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

Saturday, June 21, 2014 – 15:00 to 18:00

ICANN – London, England

LEON SANCHEZ:

...long agenda across today and tomorrow, we're going to be a lot of hours together here. And I'd like to make a brief introduction of the work that we're going to be doing here. So Gisella, if you could help me with the presentation please.

Okay, so there we are. So as I said, the subject for this thematic group is the future of multistakeholderism. We were talking about this subject just a few minutes ago, or a few hours ago, on our plenary session. And well, could you pass the slides please?

So I suggest that if you're going to tweet about the subject, use a hashtag like ATLAS II TG1, or just TG1, or just ATALS II, to help the ones that are not in the room, and that are following us remotely, to identify the discussion. The next slide please.

So, the facilitators for this thematic group are Adam Peak, which is our expert subject matter, subject matter expert, I'm sorry. Subject matter expert. Myself, I'm going to be the moderator, and my task is not to guide the discussion, but just to facilitate it. Raf Fatani is also going to help me moderate the discussion. And Evan Leibovitch is going to help us taking the notes and being the reporter for this thematic group. Next slide please, Gisella.

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.

Okay. We're going to have some other experts, besides Adam, joining us. And we're going to have Wolfgang Kleinwächter, Alejandro Pisanty, William Drake and [inaudible], who had agreed to address us with some details on different subjects and different questions. And the next slide please Gisella.

So, the session structure, we have four sessions, and the session structure, as we planned it is, we're going to have a brief introduction by an expert on the subject that we're going to discuss on that session. Then we're going to put some questions on the table to fuel the discussion. Then we're going to break into smaller groups, because we are the largest group, I think, the largest thematic group across the ATLAS. So I think it's better for us to break into smaller groups and have a discussion on the questions, or other questions we might have to the discussion.

Then make some reports from the groups. And last, a summary by our head reporter. Any questions about the procedure for the discussions? No? Okay. The next slide please. So, as I told you, well it doesn't seem to be working. Well, you around the meeting here, not us, what we're interested in is knowing what you think about the future of multistakeholderism. We need to hear your feedback, we need to know how things are working on your regions, on your countries, at a local level, at a global level. And this is the most important thing about this meeting.

So why do we need to do these? Because we need to have a report from this thematic group by the end of our sessions, which will be

tomorrow in the afternoon. And well, let's begin and let's feel the discussion, and yes, Eduardo please.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Hello. This is Eduardo for the record. I have a question, and it has to do with the, if there are already multistakeholders group, multistakeholder. I hear, you know, like stakeholder, key stakeholder, multistakeholder, equal footing multistakeholder, and I just want to have a clarification as to, in the ICANN context, what does it mean that? Just to have a picture of this...

LEON SANCHEZ: Yes, Alejandro.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Yes, Alejandro Pisanty for the record. The, I would make a footnote to that title of the session, which is that I refuse to use the word multistakeholderism except as a descriptor for what others believe, because I think by saying multistakeholderism, we're already more expressing like a belief, or a faith, or even a religion, instead of speaking of the facts of multistakeholder participation, multistakeholder governance.

LEON SANCHEZ: Yes, Andre, you have the floor.

ANDRE:

Thank you Leon, I would strongly support what Alejandro has said. We just had EuroDIG, and multistakeholder became the running gag. So people that are not very much familiar with the IGF context, or the ICANN context, and so on and so forth, they start laughing about us because they don't understand. Avri Doria actually created a new acronym for multistakeholderism, which you should take with a smiley face, it is M17M, because you have the multistakeholderism, a M at the beginning and a M at the end, and in between 17 characters.

So I don't, we take it with a laugh as well, and say the M17M project, or I would also tend to make at least a subtitle, a footnote, that it doesn't sound less as a religion. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Yes Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Sorry. Just one quick thing, this is Evan speaking. Please when you're speaking, identify yourself, both for the purpose of the interpreters, and also to make my life a little easier in trying to take notes of everything. So please, before you speak, identify yourself, even if you've spoken before. Thank you.

ADAM PEAK:

Good afternoon everybody. Adam Peak speaking. I think this is a very good starting point, because it's one of the things that even though we were writing the initial questions as the person who is meant to be the subject matter expert, which I think is a little bit grandiose in this room

because I see people who have done far more in multistakeholder processes than I have.

I think the whole idea of an –ism is that it is something that it is really a philosophy or a belief, and we’re not really in that business. We’re in the business of talking about ways of working. And I think that’s what we’re talking about. Multistakeholder is a way of working. And Eduardo I think the answer in ICANN is we’re looking at stakeholders as people who have interests in ICANN, they are affected by it, we’ve seen these words of, what’s the word that’s being used currently in the discussion of the accountability?

It’s not affected parties is the particular way of describing it. So it’s those with an interest in ICANN, and ICANN’s operators. We all have a stake in this particular body and its work. But –ism is an interesting discussion. We can either carry on about it or make a decision that we are not an –ism, we are a way of working.

LEON SANCHEZ: Yes, Carlos [inaudible] had raised his hand. So.

UNIDENTIFIED: I want to respond to Adam. More than a way of working at this... [inaudible] from India. As a response to Adam, more than a way of working, we can look at it as a way of governments, and if we take that meaning, I would ask, how do we refer to democracy or monarchy or dictatorial form of, dictatorship. Is it a form of governments? Or is it an –ism? Or is it model of governance? Or is it a way of working?

What [inaudible] multistakeholderism will have to refer to multistakeholder model by that. So as [inaudible] take hold, a model of governance, a multistakeholder form of governance. And I think we can have a brief discussion on what to agree and come to an agreement on precisely, on a precise phrase, which will be continuously used by ICANN and IGF and everywhere. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you [inaudible]. Yes, Carlos.

CARLOS ALVAREZ: This is Carlos Alvarez speaking. Thank you Leon. I will speak in Spanish as you may see. I have two topics. I'm always, I'm tired at university, and speaking at university about the multistakeholder model, and I say that this model is good for the administration or the management of Internet. And for many years, I have spoken about that.

But from my experience, I think this model should be revised, because all models are perfectible. They may be improved. So taken this into account, I have two questions or issues that I have seen, and perhaps we can debate this, taken into account, of course, the interest that you may have in this.

First, I don't want to be violent in my, rude in my expression. But, some people may believe, and I may also say that I also believe, that this multistakeholder model is a kind of trap for the [inaudible] end user, in favor of other sectors. That when they have to decide, they decide, or they have more power in their decisions than the end users.

Why do I say this? Okay, this is the second point we need to take into account. The participation on equal footing. When we speak about a model where everyone should participate on equal footing, in all of the stages of the policy making process. Those who are not on equal footing are the end users, of course. Because you do not have the economic, the financial power to attend the meetings sometimes. Their works or their activities, because sometimes they cannot travel.

Of course, we have remote participation. Okay. This is not so because remote participation is not so simple, and secondly, remote participation can be accessed or can be done, as long as, or provided that user doesn't have to work. And there are some other sectors that are exclusively devoted to working on this, for example, governments or businesses.

So I go back to the original concept. This is similar... Is this a multistakeholder model? Or is this a trap for the end user? Do they have the equal footing that we are looking for? I think we have to revise this to improve user participation, and see if we are working on equal footing. How? Well, I don't have the answer for that.

But I do believe that we can think about this.

UNIDENTIFIED:

Thank you Carlos. I think this discussion will continue. I'm sorry for interrupting you right now, but I think it is relevant to hear what Wolfgang has to say, who is our expert here, our subject matter expert. And obviously after listening to what he will tell us, we will continue with this discussion, we'll ask any questions, and we will be able to

continue with this discussion. So please, let's give Wolfgang the floor. And we thank you for the being here with. Thank you very much Wolfgang.

WOLFGANG KLEINWÄCHTER: Thank you for having me here. I have to apologize that I came late, and I also have to leave a little bit earlier because I am in a conflicting meeting, so that means I cannot stay here until the end of this meeting. You understand issues sometimes better if you look into the history of an issue.

You know, why we are discussing multistakeholder model or multistakeholderism today? Very often I think it's enough to go back to the 70s or 80s, before the Cold War ended. And when we had a huge, big international process which was called the New World Information and Communication Order. It was discussed in the United Nation system, in UNESCO, and it was a process where various countries were fighting, you know what, how the world should be organized in the future.

And they realized already, in the 70s and 80s, when there was not yet a world wide web, that information and communication is a key issue. And the discussion in UNESCO, in the New World Information and Communication Order, was a discussion only among governments. What it means to affected parties like the media, or other information people. We were not involved in this debate. It was the Soviet Union government, versus the US government.

And the third world governments were also involved. This was the triangle third world, where the Communist world versus the US. All of the media, users, people, had nothing to say in this debate. It was just an one stakeholder approach, which had three different conflicting parties.

When this collapsed in 1991, after the Berlin Wall came down, there was a lot of interesting series starting in the early 90s, saying, you know, this was a big mistake. You cannot discuss the future of information and communication without the people who are affected, and the institutions who are affected. And Alvin Toffler wrote a very interesting book at this time, which was called *Power Shift*. And in this *Power Shift*, he explained the growing complexity of your world, it was the early 90s, will lead to a more disputed system of decision making where, you know, not only governments will have a decision making capacity, but also other groups on various levels has to be included into a decision making processes, if you want to have sustainable results.

So he argued that the problems of the world are getting too big that they can be solved by governments alone. This was in the early 90s, just when the world wide web was invented. And there was unclear, you know, how to organize this when in the 90s there was a series of world summits organized by the United Nations on human rights, and women, on environment in Rio de Janeiro.

And during this world summit, nongovernmental organizations were invited to participate, but not included in the policy debate. Though, for instance, in Rio de Janeiro, the governments were sitting in one part of

the city, and the nongovernmental organizations were sitting in another part of the city.

I was in the Vienna world summit on human rights. It was in the building of the United Nations in Vienna, and we had two separate entrance doors for the governmental representatives or for the NGO representatives. The NGO representatives had their meeting in the basement, and the governments were sitting in the first floor.

And there was a checkpoint we could not cross, you know, go from the basement to the first floor. Though that it means there was already a signal that governments realized, okay, we cannot discuss human rights. We cannot discuss environment without listening to nongovernmental organizations, but we are separated. So let's then discuss alone, then more or less, you know, make our own decisions.

But insofar as the establishment of ICANN, in 1998, change this picture in a dramatic way, because when the debate reached the Internet in the middle of the 90s, and the IGO realized this could be an interesting thing, also for the ITU, and they were planning to do something to get a mandate for the domain name system, the US government stopped this discussion in the ITU and came with an alternative proposal, which later became ICANN.

And okay, the decision making is crucial. Who should have the right to make a decision on this issues? And the US government proposed a system where, okay, the people who are affected and involved in the making and using of this, they should have the decision making capacity. And the governments will be only an advisory capacity. If you go back to the original bylaws of ICANN, then you say there was a Board should

have 18 members, nine coming from the service providers, and nine from the service users.

So there was a balance between the provider and the user of services, with governments as an advisory capacity. So this was an innovation. It was a small group of people involved, and when governments realized, oh, what's going on here? Then they brought this question back to the world summit on the information society, where they tried to reestablish the old system where the governments are in the decision making capacity and not in an advisory role.

I think this was three years of the world summit of information society was a battle. Who makes the final decision? Is it the governments? Or is it, you know, the nongovernmental stakeholders who are representing the user and the provider of the services? That would be the outcome of this, lead us to our issue today, the multistakeholder model. Because when, in the first phase of the world summit on the information society, there was no agreement between the Chinese government, who was favoring the governmental leadership system, and the US government, who was in favor for the private sector leadership.

So the compromise was, okay, we cannot decide it here, let's create a working group and then let's find out, you know, what the working group will say. Kofi Anan was asking to establish the working group on Internet governance, and in the two years of the work of the working group of Internet governance, the final result was, the Internet does not need a leader.

There is no private sector leadership, whether it is governmental leadership, it means the people who are involved, and all stakeholders, has to be involved in policy development and decision making. The Internet is about sharing. And the definition which came out from the working group on Internet governance, is okay, the main groups are: governments, private sector, and Civil Society, and there is a special role for the technical/academic community.

And all what these communities have to do is to sit together and to share programs, principles, and decision making. Sharing of decision making. This is the key element of the multistakeholder model. So that no one single party makes a final decision. So that means all parties are involved, sometimes it's three parties, sometimes five, sometimes eight.

It depends from the issue. That's why, you know, you have now 10 years later, various models for the multistakeholder decision making procedure. For instance, in ICANN, we have this that the governments are still an advisory committee. We have, meanwhile, procedure where governments give advice to the Board, and the Board takes advice very seriously, so that means this is a good model for sharing of decision making, because the Board alone does not make a decision.

So it's listening to the community. You have different supporting organizations, advisory committees. So that means the final decision making is the result of the process where all stakeholders are involved. The ITU claims now they are multistakeholder, but if you look in the decision making procedures from the ITU, then they invite now like in the world telecommunication policy forum, nongovernmental people and private sector.

But the decision making is only in the hand of governments. If you look into the ITF, this is on equal footing, more or less, but the ITF has no decision making capacity. If you look at the [inaudible] 10 plus, they also claim now they are multistakeholder, but all of the final decision making is in the hands of [inaudible], this is the United Nations group of the information society where governments are sitting and making the final decisions.

That means you have, in various global organizations now, an awareness that you need other stakeholders, but the open question is still, how final decision are made. And the real, what we call the equal, multistakeholder model is that all stakeholders are involved in policy development and decision making.

I think this is the main criteria. That's why I also do not recommend to try to define what multistakeholder is. It depends on the issue. That means the multistakeholder model for the management of cybersecurity issues could look different from the multistakeholder model to manage names and numbers.

So that means probably in the fight against cybercrime, the governments and the police have to play a special role, but even the government and police in fighting cybercrime needs all of the user and the private sector and the technical community to organize the fight against cybercrime. By names and numbers, probably, there is no need that governments, you know, have the final decision making capacity.

This can be done by the community itself, but it makes sense to listen to the governments, and to take their advice. But it means for each issue, probably you have to have a different multistakeholder model, which

meets the special needs of the issue. That's what I do not try to define multistakeholderism. You have a broad variety of different models, but the key issue was defined in the definition of the world summit on information society, which speaks about sharing.

Sharing of policy development and decision making. I think this is the key element. And I want to stop here. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much Wolfgang. Well, as I said, discussions are going to continue of course. And I'd like to open the floor for questions for both Adam and Wolfgang. I see Siranush asking for the floor. So let's begin with the queue.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN:

Siranush Vardanyan for the record. Thank you very much. I just would like to, it's not a question, it's just a comment. What I understand on the multistakeholderism, it's going back to 2007 when I learned from Professor Wolfgang during my summer school teaching period, that this is enhanced cooperation. This is actually the way, how we need to cooperating, this is the sharing as you said, Professor.

This is exactly how we should come up to the solution to the decision. So one of the definition and understanding for me is, for multistakeholderism is enhanced cooperation. This is what we need. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you Siranush. So I see [inaudible] also raised his hand, so you have the floor.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: ...from Venezuela. I'm going to speak in Spanish. Thank you. I wanted to ask a question before Wolfgang would take the floor. If your heading discussion, we are going to change the order of the people who want to take the floor, you have to ask people who have asked to take the floor if they wait.

Certainly after the expert, we have a person who doesn't know anything about the subject matter. They have chosen this because they are interested in the subject matter, but not because I'm familiar with it. And I was surprised by the beginning of this session, where there was a discussion about semantics, about the meaning of the term, when actually I believe the discussion should be, or as you representatives of Internet users, how we want Internet to be governed in 50 years' time.

I think that the discussion, I think there is also an agenda issue here. I think that the way of talking the issue, discussing it, is how we should think how we want, what do we want the work to look like, this work to look like, the real world where there is economic structure, with a power structure there. We have Internet and Internet in this world which has a special history, where the...

It's not the governments but one government, which turns over to Civil Society, quote/unquote the right to use the network keeps for some time, the right to veto decisions. So we talk about governments as they

were not just one government who had the political will to develop the network, and kept the political will of having the right to veto.

So I believe that, and I take back a concern mentioned that Carlos, when Carlos said, I remember something. My father used to say, he used to say that there is a French writer [inaudible] who said that [inaudible]... man rich and poor people from sleeping in the streets, but some people don't need to sleep in the streets.

So this doesn't apply to everybody. So going back to what Carlos said, we don't all have the same possibilities of participating, of being present to express opinions in this matter, this stakeholder model. So from the point of view of the users, I believe that there are some issues to be defined. Number one, how the users participate actively in decision making, and not as it was said, this morning we need users, their comments, their opinions, and their work, but they never said that we need the user's decision on how we are going to make decisions.

And I think that what is being discussed when we talk about Internet governance, is how are decisions made and who makes the decisions, and not how willing decision makers are to listen to others, other people's comments. I believe, I have the feeling that we, that this is actual discussion. I'm talking about multiple stakeholders. Reason, in Brazil the concept of Civil Society was challenged, because somebody from [inaudible] is not the same as somebody coming from the Red Cross or the end users groups.

And as a matter of fact, in Brazil, the Civil Society was broken down into several parts, and I will talk about people from [inaudible], we talk about users, we talking about Civil Society, and we talk about scientists.

So what I'm doing is just putting on the table several issues because I don't really know how we could handle this, but I won't go into a discussion about semantics, nor into discussion that doesn't consider that the decisions, or that governance is power, and power has to be a face, it has to have a definition and it means experts.

LEON SANCHEZ: Points you're raising here, we have a queue, and I see this gentlemen raising his hand.

MATTHIEU CAMUS: Matthieu Camus from Internet Society France. Translation work for pre-ATLAS II, and I had some problem to translate the word multistakeholderism. And I saw two aspects, the governance model and the practical application. And I translated the word as practical application as a partnership. In a partnership, it implies quality and reciprocity.

And these two terms are very important in the ATLAS community, because we have the possibility to speak with an unified voice. And it will be a very true [inaudible] for the discussions with the private sector and the governments. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you. So next on queue is Vanda [inaudible].

VANDA:

I do believe that at one point that we need to focus is on how we are going try to reach some kind of consensus here. The idea to have, to get some models, and start with some formal questions. Maybe we can reach easily some conclusions on main points. So I do believe that we need to [inaudible] have some big questions like you just shared around. And try to get the answers for that, and make it, you know, narrow because we don't have so much time.

And to get all of your opinions and try to get one solution, we need to really start with something structured, or we just, we're talking about everything and it will be difficult to reach a conclusion. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you Vanda. Yes, actually the point is to field a discussion upon the basic questions posted on the slide. And then we'll breakup into smaller groups. We should have one reporter per group, which will summarize the highlights and then give this feedback to Evan, which in turn, will summarize everybody's work. Okay?

So [inaudible] is also on the queue.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Thank you very much. [inaudible] for the record. This is an ongoing discussion of course, and I would like to pick first on what [inaudible] was saying. Whether we use the -ism or not is less important than understanding that the level of the discussion is indeed as a comparison between this type of approach, and the other types of approach that have been used in the past, including authoritarian systems, or monarchies and so on, or the representative democracy model, where

basically you designate people to go and act on your behalf for a certain period of time.

As we've seen in the representative democracy transition from most, not authoritarian but monarchy systems, you can still have single person either embodying the country, there are many constitutional monarchies, or you can have presidential systems and representative democracy, where the president has a strong power.

The key challenge is, even if I agree with Adam that we should be collectively modest in what we think this model is achieving, or this project is achieving, we shouldn't be excessively modest. This is a very fundamental shift in terms of the principle. And the shift in my view is the shift between the one person, one vote. To the one person one voice, which is easier in English than in French because unfortunately in French, it is just like the challenge with free, it's the same [French].

But in English, the difference between having a voice and having a vote is extremely strong. And if by the way that I usually define the multistakeholder approach, or multistakeholderism, is one fundamental principle, which is the right of any person or entity, and I insist on the term person, any person or entity to participate in an appropriate manner in the governance processes dealing with the issues they have a stake in.

And this is as radical as the fundamental principle of universal voting right. When you think about it, representative democracy was introduced at first with only selective voting rights. You had to have a certain level of income, or paying taxes, or be of a certain category of the population. When you think about it, moving towards the notion

that any person, irrespective of their social origin, education level, gender, age, whatever, has the same right to vote, it was unbelievable that it worked so well, and it does still work so well.

The shift that we're making here is even stronger, is the notion that anybody can contribute. Of course in the definition I made, the term, in an appropriate manner, is the most tricky one, because it is not possible to have everybody participating in the same way all of the time.

Which goes to the second question, which is, we're talking about processes, we're talking about workflow that starts with agenda setting, and with the framing of the issue is absolutely essential, and the more people contribute to the framing of the issue, the better. Then you get a policy development stage. Then once some level of consensus has been achieved, whatever the process you get to validation stage, and then to an implementation stage, and then to enforcement and dispute resolution and accountability.

Documenting this workflow is the equivalent of the theoretical approach that was made for representative democracy by separation, the notion of separation of powers. It is the succession of phases as much as the separation of powers. That being said, you note in each of those five stages to answer the question, is there one multistakeholder model? No.

Or in any case, there are many implementation of the multistakeholder approach. I think this is percolating more and more. And whereas ICANN was using constantly either on the Board and on the staff, the expression the multistakeholder model meaning ICANN. I think we've all moved away from that, and we need to except the fact that if I could

just, countries like the UK, France, Germany, and the US, they're all representative democracies.

Their institutional architecture is completely balanced differently, but they're still built on the same principles. The multistakeholder approach likewise can be an international organization established by governments with a huge input from all stakeholders, and likewise be an organization like this one, where the governments are the ones that input whether the decision is different.

Different implementation models, and the final element is the whole debate that is in front of us, because we're talking about the future of the multistakeholder approach. The fundamental discussion that is emerging and that has been highlighted, in my view, at NetMundial, is moving away from the rigid definition of the role of stakeholders that were established by the article 35 of the [inaudible].

To understand that the role of the stakeholders, along those five stages, in the various implementation, vary according to the issue, the venue, i.e. the kind of institution where it is discussed, and the stage of the discussion. But the fundamental principle is that there needs to be the possibility to monitor, i.e. transparency; to contribute, remotely, consultations, and so on; and to fundamentally have also mechanisms of accountability and redress, and so on.

So this is a framework which actually today needs to be formalized, and if I want to finish with an analogy, the Arpanet was not the Internet. The Arpanet was a test bed, was a sort of proof of concept. It only began the Internet when the protocols were themselves simplified and made easily replicable. We are at that stage now.

ICANN is the Arpanet of the multistakeholder governance. It is not finished, it is in the process of being finalized, but if you want this model to succeed and to spread, it needs to be simplified in its conceptual approach, and it needs to become easily replicable, which is the case already with the IGF in a certain way.

And it needs more than anything to be put forward and demonstrate that it solves issues, and not only when the consensus is easy to achieve, also when there are problems, intentions, which is not yet the case. But I think we're at an interesting moment in conceptualizing what this model or this approach is.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much [inaudible]. Alejandro Pisanty is also in the queue.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY:

Thank you Leon. Alejandro Pisanty. First, very quickly, procedural question. The format of the session as I understand it, had two invited experts, who are Wolfgang Kleinwächter and Adam Peake. We actually jumped the queue on footnotes for conceptual reasons. And if Adam Peake would like to speak as a keynote, I would just shut up for him.

ADAM PEAKE:

Alejandro, please continue. My intention was to try and, with some others who are here, [inaudible] is here, Wolfgang has to leave at some point. But there are many people around the table who are subject matter experts, and I have no wish to give a keynote, as and when we will try and answer questions, and please continue.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY:

Thank you Adam. This is Alejandro Pisanty again. I was just trying to make sure that we haven't totally broken with planned format for the session. Coming to some of the points that have been mentioned, first to [inaudible] I think that one of the major characteristics that we need to keep in mind for the evolution of multistakeholder forms of participation in decision making, is that there is, well we can imagine that many, a large part of the world's population would wish to live in a better world.

And a fraction of that part of the population would actually be wishing to participate in changing the world and the way the world works. There are many different ways that this can happen, and many different ways that this is wished. So, whatever we are trying to do for global resources like the Internet or the environment, we have to make sure that the models can scale, and that across different political models, that they are in so far as possible, agnostic and leave a flat playing field for the evolution of different political and economic trends in society in general.

They have to be forward looking. The models for multistakeholder participation have to be forward looking, they have to be cognizant of these changes. They don't have to anchor themselves in the past, but they also have to be sure that they leave open many possible futures and not get sort of married to a single one.

I have made some studies of multistakeholder participation. One of the conclusions here, which I think are relevant. First of all, since many of us got into the multistakeholder governance through our participation

on the Internet, we tend to ignore, leave aside, or forget that there are many other fields of human endeavor and social endeavor, where multistakeholder decision making takes place, at national, regional, and international levels.

This includes the environment, which has a very important model in the intergovernmental panel on climate change, for example, where experts have very significant voice, where the decisions are still negotiated by governments. There are models like the Internet governance forum, which doesn't actually make decisions. There is models again in banking, in finance, there is models in sports.

Some of them are utterly corrupt and we have to be very careful of not copying them, but we have to learn from each of them. Second, multistakeholder participation, this is part of our research that was commissioned a few months ago. Multistakeholder participation has empowered different sectors in a different way, in different ways. As [inaudible] correctly remembers, and underlies, the role of a single government, don't have to be afraid of naming it, the government of the United States had a front start in Internet governance, and it was thus much more empowered, asymmetrically empowered vis a vis, European developing countries, or the emerging economies.

Over the years, this empowerment, this power balance has shifted in a different way, among the different stakeholders. So governments have regained, slowly, some balance against the US, and this is what we call, this actually is referred to as enhanced cooperation, but for the speaker who mentioned enhanced cooperation previously, there are many readings but those of us were at the [inaudible] do remember that

enhanced cooperation was a parallel thing to the Internet governance forum, and it was mostly meant for governments cooperating among themselves and not – say it was in their part of the room.

In ICANN, there is a significant history in which, for example, non-commercial participants were growing in empowerment until around 2003, those from developing countries. And around 2003, the non-commercial constituency picked up mostly an emphasis on privacy issues which were considered of less relevance by developing country participants.

The governance model of the constituency has changed as well. So that actually shifted the balance in favor of the north, of the global north, within the non-commercial constituencies. In the At Large, this balance has been redressed, but it's not effecting the GNSO and the domain name policy as directly as it could have. So there is lots of... This is not studying history for the curiosity about the past, to get lessons moving forward.

What we need to get out of this session, this session is called the Future of, or this working group, the Future of Multistakeholderism. We can change that to multistakeholder participation decision making. But we still have to look at this future much more globally than for ICANN. And I think the type of conclusions that we need to reach, the lines of questioning, are what are the basic characteristics of multistakeholder models that can work?

I think that Wolfgang and [inaudible] have slowly sort of subscribed to the view that many of us had from the technical side, which is that there is no single multistakeholder model for decision making because there

are many different fields. If you are going to involve cybercrime, you need all of the stakeholders, but you do need the police and you need multilateral cooperation between law enforcement agencies, and you need harmonization of laws.

And you don't need that for the domain name system. So these are the kind of scalabilities, flexibilities, and abilities that have to be built into these models. And I hope that discussion can be led both in plenary and in the working groups into this very practical principles and characteristics that they will include things like reciprocity, like simplicity, like subsidiarity.

And a few others which has also been published in the strategy panel on ICANN, ICANN's role in the governance ecosystem. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you Alejandro. We have other people on the queue. We have [inaudible] and then we have the gentlemen sitting here, [inaudible], then the gentlemen sitting down there, and after that, Marilyn [inaudible]. And Carlos, who is...

UNIDENTIFIED:

Thank you Chair. The multistakeholder approach has been a fantastic success on the mantra level. But it's also, it maybe become a victim of its success on that level, because at some point we have to turn the mantra into a method. And then the difficulties starts when we try to develop the method, we of course try to develop something that will be good for all situations and one size fitting all.

I am very glad that this situation is now taking the term into realizing that there is no, one size doesn't fit all. So what I think that the, we might need some more general principles, a little forward from what Wolfgang mentioned. The enshrined principles, coming from working group for Internet governance, about share, share responsibilities.

But from there, I think that we should pretty much take the empirical road, and actually instead of just discussing this, start actually doing it. Start doing it in various situations, various environments, in relation to various issues in various ways, and then we learn from those experiences that perhaps at some point, we can develop the theory further.

I would like to quote Mao Zedong. When he said that when you make revolution, we don't first learn to make the revolution and then do it, but rather do our revolution and by doing, you learn from it. Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Yeah hi. This is [inaudible] for the record, from ISOC India. My view on multistakeholderism is first of all, this concept we should look in a broader sense to include governments and crowd sector, and the technical community, because it can't only be a Civil Society discussion. It would have a better, the better forum for discussing something like this would have been inclusive discussions taken also part of the [inaudible] and share their views.

But having said that, I think the purpose of multistakeholderism should be, on the [inaudible] why not rather than why. And every [inaudible], as we broadly classified into four right now, should be contributing to

find a solution to the gaps which have been cleared by others as a solution. For example, if a government is not able to find the solution to one, it should be the technical community helping the government, and the private sector running it, and the Civil Society trying to find out a consensus in the user community.

That is how I feel the multistakeholderism would work in the long run, rather than in confrontational or having this as [inaudible] Civil Society is quite, you know, [inaudible], while the government on the other hand thinks that they have a constitutional right to represent the public, and their word is the last word in a particular decision making process.

So one point which I want to highlight is it has to be together and has to [inaudible] and holding each other's hand. Second is, but in doing that, we face to two challenges which we can divide into two phases of multistakeholderism. One is the initial stage where we struggle to make it inclusive, we struggle to bring in communities so that the thoughts, the views could be shared and be considered in decision making.

Where we find challenges of cultural limitations. We find challenges of legal structures where there is right society, and there is Communist society. We find the challenges of money in some societies. We find the challenges of technical no harms in societies.

But moving forward, presuming that there will be a better world tomorrow, the other challenge which will start coming in would be diversity. I come from India and we have faced that, in the last 60 years of independence, handling diversity is a problem in itself, because there are so many people with so many views and everybody thinks that their view is final, definite, they're correct.

And to take everybody along in the long run is a challenge itself. So again, I go back to the original thought which I have on multistakeholderism is that, the purpose should be finding a solution to other's problem without creating a problem for them to work in the long run. And believe you me, this is a very, very slow moving process. When you want to grow inclusive, it takes time and it requires a lot of patience. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much. The gentlemen in the white t-shirt, which I don't know his name. Could you please?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Thank you Mr. Chair. My name is [inaudible]. I work with [inaudible] Africa. I sit on the Board of [inaudible]... Internet Association. I must state here that the subject we are discussing here is very apt on the issue be taking very seriously. And I'm sure that's why most of us are here. In discussing multistakeholderism, my approach to it is that it's as good as talking about broadband. Open up the space for all-inclusiveness.

So it's something you cannot over emphasize at any point in time, and should be encouraged in terms of us to continue discussion. All right. Then the other... So Wolfgang has just stepped out. I still have a question for him, but I would like to share it here before emailing him personally. One thing from my own end of organization is the sense that we have also realize in engaging government and trying to do our

bit as well as Civil Society entity, is that within the government itself, they are not united.

In terms of government agendas, it's fighting or who should present them [inaudible] like that. So it [inaudible] in making decision for the populace, the level of understanding is not what is expected. So I would like the [inaudible] in the house, to probably share some thoughts on how this kind of hiccups or challenges could be [inaudible]. Because [inaudible] that has been kind of [inaudible] setup, as bedeviled most developing countries.

And also, the [inaudible] in government to realize that Civil Society actually have roles to play when it comes to multistakeholder to be a success, because only then can we not do it alone. And if they have to assist on doing that, the idea or concept of multistakeholderism is defeated. Thank you very much.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much. Next on the queue we have Marilyn [inaudible] and I'd like to ask the other people in the queue which have previously spoken to the group, if we could prioritize those seats to the ones that haven't spoken before. Are you okay with that? Yes. Okay. So thank you. Next in line is...

MARILYNN:

Thank you very much Leon. I just wanted to make some brief comments about two processes that happened recently. One because it did not touch upon multistakeholder participation very extensively. Another because it did touch upon multistakeholder participation on a

very concrete way. The first one is the [inaudible] plus 10 high level event that produced some outcome documents recently.

And the second one is the ICANN high level [inaudible] board that has been launched a month or so ago. And there was this plus 10 high level event is an extended version of the [inaudible] forum that happens every year. The goal of the high level [inaudible] was to assess how was the implementation of the [inaudible] action wise. How we are 10 years after [inaudible] in terms of implementation?

And try to assess what are the emerging trends and things that should move the community after the [inaudible] plus 10 in 2015. The meeting has produced an extensive outcome documents. I think it should be remarked that there was a multistakeholder platform for discussions, although there were last minute intergovernmental negotiations on key points of disagreements, but they have tried more than before at least to put in place a multistakeholder process.

And I think that is positive that an agreement was reached. I think it's important to highlight that in this process, the focus was on the Geneva documents. They did not touch upon Tunis very much. So they left most of the points that are still controversial in terms of Internet governance. And some of the points that we have been discussing here such as multistakeholder participation, and the roles and responsibilities of the different actors out of this discussion.

And it's not clear so far where these issues that are still open, and NetMundial also recognized there are issues that are open, such as the different roles and responsibilities of actors where decisions are going to be discussed. And it's not clear how the [inaudible] plus 10 in 2015 is

going to be carried out in terms of modalities for participation. So I think that one pressing issue in our agenda should be maybe to take action and to take these discussions of this points that the community identify that are still open to a multistakeholder space such as the IGF.

So this is something that we should really look into in the future, in my opinion. Another process that I think we should not overlook is the report that has come out, out of the high level panel committee that has been launched and carried out by ICANN. I think that the report implicitly puts itself as a milestone document, the implementation of multistakeholder participation.

It carries out and advances what has been discussed in NetMundial, particularly in terms of the roadmap, which is something that most of the actors felt that NetMundial could have been more concrete about. I think there are very good points and suggestions that are present in the report, and maybe we should look into the suggestions more carefully.

There are concrete suggestions on how to implement a distributed model of Internet governance, which is something that some Civil Society people have also put forth papers, such as a very good paper that has been launched by the Internet and Democracy Project on [inaudible] some months ago. But I think that there are some very important points that the report does not give enough attention to.

It does list at the end of the report a set of questions that the [inaudible] that identify that are too open, such as how to guarantee inclusion, representation, balance, participation among actors. And this for Civil Society, for non-commercial interests. And for end users, these are key points. We should not move forward in terms of implementing

a distributed model if we are not clear enough how we are going to include all the voices that should be included into the process.

So I think that the report is something we should give more attention to and look into carefully in order to try to answer this questions and take what the report advances as good ideas. There has been, in my opinion, as well scant consideration for the lack of resources of developing countries to many times participate in this distributed networks.

You know, financial resources, resources of knowledge. Of course the report says that it's fundamental to have resources for participation, but how? And the implementation is something we should bear in mind. Just one last key point about, that I'm going to mention. Adam ask me to just touch upon briefly about national models of governance because when we come to this global environments, sometimes it is natural that we focus on global Internet governance.

But there are different levels that Internet governance is carried out. The global, the regional, the national levels. And some of us have been noticing how it is important that decisions are taken in the closest level to the end user as possible, because it empowers the end user, because decisions are then tailored to the needs that are actually perceived on the ground.

And some, a very good experience that we have is with models of multistakeholder participation that have been developed on the national level. I know that Japan has been trying to foster this, and we are in touch with Adam, and we also have this multistakeholder model in Brazil.

So it's just to mention that there is this overlap and interplay and when we put in place multistakeholder models for participation on national level, it gradually reinforces multistakeholderism on the global level as well. And we have this in Brazil, and it's not a model that should be copied, but maybe [inaudible] an experience that other countries could take into account, and maybe to reinforce multistakeholder participation on the national level as well. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much Marilyn. We still have five people on queue. So in order to continue with the work of the group, I suggest we close the queue here. And next we have people who haven't spoken before, which is [Sunny Lou].

[SUNNY LOU]:

Hi everyone. This is Sunny. I try my best to use English. So multistakeholderism, when I first heard about this word, and with this word, there are different understanding from different people. For me, I think it's something like everyone can have a voice in the policy development process, and the rejection. When it comes to amendment, they also have a voice in that.

But when it comes to light everyone has a voice then, it also raises another question, which is the equal footing problem. If everyone can have a voice, doesn't mean that someone should have a bigger voice in this community. Because like there is some governments, they think that their opinion represent a bunch of people for their country, and

just also like for the technical people because they own the technology for the IP address and the domain name.

So they also have a bigger say in that. So, I think one of the question in my mind, is like how is the equal proportion, or the equal footing being assigned to different stakes in the system? And the second point I would like to make is that, from my understanding, I believe the system is something organic, that cannot be designed by a single person or a single authority.

Just like democracy is a process that has been evolved through the years. We found problems and we tried to fix the bugs. And now multistakeholder is something is operating quite successfully in ICANN, I think we should keep doing this. But the point is how to make it better. And I quite like the idea that we should do this, learn it by doing.

And the reason, the problem I see, I mean as a fresh people here, fresh person here, I think ICANN is using something like a [inaudible] strategy, which is like if the people who find that they have a stake in this topic, they would come to ICANN and raise their hand and voice their opinion. But how other people who are not being engaged at this moment.

The people who are not that interested in this, the Internet governance issues, because they find that they do not, that this kind of governance, or this kind of policy does not have a direct impact on them, and they are not being joined in this meeting. I am fortunate because my organization, that mission is a young program that try to bring young people to this arena.

And I got admitted in that program so I have a voice here. And after joining this, I realized that this kind of issues is very closely related to our everyday usage of the Internet. Take a very brief example which is like, we have... I come from Hong Kong, and there is a [inaudible] a vote happening online right now. [inaudible]... attack right now, because some governments do not want us to have this kind of voting.

They originally try to do a DOS attack to the application and to the website, and then they find out this is not working because the file system is so good. So they are trying to attack the dot Hong Kong domain name. And it's just point that I feel that, okay, the reason that I'm sitting here has something really closely related to my everyday life.

So I think this multistakeholderism is going to be continued, we got to fix, I mean to find a solution to a question which is like, how to engage the people, or how to outreach to people who are not in this community, because they are not interested or they do not find it importance of this matter. And this is the way to sustain the multistakeholderism.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you. So next on queue who hasn't addressed anybody before is Sandra Hoferichter.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER:

Thank you Leon. It's Sandra Hoferichter speaking. I just want to share some thoughts with you, no solutions, and no statement. Well, where we are at the moment. I mean, the Internet is a great source which effects millions and billions of people all over the world. But people

who take care about the governance of the Internet is actually a quite small group of people only, and we should be very aware of that thing when we are talking about the global impact of what we're doing here.

When I talk to my well-educated friends in Germany or elsewhere in the world, I have problems to explain them why the Internet needs to be governed, because for them, everything seems fixed and seems there, and they don't see much where we actually step into and create a new model of governance or the multistakeholder model.

When we say everyone has a voice and can participate, I had the experience that people say, at least in Germany because people in Germany used to somehow trust their governments, they say, "I get my voice during the elections to a certain party, and I expect them for me to solve the problem." So the whole point is that I haven't really understood the impact of, okay, it's not about the government anymore, it's about the end user.

But as an end user, they are actually not interested at all to contribute or participate. I call myself, I'm here within the ALAC as a representative for Europe, for the end user. But none of the end user actually voted for me. I mean this was a very small group of people who said, "Okay, we put Sandra forward and she can contribute to the ICANN content."

And when I talk to the end user, in fact at a party with a glass of wine and so on, and I try to explain what I'm doing in my professional life, and what I'm doing when I'm going to those fancy places all over the world. And I try to explain them, okay, actually I'm representing you.

And they totally do not understand why should I represent them, and what I can do for them.

And they have totally different angle on the things going on. So I think in all of this discussion we should be very much aware that we are on the one hand talking out loud about a global source, the Internet which is maybe not that huge as our climate, but at least it has quite an impact. But on the other hand, we should be aware, that actually what we are doing here will not find global attendance as such, as for instance, the negotiations on the financial or on the climate market.

And here I'd like to object to what Alejandro said. They are not really multistakeholder models because the final decision, at the end, on the climate or the financial conference is taken by one part only, and this is not, okay then. I might got it wrong. I'm sorry.

So I think what we can do here is that we narrow the scope, and maybe we should, at the end of our three or four sessions we have, at the end we should come back to the title and make an additional suggestion, a footnote, or whatever, how we rename it and narrow it to the ICANN scope.

I think we are all here for the ICANN meeting. We have great challenges ahead with the IANA transition, and how the end user can actually meaningful participate in that process. So if we do it, maybe at a certain, or at this stage, on a very narrow space on the ICANN level, and then, as [inaudible] said, succeed and make it a model which really works out at the end. Maybe then we will be able to have a greater impact on the global level, which the next step is of course, the IGF and maybe other forums.

Because then we will be more recognized if we stop putting more mantra and more religion in it, but if we really start thinking about how we can meaningful contribute as a Civil Society end user, ALAC, At Large, or however we, I think this is what we're here for. Thank you very much.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you Sandra. Next in queue we have Alberto Soto who hasn't spoken. The queue is closed already, I'm sorry. But we have Alberto Soto.

ALBERTO SOTO:

This is Alberto Soto. I heard words such as to start, once again, to the participation criteria. So I see in this model two things that are important, and this is government on one hand and end users. As an At Large member, I will speak about At Large as an end user representative, not because I am less interested in the other part, but in this case, I am responsible for, I have the obligation to speak about that.

I will give an example of a workshop that was held in Santo Domingo, and I was lucky enough to have in one discussion. The multistakeholder, all together, we had ISPs, we had at the time telecommunication providers, government, end users, Civil Society, education of the academia. And at one point, an ISP said ICANN cannot interfere when we want to increase the prices, or when we want to provide a different price.

And an end user said, "Okay, that affects Net Neutrality." And as you may see, this is a very clear example of how this is developed. I am very

pragmatic in sense, so that's why I'm given this example. My concern is that end user should be able to modify the policies within ICANN. And I explain to them what the end user is, and they understood what the multistakeholder model in ICANN is.

So, the seat 15 in the Board, well that seat or that position, it has the opinion, that person has the opinion that it's not really needed to what we're saying right now. And another example that I can give is this, when an organization wants to become or be certified as an ALS, the RALOs can only give an opinion.

We cannot decide the end position belongs to ALAC and sometimes they do not agree with us, who are, or the end user representatives. So we need and we have organizations within our RALO, for example, that have a very important contact with the end users. And one of these organizations presented 200 reports regarding Internet user issues, that were affecting end users.

So we had contact with them, and we need that feedback from end users. But, as we are saying now, my question is how the end user will, how will the end user participate? How can we participate in the policy making process if we can only provide opinions? Or how that seat 15 will agree with the end user opinion.

For example, I have an organization, I belong to an organization, or I have an organization that may be certified as an ALS. But in that case, well, what is the benefit that we can get from that? And I cannot see an example of policy within ICANN about that.

LEON SANCHEZ: ...queue, we have Carlos [inaudible].

CARLOS: Thank you Leon. My name is Carlos [inaudible] for the record. I think that my views were already expressed by Marilyn and Alberto Soto. I am totally convinced that the model is one, despite having different implementations, and this by the topics being that with... And I think it makes sense that are some topics that are more important than others, but we must guarantee the end user, the community, the At Large community is, at least, their inclusion, their participation, the possibility to evade the topics, regardless the fact that during implementation or execution.

There are other stakeholders that have other way. But we need to request to ask for that inclusion, and to be able to participate in the debate. And this implies many situations, many questions for example, it implies having the end user the ability to have their own leaders. We need to create these leaders, we need to create capacity building in a responsible manner.

And those leaders should have the possibility then to be able to participate in debates. So this should be included our final statement. Of course, I don't want to force anything. I mean, this is if we all agree. But as Marilyn said, this is one of the pending discussion topics that comes from the big discussion, and we need to promote it.

We need to start working on that and discuss and say we, from the community, from the At Large community... Okay. We understand and we see and we want that this is produced. So I liked what I heard

before regarding the revolution. Revolution is created by producing or making, and this is one of the expressions that we need to use.

We need to implement the learning by doing. We are learning while we are working or doing. So let's not stop doing. Let's continue, let's keep on doing because in that way, we can learn. I am not fully convinced about the expression, that has to do with the expression that my colleague from India said, that growing takes time and requires patience.

I mean, I like the idea of having revolution more than having patience, because we are here to change things, and not to be patient and to keep the status quo. Finally, I think we should realize, or materialize what Sandra said before. Everyone has a voice, and everyone can use that voice.

And this is the concept we need to take into account. We have that voice. We can use that voice, and we should be allowed to use the voice, or that voice. We should have the opportunity to use a voice. The multistakeholder model should be that, a model of multistakeholders where everybody can say, express his or her voice. And that's it. Thank you very much.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you Carlos. Last, Silva [inaudible].

SILVA:

Okay. I'll go back, go beyond ICANN to come back to ICANN on multistakeholderism. So at different points in time in different

countries, different problems remain unsolvable, or unmanageable. For example, if you take United States, for example, some lobby groups remain unbalanced, or it took longer to balance them.

Well, maybe the [inaudible] lobby or the insurance lobby, or different lobby, from outside looking in and not talking with inside knowledge. So, and you could say that certain things, certain sectors are unbalanced or unmanageable, or uncontrollable by governments.

So maybe for example, the banking or insurance sectors. I'm not calling them evil, I'm just saying that there are oversized that, governments cannot present a form of governance, manage them effectively. And certain [inaudible] remain unachievable, and impractical, world peace perhaps. Religious harmony or [inaudible] harmony.

All that limitation went through different forms of governance, like monarchy, could not achieve that democracy, could not achieve that. And in the process of evolution forms of governance, I feel that multistakeholder role of governance is the next higher level evolution, over all other previous forms of governance. And the future of multistakeholderism, is the future of governance.

With that thought, if the governments, be it United States, Germany, or India, can look at multistakeholderism, and appreciate the value of what ICANN is offering to the world as an experimental model, whether it take 50 years to implement multistakeholder model of governance in governments, it could start looking at this model of governance for ICANN, an Internet that much more openness. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you Silva. So, we're going to take a 15 minute break so we can replenish our levels and water, and other things. So we'll be back here in 15 minutes so we can begin discussing the basic questions that will be making to the different groups. Thank you.

[End of Audio 1]

[Begin Audio 2]

LEON SANCHEZ: Everyone please take their seats so we can continue.

Okay. So next on our agenda is the discussion by breaking into smaller groups. So, I would ask you to please take a number from one to four, subsequently, and then we'll group all ones, all twos, all threes and fours. Do you have a better model Alejandro?

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Alejandro Pisanty. Just for practical purposes, let's just sort of cluster geographically where we already are instead of having everybody shuffle around. That will get started faster.

LEON SANCHEZ: Okay. That sounds reasonable. We have one, two, three. Evan? Okay, then three groups. We can balance it, we can balance it.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Some geographies are bigger than others.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Okay. So once we break into these groups, we have some basic questions on the screen that are not the whole set of questions we would expect to answer, but just as a suggestion or a baseline, from which we can start the discussion. And these basic questions are, who represents who and why within multistakeholder effort? And is the multistakeholder model the best way to address the needs of the decision within Internet governance?

And is this the only model? I mean, the ICANN model, is this the only model that there is around? And also Evan has another very important question to raise.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Actually, this came about by examining some of the discussion that took place already, and it has to do with the world of government. How does multistakeholder...? How does the multistakeholder model address the criticism by governments and others that say government was democratically elected, people voted for it.

Does that government not already represent various interest, business interest, personal interest, Civil Society interest? By virtue of its existence as a government, especially one that was democratically elected? How does our model, how does our need to have a multistakeholder system, address the complaints that we have indeed heard from some governments?

That the government already is a custodian of the public interest by virtue of their political mandate. So that's a question that I think should at least be raised in your group. And one thing that I want to ask of you,

please one of the first things you should do when you get together in your group, appoint one or two people as your own note takers, that then will come back and I will work with them to try and incorporate it into our documents going forward.

So please assign somebody first who will be the person who is taking your notes, will summarize what you're talking about, and then come back so we can incorporate that. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thanks Evan. And we're running short on time, so it's 5:20, we're supposed to finish this meeting at six, so I'll ask you to end your work with your group at five before six so we can reconvene and then go to our next meeting. So let's begin and let's have the discussion. Thanks.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Mr. Chair, we have a question. This is Eduardo. Which question are we going to answer? The third one?

LEON SANCHEZ:

I would think that each group answer all questions so we can have a broader point of view.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

But you can do this in whatever form you want. You don't have to say, answer number one, this, answer number two, this. Essentially use this as something to just guide or provoke your own discussion. Take it in

whatever direction wants to do and just come back with some comments on it.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]