet governance process principles. I think that builds on the WSIS, except for the people-centric aspect, which is not mentioned as a particular criteria there.

I'm looking at them here. It says "multistakeholder" and then has a description of what that is. Then "open participative consensus-driven governance". "Transparent" as another principle. "Accountable" as another principle. "Inclusive and equitable", "distributed", "collaborative", "enabling meaningful participation", which also includes a notion of that actually has to be financed. You can't just say, "We're going to be open." We actually have to have capacity building and the ability to then participate through some sort of financial support in that sense.

"Access and low barriers and the agility of the policy making processes..." We're seeing a whole set of principles that can be applied

---

to what are good, open, inclusive, bottom-up, multistakeholder type of processes. Perhaps we might want to refer to these as the principles that ICANN should be ticking off and making sure that it does accomplish, for all of its different silos and processes. Thanks.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you Adam. While we wait for Bill Drake to... If he can come...? Okay, well, then we won't have Bill with us. Alberto, do you want to say something? Okay.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you very much. I do agree with Sandra when she says that this forum should deal with not only the relationship but with the model related to the relationship between the end user and ICANN. Most of us represent end users. This is our mission. This is our objective. That's why we speak about that – because we have the knowledge and we represent the end user.

Particularly, I may have knowledge about ICANN and its relationship with the government, but I don't have enough knowledge to speak about its functionality, for example, or if it's suitable or not, or about the problems. For this specific point I'd like to have a representative from GAC, for that person to tell us what their relationship is with ICANN. We speak as end users.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much Alberto. Next on the agenda would be breaking up into groups again. I think the way we did it yesterday, geographically,

---

like this side of the table and this side of the table here will work together. The basic questions to answer or spark the discussion within the groups are the following: is equal footing real within ICANN? That's a tricky one. Is equal footing happening within ICANN?

What are the essentials to keep the different stakeholders engaged with the discussion? How do we build consensus? Is it a problem that stakeholder groups are typically divided in the configuration of governments, civil society, private sector, etcetera? One particular question that Evan added to the set is, is there any use in the term "public interest" and who exactly is ICANN accountable to? Gisella, could you help us display the questions?

I'll post them to the Adobe Connect. Let me paste them into the chat in the Adobe room. Okay, so the questions are in the Adobe Connect chat. Let's split into groups please and discuss. We'll have some 40 minutes to do this. Then we'll come back with the summary for Evan to take note on that. Here's Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Sorry to interrupt. Just before you go into the breakout sessions – I'll be leaving in 40 minutes. If I can just remind everyone that we'll be leaving for lunch, finishing here at 13:00. Unfortunately you can't leave your computers here because the room is not locked. We're meeting in the East Wing lobby, that's where the check-in is, reception, just when you come out the top here.

Please follow their RALO. They'll be holding a board up like this. I know, but we've got 150 people to get there. You'll be walking straight down

---

Parade Street. If you get lost you'll do it on purpose, because it is literally straight down. These will be here on the table for you to take when you leave. We'll see you there. Please be on time. We'll be serving lunch when you get there. Let's say 13:30, 13:45 the CEO of PIR, Brian Cute, will be giving a short presentation.

You will already be eating by then, so you won't go hungry. We'll have a Q&A session at about 14:20, which will be moderated by Martin [unclear 00:45:30], because Brian Cute will have to leave us by then. Then we'll be leaving there at about 14:40 to come back here to start the session again at 15:00. I will leave in 40 minutes. Please just follow your leaders upstairs.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you Gisella. That's a reminder for us to keep it short and to leave on time for lunch. Well, let's break into groups then. Please answer these questions to the best of our capacities. Alejandro? I guess that's Gisella. That's not me. There they are in the Adobe Connect room chat. I'm not sure if the last one pasted, but... Exactly, there they are. There they are. Yes, this is not more about regions. This is about tables.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]