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PRESIDENT: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. First of all, welcome to everybody. Just to go through some formalities, we have a list of participants which I hope everybody has but for the record, on my right is Professor Yves Derains, on my left is Professor Kaj Hobér, and I am Julian Lew presiding in this arbitration. To our left side, behind Professor Hobér, is our Tribunal secretary, Veronica Lavista, and I do want to express right at the beginning our gratitude to her for having co-ordinated between the Tribunal and with counsel on both sides having made the arrangements to get going today.

Although we have the list, for good order I am going to ask both sides to introduce the people who are with them. Before I do that, can I remind you that if anything is to be discussed at some stage which is confidential, then it will be necessary -- this is outside the legal side -- we will need to make arrangements because we do have on the line the representatives of the State Department who will be making a presentation later.

So let me ask Claimant's side to introduce the people on their side, and then we will come to
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legal defence agency, and just behind us you have 09:35 the three witnesses put forward by Colombia in this arbitration: Sylvia Constaín on the left, Luisa Trujillo in the middle, and Iván Castaño on the right.

PRESIDENT: Thank you very much. And I believe we have American counsel for the US department who are online. Is that correct?

MR BIGGE: Yes, good morning Mr President, members of the Tribunal. My name is David Bigge, I am the chief of investment arbitration for the United States, and I am not sure, I believe I have one of my colleagues on the line as welp

MR PERALTA: This is Alvaro Peralta here on behalf of the United States.

MR BIGGE: Mr President, if I could just have the floor for an administrative matter, just to alert the secretary or the IDRC administrator, I am having a little bit of technical difficulty. So I am calling on my phone. I am calling from my hotel room in New York I am here forUNCITRAL. So if you get another request for admission from me that is because I have been able to make my computer work, so please admit that request and then I will close out the line from my phone. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: Thank you very much. | We::37 |
| :--- |
| Well, thank you for those introductions |
| and just to recognise our court reporters and also |
| our translators on both sides, which does remind all |
| of us, as we are speaking, to remember that we are |
| having translations made and we should speak that |
| little iota slower so that we can keep up-to-date as |
| much as possible. |
| Before we go on to any other issues, today |
| we are going to hear, first of all, opening |
| statements from Claimant, then opening statements |
| from Respondent, and after that we will hear from |
| the United States interveners and then there will be |
| an opportunity for counsel, should they so wish, a |
| short opportunity to respond. |
| What we would like to do is to get on to |
| our first witness today if at all possible, and |
| while we cannot be absolutely certain that we will |
| complete everything by close of business tomorrow, |
| we certainly like to aim to finish the witnesses by |
| the end of tomorrow and show the necessary |
| flexibility. And with that context, let us try and |
| also remember that when we do have a break, let's |
| all try and keep, when we have 15 minutes, let's try |
| and keep to 15 minutes, rather than 17 to 18 or 20, |

m,

PRESIDENT: Thank you very much. 09:37 and just to recognise our court reporters and also our translators on both sides, which does remind all of us, as we are speaking, to remember that we are having translations made and we should speak that ittle iota slower so that we can keep up-to-date as Before we go on to any other issues, today we are going to hear, first of all, opening statements from Claimant, then opening statements from Respondent, and after that we will hear from the United States interveners and then there will be an opportunity for counsel, should they so wish, a What we would like to do is to get on to our first witness today if at all possible, and while we cannot be absolutely certain that we will complete everything by close of business tomorrow, we certainly like to aim to finish the witnesses by the end of tomorrow and show the necessary fexorem. And wit that contert, let us try and and keep to 15 minutes, rather than 17 to 18 or 20 ,

## as often happens. <br> 11 $9: 38$

Very good. Is there anything on the housekeeping side that either side wish to raise? Mr Baldwin from Claimant's side?

MR BALDWN: There is nothing from
Claimant's side, Mr President.
PRESIDENT: Mr Gouiffès?
MR GOUIFFÈS: Nothing either, Mr Chairman.
PRESIDENT: So then we will proceed to hear the opening statement from Claimant. We have received from you a hard copy presentation. Are these going to be used on screen as well, or are we only using hard copy?

MR BALDWN: No, Professor President. We will display it on the screen as well and we have circulated it by email as well, as per the Procedural Order to the parties and to the Tribunal, and the court reporters.

MR GOUIFFĖS: You have circulated it, or you are going to?

MR BALDWIN: We have.
MR GOUIFFÈS: We have not received anything and we have only one copy forall our team. It is a bit unfortunate. But we have not received the electronic. I think we should have received it
just slightly before. I don't want to make a big 09:40 point, but we haven't received it, because we have only one paper copyit would be good to receive it.

MS BALDWN: It was sent at 9.32 am
MR GOUIFFĖS: We haven't received anything.

PRESIDENT: Do you want to run downstairs? I hate interrupting things, but does somebody want to run out and get another photcopy of this opening?

MR GOUIFFÈS: If we could have two copies, it would be good.

MR BALDWN: It looks like the court reporters are willing to give up their copy, and just for the record we will also as we said display it on the screen so it will be very visible to everyone.

PRESIDENT: Let's proceed, please.
MR GOUIFFÈS: When I want to speak sometimes it just doesn't switch on. It is a technical problem. We just received the presentation by email just now, 9.40. But we have a spare copy too, so that is okay.

MR BALDWIN: I will check the email to make sure. There might be delays in different
servers. I would say with regard to the microphone $\begin{array}{r}13 \\ 09: 42\end{array}$ situation, it appears it is one of those systems where there is a limited number of active microphones. I wasn't able to get on when yours was still on, so we will try to do a really do a good job of turning ours off.

PRESIDENT: Let's go ahead with the substance, please. Mr Baldwin.
Claimant's Opening Statement
by Mr Baldwin
MR BALDWN: So thank you to everyone again for this opportunity to present the Claimant's case in this arbitration. As you can see, this was the 7th arbitration filed with ICSID in 2020, and here we are in 2023 and we are very grateful to be having this proceeding.

I have heard from Respondent several times talking about what's the problem, you know, you hal the concession, you got a new concession, why are you here, this is a waste of time. We don't believe that is the case at all. We think this is an important matter. It is an important matter for the Claimant. It is an important matter I think generally. And if you look at the investments that have been made, we are going to get into this in
other slides, but just to give an overview, if you $\begin{aligned} 14 \\ 09: 43\end{aligned}$ look at the investments that have been made, Neustar made substantial investments in the .co domain. These investments included lots of money spent on marketing, on operation, on security, on all the things you need to do to run a successful domain, an enterprise which at the time that the concession began in 2010, Neustar had quite a lot of experience with.

These investments also included a purchase of the remaining portion of .CO Internet, which was 99 per cent of the shares, in 2014 for 113 million. So this is no small matter. It is no small matter in terms of money, but it is also no small matter in terms of the treatment that the Claimant has been subject to, of the rule of law, of expectations and discrimination and other issues that we will talk about today. So we take this very seriously.

And of course the money that was invested, as we will get into and particularly in the next phase of the arbitration get into, was based on the expectation that there would be a renewal of the concession, which is the very common practice in Colombia.

Another factor to think about in the 'why
are we here' category before we get into someof the $\begin{array}{r}15 \\ 09: 45\end{array}$ substance, is Respondent's refusal to even negotiation an extension. And I will point out, not that it is extraordinarily relevant, but I was involved in this early on, so I didn't come on just as a notice of intent was being filed, but was involved early on, and Neustar, as the record shows, wanted very much to have discussions with Respondent about an extension, about a matter that was very important to the company, very important in terms of the investment and the work that went into creating this domain, and there was not even an ability to have a discussion on the other side, despite frequent efforts to do it.

The Respondent often paints those as abusive. They kept writing and writing. Well, we were writing to, you know, make it known that we wanted to negotiate, and we felt like we had a right to, all the time and money and effort that had been put in, and we wouldn't even get a response. The first notification that was sent in September of 2018 stating, you know, the formal notification that we wanted to extend the Contract went unanswered for two months. Other letters that were sent went unanswered as well for long periods of time, or some
were never answered at all.
It became apparent tous going through this, and the record reflects this as well, that it wasn't the Ministry making these decisions, but these decisions, it appears from the record, these decisions were being made by the new presidential administration. And I will point out that the three witnesses - we are going to talk about witnesses towards the end of this presentation today-- but I will point out that the three witness that are here all came in in August and September of 2018, and so did the new president, President Dque came in in August of 2018, and so did all these witnesses. There was a change in administration, that administration sought to, for whatever reasons, it is not anything we have to prove, we certainly think there is cause for concern about corruption or nefarious reasons, but for whatever reason the administration wanted to make sure that this didn't go to .CO Internet, and we explain why it ultimately did, but we think the goal was to keep it away from .CO Internet and to give it to its preferred bidder, Afilias, without any real explanation as to why that was its preferred bidder.

This is very basic but I think it needs to
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be said. The TPA, Trade Promotion Agreement between the US and Colombia, provides both parties, but certainly provides Colombia benefit. There are benefits to Colombia with the TPA, and so when they say well look, you got the concession, even though it was coerced and on drastically different terms, why are you here. We are here because we have a right to be under the TPA. We are here because a respondent should not be -- I represent states as often as I represent investors, and I will say that, you know, even with that background respondents do not deserve to escape liability just because they are a state. And we are here to present our case before the Tribunal, we have presented our case in the pleadings, and we think we have a right to the remedy that we are seeking.

I just show this. This is the current pending ICSID cases only for the Respondent, and you can see many in the last several years and this is one of the reasons why the rule of law is important. Nobody is picking on the state or wants to exert some influence, but what we do want is to make sure that the rights of the Claimant are respected and as a broader matter that rights generally are respected.

So we are going to start off talking about $\begin{gathered}18: 50\end{gathered}$ the merits first. I am going to go through the merits, and then my colleague, Ms Baldwin, is going to go through the jurisdictional objections

So let's talk about the.co domain. .co is what is called a country code top-level domain. The most common top-level domain is obviously .com But there are others. There is.biz, there is .us, which is a country code toplevel domain. So each country is assigned a country code top-level domain. Colombia was assigned .co. Now .co is very similar, it is the first two words of 'company'.

At the time of the concession, the first concession in 2010, there were only 27,000 users of the .co domain. It wasn't being used. It certainly wasn't being marketed or presented or developed as an alternative to .com, but that is precisely what the Claimant did with their .CO Internet company that they formed. They took that uniqueness of it being.co.

But there is nothing magical. Colombia, this was done in 1991. Colombia didn't do some magic to get .co, it is just randomly by their name and Tuvalu is mentioned up here asit is out in Micronesia, a very small place. They are very
fortunate to get.tv which has also been marketed as $09: 51$ a very popular domain, because it has the initials TV. So that is the basis of the .co.

When I look at Respondent's papers I see it presented almost like this is some natural resource like a gold mine or some oil field, and it is just not that. It is different. And it had to be developed. It is not a natural resource that has some large value if you don't market it, you don't promote it, you don't provide the security and do it the correct way.

The .co domain was initially delegated in 1991 from IANA, which is a group that oversees the internet, to the university of the Andes in Colombia, and the university of the Andes held that right to manage the domain since 1991 and held it up until the government essentially took it over, as we will get to later.

Around 2001 the university, I think rightly, wanted to commercialise the domain. Now if you think about what was happening at the time-you have to put yourself in that mind set -- in 2001 we had the .com boom, we had domain registrations going all over the place. .com people were grabbing websites and they were even squatting at that time
on websites. So there was a lot of activity in 2001 09:53 when the university wanted to commercialise this domain. It was not like some novel thing at that point. Probably there would have been a big advantage tocommercialising it even sooner, but the university decides to commercialise it in 2001.

The government stepped in, in December, 11 December 2001, tostop that commercialisation, and took steps over the next year essentially to take over the domain, or at least stop the university from commercialising or taking actions with respect to the domain to make it anything of value.

The Colombian government actually - the university complained about, this is in the record at exhibit C-0124, because the university complained that the government had secretly taken steps to take over the domain, even though the university had been managing it to that point, and the university complained about that and ultimately the Council of State of Colombia ordered that the Ministry of Communications take over the domain from the university.

Even after this happened in 2001 and 2002,
Respondent neglected the domain for quite a while.

Really, and you will see as we go through this, they $\begin{array}{r}21 \\ 09: 55\end{array}$
in essence neglected it completely until 2009 when
they decided to put it up for tender and choose an operator.

Again during that time, even if you look at what happened from 2001, think back from 2001 to 2009, think of the growth of the internet during that period, how many more websites were coming online, how many more top-level domains started to be used and became popular during that time and this was a time period that was essentially wasted.

And, you know, the record shows that Respondent wanted to kind of operate it themselves. They wanted to operate this domain themselves, but the problem is, as they admit in their witness statements and other places, they just didn't have the capability to be able to operate the domain. They didn't know how to do it It takes technical expertise, you have to do security, that is without even getting to the marketing and promotion aspect of it all.

So, in other words, when Respondent stopped the university from commercialising it in 2001 nothing happened. The first thing, the really only thing that happened after they took it over was
the law that they passed in 2006, but even after -- $09: 56$ and here is the law, it just states that the .CO is a resource of the telecommunications sector, of public interest, which is relevant as Ms Baldwin will talk about in the jurisdictional section, and it gave the right to manage that to the State under a law where previously it had been done by, I believe, resolutions.

This was a provision in the law which talked about an extension of the concession of a right of the concessionaire to have this right that is mentioned here for up to ten years for an extension, and we will get into that more later on.

But even after 2006, as I mentioned, the Respondent continued to let the domain languish as the internet was booming. It was not until July 2009 that the Ministry issued a resolution clarifying that its role was to define the policies and regulations and that a concessionaire would be chosen to manage and promote the domain. That was July 2009 before anything was really done.

So MinTIC opened the tender for the .co domain on 24 June 2009, so right before the resolution. I found this interesting. The tender documents require that thesuccessful bidder have
specific experience, 'individually or by at least $\begin{array}{r}29: 58 \\ 23\end{array}$
one member of the joint venture ... of at least 500,000 registrations within a cclLD', and again the cc part is country code, so it is not even just a top level domain like .biz but it has to be a country code top-level domain. They wanted that experience.

Respondent had been tryingto do something with it and just letting it is sit there for years, and when they did finally put some qualification up there was no way that they themselves could meet or have the experience to do.

Neustar was really one of the few entities in the world that had the experience to support the operation of the .co domain, had the experience required. As IANA noted during its assessment, this is in the memorial at paragraph 43 -- 'the operator," meaning .CO Internet, the company that was formed to operate and manage and promote, the Colombian company that was formed to operate, manage and promote the .co domain, .CO Internet 'is partly owned by Neustar, an experienced provider of domain registry services for top-level domains such as .US. The registry back-end operation will utilise Neustar's established registry, DNS and WHOIS
implementations, including their Ultra DNS platform 09:59
that has been in operationsince 1999' -- two years before the government stopped the commercialisation of the .co domain, "and their registry SRS platform that has been in productionfor eight years".
.CO submitted a bid. There were two bids that were submitted, .CO's and the other bidder, Verisign, who I believe did not qualify, they weren't able to meet the qualifications and so there was only one entity standing at the end of the day and that was.CO Internet which had the support of Neustar as part owner, but also as the technical expert for the venture.

Again, the concession contained an extension clause as well, and this case is about the treatment by Respondent of the Claimant's investment, but it is worth noting that the way that the Respondent seeks to read this clause would render this clause meaningless. They would give this clause no meaning under the way they read this clause, and we will get into this as the case develops over the next couple of days.
.CO Internet grows the domain
exponentially. So the concession started on 7 February 2010. At the beginning of the concession
period only 27,000 domain registrations existed for 10:01 the .co domain. It was only after the concession started that the .co domain began to be soldand marketed, began to bepresented as an alternative to .com, sharing the first two letters of 'company' and being something that looks like 'company'.

And When the 2009 concession ended .CO Internet and Neustar had registered nearly 2.3 million domain registrations, an increase of a factor of 80 . And again keep in mind the internet didn't start in 2009. The internet had been around. So to be able to come in and to have that kind of growth during that period to compete with lots of other top-level domains that exist out there, and be able to get that growth took work, and it didn't just happen by accident. There were over 200 million registrations for all domains, every one -- .com .biz, all of them-- at the end of 2010, but .CO wasn't even a blip on the radar. It had that 27,000 startingwhen the concession started.

Neustar brought its technical expertise to make the .co domain safe and secure. As you can imagine, when people are deciding what domain to be use, they want to make sure that that domain is safe, secure and operational. That doesn't happen
by accident, that takes a lot of work, it takes a 10:03
lot of planning, it takes a lot of technical know-how to make that happen. It just doesn't happen.

It seems to us like it just happens because we go on to a website and buy a domain and everything seems to be fine, and these days it will even make your website for you, but that doesn't happen by accident. That takes work, planning and investments. And indeed Neustar made investments, both investments in the marketing, promotion, and security and operation of the .co domain, but also its promotion and carrying out those activities, and it did so with the expectation that it would have that right to renew the Contract for an additional ten years.

In 2014 Neustar wanted to increase its ownership of .CO Internet to 100 per cent. It had previously owned 1 per cent but was doing a lot of the back-end work. It bought the other 99 per cent from its joint venture partner for $\mathbf{1 1 3 . 7 \text { million, }}$ made further investments in the operation of the company of .CO Internet, its investment

Respondent was part of the agreement.
This wasn't done without Respondent's knowledge. In
fact they had to agree to it, entered into an 10:04
amendment to the concession to allow this to happen and one of the clauses Respondent insisted on was a term that said.CO Internet would have to organise a minimum of two events per year to support MinTIC programmes. That was what they wanted out of this. These investments that Neustar continued to pour into .CO, did billboards in Times Square, Superbowl ads, but those are the flashy things. We mention those because theSuperbowl ads are expensive. It is like a World Cup final ad, these are expensive ads, and this money was spent. But it was not all that was done. We don't want to lose sight with these large investments of the day-to-day work that was required to make this work.

And you can see from the memorial at 49, it says: "Prior to the sail of .CO Internet, Neustar/.CO Internet sponsored anaverage of between 800-1,000 start-up business development event on five continents to introduce the .co domain ...'

They opened up marketing offices in India, EU, Australia, US and Colombia and they also made sure that the domain got licensed in China, which opened up a whole entire other market.

So this wasn't just flashy ads, the ads
were I think important, but it was real work done by $\begin{array}{r}10: 06 \\ 28\end{array}$ real people to take the domain fromits 27,000 and to get it to almost 2.5 million registrations by the end of the concession.

This is just a chart that we have in the memorial at 60 that comes, I believe, from -anyway, the cites in there, I believe it comes from Respondent but it might not. In any event, the cites in there are not contested. This is the growth of the .co domain over the life of the concession.

And people in the internet community recognise this. One memorial at paragraph $4(1)$, you know, very popular internet trade publication noted that the .co domain has been described as "easily Colombia's biggest start-up success story'. This was a success story.

Maybe we will talk about this later too, but in these cases you often see the Respondent stating, look, the Claimant just acted poorly. They didn't do the job they were supposed to do, they created environmental damage, if it is a mining or an oil dispute. There is always the state stepping in and talking about the Claimant not doing a good job. You don't have that here and the reason you
don't have that here is it would be impossible to do $\begin{array}{r}29 \\ \hline 0: 07\end{array}$ because time after time Neustar and .CO Internet were really doing a great job in doing the marketing and being responsive to the stateand doing all the things they were supposed to do, being good corporate citizens to get this done and they deserved to be treated better.

The Respondent agreed that .CO Internet has been a success. This is in the memorial at 64. The advisory committee concluded the .co domain is "trustworthy, secure and stable". This was in 2017. So there was an agreement on behalf of Respondent that .CO Internet was doing a good job and obviously they bid and are currently the concessionaire, even though they are not owned by the Claimant in this case, so they are still doing the job of running that domain.

I wanted to talk about as the success was happening it became time to go into the extension process, looking at doing it, and there is a report that we will talk about I think a few times in the next few days, it is a July 2018 report from Respondent's Vice-Minister of Digital Economy that talked about an extension of this concession. And the Vice-Minister in this report talks about the
extension as something that should happen, or at $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10:09 }\end{aligned}$ least it makes sense to have it happen, it certainly gave arguments for having it happen, but did something a little bit different too and said that economic re-negotiation needs to go hand in hand with this renewal.

Now, as we will get into later, Respondent tries to assert that because the economics would be different, you know, that they couldn't just renew it, that their competition law would prevent them from doing it, but it was in fact the Vice Minister in July 2018 that said there had to be an economic re-negotiation as part of this process.

This is a government official stating that there should be a negotiation to extend it and that negotiation needs to have different economic consideration, and without any mention that that wouldn't be possible because of a competition law, and that would prevent them from moving forward with it. It is part of our case for arbitrarinesswhich we will get into later.

Minister Constaín becomes a Minister. She worked on the Duque campaign, I believe starting in March of 2018she began to work on his campaign. He won the election and he assumed office on

7 August 2018. She assumed office as the Minister $\begin{aligned} 310: 11\end{aligned}$
of MinTIC, the entity that had the responsibility for the oversight for the .COdomain, she became the minister on the same day.

Obviously it is pretty apparent that her role with the campaign is what led to her taking on that role of being the Minister. And that role of Minister came one month after that July report, even though I believe she was involved in the transition. We will probably get into that during her examination, but I believe she was involved in the transition during that time as well but officially took office on 7 August.

Neustar and .CO Internet did not delay, they didn't hide in the bushes. They were very present, very willing to discuss with Respondent about the extension and made their willingness and their desire to extend this contract formally known. There had been ongoing discussions taking placewell before Minister Constaín and the other witnesses here were involved at all there had been discussions about this extension but the formal notification happened on 20 September 2018.

There was an offer in that discussion by .CO Internet to re-negotiate the financial
considerations which was based on the July 2018 10:12 report from the Vice Minister which said that such a financial discussion had to happen with the extension of the concession

Respondent waited two months before there was any response. You will see, as we look at the timeline as we go through this case and we look more and you have the chronology that we submitted, the Claimant's chronology that lays out the timeline of this, and you can see that a lot was happening, that Respondent was doing a lot of things behind the scenes unbeknownst to .COInternet or Neustar but it took them two months beforethey responded to .CO Internet's letter asking for the formal extension.

In their reply, MinTlC ignored .CO
Internet's request to negotiate and talk about the concession. I find this lack, this refusal to negotiate and talk, it is telling. It is telling, as we will see later, that there was this refusal because it sort of shows that the decision was predetermined and likely not even made with the ministry but with the presidential administration in his office.

But there was a predetermination of a decision not to proceed forward, and everything else

1 was just more games, lack of transparency, $\begin{array}{r}\text { 10:14 }\end{array}$ opaqueness, lack of candour by the administration of this, and you have that happening throughout this time period without - while Neustar was and .CO Internet was saying let's meet and let's talk about this. Why wouldn't somebody not want to talk about an extension? The only reason would be if you had already decided it is not going to happen. We will move on.

On 27 December 2018, Neustar, through .CO Internet, reiterated its desire to extend the concession and requested to commence discussions. Again, no response was received to that entreaty from Respondent. After several more entreaties, Respondent and .CO Internet were finally able to secure a meeting with some of Respondent's officials. Not all of them and not all of them that mattered to discuss the extension.

The Vice-Minister who was present at the meeting stated that MinTIC was going to establish a process whereby the tender process would start as well as continuing negotiations. So this is one of the times when the Respondent comes out and says we are going to put this out to tender despite the request, the very early request, from.CO Internet
to negotiate an extension
Respondent never engaged in good faith
negotiations. They really didn't engage in
negotiations at all but they certainly didn't engage
in good faith negotiations. It was sort of, this
thing you learn never continued to make offers
against yourself. I will give you a thousand for
that. Oh, there is no answer. Okay, I will give
you 2,000 for that. That is never a thing to do
when you are trying to negotiate with another side,
but essentially.CO Internet was put in a position
where it sent an offer even though nothing was
happening with the other side to try to get
something started, to get a process started. And
despite doing that, the Respondent never submitted a
financial offer in return, never did anything else
of that nature.
And that is important too because if this
is about financial considerations, you know, we have
heard a lot from Respondent and they at one point
say that Neustar was gorging on 93 per cent of the
profits of the domain, which is not true because
revenue is not profit, I am not surprised that
Respondent might make that mistake, but 93 per cent
of the revenue is not 93 per cent of the profits,

Respondent never engaged in good faith negotiations. They really didn't engage in negotiations at all but they certainly didn't engage in good faith negotiations. It was sort of, this thing you learn never continued to make offers against yourself. I will give you a thousand for that. Oh, there is no answer. Okay, I will give you 2,000 for that. That is never a thing to do but essentially. CO Internet was put in a position where it sent an offer even though nothing was happening with the other side to try to get something started, to get a process started. And despite doing that, the Respondent never submitted a return, never did anything else

And that is important too because if this s about financial considerations, you know, we have lar profits of the domin which is not true because revenue is not profit, I am not surprised that of the revenue is not 93 per cent of the profits,
$\square$
$\qquad$



the domain would be held n the second half of 2019, $10: 20$
but on its own case the Advisory Committee supposedly only recommended continuing with that tender process two days later, so two days after the presidential adviser had made that announcement.

On 30 March2019, President Duque
announced that he had decided to launch a tender for the .CO domain. Despite the concession being with MinTIC, and MinTIC having responsibility for the oversight, the presidential control was apparent of this process.

Minister Constaín meets with Neustar's registry competitor, Afilias. The record shows that there were other competitors that were met with. Certainly it appears that she met with Afilias, the competitor, to the exclusion of Neustar and .CO Internet. And this was as other things were going on. This is the March 17 announcement about the tender process.

On 10 April, so after all this has gone on, after the President had made statements, the adviser to the President has made statements, MinTIC formally informs .CO Internet that a decision had been made not to extend the concession and Respondent stated that it was in its sole discretion
to decide -- of whether or not to extend the $\begin{array}{r}38 \\ 10: 22\end{array}$ concession although it is pretty clear that the sole discretion resided with President Duque and not as an administrative matter through proper channels.

Respondent's announcement was an abrupt change because at that time.CO Internet and Neustar were still very much trying to engage the Respondent to have good faith negotiations and to have a discussion about this extension. Despite the new tender, Neustar still sought to cause the Respondent to abide by its obligations, including again, I am a little bit of a broken record here, but there was a continued effort to try to get an engagement with regard to resolutions, with regard to negotiations, and the Respondent calls that abusive. We call that trying to engage a party that is not complying with its obligations and is not responsive.

And I mentioned this offer that was made before. One of the things that Neustar .CO Internet did was to submit an offer, again to try to start a discussion. That offer was in line with the July 2018 report that talked about a financial reconsideration. And it did some things like provided an upfront payment so the Respondent wouldn't have the risk if the internet started not
to perform or other things happen, Respondent would
39
$0: 23$
still get its upfront payment and would not be subject to the whims of internet growth and risk associated with that.

Respondent -- you are in these cases sometimes and maybe you are meeting with the state and the state says well, yes, we did that because that is what the regulation says, and the regulation says we can deny this environmental permit because the slope of the land is too steep. Okay. So you denied it for this person, but what about all the people that you granted it for that had land of the same slope? You granted a permit for all them but you deny it there.

So it is not a question - Respondent believes that the law and the concession gave them the sole discretion of whether or not to extend it. We don't think that is the case, but even if there was some validity to that, the question is they regularly have done it in what looks like an apparent obligation to do it for other investors, both investors in the telecom sector and investors in other sectors.

I am not going to go through each one of these, they are in the memorial, we have listed them
here, but these are ones that have similar language, $\quad$ 10:25 like this one saying the concession 'may be extended" and then it was in fact extended We could not find an example of an entity that wanted an extension and was refused that extension, and we certainly couldn't find an example of an entity that wanted to negotiate and there was a refusal to negotiate. So these are laid out in the memorial, paragraph 91, for the telecoms sector, and then the mining sector examples are laid out in paragraph 93.

So we don't believe Respondent has provided justification. They tried to make legal points about these are not comparators, there are different circumstances, but they haven't, in our view, provided a real justification for these differences as to why things are treated differently. And I will tell you, talking to people in Colombia, it is well known that these rights happened and these extensions happened, but they did not happen here.

Now what really I think was shocking about the new tender when it came out, was so this new tender comes out and the tender as written only allows one bidder. There is only one bidder on the planet which would have met the technical
qualifications for that tender and that bidder is $\begin{array}{r}\text { 10:27 }\end{array}$ Afilias, which we will talk about in a moment.

But first, going back to this,
Minister Constaín we have said met with Afilias in September 2019, might have met with them on other occasions. This meeting was not disclosed to .CO Internet and they weren't allowed to have a private meeting with Minister Constaín, and in fact in several of the meetings that.CO Internet and Neustar were able to have, Minister Constaín wasn't present, so it wasn't even important enough for her to be at those meetings but she had met privately with Afilias.

And the meeting was disclosed by an investigative reporter, despite efforts to keep it secret, and the meeting was happening at a time when Respondent was saying that there would still be a -Respondent was at least leaving open the possibility of a negotiation of an extension.

Interestingly, Afilias knew of
Respondent's views on the concession with.CO Internet. Now, it is hard to imagine how Afilias would know how Respondent's officials thought about the concession and what they wanted to do with the concession had they not been told by Respondent's
officials. So there did appear to be communication 10:28 and co-ordination between Afilias. There are other signs of communication and co-ordination between Afilias and MinTCC and other government officials.

The tender provisions were based on a tender that Afilias had won, not a tender that involved Colombia, but a tender that Afilias hadwon and Section 6(9) of the Technical Appendix we have laid out as based on that is an exact transcript of the provision that was in that particular tender. So tenders that Afilias had won were copied into this tender with regard to the technical requirements, and you can see that in this Section 6(9).

As I said, the original tender excluded all bidders except for Afilias. As one example, section 5.2 of the preliminary TORs requested proponents to demonstrate financial ratios including the level of indebtedness to be 70 per cent, which is unusual given the average of the domain industry is 115. Afilias was under that 70 per cent therefore they met that requirement. As Respondent was aware, Neustar and .CO Internet was at 72 per cent, meaning they didn't meet that requirement.

Another example, section 5.4 of the $10: 30$
preliminary Terms of Reference requiredproponents to demonstrate experience of having more than 1500 distributors (registrars) accredited by ICANN. Afilias had 1600. Neustar had fewer. There were technical reasons for that and it certainly didn't affect their ability to manage the domain. Respondent has never raised that as an issue. Yet it didn't allow them to meet the preliminary Terms of Reference to even be able to bid on the project

Now it is quite odd to have a domain operator who has been operating it for ten years, very successfully, both in terms of the registrations that had been done, but also in terms of their technical, safety, security, everything related to the operation of the domain and have that person not be qualified to be able to bid on the next concession. That is quite an odd thing to happen. Yet that is precisely what happened.

And I will point out that as
Minister Constaín and the other witnesses state, this was done supposedly in consultation with experts, so even after the consultation with the experts they created, you know, their argument is that even after this consultation with the experts
they ended up creating a tender process where only 10:31 one bidder, Afilias, would be allowed to bid and the current operator would not be qualified to meet the technical qualifications as a bidder.

Afilias drops out, so there was enormous, and this is in the record, we highlight some of the reporting, there was an enormous pressure, very good reporting on what was happening with Afilias and how it certainly appeared by all measures that the tender was designed to allow Afilias to win it and no others.

And when it came time for the bidding to actually happen, Afilias dropped out and didn't end up submitting a bid. Afilias is a US company. I think they probably looked at this. Certain people at the company probably looked at it and decided not to go on with the bid. So, in essence, this attention that was brought, this attention that was brought by .CO Internet, by others, appears to have actually worked and kept this kind of stitch-up, as its referred to in -- one of the reports refers to it as an apparent stitch-up-- for Afilias the stitch-up was avoided and Afilias did not end up bidding.

The new tender which had two bidders, and
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but for the sake of good order I wanted to go
CO Internet was one of the two bidders, was 10:33 drastically different. It is very odd, when I read Respondent saying, you know, why are we here, you got the new bid, what does it matter, you got the new tender. We are talking about a ten-year tender versus a five-year tender, one thing. Much different time period, but also much different in terms of the scope of the financial aspects to it and to maintain that growth and to maintain the administration of it, I think those investments were key and they were proper.

So this is like saying I promised you I would give you 100 USD, but I gave you did five cents instead and you should be happy because I gave you something. That is an absurd argument to make. It is a much different tender. And we have laid out that .CO Internet was sort of forced to do it because it had been the operator and that continuity was important, that reputational risk was important, and that was an issue.

So I amjust going to briefly touch on the claims that we have here.

The first is the MST, the minimum standard of treatment. This is all laid out in the papers but
through some of it. We all know what the provision 10:35 says in the US-Colombia TPA. As many tribunals have noted, including the Tribunal in Eco Oro v Colombia, the MST should not be static. We don't have to go back to the Neer standard in 1926 and look at that and say we have to look at this as we would have looked at it in 1926.

We are not suggesting that other substantive protections be added to the MST but we are saying that the MST develops and is not a static thing and changes over time to account for the reality in the world that we live in.

And as the Tribunal in Mondev International v USA stated:
"To the modern eye, what is unfair or inequitable need not equate with the outrageous or the egregious. In particular, a State may treat a foreign investment ..." -- this was obviously done under NAFTA so has the same MST - "may treat a foreign investment unfairly and inequitably without necessarily acting in bad faith ... the content of the minimum standard today cannot be limited to the content of customary international law as recognised in arbitral decisions in the 1920s'", clearly making a reference to Neer and other cases.

I won't get into this but we all know what $\begin{array}{r}47 \\ 10: 36\end{array}$
Waste Management v Mexico says. Both parties cite
Waste Management v Mexico. I think we all agree it has relevance to it and you can look at how Waste Management v Mexico talks about several different ways that one can offend or violate the MST.

And one very important one in there as you are thinking about this case is the lack of transparency and candour in an administrative process, and we think thatseveral of these -discrimination, arbitrary, grossly unfair -- we think all these things are relevant and if you look at the facts that we lay out with each of these, with discrimination, with arbitrariness, with lack of candour in administrative process, we see all of those, but particularly this lack of candour seems to be very acute in this proceeding.

In Echo Oro they list indicia of
arbitrariness, where we move to the arbitrary part of the discussion, and they list indicia which include: "A measure that inflicts damage on the investor without serving any legitimate purpose; it is not based on legal standards but on discretion, prejudice or personal preference" particularly when that discretion or personal preference is hijacked
by the President of the country as opposed to the $10: 38$ people who are responsible for caretaking it and making those decisions. "A measure taken for reasons that are different from those put forward by the decision-maker", and so on

Paragraphs 227 to 238 of the Reply lay out the facts that show Respondent's actions to be arbitrary, so I would give you that citation so you can look through. I didn't want to go through them all here but they are laid out there and I think they show why we believe these actions to be arbitrary and a violation of the MST.

One fact that bears repeating here is that Respondent refused to negotiate, as we have talked about before, even though Respondent had asserted in previous examples that a negotiation was required or should have happened. Respondent never replied or countered to Neustar's offer as we have also mentioned, another thing that really bears into this question of arbitrariness.

Again, it is like the Teco Guatemala Holdings' case v Guatemala. When there is aprocess that is supposed to happen, if that process is opaque or that process doesn't happen, or there is a lack of candour with regard to that process, and
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that was a case decided under the MST too, those 10:39 actions violate the MST. You can't have a case where nobody understands what is going on, where nobody knows what they have to do, how they have to do it to get an extension, what's required, how the process is made. Even after three witness statements it is very unclear as to how the process was made, and we will get into that when we get into the witnesses.

Respondent in July 2018 told .CO Internet that it needed to change the economics in order to avoid a tender. Now Respondent states that because the economics were changed that the competition law prevents it from extending it. So Respondent says we got to negotiate the economics if we are going to do extension of the concession, and then they say oh, because there is a change in economics, our competition law prevents us from doing an extension of the concession and we have to put it out for tender. That is arbitrary.

Respondent's failure to give a counter-proposal is arbitrary. If their reason was that they didn't like the economics of the deal and the economics had to be different, then that had to be the reason because the performance was good.

Everyone agreed their performance was great. 50
$10: 41$
If the issue was economics, why was there no counter-proposal. Why was this a real lack of transparency, a lack of candour in the administrative process. If you were .CO Internet what would you think to do? You have made an offer, you are not hearing anything back, you see all that is going on with Afilias, you see the President making these decisions. This is the types of facts that arbitrariness is made of.

Respondent engaged in blatant
discrimination with respect to Neustar without any justification. As we have talked about, Afilias, as one reporter put it, "the technical requirements listed by the Colombian government mean that just one single company on the planet is eligible to run the .co registry despite that company being ranked somewhere between 18 and 24 inglobal registries", and again the fact that Afilias dropped out says something about the process

Respondent's tender was discriminatory in that it kept the very successful operator that had been operating the tender for ten years, the original Terms of Reference, they would have been excluded and had there not been interventions and
public pressure I think that might have actually $\begin{array}{r}510: 42\end{array}$ ended up happening, instead of the pressure that changed some of those terms to allow Neustar and other companies to bid.

We have talked about the competition law, how they say you have to change the terms. When we changed the terms, they say you are changing the terms and therefore it has to go to tender.

Respondent failed to act in good faith. These are set out in paragraphs 260 to 266 of the Reply.

Two points regarding this failure to act in good faith deserve highlighting. First, the Claimant's claim does not rest solely on the failure to renew the 2009 concession, but it rests also on the way in which Respondent acted in bad faith in dealing with Neustar and its investment, and this goes to several of the items that for arbitrariness also relate to good faith.

And the other is that Neustar is not required to give a motive. I think there are reasons for motives, ones that are rather apparent. But we don't have to prove corruption, we don't have to prove a secret deal between Afilias and the President, or anyone, to be able to make our case.

We have to point out and show how the actions were $10: 4$ not done in good faith.

The Respondent failed to afford due process to the Claimant, and this is where we get back to the Waste Management where due process is also defined as a complete lack of transparency and candour in the administrative process, so it doesn't have to be a denial of justice, it is not limited.
This lack of due process is not limited to a denial of justice type of claim. You don't have to prove that to get there. You can show among other things, that there is this lack of candour in the administrative process.

Legitimate expectations, had an expectation that they would act in good faith. Those investments were certainly made on that expectation. This is all set out in our Reply in paragraphs 297 to 315 . Had expectations about the law and the language, expectations from the well-known practice in Colombia and the practice where these concessions were extended without effort, essentially.

At a minimum, though, Respondent had an obligation to negotiate the concession. If we had been sitting here and we had tried to reach an
agreement and ultimatelyat the end of the day there $\begin{aligned} 53 \\ \text { 10:45 }\end{aligned}$ were differences that were too large on financial considerations or something else, this would be a little bit of a different case. I am not saying that we wouldn't still - that Respondent wouldn't in that case have violated the agreement, but that would be a different case. But the fact that they wouldn't even sit down and have that discussion really tells you something.

Discrimination -- national treatment and MFN. We have laid that out. We have shown how they did this in other cases. If you allow extensions without - if you allowed extensions as a matter of obligation, a matter of course, for other investors and then you treat one particular investor this way, that is violative of both national treatmentand the MFN and that is laid out in our papers for both of those. We have certainly been treated less favourably than both domestic investors and other foreign investors, and Respondent has not countered with examples or given a real justification for that.

We have our decision-making was not based on public policy rationales, that is also in our papers. Respondent didn't really address it in the

Counter-Memorial and so we view that as waived. $\begin{aligned} & 54 \\ & 10: 46\end{aligned}$
In the memorial at 265 we talk about the requirement to protect the confidential business information, and we also have our argument under the MFN clause generally of article 4.1 of the Swiss-Colombia BIT where you have this use and enjoyment essentially of the Treaty, and that is laid out in the memorial at 266

So with that I am going to turn the mic over to my colleague, Ms Baldwin, to talk about jurisdiction.
by Ms Baldwin
MS BALDWN: Good morning. My name is Chloe Baldwin and I am going to be presenting the Claimant's position on jurisdiction here today.

Now, the Respondent in this dispute has really presented just a litany of jurisdictional objections effectively trying to throwmud at the wall and to see if any of it will stick. As I will discuss today, none of these claims are valid. They either depend on a mischaracterisation of thefacts in issue or novel legal theories that are not only unsupported, but are in fact largely contradicted by its own legal authorities.

These arguments also depend in part on the

Tribunal accepting the smoke and mirrors approach
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that the Respondent has taken to presenting its arguments. And to this last point, as you will see, as we work through the Respondent's objections, the Respondent has continuously tried to raise a spectre of mystery around the Claimant, repeatedly referring to the Claimant as being mysterious, elusive, failing to adduce evidence or providing the redacted documents. But these allegations are wholly fabricated and are designed to establish questions in the Tribunal's mind where really none should exist.

The Respondent does not dispute that the Claimant held a protected investment under the TPA and was a protected investor at the time it filed its Request for Arbitration. The Tribunal can also see the some 158 factual exhibits filed by the Claimant in this dispute which includes extensive corporate documentation, communications with Respondent over the years and other materials supporting its claims.

And while the Respondent complains that the Claimant redacted confidential commercial information not relevant in this dispute, it does admit in the smallest of footnotes that the Claimant
in fact provided its counsel with unredacted copies 10:49 of these materials.

Likewise there is nothing nefarious about the timeline of this dispute, either with the Claimant's actions in properly contesting the Respondent's wrongful measures under the TPA or with the corporate transactions post-dating the Claimant's initiation of this arbitration.

Consequently, and as we discuss the Respondent's jurisdictional objections today, I ask you to bear these facts in mind to cut through the embellishments of the Respondent to determine in fact and in law the Tribunal has jurisdiction to hear the Claimant's claims.

The first jurisdictional objection of the Respondent hinges entirely on its attempts to reframe the Council of State proceedings froma request for interim measures to what it calls a definitive forum selection. Given the Respondent's mischaracterisation of these proceedings and the fact that it also comes up in relation to other jurisdictional objections, I am going to spend a little bit of time walking through the applicable law, what the Council of Stateconsidered and how it reached its conclusions.

First of all, there is no dispute between 10:50 the parties that article 10.18(3) of the TPA expressly carves out actions for interim relief, as do the ICSID Arbitration Rules.

Footnote 9 to article 10.18(3) further confirms that the law applicable to determine actions for interim injunctive relief is local law first and foremost. The United States, in its non-disputing party's submission, further confirms the correctness of this position

So let's look at the local law applicable under which the Claimant brought its request for interim measures. Chapter Eleven of the Colombian Code of Administrative Procedure, referred to here as the CCAP, covers precautionary measures which are set out here in article 230. In order for a court to impose such interim measures, article 231 sets out certain requirements. These include, most relevantly for our purposes, a determination that the claim is reasonably founded in law and that the plaintiff has demonstrated ownership of the rights invoked in seeking interim measures.

Finally, article 234 confirms that if these requirements are fulfilled, a court may adopt urgent precautionary measures.

With these provisions in mind, let's look 10:51 at the Claimant's request for interim measures under the CCAP. On 18 September 2019 the Claimant filed a request before the Council of State for urgent provisional (sic) measures which you see here on the left is the subject of the court's later judgment.

As the court itself recognised, the
Claimant's request was based on article 10.18(3) of
the TPA, ICSID Arbitration Rule 39.6, and article 234 of the CCAP. That is those provisions we have just discussed. And the Claimant filed this request for the sole purposes of preserving its rightand interests during the pendency of the arbitration. This objective is crystal clear from the Claimant's pleadings which, as shown here, requests the court order the Respondent not to aggravate the international investment dispute while the arbitration under the FTA is pending and until a decision is taken on the merits.

Given the nature of the available relief as determined by domestic law, the Claimant formulated its request for interim measures in accordance with article 230 of the CCAP. For example, as you see here on the left-hand side, article 230 refers to the preservation of the status
quo and provides power to the court to suspend 10:52 administrative proceedings, actions, contracts or acts. As you see on the right-hand side, this is precisely what the Claimant requested, the suspension of the roadmap process, suspension of administrative acts and suspension of contracts and acts relating to that process.

Article 230 also provides a court the power to order the adoption of an administrative decision to avoid or prevent aggravation of its effects, or to broadly impose obligations for a party to take action or to refrain from taking action. Again, these powers inform the scope of the Caimant's request, as you see on the right-hand side, which requested the adoption of a decision with respect to its investment and orders that the MinTC both take and refrain from taking certain action.

On 30 October 2019, the court denied the Caimant's application on procedural grounds as both parties agreed, because no Request for Arbitration had yet been filed, only the notice of intent to arbitrate.

Concerned for the protection of its investments and the preservations of its rights
while it tried to consult with the Respondent under the TPA, the Claimant filed a request for review of the order on 14 November 2019, more than a month before it filed its Request for Arbitration.

On 12 March 2020, the Council of State again rejected the Claimant's request. The basis for this decision was procedural, not a substantive review of the merits, as the Respondent nowasserts. As you can see here, the court considered that the request for interim measures fulfilled the requirement of urgency. However, it determined that the request did not satisfy the legal requirement of an appearance of good law as set out in articles 231 of the CCAP.

In issuing its decision, the court stressed that the study of appearance of good law is a requirement under Colombian law to issueinterim measures and does not imply prejudgment of the merits of the case.

In determining whether the Claimant had the appearance of good law in order to obtain interim measures, the court looked at its rights under Colombian law and the need to protect its rights as an investor of the United States. The court decided, wrongly in the Claimant's opinion,
that although the Claimant is an investor of the 10:55 United States, it had no investment for the purposes of the CCAP, and therefore no rights to be affected or protected by interim measures.

In reaching this conclusion and denying the request under procedural grounds, the court addressed the brief arguments submitted by the Claimant to show that its request had the prima facie appearance of good law. The court's consideration of these issues was brief and encompassed four subparagraphs of its decision.

As you can see here, this consideration is hardly a detailed analysis of the Claimant's claims under the TPA. It does not refer to any evidence, any submissions of the parties and the merits of the dispute under the TPA itself, and it is entirely conclusory.

Despite this clear record by its own Council of State, the Respondent has asserted that the Claimant made a definitive forum selection under annex 10G of the TPA, a provision whichas you see here expressly refers to those requirements set out in article 10.16.1.

It is clear from the record of these proceedings that the Claimant never alleged a breach
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of section A of the TPA for resolution by the 10:56
Council of State as required under 10.16.1. The request for provisional measures under the CCAP was entirely distinct from the Claimant's actual claims of breach under the TPA which you see here on the right-hand side.

Moreover, the Request for Relief the Claimant submitted in the Council of State proceedings did not allege loss or damage but was formulated in line with article 230 of the CCAP as we discussed just a moment ago And by contrast, as you see here on the opposite side of the screen, the Claimant in this arbitration proceedings has alleged loss and damage as a direct result of the Claimant's breach of the TPA and principles of customary international law.

Finally, the Respondent has repeatedly argued that the purpose of annex $10-\mathrm{G}$ is toshield the state from the risk of multiple proceedings to prevent double recovery and conflicting outcomes, but this argument is entirely hypothetical in this case. The Respondent here was subject to one request for provisional measures in domestic proceedings by the Claimant, as is permissible under article 10.18.3 of the TPA.

This proceeding concluded at the outset of $\begin{array}{r}63 \\ \hline 1057\end{array}$ the arbitration before this Tribunal was even constituted. There is no duplication of proceedings, no conflicting decisions, and not even a request for double recovery, let alone an order for the same. In these circumstances the Tribunal should be able to easily dismiss the first of the Respondent's objections to jurisdiction.

The basis of the Respondent's second objection to jurisdiction is the waiver requirement which is set out in article 10.18.2 and 3 of the TPA, which is set out here on your screen for reference.

The first limb of the Respondent's objection is that the Claimant's written waiver contains formal defects and thus it does not satisfy the preconditions to arbitration. The Respondent's argument is incorrect, both as a matter of fact and of law.

First, the Claimant's written waiver attached to the Request for Arbitrationoperates to renounce any rights to initiate claims before any tribunal or court in a domestic forum with respect to any proceeding relating to the measures in this arbitration. As the Claimant explained in
paragraphs 54 to 64 of their Reply, the formulation $10: 58$ of its waiver was based on the requirements of the TPA and the facts in issue in this dispute.

In any event, however, the Respondent's
claims that the waiver is invalid because it refers to Colombian law and the initiation of disputes is irrelevant. This is because the Claimant in its Request for Arbitration also expressly included a waiver under the terms of article 10.18(2) and as the Respondent's own legal authorityAmorrortu v Peru confirms, there is no support for the position that a waiver under this provision must be included in a document separate from the Request for Arbitration or must be signed personally by the Claimant.

In this respect the Claimant's further waiver in its request signed by Claimant's counsel not only remedies the alleged defect in its separate waiver, but would alone fulfil the conditions set out in article 10.18(2).

Moreover, the Respondent's claim that the Claimant's waiver was limited and conditional in the same way as it cited casesof Renco and Amorrortu is unfounded. In these cases, as you see here on the screen, the Claimant's added clauses to reserve
rights to bring their claims in other forums in the 11:00 event that those tribunals found that they lacked jurisdiction. No such reservation of right was included in the Claimant's waiver and it did not limit or condition its waiver in any way, as you can see by means of comparison in the third column. The Respondent's assertion of a formal defect must therefore be dismissed.

You may be relieved to hear that the second set of arguments can be dismissed relatively expeditiously in light of our already extensive discussion on the Council of State's proceedings. In effect, the second limb of the argument is that the Respondent asserts that the alleged continuation of the Council of State proceedings amounts to a material defect of the waiver requirement. But this position fails to account for article 10.18 on interim measures. It is contradicted by its own legal authorities, the United States non-disputing party's submission, and the findings of the Council of State itself as we have already discussed and as you see here.

In light of this evidence, there is simply no basis for the Respondent's assertion that the Council of State proceedings is a violation of the
waiver requirement.
Moving to the third of the Respondent's objections, it asserts that this Tribunal lacks jurisdiction because preliminary requirements of the TPA have allegedly not been met. The Respondent first argues that the notice of intent did not comply with the requirements as set out in article 10.16(2) of the TPA as you see here.

The Respondent raised a similar objection in Eco Oro v Colombia which was rejected by the Tribunal. In considering the purpose of the requirements of the notice of intent, the Tribunal confirmed that it is to ensure that a state 'is provided with sufficient detail to enable it to engage in constructive and informed discussions with the investor before the arbitration is commenced"', and the Respondent has itself described the purpose of a notice of intent as to enable the state to prepare and argue its defence by having "a clear framework of the claims'.

With that in mind I want to look at the Claimant's notice of intent in this dispute

As you can see hereon the screen, the notice comprised of a number of parts covering all aspects of the requirements set out under article
10.16(2) of the TPA. The notice was detailed and 11:02 spanned nearly 40 pages. This can be compared to the notices of intent provided in disputes with similar provisions which range, as you see here, from 4-17 pages, and while the Respondent asserts in its Rejoinder that the length of the notice appears to be the Claimant's main defence, the Claimant merely described the comparative length of its notice to root the Respondent's assertions in reality. The point remainsthat in this case the Claimant was careful to draft a detailed notice of intent to ensure that the Respondent had a framework of the claims in issue to facilitate resolution.

For example, with respect to the legal and factual basis for each claim as required under article 10.16(2), the Claimant not only drafted a detailed introductory overview and factual section, but then linked these facts with each of the specific claims in dispute. The Tribunal can see for itself the scope of these discussions in the notice of intent which included discussions of fact from pages 4 to 25 and then discussions of law and causation from pages 25 to 33 . These are with respect to the Respondent's failure to comply with the minimum standard of treatment under article
under 10.14 of the TPA. As a preliminary matter, $11: 04$ article 10.16(4) of the TPA makes clear that it is the Request for Arbitration that is the controlling document for the claims asserted, not the notice of intent. As the Kappes Tribunal noted under a similar provision, it is perfectly permissible to later specify the claims in the Request for Arbitration. This is not a convoluted argument as the Respondent asserts in its Rejoinder, but a point evident on the plain terms of the provision as the Kappes Tribunal notes.

Here under the Request for Arbitration filed on 23 September 2019 specifically identified claims under the Swiss-Colombia BIT and specifically pled a factual basis for claims that the Respondent had breached article 10.14. Even if this were not the case, the Claimant's claims under this provision clearly relate to the same subject matter of dispute under ICSID Arbitration Rule 40, and as described by the Tribunal in Eco Oro. The Respondent's arguments relating to the Claimant's notice of intent compliance with article 10.16 should therefore be rejected.

The Respondent then asserts that the Claimant filed its notice of intent prematurely,
because according to it no investment dispute under 11:06 article 10.16(1) existed until the Claimant filed its memorial on 22 October 2021. The definition of a dispute has been considered by numerous tribunals and there doesn't appear to be any real contention that a dispute will exist where there is a disagreement on a point of law, or a fact, or a difference of claims or positions that had been presented by one party to the other that is either ignored or contested by the other party. These elements are all met here.

On 7 June 2019, the Claimant notified the Respondent that it intended to file a notice of intent under the TPA describing the investment dispute by virtue of its position on the law and on the facts. The Claimant then filed a formal notice of intent on 13 September 2019, again setting out its position on the facts and the law as we have already discussed at length this morning.

The Respondent provided no written response to the Claimant's letter of 7 June 2019. In other words, the Respondent ignored the Claimant's position on points of law and fact for a period of roughly two months before the Claimant filed a formal notice of intent. The Respondent
then continued to ignore the positions taken by the 11:07
Claimant for another three months. Then just days before the expiry of the 90-day cooling off period, the Respondent contestedthe Claimant's position on both the facts and the law.

On 23 December 2019, the Claimant therefore submitted its Request for Arbitration, again highlighting the existence of an investment dispute between the parties. TheClaimant explained how the notice of intent had set outa dispute on the facts, law, and with respect to damages, and how the Respondent had ignored and then rejected the Claimant's position.

In light of this evidence, it is abundantly clear that there existed an investment dispute for the purposes of the TPA and the ICSID Convention as early as June 2019, at least when the notice of intent was submitted in September 2019, and most certainly when the Request for Arbitration was filed in December of the same year.

We are getting there.
Under its fourth objection to jurisdiction, the Respondent asserts that the Claimant does not have standing to bring and
maintain a dispute before this Tribunal. At the 11:08 outset, the Respondent has acknowledged that the assessment of jurisdiction occurs at the initiation of the proceedings. However, and in order to support its jurisdictional objections, the Respondent has asserted that in this case the proceedings were only initiated by the filing of the Claimant's memorial on 22 October 2021.

But the Respondent's argument is undermined by the TPA, the ICSID Convention, and its own legal authorities, all of which confirm that the initiation of arbitration proceedings occurs at the date of the Request for Arbitration, as you can see here on the screen. In fact, not a single authority supports the Respondent's novel position.

At the time the Claimant filed its Request for Arbitration on 23 December 2019, it wholly owned .CO Internet as demonstrated by documents from the Respondent itself. The Respondent has not disputed this point and nor could it.

Instead, the Respondent argues that the Claimant lacks standing because it no longer owned or controlled the investment at stake when it filed its memorial. As we have just seen, this is legally inaccurate. In fact multiple tribunals and
commentators have noted that events taking place 11:09 after the date of Request for Arbitration will not affect jurisdiction.

Here, the Claimant signed a unit purchase agreement with GoDaddyfor the sale of.CO Internet and other assets on 3 April 2020, more than three months after it had filed its Request for Arbitration. The sale was not completed until August 2020, well after this day. The Respondent's attempt to paint theClaimant's sale to GoDaddy as precluding the jurisdiction of this Tribunal is therefore entirely unwarranted.

The Respondent then attempts to bolster its arguments by asserting that at the dateof the Request for Arbitration, it could not beconsidered - the date of Request for Arbitration could not be considered the date to determine standing because the dispute had not crystallised, the Request for Arbitration had excluded claims and the Claimant had modified its claims. I have already discussed each of these in some detail and in our Reply submission. I am not going to rehash them here.

The second strand of the Respondent's argument on standing appeared in the Rejoinder and relates to the Claimant's spin-out. In filing its

Reply, the Claimant explained that, on 11
1 December 2021, the ultimate beneficial owners of the Claimant, Golden Gate Capital and GIC, sold Neustar's fraud, marketing and communications business to TransUnion. However, this transaction excluded Neustar's legacy cloud-oriented security services business, which was spun out as Neustar Security Services.

Now the Respondent has accused the Claimant of acting in bad faith and asserting that it is attempting to replace the original Claimant in these proceedings with a third party. But it is clear by the evidence submitted by the Claimant in its Reply and in its letters dated 29 July,
15 September and 3 October 2022 that Neustar Security Services is not a third party.

The rights to the arbitration and the Claimant's standing to maintain its claims before this Tribunal were preserved under the terms of the unit purchase agreement which was provided in redacted form as exhibit C-136 and in unredacted form to the Respondent's counsel on 28 November 2022. The terms of the agreement show that Neustar Security Services has the rights under the ICSID claimand is the successor of Neustar's


Moreover, and as the Respondent itself notes, Neustar Security Services has maintained board and management continuity from Neustar Inc including those involved in this dispute. As you can see from the Respondent's dramatis on the right-hand side, Neustar's CEO, Charlie Gottdiener, also now serves as director on the Neustar Security Services board of directors. Likewise, the executive vice president, general counsel and corporate secretary of both Neustar and now Neustar Security Services Mr Kevin Hughes is here with us today.

For the avoidance of doubt, Neustar Security Services also remains under the same beneficial ownership as Neustar Inc. As you can see here from exhibits from the Request for Arbitration, RfA-13 and 14, Neustar Inc was funded by Golden Gate Capital and GIC Investments, both companies incorporated in the United States.

As widely reported and outlined in the Claimant's letters on this issue, including with links to SEC documents, Neustar Security Services remains a portfolio company of Golden Gate Capital and GIC. There is nothing in the TPA or the

ICSID Convention that prevents Claimant from 11:13 retaining its treaty claims and the Respondent's argument that the Claimant must have been clearly identified under these instruments is nothing more than a red herring in this case

The Claimant has been clearly identified throughout these proceedings and has not changed in substance. The same board members signing the internal approvals to commence this arbitration in December 2019, Rishi Chandra, David Dominik, and Charlie Gottdiener remain part of the board of Neustar Security Services today and Mr Hughes, the original Claimant representative in the trigger letter, notice of intent and Request for Arbitration sits here as the client representative for Neustar Security Services. The Respondent's arguments therefore have no basis.

Turning to the fifth objection, the Respondent asserted in its Counter-Memorial that the type of abusive process arising in this case was where an investor engages in 'corporate restructuring for the purposes of gaining jurisdiction" and that the criteria to assess whether such restructuring constitutes an abuse of process is whether the investment dispute was
foreseeable at the time. $\quad \begin{array}{r}71 \\ \hline 14\end{array}$
In its Reply, the Claimant pointed out
that all of the cases cited by the Respondent involved a circumstance where the Claimant engaged in conduct to gain jurisdiction which it otherwise would not have had, which is not the case here.

The Respondent then somewhat backtracked asserting, somewhat confusingly, that it never submitted that this case involved a situation where the Claimant would have tried to gain jurisdiction through corporate restructuring, but that the Claimant had engaged in conduct to gain jurisdiction. But this misses the point. Why would a claimant who already has standing to bring a claim under the TPA engage in conduct to gain jurisdiction? There is simply nothing to gain

The Respondent also lacks any factual support in the circumstances of this dispute. The timeline in issue is uncomplicated and straightforward and I won't rehash it here again but put it here for reference.

In insisting that the Claimant's initiation of the dispute on 23 December 2019 was an abuse of process, the Respondent bears a high burden of proof to support its allegations and to
demonstrate exceptional circumstances as you see 11:16 here. Even if the Respondent had produced a single legal authority in support of its novel claim, it has not met this burden to demonstrate an abuse of process. In fact, each piece of evidence that the Respondent claims it has been unable to uncover has a very simple and logical explanation.

I am going to run through these quickly here simply because it demonstrates the absurdity of some of the Respondent's allegations. The Respondent first asserts that the Claimant in GoDaddy started negotiating a year before they announced the transaction. It is not uncommon for large corporations to engage in lengthy negotiations before reaching agreement, particularly when the sale is worth hundreds of millions of dollars covering a range of business interests as here.

The Respondent then submits that negotiations were finalised before the Claimant filed its Request for Arbitration and blindly asserts that this must mean there is an abuse of process. But the Respondent has not produced one iota of evidence for its speculation on the finalisation of negotiations which is not only incorrect, but it is also irrelevant.

The unit purchase agreement on the record 11:17 of these proceedings was signed on 3 April 2020, more than three months after the Claimant had filed its Request for Arbitration. It is simply not commercial practice to sit on the finalisation of agreements after terms are agreed and said companies want to sign almost immediately to ensure the deal remains in place.

The Respondent then asserts that the Claimant conducted an internal restructuring in February to 2020 to transfer .CO Internet to Registry Services LLC. Again, by this time the Claimant had already filed its Request for Arbitration and it is unclear how this would somehow demonstrate an abuse of process by initiating proceedings.

In any event, Registry Services was a fully owned subsidiary and made no difference to the Claimant's status as an protected investor. The irony is of course that the transfer was done in connection with the Respondent's RFPfor the tender process. The Respondent's statementthat there is no evidence that Registry Services LLC remained under Neustar's control is debunked by the recital of exhibit C-126 which confirms that the Claimant
"wholly and directly" held Registry Services at the 11:18 relevant time.

The Respondent then concludes that because Claimant and GoDaddy signed the unit purchase agreement on 3 April 2020, the same day as MinTIC issued Resolution 649, that this again is somehow evidence of abuse of process. But the agreement itself makes clear that there were no rights to terminate and the agreement was set with or without the .CO tender.

Finally, the Respondent argues that the fact that the Claimant kept the sale secret shows that it was somehow abusive. These arguments continue to expose the naivety of its understanding of large scale business transactions.

Prior to 3 April 2020 there was no sale to disclose. Publication of the negotiations would have placed the sale in jeopardy, not to mention would have given rise to serious legal consequences arising out of a breach of SEC rules and commercial confidentiality provisions. The fact that the sale was not announced until 6 April 2020 simply reflects that the deal was concluded late ona Friday, 3 April, and business practice is to wait until before the market opens the following Monday, that
is 6 April.
In conclusion, the Respondent has failed to demonstrate an abuse of process through the initiation of these proceedings and its speculation on the Claimant's alleged motives and actions cannot be sustained.

Perhaps aware of these fundamental shortcomings, the Respondent then claims that the Claimant has sought to use the ICSID proceedings for what it terms to be "purposes other than genuine dispute resolution'. The Respondent bases this theory on an article by the late Professor Gaillard. In that article, Professor Gaillard provided three types of actions which might interfere with genuine dispute resolution.

The Respondent in its Rejoinder objected to the Claimant's description of these three examples, and so I have reproduced them here on screen. In essence, the three categories identified are, first, bringing a claim for the primary purpose of gaining media attention, including the publication of expert reports before they were even filed with the Tribunal. Second, where a claim is sought to block ongoing criminal investigations by the host state, and, third, where a series of
claimants have brought multiple disputes at all $\begin{array}{ll}\text { 11:20 } & 82\end{array}$ levels of the corporate chain against the host state.

It is obvious that these three categories are not in issue in this dispute. Instead, the Respondent seeks to broaden Professor Gaillard's theory, embarking on some more wild factual accusations without the evidence to support it. But again these accusations are not grounded in reality.

For example, the reason the Claimant sent a letter to the Respondent on 7 June 2019 was to advise that it considered a dispute to exist under the TPA and to provide the Respondent almost double the cooling off period to consult and engage in negotiations. There is nothing nefarious about a claimant trying to actively engage a host state to resolve a disagreement.

The same is true of the fact that the Claimant allegedly mentioned the TPA to both the Ministry of Commerce and MinTIC to create confusion. Annex 10-C of the TPA requires a disputedocuments to be filed with the Ministry of Commerce, and far fromtrying to creating confusion, the Claimant was simply trying to keep MinTIC informed, given that its actions formed the basis of the dispute in
issue. And likewise because the dispute had crystallised as early as June 2019, there is simply no basis that the Claimant somehow submitted its notice of intent and Request for Arbitration to thwart the 2020tender process. The tender process in fact did not commence until 13 December 2019, three months after the daimant had submitted its notice of intent and just as the cooling off period ended.

I won't rehash the fundamental flaws with the Respondent's assertions that the Claimant's request for interim measures under article 10.18 amounts to an abuse of process, nor the articulation of the Claimant's claims. However, I do want to raise that, in its Counter-Memorial, the Respondent asserted that the Claimant was somehow using this arbitration to air claims against Arcelandia relating to the 2014 acquisition of .CO Internet. The Respondent now appears to have quietly dropped these claims, presumably because there was no evidence in support of its assertion, even after the Claimant produced documents as ordered by the Tribunal.

Finally, the Respondent asserts that the Claimant has engaged in an abuse of process simply
because it has brought this dispute against the 11:23
Respondent. However, as my colleague has already discussed, the Claimant initiated these proceedings to remedy the international wrongful conduct of the Respondent. The Claimant's attempt to hold the Respondent accountable for its actions under the TPA negotiated and agreed to by Colombia and the United States does not amount an abuse of process. The final objection to jurisdiction raised by the Respondent is the claim that this dispute is a contract dispute. As always, the Respondent has advanced two lines of arguments under its objection, the first being that the Claimant's case is a contractual claim, dressed up as a treaty case, and the second being that the inclusion of an arbitration clause in the concession means that the ICSID proceeding is not the appropriate dispute resolution forum.

As an initial and fundamental matter, tribunals have repeatedly recognised that an investment based on a contract may gave rise to treaty claims. The Respondent does not dispute this, and nor could it. Nor does the Respondent dispute that distinguishing between a contract claim and a treaty claim depends on whether the respondent
state has acted in its sovereign capacity
Instead, the Respondent claims that the Claimant is simply pretending that this claim is treaty-based, when in fact in reality it is a contract claim However, it is clear from the facts before this Tribunal and the claims advanced arising out of those facts that the Respondent's actions amount to those taken in its sovereign capacity.

There is no dispute between the parties that the .co domain is a public asset, regulated by Colombian laws and administrative acts. As you see here, the legal framework governing the .co domain as a sovereign asset is extensive and longstanding. Moreover, the actions taken by the Respondent leading to this dispute were not actions taken by MinTIC in its commercial capacity.

The Respondent's actions taken to exclude the Claimant from advisory committee meetings was done by sovereign act, overriding the express terms of 2009 RFP and concession. The advisory committee was then distinctly composed of governmentofficials acting in their sovereign capacity, not as a commercial partner in a contract negotiation. And, as you can see here, advisory committee meeting minutes reflect Minister Constaín advising that the
future of the .co domain was such to the 86
$11: 25$ considerations of the national government. She also stated in an interview that Colombia made the decision with respect to the concession, notably not the contracting partner.

And while the report of the Vice Ministry of Digital Economy in July 2018 had recommended engaging in negotiations for the extension of the concession, the Respondent delayed this work due to presidential elections. If the Respondent was simply acting as a commercial partner, it is unclear why this would matter.

The President of Colombia was also regularly briefed and updated on the actions taken by MinTIC on the future of the .CO domain as explained by Ms Constaín's in her witness statement. Again, if the actions taken by Respondent were solely in its capacity as a contractual party, it would make little sense to seek political input in such actions.

In short, the Respondent has effectively admitted that its political processes guided its actions with respect to the concessions, not commercial contractual decisions. And nowhere was this clearer than the tweet of the presidential
adviser on 17 March 2019, stating that the President ${ }_{11} 8$ would announce the tender process for .CO for later in the year. Yet, by its own account, the Respondent says that Min7C only decided in the advisory committee meeting on 19 March that it would take this course of action two days later.

Then the President announced on 30 March that the public tendering process for the administration of the .CO domain would be launched. Neustar, as the party to concession was not formally informed of this decision until two weeks later.

Moreover, the Claimant's claims are clearly treaty-based and go far beyond the obligation to merely extend the concessionbased on contractual language. Although the Respondent continues to try and fundamentally represent the Claimant's claims of breach under the TPA, framing them as a question of contractual interpretation, but the Tribunal can read the submissions of the parties for themselves and note that the Claimant's case is devoid of any claim that the Respondent breached a particular term of the concession, any request for damages based on a breach of the concession, any request that the Tribunal settle
$\begin{array}{lrl}\text { treaty claims raised by the Claimant, as I have just } & 11: 29\end{array}$ discussed.

You will be relieved to hear, no doubt, that that concludes my comments on the Respondent's jurisdictional objections. I thank you for your attention. The Claimant is of course ready to answer any questions, but in the meantime I will hand over to Mr Baldwin to wrap up the presentation.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. On my clock you have about eight minutes left of the two hours -- we started a bit early -- and we will benefit from that, but Mr Baldwin, do you want to add anything further?
by Mr Baldwin
MR BALDWN: Yes. Thank you, Mr President. Just a few concluding thoughts to this but we will be under our two hours.

The first thing you have just heard Mrs Baldwin go through - when I say Mrs Baldwin I think I am talking about my mother, definitely not my mother - you have just heard Mrs Baldwin go through a very long discussion of the jurisdictional objections in this case, and I think you can listen to how much those are wellfounded when you think about the way this case has been prosecuted, the way
this case has been defended, I think you have to 90 look at the fact that we have spent a lot of time on these jurisdictional objections. Some are very questionable and some relay a lack of understanding of simple concepts of corporate law.

I don't think my colleagues on the other side were very happy when we took Hogan Lovells' corporate law page and displayed it, but it was important because they were acting like a spin-out had never happened. Like when Neustar went through the spin-out that this was a novel thing, when their own corporate law page had an entire page devoted to it, talking about it being common, talking about this is the way. These are natural business transactions. The assertions that you hear Mrs Baldwin make about the sale that was a secret sale, they kept the sale secret. All sales of that are secret. All sales like that don't become final. The negotiations continue until the agreement is signed. Until that agreement is signed, there is nothing. Until that agreement is signed, you have a piece of paper. You have discussions between the parties. So to act as if this is to create these issues and to make these representations and to do all these objections which require so much work has
really added to this case in a way that is not good. 11:32
They spent 100 pages making their jurisdictional objections, we spent 80 pages addressing those and almost an hour here today, so we just mention that as part of this proceeding The Claimant's presentation of its case, I have heard Respondent on numerous occasions talk about that oh, I have never seen a claimant without witnesses. What is going on with these witnesses. Well, there are several factors going on.

The first is that the witnesses who worked for .CO, and correspondingly at least one of them also worked for Neustar, but the witnessesthat worked for .CO that were involved and the people I was meeting with who were involved in this case and the facts in this case continueto work for .CO, or continued to work for .CQ, and are now working for the company that is administering the new concession for Respondent, and I think -- and they also now work for a different company, GoDaddy being their ultimate owner.

It is very obvious that those people -- it would be difficult for them as they are dealing with the Respondent on these contracts to come forward and put together witness statements. We have seen
?
and I showed you the number of disputes that 11:33
Colombia has going on right now to act as if there wouldn't be pressure on them or there wouldn't be reprisals or recriminations for them submitting a witness statement is absurd, so the people with the knowledge of that are those peoplewho were in that position that makes it very difficult for them to put a witness statement.

But what do we have instead of witness statements? What we rely on for these assertions are contemporaneous documents -- letters, minutes -other things that reflect what was happening at the time, and I would ask you, is a witness who is telling a story, a story with not much documentary evidence to support the assertions they are making, that is telling a story years later, is that a better proof of what happened? Or are contemporaneous documents that state facs and lay out what was happening and in which cases the Respondent either doesn't challenge the fact or accepts it, or when they do they note their disagreement as to whether or not, for example, the extension was required, as opposed to being in their discretion.

So I just point that out because I know my
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colleagues in their presentation have at least one | 11:35 |
| :--- |
| 15 |

slide where they want to sayoh, we have never seen anything like this. This is a bit of a unique situation, but I would ask you, as people who decide these cases, whether you find a contemporaneous document set out, sent to the other party with the other party allowing to comment, a better proof than a witness's recollection without any support later. So that is what we have in this case andwe think that is very strong and very good.

Respondent's witnesses, on the other hand, as we will see as we go through this, have very limited knowledge. They come in in August and September of 2018 with regard to this contract, they don't have the background, they don't have the continuity of what happened before they came in, they don't provide the documents that one might expect them to provide to support the assertions that they made. So the fact that they have three witnesses and we have none is a function of how this case developed, and certainly we could have saidoh less blunt criticism by putting in a witness, but there is enough, our US folks here and the UNGTRAL hearings right now, there is enough discussion of the proliferation of unnecessary work for these
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cases, and I think it is important that these cases $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11:36 } \\ & \text { are run so that evidence that is important, relevant } \\ & \text { and strong is presented, and that is how cases } \\ & \text { should be run. We shouldn't put in witnesses just } \\ & \text { to do it so the other sidedoesn't stand up here and } \\ & \text { repeatedly say that. So I wanted to make that point } \\ & \text { about the difference of the presentations of the } \\ & \text { cases. }\end{aligned}$
Also, and I mentioned this and my colleague mentioned it too, as you go through -- and I mentioned this 93 per cent profits thing -- as you go through the Respondent's case we would ask you to look at the assertionsthey make and see how they measure up with regard to facts in the case, and one is this example of them saying that Neustar received 93 per cent of the profits. This is what made them mad, gorging on 93 per cent of the profits. It is a complete misunderstanding, just like the corporate law questions are a complete misunderstanding.

With that, we conclude. We thank the
Tribunal for their attention and conclude our opening presentation.

PRESIDENT: Thank you, Mr Baldwin and thank you, Ms Baldwin. We don't have any questions now. I think in any event we will withhold our
questions until we have heard the response andthen 11:37
we will see whether we put these to counsel or whether we keep them for the Wednesday morning discussion.

If you agree, we are running ahead of time, which is a wonderful thing let's take our 15-minute break now and then we will proceed with Respondent's opening statement

MR GOUIFFĖS: You mean our opening statement is going to be cut? Because we need to have lunch and if we take 15 minutes it will be 12 which is what was anticipated in the calendar, and we were supposed to restart at 1 . Sothat means if we are starting now, it means we have lunch at 2 pm .

PRESIDENT: I am not sure to what extent lunch will be available downstairs. If we are going to then start at 20minutes to 1, it might be a little bit short time for eating but we can manage on that I would expect.

MR GOUIFFĖS: I misunderstood, Mr Chairman. We didn't have the 15-minute break this morning because everything went quicker, which is great.

PRESIDENT: I think we should break now and we should revert at - I make it 20 minutes to
which I will make, Ana Maria Ordoñez for the $\begin{array}{r}\text { 12:43 }\end{array}$
Colombian Legal Defence Agency will address the Tribunal for five minutes also. She will speak in Spanish so at that point in time you will have to put on your headsets or not. Then I will take back the floor, present the factual and procedural background of this dispute for 45 minutes or sa

So, introduction, then Ana Maria and then myself relevant factual and procedural background for 45 minutes or so, then my colleague, Melissa Ordoñez, will explain why the claims are outside the Tribunal's jurisdiction for quite an unusual number of reasons in this case, and she will take 30 minutes or so to dothat. And then my colleague, Dan González, will explain why the claims are in any event meritless and request that this Tribunal award the Republic of Colombiathe entirety of its fees and costs. That is going to take another 30 minutes also. So that is the plan

This case is about a former investor, Neustar, which after having profited of Colombia for ten years and having failed to coerce Colombia through aggressive procedural tactics, which we are going to present later on, is now trying to extract undue further profit before this Tribunal.
the renewal (allegedly 350 million USD). $\begin{array}{r}99 \\ \hline 12: 46\end{array}$
In all aspects this opportunistic claim should be dismissed and the full costs that Colombia had to incur to defend itself against this abusive process should be reimbursed, and on that point we will ask the Tribunal to issue an award against Neustar Inc and not just against Security Services LLC, maybe also against Security Services LLC, but we will develop that later, but certainly against Neustar Inc, which started this arbitration, so its Request for Arbitration. I pass the floor to Ana Maria Ordoñez.

MS ORDOÑEZ PUENTES: As it was announced, as Colombia State's representative, I will address you in Spanish.

Good afternoon. A very warm greeting to the President and other members of the Tribunal. I would like to greet our opposite colleagues, the ICSID team, court reporters and interpreters that are making this possible

I would in the next few minuteslike to set forward to you the peculiarities of this case, so that without any confusion we understand that this is a case of an abuse of the use of arbitration proceedings.

From 2010.CO Internet, which was the $\begin{aligned} \text { 12:44 } \\ 98\end{aligned}$ joint venture between Neustar and Arcelandia, operated Colombia's domain .co pursuant to the 2009 Contract under which it kept 93 per cent of the proceeds.

The 2009 Contract provided for a 10year term which "may" be renewed by mutual consent. This 'may be renewed' of course is key to this arbitration.

When Neustar fully acquired. CO Internet in 2014, so halfway through the 2009 Contract, it could not ignore that a renewal was only a possibility.

In 2019, as the term of this first contract was to expire and the market had considerably evolved, MinTIC, which is the Ministry of Telecommunications of Colombia, decided to re-tender the operation of the.co domain and .CO Internet participated in the process and ultimately won the tender on 3 April 2020. So why they are on the other side? I am not sure.

Despite this, Neustar walked out, announcing its sale of .CO Internet to GoDaddy shortly after and testing its luck before this Tribunal in order to extract the supposed value of

> I will, in order to do so, very briefly 12:48 refer to the legitimate measures.

> I would like to take these next few moments to present to you the specifics of this case so that there is no misunderstanding, and we understand that we are facing here a clear abuse of an arbitration proceeding, and I will for that purpose refer to the measures in dispute and I would very respectfully ask that you take an exemplary decision to avoid this type of case ever happening again.

As the director of the international legal defence department at the national agency for state's legal defence, it has been my responsibility to lead Colombia's defence in 21 international investment arbitrations, and it is quite striking that this is the first case in which the investor, the Claimant, voluntarily accepts and at the same time is benefiting from the very measures that they are now questioning before an international investment arbitration tribunal.

This is the main reason why we are saying that this is an irresponsible use of international investment arbitration.

You will notice in the Claimant's claims
that what is being claimed does not actually reflect 12:50
how the facts actually unfolded and this arbitration has been taken forward in carrying for Colombia some disproportionate costs and efforts, taking into account that the claim isn't supported neither in law nor in fact, and that we don't really know who Neustar or Security Services LLC are. We are looking at a legitimate decision taken by the Ministry of Information, Technology and Communication ( MinTC ) to exercise its contractual right not to renew a concession. The rules were clear. There were no surprises, no breaches, and in the next few days you will see that this is a responsible and very diligent state in terms of the way it manages a public resource which proved to be extremely valuable.

The Claimant, without grounds nor evidence, holds that it had the right to lave its contract extended according to conditions that were agreed upon ten years previously, and theobvious reason for that is that they wish to continue to enjoy the very lucrative and very high income that this contract confers. But the language of the Contract was very clear. The extension was a possibility and it had to be agreed upon freely by
exercise by Neustar to try and get the most out ofa
business that they had undertaken for ten years before leaving the country, just before they presented their Request for Arbitration

The Claimant unduly feels entitled to keep receiving 93 per cent of the business income, and they have tried to misrepresent a reasonable and legitimate decision that was taken and have presented it as a breach of right that they never actually had, and this is what they are putting to the Tribunal.

The State of Colombia is fully committed to its international obligations. Proof of that can be found in six out of the seven international awards that have been found in favour of Colombia, thanks to which we can report a 99 per cent monetary success rate for Colombia in investment arbitration.

The State believes that arbitration should be used in good faith, preventing opportunists from using this mechanism. This case in hand is a clear example of an abusive practice by the Claimant who is seeking to get ICSID jurisdiction in order to ignore the words of the Contract signed in 2009 and get unjust compensation for it, but we hope this is not a waste of Colombia's resources which could have
both parties.
102
In light of this, the Claimant has had to argue that the decision not to renew the2009 Contract was a mistake and that the 2020 bidding process was pitted with acts of corruption. These are just allegations and are not based on anything more than speculation. There is no reality behind the fact and there is no proof to show it and in the next few days you will have the opportunity to hear from three of the high State officials who were directly involved in said decision:
Sylvia Constaín, who was the Minister of the MinTIC at the time, Luisa Trujillo, previously Secretary General of the Ministry, and Iván Castaño, former director for development of industry of MinTIC.

All of this was done in a transparently, diligently and in a well informed way. This is how the state of Colombia took the decisions that the current dispute refers to. However, the Claimant has not provided any testimonial evidence to support its allegation.

This case has many jurisdictional defects which prevent the Tribunal from actually being competent to hear the case.

Gentlemen, this is an opportunistic
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

$\qquad$
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Then in 2019 the new tender process. The result of 12:56
the tender process in the fifth part, and then I will present two things which are in parallel or afterwards in part which is the sale of .CO Internet from Neustar to GoDaddy and the several proceedings launched against MinTIC to pressurise the government.

So, if I go on my first part, you have here a simplified chart. If I start with
Respondent, which is easiest, you have the Republic of Colombia, then the MinTIC, which is the Ministry of Telecommunication, although the only respondent is the Republic of Colombia. At the bottom you see here on our chart we have put in blue the .co domain, which is the Colombia public asset which I believe was incorrectly described this morning but we will come back to that later.

Then you have the .CO Internet, which is the domain operator, which is a Colombian company, and on the Claimant's side of course, and what is relevant for this Tribunal, Neustar Inc, which started the Request for Arbitration in 2019, which from 2009 to 2014 owns only 1 per cent of .CO Internet, and from 2014 to 2020, one hundred percent of .CO Internet, after which it sold the business to

GoDaddy, which is today a one hundred percent owner 12:58 of .CO Internet.

When you get then upstairs, you have the Security Services LLC doing business as Neustar Security Services. We are going to discuss that a bit but frankly what is the chain of control between Neustar Inc and .CO Internet and Golden Gate Capital, et cetera, et cetera, it is very unclear. We have learned this morning that it remains, so I quote: 'It remains a portfolio company of Golden Gate Capital'. We would suggest this is an empty shell which is just dealing with this arbitration, but again we have asked many questions on this and we got no answer. Hopefully we will get some answers in the course of these three days. So that is for the two parties here in this arbitration, Respondent and Claimant.

If you get then to the domain name system, the DNS structure, my colleague presented a few things this morning and I won't repeat that. We have made here a chart. You can see the three levels. You start with the root server, which is the basis of the system, the DNS server you see in the middle, it is what we put in green here, the DNS Server.root. The DNS server sits at the top of the
hierarchy and it is the root of the server. That is important. The policy making of this is done by ICANN, as you know, and the technical function of this is done by IANA, which is the internet assigned numbers authority.

What is relevant for this case sothat we understand the acronyms for us lawyers of what is used here in this internet world is the top level domain, TLDs. You have generic TLDs and country code TLDs, so the generic TLDs are .org, .com, .edu, et cetera, and the country code TLDs, so the ccTLD are, for example, we put other examples.co, .fr, .uk .se. Of course no relations to the members of the Tribunal in choosing these three examples.

The TLDs are administered by a registry, and in that case the registry is .CO Internet. No dispute. Then you have the second level domains. I am not going through this. This is basically sold to individual users by a registrar, and you have the un.org, second domain level you can see here,or you put the company .co, et cetera, and that is how you do business. There is no dispute on this. This is just to basically present it for you in an easy manner what we are talking about.

So the .co domain was created in 1991 as
part of a first series of country-code domains and 13:01 in the early stages it was administered by
Universidad de los Andes, and it was only in 1998 that the national government were internationally recognised to own their country code domain. So that is the .co. I think on this what was presented to you this morning is correct. .co has become popular because it is easy like .tv, that is how it was presented this morning and I think on this that is correct.

In 2002 it was recognised by Colombia as a public asset, and here what was said this morning is incorrect. This of course has a lot of value as the Tribunal knows, and that is why we are here in London today.

If we go to the creation of a regulatory framework, I go through it very quickly. This starts with the 29 July 2006 Law which explained that there could be a tender for up to a maximum of ten years. This is C-9 here. And in 2007 and 2008, so the two years afterwards, the MinTIC conducted a public consultation process on the.co domain, and it appears quite quickly that the State, Colombia, did not have the necessary in-house capacity to manage and develop the .co domain.

So what happened here, threequick dates: $\begin{gathered}13: 02\end{gathered}$ 23 March 2007, the .co advisory committee was set up; 21 February 2008, a total exclusive outsourcing model was adopted. That is important because that is how Neustar was able to basically manage on behalf of Colombia the .co domain; and on 30 July 2008, the authorisation by MinT1C of the commercialisation of the .co domain, not just in Colombia but worldwide. That is why you can use that even if you are outside Colombia

When we get to the first tender-- also here we are not going to spend too much time for the purpose of this presentation-but on 2 April 2009 the MinTC started this process. Several documents were issued and many of them-- sorry, all of them but many certainly on the record here - specified that the renewal of course would not be automatic. In 2009 you had the Terms of Reference
finalised. What is important for us is what is below here on slide 8. On 13 August 2009. CO Internet is selected as the new .co domain administrator. .CO Internet was founded by Juan-Diego Calle, and .CO Internet at that time was a joint venture between Arcelandia and Neustar. Arcelandia owned 99 per cent of .CO Internet, and
this is owned by JD Calle family, which has many 13:04 other businesses in Colombia. Neustar is only 1 per cent and is the technical partner, the US technology company which is specialised in the provision of internet services including domain registry operation. That is what you have in 2009.

On 3 September 2009, MinT1C and .CO
Internet signed the 2009 Contract. I would say three main provisions in this contractare relevant for this Tribunal today. This is a tenyear term which may be renewed once. Now, this morning we heard that there would be an explanation of the "may" but you didn't get any explanation on the renewal conditions or what is written, so we put here for the Tribunal. You have it here in Spanish at the top and in English at the bottom on the right side of this slide.

In Spanish, "el plazo pactado podra ser prorrogado", may be renewed in English. That is Article 4.

The second thing is that. CO Internet is entitled to 93 per cent of the proceeds. So MinTIC, Colombia, received only 7 per cent. This morning we had oh, they confused the proceeds and profit and revenue and profit, et cetera, but it is 93 per cent
today, who can testify on these aspects. $\quad \begin{aligned} & 112 \\ & \text { 13:07 }\end{aligned}$
My third point is what happened in 2014.
That is quite important in relation to the standing
-- not the standing but how Neustar portrays itself
today as the investor who has made a superb contribution, it is the good guy here all throughout.

On 3 February 2014 -- sorry, on
14 March 2014, to get to the point straight, Neustar and Arcelandia concluded an agreement for the sale of .CO Internet, and the 99 per cent shares of Arcelandia were sold to Neustar for the price of 114 million USD. This was allowed, and that is my first bullet point in the slides, by an amendment No 3 to the 2009 Contract where the full share of capital is not necessarily now Colombian but could be foreign, so it could be American or it could be whatever, and this is what has happened here on 14 March 2014.

Another point on this 2014 contract, which is crucial, all the more as the Tribunal remembers it ordered Claimant to provide lots of documents in relation to that transaction and we got absolutely nothing. One important point here is on one contract, which is $\mathrm{C}-133$ here, sections 5.19 , is the
contingent payment of up to 6 million in case of a $\begin{aligned} & 13: 08\end{aligned}$ qualified renewal.

What is that? Well, that is interesting. That is that in 2014, when Neustar acquired one hundred percent of .CO Internet company, so buying again for 114 million USD Arcelandia's share in .CO Internet, there are specific discussions between Arcelandia and Neustar as to the renewal or not of the Contract of 2009, and that would be a payment of up to a further 6 million, so in addition to the 114 million, to Arcelandia in case of a qualified renewal, and qualified renewal, you can find it in the Contract, this is a renewal of the 2009 Contract. These are [terms] substantially consistent to those of the current Contract, so not much change, a little change okay, but not much changes, and the binding determination that this contract will run until 2030.

So for now, and we move on, at that point in time in 2014 it is clear that the potentiality of a renewal or not of this 2009 contract was envisaged between Neustar and Arcelandia, and again there is no document in this dispute because the other side has not provided any documents, despite it being ordered by the Tribunal.
have and you put a report and you pass the hot 13:11
potato to the new one and you go on holiday, because this is July and August, and this is for the new administration to deal with.

Four main points in relation to that document. The first is that it sets out that for the 2009 Contract, MinTIC had two options: renew the 2009 Contract or conduct a new tender process. So you heard this morning that according to that, the outgoing administration they were saying you have a duty to negotiate and that is the solution. That is totally wrong. That is not what this document says. This document says there are two possibilities: you can renew the 2009 Contract or you can conduct a new tender process.

The other thing is it looks at the financials, and of course it says any renewal of the current concession contract would be advisable and reasonable only if it goeshand in hand with an economic re-negotiation of the financial terms in favour of MinTIC. The reality is these financial re-negotiations is agreed by everybody. It was clear that at that point of time 93 per cent of the proceeds to the external company was absolutely scandalous already and they agreed. But we are

## going to come to that
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The third point is that it identifies also the legal requirements which are associated with the re-negotiation of the financial terms. We will get back to that again later. It is very important. You can't do whatever you want under Colombian law and I would suggest under any kind of law - I don't know about in the UK but certainly in France, and I am sure in Sweden it is a bit the same -- when you have a public document you cannot just say okay, we will agree the financial terms, we will divide them by half and we will allocate it to you. No. You can renew the Contract in the same conditions, change it maybe marginally, but if you change something substantially you have to retender because others might be interested. If you don't do this, you have a problem. This is the same in every country in the world, certainly in France, as far as I am concerned. And actually it doesn't matter what is in France. It is of course important for Colombia, and this is what the legal requirements are saying already in this July 2018 report, and the recommendation in the conclusion is that it is better to have a new tender process, because this is the most convenient andfavourable legal scenario
and overall the best option for Colombia, and that $\quad 13117$ is quite obvious.

If we go to the second point, and I will be quicker on this one, in the fall of 2018 the new MinTIC administration took steps to structure its decision-making process. It reorganised the advisory committee and recruited the International Telecommunication Union.

Now you have heard extraordinary allegations, and these are completeallegations, they are scandalous on all accounts, that is because you had a new president and you had allegations that the minister - she will be a witness tomorrowso you can ask her questions -- but she actually had her position just one month after the concession was renewed, and all these things. This is complete I need to use the proper word in English -- this is nonsensical, completely nonsensical. It is certainly not substantiated by any documents

What has happened here is there is a genuine decision made that this is the interest of Colombia, and of course this advisory committee, .CO Internet can no longer participate into it. It is not that they are excluded, and by the way this is completely stupid because at the end of the day they
got it. So why would they be excluded because they 13 13:15 got the new concession, different terms. But they got it. It is just that there would be a conflict of interest if they were still staying in the advisory committee, so the right decision is made then and actually the good decision too is to take the International Telecommunication Union (ITU), experts and external consultants. The external consultant, you have their names here on the slide, Adriana Arcila for technical and Lucas Quevedo and Dominique Behar for legal.

But maybe what is most interesting here is the ITU experts -- and you had many experts --came in and basically helped Colombia. That is what has happened. Now ITU is the oldest technical cooperation body within the UN system. This is not friends of the new President, of the new Minister and corruption with them This is an international organisation, the oldest of the UN nations, and it has expertise on domain names, so they helped Colombia.

My third point here is that in parallel, when they know this is happening, .CO Internet already said I am interested, I am interested, and you have many correspondence here on these slides
where they express interest, despite knowing that
there would be a tender process in parallel, or just thinking that there might be a process in parallel at that point of time.

And if you look at the first expression of interest on 20 September 2018, .CO Internet writes that, we have highlighted it in yellow on the slides:
"We are conscious of the dynamism of the industry and that a renewal of the contract would entail working on a restructuration of the compensation package", and then it says "which would improve the contribution of the .co ccTLD to the digital transformation efforts in Colombia'.

So here. CO Internet saying we know 93 per cent is not feasible any more, we are aware it is not in line with what's happening in the market and we are ready for that.

Fourth point, what is happening in 2018/2019 is the preliminary investigations of 18 and 19 March 2019. Now they just confirmwhat the July 2018 report recommended, and this is based on two things: the change in market conditions and best practices, and again we are talking of the internet, so in ten years, even at our level, this goes so
quickly, they had a contract for ten years. They 13:18 benefited from this for ten years. It is already a lot.

Here they say, and they say clearly, the conditions are of course different from those we were considering in 2009. And again, as I have said before, there were legal analyses made that it was actually necessary under Colombian law, for the reasons I explained before, in relation to a public tender.

The fifth and last part here is the decision to launch the new tender, which was announced publicly on 19 March 2019, 'the advisory committee recommends to continue with the structuring of the selection process (public tender) in order to choose the operator for the administration of the .co domain'".

You had the announcement made by the President of Colombia alongside Sylvia Constaín. I don't want to delve into this specific issue now: I am sure this will be dealt with in some questions with the witnesses later on, but the allegations here are that everything was organisedby the President at that time. It is completely nonsensical. Of course there were communications

1 between the President and his minister, but it ${ }_{13: 19}^{121}$ wasn't engineered by the President. It was just the process ongoing as is normal in an administration

What is important here on these slides is that on 21 May 2019, that is my last bullet here, .CO Internet submitted, they know there is going to be a tender but they carry on They push, they push. Remember the terms which were used this morning: we want to sit down, have good faith negotiations, there is a lack of candour of Colombia and this kind of nicely wishy-washy words. That is ridiculous. Here they say on 21 May 2019, they submitted an unsolicited offer to MinTIC for the renewal of thecontract and they propose substantial modifications of the financial terms and even here they propose a 50 million USD payment upfront. So we are in the process, it is a public tender and these guys there is no problemto do what they have done on 21 May 2019

Now I go on the tender itself, which is the fifth point of the seventh of my part. I go through four points here. First, the preparation, the conduct of the tender process, third, the corruption allegation in relation to Afilias, because we have heard it again this morning so we
are going to tackle it now, and the attribution to $13: 21$ .CO Internet finally.

Are you with me? So my first point here on the tender process is the preparation of the 2020 tender process. This starts in May 2019 withan ITU report. Again, this is an ITU report, this is not just a report done for corruption oruhatever. This is ITU, 176 pages which confirmed the necessity to adapt the conditions for the operation to align with best practices.

What is important here is what I have said before. These are the three points you seehere in these slides. Colombia should increase its participation at ICANN to be able to take an active role when necessary to defend its interests. Well, opposite what is written here it means Colombia has not been able to defend its interests for the past ten years properly, that is what half empty, half-full glass is what it says here. MinTIC should develop its internal expertise and better supervision, and Colombia of course should have more favourable terms more in line with the market conditions.

Then it sets out detailed recommendations
in relation to the upcoming tender process. We will
get to that later. Very quickly, it had additional consultants. You have the law firmDurán \& Osorio for the legal aspect of the tender and GACOF Consulting for the financial aspects of the tender. This is the first point which is the preparation. Then you have the conduct of the process itself. In the interests of time we have just put dates here which I am not going to go through now. This is the chronology which the Tribunal can refer to in terms of what has happened here between 2019 and 2020.

Maybe two points to note here is that on 3 January 2020 .CO Internet submits 40 pages of comments to the final Terms of Reference, so it is ridiculous to say theyhad been excluded. They were not and they were heavily participating.

Another important point is the conclusion on 10 January 2020 of an Amendment No 4 to the 2009 Contract. Now, it is important here because the 2009 Contract was due to expire on 6 February 2020, and so they had an issue and it has been an issue for many months that it was coming, that this contract would expire soon. So what to do?

And from June 2019, Neustar was approached, and what they have done here is they knew that Colombia would be in difficulty at the
moment of the renewal, they pushed up to the 13:24 absolute limit to make sure they had a renewal of the Contract. That is what they have done in practice. They were obstructive, disloyal, pushing for the renewal. That was the only thing they had, and it was only because it was one month before the expiry that they had to agree to it otherwise it would have had legal consequences.

It is just in terms, then, that is not disputed. The Contract was extended. By the way, it was extended on the same terms and financial conditions, so they benefited another eight months of their 93 per cent proceeds out of the Contract as they had done for ten years.

The third point here is the conduct of the tender process itself and the corruption allegation in relation to Afilias. On all levels, as many things in this case, this makes no sense whatsoever. Afilias did not even participate in the tender. Everything would have been organised so they are preferred and the President would have pocketed money or whatever it is said on the other side with absolutely no legal basis, not the beginning of a truth.

This is totally silly, if you look here,
and they said this morning, they went in detail, you 13:25 may remember, on the 72 per cent, which was exactly done on purpose to exclude Neustar and benefit Afilias.

Let's have a look at the three arguments because this is the three arguments they made through their pleadings, which are on the table here you can see on slide 19. I am not going to go into the technical aspect of it, it is just the three steps they say look, it is proof that we have done it, Colombia did it on purpose. It is about the maximum level of indebtedness, the number of distributors, the number of registrars, and the experience in the management of DNS databases. So they say this has been organised by you and maybe directly by the President himself to exclude Neustar in favour of Afilias.

Well, there was an ITU recommendation. 70 per cent, 1,500, 25 million transactions per day. Then you had a draft ToR which was published, 70 per cent, 1,500, 25 million transactions per day, and then you had the final 2020 Terms of Reference, which is an adaptation after receiving comments including for .CO Internet itself, .the first level was set at 75 per cent, so there was a change. The
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number of distributors was removed, and then the 13:26
25 million was planned from one day to one month.
So how can it bethat still today they say
before you that everything was organised to benefit
Afilias for an alleged corruption? This is quite extreme to say there is corruption when you have the exact opposite herewhich came in 2014 in the circumstances that I have described before, and now it was stated that in 2020 everything was organised to push itself out. It makes no sense

And my last four points on this tender process is the attribution on 24 February 2020 the deadline for the submission expired with three proposals. You have Consorcio.co, .CO Internet and Nominet UK. So as you can see here, you have no offer from Afilias, and then Nominet UK ultimately failed to submit some required documentation and they walk away. I think there is no dispute between the parties on this.

The result of this is that on 3 April 2020 MinTIC conducted the adjudication hearing and opened the two qualified financial proposals. Consorcio .co... - so, they opened the letter, it is in public, it is on videotape because we are still in the bad world of Covid which we have had to suffer
over the past two years or so, I can't remember 13:28
when, but I am so glad we are here physically in London with you. Whatever, at that point in time things were done this way and were therefore recorded, and Consorciaco offered to retain 36 per cent of the share proceeds, so onethird roughly, and .CO Internet offered 19 per cent of the share, so compared to the 93 per cent that they had under the 2009 Contract, and of course were therefore the best company and therefore got the offer.

Now, what is interesting, and we have a short video here, we put just an extract of that tender process so that the Tribunal can see it or listen to it. It is actually going to be in Spanish, again, Mr Chairman, so this is only one minute but in Spanish, so if you want to listen to it in Spanish, what you will see here in this short video is at the beginning Luisa Trujillo. Luisa Trujillo, as you know, she is a witness in this room, behind me here, and she is conducting the attribution process at that point of time, so she is here at the beginning of the video. And then you had two people who participated in this, Nicolai Bezsonoff, Senior Vice-President of Neustar,
and Eduardo Santoyo, general manager of .CO 13:29
Internet. They both participated to the adjudication hearing and of course.CO Internet was awarded the 2020 contract and Nicolai Bezsonoff expressed his full satisfaction. This is what you are going to hear in this one-minute video.

What I would say for now is
Nicolai Bezsonoff, or Eduardo Santoyo, or any witness from Golden Gate Capital, because apparently they have been the owners throughout, or the gentleman on the other side as client representative on the other side, all these people are not witnesses in this room, but for now Nicolai Bezsonoff, who is Senior Vice-President of Neustar, he expressed what he is just expressing now and we are going to listen now to this
[Video played]
"I give the floor to .CO Internet
Can you hear me? Yes. Thank you very much. First of all, we are honoured because of this opportunity we can continue during five years to serve the interests of this Ministry with .CO Internet and we will bring the best of our human resources and technical capacities and all kinds of capacity. We will start immediately all the tasks
in order to execute this new contract and to $13 \mathbf{1 3}^{129}$ implement the different new elements that have been defined by MinTIC, and we are really proud to continue to promote and to grow this.CO Internet domain as we have been doing for ten years.

Thank you to all of you. Thank you to all of my team Thank you to the Ministry, and let's continue growing together'.

So the translation isfinished. As I say, it would have been interesting to have this person in the room or anybody else. It is quite extraordinary and we maintain that there is not one single witness on the Claimant's side, but I will come back to this in a minute or so.

I go to my final two points which is the finalisation of the sale of .CO Internet to GoDaddy and then I go to the procedure and I pass over to Melissa Ordoñez.

On 3 April 2020, Neustar concluded an agreement with GoDaddy for the sale of its registry business including. CO Internet. So what we have to see here, and this is apparently pure coincidence maybe, this is the same day of the tender process, so when they are sure that actually they got the new contract, the 2022 contract, they sign the sale to

GoDaddy, and they haven't said anything to the 13:32 government of Colombia. That is on the same day.

So we have been told this morning oh, they only announced it on the 6th, because the 3rd was a Friday and the 6th was a Monday, et cetera. All right, but you are with a counterparty, you explain that you need to have a candour in your negotiation, good faith negotiations, and in parallel for a time which we will have to find outhow much because we still don't know they are actually negotiating the sale to GoDaddy in the back of Colombia.

Now, it is as it is; we take things as they are. GoDaddy today is the owner of .CO Internet. Two things I want to say here is back on the basis of an extract from an article which you have on slide 21 of El Tiempo which is an interview between GoDaddy (Andrew Low Ah Kee) and Neustar, the same Nicolai Bezsonoff you have just seen, of 5 May 2020, the same Nicolai Bezsonoff, by the way, who when he was Neustar had no problem to approach the minister at an airport when it suits him to have a conversation aside the normal things which are done, but okay, maybe I shouldn't have said that or we will say this later.

Here for what is relevant we knowfrom
this that they have been in discussion for a little 131 over a year, and the things we know is thaton 24 January 2020 they completed the transfer of .CO Internet to a special purpose vehicle called Registry Services LLC, and when Colombia asked, they said oh, it is the same, it is still Neustar. And on 5 May they say exactly what I have just said, this is little over a year, let's just have a look -- Andrew Low Ah Kee: 'The negotiation process has been a long one. We had been in discussions for a little over a year." Here he says this on 5 May 2020, so it is at least since 5 May 2019.
"It's important to clarify that we had not disclosed anything because we did not want to hinder the tender process'". So it is clear that the Colombia deal had an importance for them.

Nicolai Bezsonoff: 'It is key, as Andrew puts it, that we did not want the tender process to be influenced by GoDaddy's image ..." That is the explanation. What is relevant for here isit has been announced, like it has been announced to Colombia, but we know it has been over for more than a year.

A bit later, a month or so later, on 22 May, MinTIC and .CO Internet signed the 2020
contract, and on 5 October 2020, the 2020 Contract 13:35 entered into force following the expiration of the Amendment 4. You will remember Amendment 4 is the one I described to you before. This is the eight further months where Neustar carried on making its juicy profit of 93 per cent of the proceeds.

The performance of the.co domain and related proceeds contrary to what was told to you this morning, has increased dramatically under the 2020 contract. So you were toldoh, we have been so good, we have made many investments -- actually making investment is normal for an investor - but you have no quantification of this. What we can see, and here we are using, it is interesting, the same chart as you saw this morning,you see the blue C-120, registros por año, from 2009 to 2021.

I would suggest what you see here is a sharp increase and there is no dispute about that, and on this there has been no claim back from Colombia to Neustar for the past, that is true, but you see from 2009 to 2015a really good increase of the number of .co domain, and frankly from 2015 to 2019, something relatively flat, clearly they are not so interested, yet the new contract, boom, it starts.

My colleague on behalf of Neustar started $\begin{array}{r}13: 37\end{array}$ the presentation saying 3 million. Not really, it was 2.3 million in late 2019, and in the space of a year you had almost 3 million. So quite quickly 2.85 million exactly. As an additional thing I would say if you had more than 3 million in the previous contract for Neustar the proceeds would not have been 93 per cent but 50 per cent. So there was a provision which made something very different at the time. So they had no interest to go above 3 million.

So clearly here this goes up as soon as the contractor changed, and this is important here, so the table you have here, you have inthe 2009 Contract, the full term is ten years and we have put the amount here in Colombian pesos, in billion and in US dollars. And to make it simple, you have here 2009 Contract, 13 million for the Contract and then 2020 contract, only the first year of operation only. So October '20 to October'21, 23 million of proceeds for Colombia.

So in one year Colombia had made double what it did during ten years of the previous contract. It is extraordinary. There we are. And that just shows it was of course the right decision
on an economic basis, for sure $\quad \begin{gathered}134 \\ 13: 38\end{gathered}$
I amfinishing my part here on putting
some -- so we have put lots of dates here but in the interests of time probably I will go through probably the important things here which we want to say is that Neustar, contrary to what it presented this morning, tried to force MinTlC to renew the 2009 Contract through a massive amount of proceedings and pressure and everything which they could do.

We have discussed the Notice of Dispute, the meetings, the notice of intent, and then you had the first things on 18 September 2019, the request to the Council of State. I will not get into it because my colleague, Melissa, will deal with it in the jurisdictional aspect, and then the filing on the 23 December 2019, or the Request for Arbitration with ICSID.

Now what was happening with GoDaddy at the time on 23 December 2019, I am sure the gentlemen on the other side know, but they haven't given us any information because they have refused to give any documents when ordered by the Tribunal in relation to that specific issue, so the timing -- it is [23] December, just before Christmas, or just before
the end of the year-- and that has a relevance as 13:40 to GoDaddy's standing or not, and also Security Services LLC, which we have described very recently. Is there anything here or not? We don't know.

What is clear is it is a mess, because from 23 December 2019 to 9 March 2020 thereare three months of communications andactually they even had to change their Request for Arbitration because. CO Internet is ultimately excluded as Claimant, but it is quite rare, a level of unsophistication in an ICSID proceedings like that, three months' of proceedings.

What is extraordinary too, and this is the second point, you have six months' of inactivity afterwards. What is happening here on the other side? We don't know, of course. But the only reason it was not discontinued is because ICSID reminded that there was inactivity. It is very strange, I would submit.

Of course this Tribunal is at the bottom of these last lines, as far as I am concerned, constitution of the Tribunal, 21 April 2021. That is where you come here onboard.

We had our first session on 15 June 2021,
and you may remember Hogan Lovells had just come in 13:41 just before, literally the day before, we were discussing a few days before but literally we came to this hearing just the day before.

One point I want to make in relation to this because they were enshrined then in the PO1 of this Tribunal of 9 July 2021 is the quantum has been bifurcated. This was Claimant who asked for bifurcation of the quantum. At the time Respondent, we have jurisdiction objections, why would we not want to avoid that cost?

But why have they asked that today when there is no factual witness or expert witness today? Is it to limit disclosure in relation to financials, for example? I don't know. I am just saying at that point of time it was between the first session of the Tribunal and 9 July they asked for bifurcation of the quantum, which we have accepted and which has been enshrined in PO1.

Then between 18 March and 10 June 2022 you have a document production phase. In the interests of time I won't get into it because my colleagues are going to do that, but there is a blatant hole in this. We have discussed the documents around the 14 March transactions between Arcelandia and

Neustar. This is highly relevant for the knowledge $\begin{aligned} & \text { 13:42 }\end{aligned}$ of the non-renewal by the other side and dl the questions in relation to the filing of the RfA.

Another thing I would say which is strange is when we had discussion last summer, in June last summer, and we discussed the hearing which would happen here, we were of the view already that a hearing of two days with one was the maximum which was necessary. The other side told usthat they were considering one to two witness and therefore we had a whole week to book, so three plus two, which ultimately we presented to the Tribunal.

Of course that is not exactly the same to have the availability of this Tribunal for just two days, which would have been sufficient, and a whole week. In the end you got no witnesses at all, as you know today.

My final point here on what's happening in terms of the procedure is it is quite extraordinary, I would say, that 29 July 2022 you had the Reply on Jurisdiction and the Merits, but this alleged transfer of the ICSID claim to another entity, Security Services LLC, is made for the first time This is properly scandalous. This has happened on 1 December 2021. We could have made other decisions

Services LLC company group as part of a sort of business re-organisation and that Neustar Inc was then sold to TransUnion on 1 December 2021.

And what is very concerning and was highlighted by colleague, Laurent, was that daimant did not disclose this fact until after Colombia had filed its Counter-Memorial of 25 February 2022, and after the conclusion of the document production phase which concluded on 10 June 2022. And of course, because of that, we were prevented to ask the Tribunal for documents regarding this alleged transfer. And, even worse actually, we asked documents to Neustar Inc and who knows actually if this Security Services LCC entity had access to the documents that we were asking? This is very concerning. Of course when this fact was disclosed to us we requested more documents regarding this transfer on 5 September 2022

And it is under PO 3 of 25 October 2022the Tribunal considered that perhapssuch order was not necessary because at the end Claimant has the burden to prove that it is entitled to present and recover in respect of the claims.

Well, what is the situation today? We did get access to the non-redacted version of the UPA.
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However, this has not changed much. Claimant has $13: 42$ entirely failed to meet its burden and this is because today we don't know how and to whomthe MinTIC claim was transferred to. There are no documents detailing the terms of this alleged re-organisation, and how the MinTIC claim was transferred, there are no documents showing to which entity the MinTCC claim was transferred, and there are no documents setting out clearly the corporate ownership structure of this new intended claimant before and after the transaction.

What is more, we heard this morning that Security Services LLC is the legal successor of Neustar, but this is entirely misleading. We are not here in a merger scenario. We are not here in a scenario where one company has ceased to exist. Security Services LLC existed since April 2017, so before the spin-out, and Neustar Inc has continued to exist after the completion of the spin-out

But there is even more. Even if we assume that the transfer had occurred there would still not be jurisdiction because such transfer would affect the Tribunal's jurisdiction ratione voluntatis, and this is because, as we all know in investment treaty arbitration, consent
derives from the arbitration agreement which is
formed following the investor's acceptance of the host state's offer to arbitrate, and therefore consent is necessarily limited to a specific party, and this is notably the case under the TPA.

For instance, article 1016(2) of the TPA provides that the notice of intent shall specify the name and address of the Claimant. Similarly, article 10.18 of the TPA provides that the specific Claimant must consent in writing to arbitration and submit a waiver. Security Services LLC has never submitted a waiver in this arbitration. It therefore follows that an original claimant investor cannot be replaced midway the proceedings.

Now we heard this morning that Claimant is trying to rely on the Daimler case but this is entirely inapposite. In that case theobjection related to the continuous ownership rule. The issue was not an issue of a change of claimant in the middle of the proceeding.

But if we look at tribunals which have faced a similar situation, they have all said that this cannot be done. For instance, the Tribunal in Sumrain said that "once an arbitration agreement comes into existence and the parties to that
agreement have been defined, the arbitral tribunal 13:52
cannot modify that agreement without the consent of all the parties to that agreement".

Similarly, the Tribunal in Wintershall held that "an objection to the substitution of the Claimant by a new entity during the course of ICSID arbitrations proceedings may well be taken - for lack of empowerment of a tribunal to do so, absent consent".

So we are clearly in that situation and therefore jurisdiction should be denied outright actually, in limine litis. We could stop here and it is a shame that this was not disclosed before

If we move on to the next jurisdictional objections, and if we analyse the claim as introduced by Neustar Inc, it is also replete with jurisdictional defects. First of all, there is no jurisdiction due to the Council of State proceedings.

Why is that? Well, two main reasons Firstly, there is no jurisdiction because by launching these proceedings Neustar triggered the fork in the road clause which is contained in Annex 10-G of the TPA, and you have an extract here on the present slide. And this clause provides that "an
investor of the United States may not submita claim to arbitration if it has alleged a breach of an obligation under the TPA before a local court or an administrative tribunal, and if it does so, then the election shall be definitive."

That is the wording of the clause.
Well, this is exactly what happened here. We can see to be triggered the only thing that an investor has to do is to allege a breach of an obligation under the TPA before local courts. This is exactly what happened here when Neustar introduced the Council proceedingsbefore the Request for Arbitration. The alleged breaches of the TPA and the Council of State examined Neustar's allegations under articles 10.3, 10.4 and 10.5 allegations which are being brought today before this Tribunal.

Now, we heard this morning that this clause was not triggered because the Council of State proceedings would fall under the exception of Article 10.18(3) of the TPA which allows an investor to seek interim injunctive relief.

We submit this is not the case because this exception is limited to very specific conditions, in particular the action for interim
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injunctive relief has to be brought for the sole ${ }_{13} 146$
purpose of preserving the Claimant's right. In this case, the Council of State proceedings exceeded this scope and this is because Neustar requested that MinTIC be ordered not only to suspend the 2020 tender process, but also to renew the 2009 Contract, and that is very clear when you look at point(v).
This is an extract of the Council of State decision recounting Neustar's request for relief. When you look at point ( $v$ ) they asked that the MinTIC be ordered to formalise the extension of the concession until 2030, so not only duringpendency of the arbitration. They were asking for a renewal of the concession. This was way beyond the sole purpose of preserving rights and therefore the fork in the road clause was triggered.

For the same reasons there was also a breach of the waiver requirement contained in the TPA. According to this requirement which is contained in article 10.18 and which is a condition on consent, we can see that a Notice of Arbitration has to be accompanied by a written waiver of the investor to initiate or continue any proceedings before any administrative tribunal or court under the law of any party.

Well, if we look at Neustar's waiver, it 13:57
is clearly defective because in that waiver, and you have an extract here, Neustar only waived its right to initiate proceedings before local courts in Colombia, but it failed to waive its right to continue proceedings and in practice it actually continued the Council of State proceedings, so this waiver requirement was also breached and there is no jurisdiction.

If we move on now to the next objection. the claim is also jurisdictionally flawed because the dispute had not crystallised when Neustar filed its Request for Arbitration. And this is because under the TPA, and that is article 10.16(i), there is a requirement that before submitting a claim to arbitration there must be an investment dispute. This is a requirement under the TPA.

Now, when does a dispute come into existence? Well, we can use the definition given by Emmanuel Gaillard in Eurogas: "A dispute presupposes the existence of the factual and legal framework on which the disagreement is based and cannot arise until the entirety of such constituent elements has come into existence'.

And the TPA actually also provides further
guidance in article 10.16(ii) which also provides $\begin{aligned} & 13: 58\end{aligned}$
that when the Claimant submits a claim to arbitration, it must have "incurred loss or damage". This is also very important and therefore as the United States' non-disputing party submission put it in AmecFoster, "no claim based solely on speculation as to future breaches or future loss may be submitted" to arbitration.

Now in the present case these preliminary requirements were breached and mainly for three reasons. First, all the constituent elements of the dispute were not yet in existence. We can see that by the fact that, for instance, the 2009 Contract was still in force. The 2020 tender process was still ongoing. It only concluded on 3 April 2020 That is to say more than three months' after the Request for Arbitration was filed.

Secondly, Neustar had not incurred any certain loss or damage as required by the TPA. It submitted a 350 million claim which was purely speculative, and it was purely speculative for many reasons.

First of all, at that time they didn't know whether or not they were going to get the new contract because the tender process was ongoing.
arbitration. First, schemes which are designed to $\begin{array}{r}14: 06\end{array}$ secure jurisdiction and, second, the use of proceedings to gain a benefit which is inconsistent with the purpose of international arbitration.
These two types of abuses are characterised in this case.

If we look first at the schemes to secure jurisdiction, it is widely admitted that the restructuring of an investment to gain jurisdiction when the dispute was foreseeable constitutes an abuse of process. We submit that in the present case the Tribunal should reason by analogy, and by analogy here there is an abuse of process.

Claimant basically tried to fabricate the appearance of good standing byprematurely filing the Request for Arbitration and keeping silent on the sale of GoDaddy, which was essentially agreed, and of course it would have been a much bigger hurdle for Neustar to claim standing in these proceedings if the sale of .CO Internet to GoDaddy had been officially completed before the submission of the RfA, and therefore we submit they put in place an abusive strategy of which these proceedings are unfortunately a part and which should not be tolerated, and several elements on the record prove
this.
154
The sale to GoDaddy was very well advanced, if not agreed, at the time of the filing of the RfA or its registration. You can see two important events in the timeline before you which are in red. As you can see, negotiations between Neustar and GoDaddy had started at least since April 2019, and this is not us saying it; this is representatives of Neustar saying it toEl Tiempo in the interview that was mentioned by my colleague, R-75.

And just after the Request for Arbitration was submitted, we can see that, on 24 January 2020,
Neustar completed the transfer of .CO Internet to Registry Services, and this was a key step actually in the sale to GoDaddy, so just after the Request for Arbitration this key step for the completion of the sale occurred

But there is more. Neustar deliberately kept silent and delayed the announcement of the sale. Despite the fact that they had several opportunities to disclose the sale to Colombia, or to ICSID actually, on 23 December 2019, when they submitted their Request for Arbitration they made no mention to GoDaddy.

On 24 February 2020, when they notified
the Registry Services transaction to MinTlC, they make no mention of the GoDaddy sale. They even tried to assure MinTIC that the situation remained the same. And on 6 March 2020, after Colombia raised before ICSID observations regarding this transfer and was seeking for clarifications, Neustar explained to ICSID that the Registry Services transfer was just to satisfy the tender requirements, and again no mention of the GoDaddy sale.

It is only after the RfA is registered that the announcement that the sale was publicly announced, and here again in the interview that was given to El Tiempo (R-75) the representatives of Neustar and GoDaddy expressly admit that the announcement was delayed and in the present proceedings it was only when Neustar submitted its memorial in October 2022 that there was a reference to GoDaddy.

So we submit that this confirms the abusive nature of the claims that had been introduced. What is more is that these allegations have not been disproven by any witnesses or by any documents. In fact, we asked for documents, but we
had no responsive documents regarding the timing of
the GoDaddy negotiations or the timing of the filing
of the RfA, and we believe that adverse inferences
should be drawn by this Tribunal.
There is also an abuse of process because
the Claimants are trying to use these disputes for
purposes other than genuine dispute resolution. As
my colleague Laurent mentioned, they used the threat
to arbitration to try to force MinTlC to renew the
2009 Contract. But of course they are also seeking
to gain through these proceedings an undue benefit
because they are trying to obtain the value of a
renewal in utmost disregard of the contractual
language of the Contract which says "may'. And in
fact, not only that, they were perfectly aware that
the renewal was not automatic, as mentioned also by
my colleague.
And what is all the more questionable is
they have continued these proceedings despite
obtaining the 2020 contract and then selling .CO
Internet to GoDaddy, andall of these just makes us
think about why are they pursuing these proceedings.
proceedings are serving purposes which have nothing
to do with Colombia. Are they doing this because of
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14:11 the GoDaddy negotiations or the timing of the filing of the RfA, and we believe that adverse inferences should be drawn by this Tribunal.

There is also an abuse of process because the Claimants are trying to use these disputes for purposes other than genuine dispute resolution. As my colleague Laurent mentioned, they used the threat o arbitration to try to force MinTIC to renew the 009 Contract. But of course they are also seeking gan these proceedings an undue benefit rews in anguage of the Contract which says "may'. And in fact, not only that, they were perfectly aware that he renewal was not automatic, as mentioned also by

And what is all the more questionable is they have continued these proceedings despite obtaining the 2020 contract and then selling .CO nternet to GoDaddy, andall of these just makes us

This seems to indicate that these
to do with Colombia. Are they doing this because of
the Arcelandia transaction, because of the GoDaddy 14 15:12 transaction, because of theTransUnion transaction?
Difficult to tell, but what is clear is that the failure of Claimant to produce documents regarding these transactions has to be held against them

Moving on to the last jurisdictional objection, the claims are contractual claims in nature. The whole dispute that you have before you revolves around whether or not Colombia had an obligation to renew the 2009 Contract, and the fact that this is the case can actually be found in Neustar's submissions themselves.

For instance, we see here in its memorial of 22 October 2021, Neustar makes reference to the fact that its legitimate expectations derive from the law and the terms of the concession itself. In its memorial of 29 July 2022, Neustar makes reference to the purpose of the provision and criticises Respondent's interpretation of the same

Now, if they had of course an issue with this interpretationthey should have submitted these claims to the appropriate contractual forum, which you can find under article 19 of the 2009 Contract. That is arbitration before the arbitration centre of the Chamber of Commerce of Bogotá. These are purely

Colombia is involved and that is a pretty dramatic $\begin{array}{ll}14: 15\end{array}$
statement by Colombia itself to tell you that it's the most frivolous and senseless treaty case that they ever had to deal with

You also heard from my team that the factual history and the jurisdictional realities of this case also show that there is no basis for a treaty claim and that you should dismiss it on jurisdictional grounds.

I am now going to present to you that the fact is there is also no merits to any of the claims in this case. This morning we heard an amazing -I regard it as a fascinating story, but that is what it was, a fascinating story, a story that was not tied to any evidence. In fact they themselves told you, at one point I heard them say that some of it was gathered by walking the streets of Colombia they got facts. We also heard that they got news clippings, and we saw that in their memorial that they rely on news clippings, and we also knowthat they refer you back to the memorial which again still doesn't refer to evidence, so it is all circular. And most dramatically we heard at the end of the presentation today by the Claimants who needs witnesses? We don't need witnesses to present a
hearing. Why should we even have a hearing, then?
This case really reminds me of something
that John Adams, the second President of the United
States once said. He said:
"Facts are stubborn things and whatever
may be our wishes, our inclinations or the dictates
of our passion, they cannot alter the state of facts
and evidence".
No matter how many claims Neustar tries to
make, nor stories its lawyers have argued in their
briefs for today, it cannot change the stubborn
facts that its claims are not supported by the
evidence.
In this case you must decide what are the
real facts versus the Neustar facts, and this very
experienced Tribunal knows that what lawyers argue,
what they have argued here today, that is not
evidence. Specifically, without any substantiations
Claimant claims that Colombia violated articles
10.3, 10.4 and 10.5 of the Treaty.
Now, for this afternoon I want to reverse
the role here and I want to start with article 10.5
and its three sub parts, and then we will turn back
to 10.3 and 10.4.
The appropriate starting point to discuss
hearing. Why should we even have a hearing, then? 14:16
This case really reminds me of something
that John Adams, the second President of the United
States once said. He said:
"Facts are stubborn things and whatever may be our wishes, our inclinations or the dictates of our passion, they cannot alter the state of facts and evidence'.

No matter how many claims Neustar tries to make, nor stories its lawyers have argued in their briefs for today, it cannot change the stubborn facts that its claims are not supported by the evidence.

In this case you must decide what are the
whet they have argued here today, that is not
evidence. Specifically, without any substantiations
Claimant claims that Colombia violated articles

Now, for this afternoon I want to reverse the role here and I want to start with article 10.5 and its three sub parts, and then we will turn back

The appropriate starting point to discuss
the claim is the Treaty itself. The wording is $14: 17$
clear. Colombia needs to provide a 'fair and equitable treatment" in accordance with "customary international law, minimum standard of treatment".

What does that mean? As the Tribunal members well know, the minimum standard of treatment has been the subject of long discussions by different tribunals and academics, and it is now well established that the threshold required to show that a sovereign's acts violated the minimum standard is very high.

Claimant must show a wilful disregard that shocks a sense of juridical propriety. In short, not any misstatement in a violation of this standard, not any communication that lacks response, or a mere delay in answering a request are sufficient to be violations of FET.

This morning I heard even other more remote ideas of well, we werejust offended because he didn't call me back. That is not an actionable claim, members of the Tribunal. And at all times it is Neustar who has the burden toshow you that in fact this minimum standard was violated by Colombia .

So let's go back and look at our roadmap.
What does the Claimant allege here to try
and substantiate a violation of FET? If we break it $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14:19 }\end{aligned}$ down into three alleged violations, and first we are going to look at the arbitrary acts, which are further broken down into four sub parts. So I will quickly go through each one of those

Neustar claims that Colombia's conduct basically had no real legitimate purpose and that they were simply acts to harm Neustar. That is their allegation in the memorial, the same memorial they cited today again in their opening statement.

Now with support to that statement in their memorial they provide you with no witness offered. They told you they don't need any. They also provided you with no documents tendered, they talk about how they had other evidence, but you are not going to find any evidence in support of these allegations, and without any witnesses and without any documents there simply is no evidence to support this allegation.

We will go further, even though it is not Colombia's burden to do so, we will look at what is the evidence that we have. The evidence actually shows the contrary. The evidence shows that MinTIC had a real and legitimate reason not to renew the Contract. Nothing less important than protecting,
as you heard today, the state's public interest in 14:20
administering its asset in an economically profitable way.

Now you heard counsel tell you a lot about what little value it had back in 2009. You didn't hear them tell you anything about how much they valued it in 2018 or 2019, did you? Well, by that point is the point we are talking about, and at that point everybody knew how valuable it was. Because they are right. .co grewtremendously. And whilst maybe you can dismiss them for why they took [93] per cent backin 2009, and in 2018 and 2019 we knew we were dealing with a very different asset, and that was an asset of the state. There is no question about that.

In two different reports, then, while they were doing this internal analysis, Colombia reviewed the issue. You can see that recorded in C-27 and R-88. For the record I will provide you the reference number of the exhibits of the actual evidence supporting and I will do that throughout my presentation. I didn'treally hear much of that from Claimant's counsel.

We can see that in these documents the State did a thorough analysis showingthat the
original financial model under which Neustar operated was not sustainable for the state and was not in accordance with the current market that had massively changed and grown in the past ten years. That is exactly what I said a minute ago and that is That is exactly what I said a minute ago and that is
what was being found, and this is the internal analysis, just the first of many layers of assessment that Colombia did to fairly assess what it should do with this valuable asset. Do we renew this contract under the renewal terms which allowed them not to renew it, it was said "may" not "shall", or should we have to go out for a new tender
process. This is step 1 of that processand you can or should we have to go out for a new tender
process. This is step 1 of that processand you can see that thosereports recommended a new contract, even under that process. But let's go further, because this was not a closed door process, this was an open door process. As explained by Colombia's witness, process. As explained by Colombia's witness,
Ms Trujillo, who you will hear from - you have already heard from her in the witness statement and you will hear from her further - this process they continued to review and they also retained external consultants to analyse the status of the concessions and the market of a comparable domain. MinTICin fact retained Adriana Arcila, who was an expert with
$\qquad$
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$\qquad$ 列
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { a master's degree from MT, and had substantial } & 14: 23\end{array}$ experience in this field.

And you saw from Laurent in terms of some of those feedback results and because we are short of time I won't go back to look at those. But we also had external experts and you saw references to this as well. MinTIC hired external consultants, including International Telecom Union, which is a specialised UN agency for information and communication technologies.

This group issued a final report in May of 2019 which reaffirmed the need not to renew the same terms of the original contract. Under the original concession contract, they said, MinTIC was receiving only 7 per cent of the price paid byusers, which was significantly lower than what the consultants reported for the rest of the market. This confirmed what we had been talking about here but at that time this was being analysed and outside experts were advising Colombia of exactly what the conditions were and they were acting openly and transparently in assessing that information.

All of this objective and credible information was more than enough to justify a legitimate purpose to change the model, contrary to

| Neustar's allegation. This was not just some$14: 24$ <br> arbitrary act just because they wanted to kick out <br> Neustar after they hadin fact honoured the Contract <br> for ten years. <br> Let's look also at what the minister said, <br> Ms Constaín, and you have heard some references to <br> her and you are going to hear a lot from her. Ms <br> Constaín, who assumed her office in August of 2018 <br> has testified through her witness statement that the <br> share proceeds to Colombia under the original <br> concession were extremely low compared to the <br> market, and MinTIC had acted prudently and with <br> legitimate purpose for not renewing Neustar's <br> contract. <br> Now somehow she was criticised because she <br> had only come on the job in 2018. Gentlemen of the <br> Tribunal, I don't think it takes two years for you <br> to figure out that if you are only getting <br> 7 per cent return and the market is telling you that <br> the return should be a lot greater you are not <br> getting the right share of the market on this. <br> I think the Minister is a lot brighter and you are <br> going to meet her for yourselves and you'll see what <br> I mean by that. <br> Now Neustar also alleges that Colombia's |
| :--- |

arbitrary act just because they wanted to kick out Neustar after they hadin fact honoured the Contract

Let's look also at what the minister said, Ms Constaín, and you have heard some references to her and you are going to hear a lot from her. Ms Constaín, who assumed her office in August of 2018 as testified through her witness statement that the hare proceeds to Colombia under the original market, and MinTIC had acted prudently and with legitimate purpose for not renewing Neustar's

Now somehow she was criticised because she had only come on the job in 2018. Gentlemen of the Tribunal, I don't think it takes two years for you to figure out that if you are only getting
7 per cent return and the market is telling you that the return should be a lot greater you are not getting the right share of the market on this.
the to meet her for yourselves and you'll see what

Now Neustar also alleges that Colombia's
actions were not based on any legal standard had no $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14:25 }\end{aligned}$
standard whatsoever, and it was just based on discretion and prejudice. They tie those magic words and then try to get into the statute. But let's look at that because what do they provide for support for this allegation? They must have some support to say that they completely acted arbitrarily with no legal support for their position.

Once again, we don't have any legal experts. They could have brought in a legal expert to say that Colombia acted arbitrarily without any legal support, they could have done that. They didn't do that. They say they didn't bring any fact witness because the fact witnesses were all intimidated. Are you telling me that all the experts in the world were also intimidated? They couldn't be brought in either? They didn't bring in any documents either. There's no documents to support the notion that there is no legal basis for the decision made.

Once again, members of the Tribunal, there is no evidence to support this claim. Once again, even though it is not my burden to do so I will demonstrate to you what is the evidence to show that
there was a legal basis for the decision
In fact, Colombia's constitutional court,
the Constitutional Court of Colombia had decided back in 2001, not some later day, not the court and some other corruption allegation made by Claimants, how the court was corrupt and was trying to oust Neustar. No, no. We are talking 2001, way before the whole concession was granted, yearsbefore that the court rendered a decision with regards to concessions related to electromagnetic spectrums, and they said that they could not be automatically renewed.

For Colombia's highest court no entity could guarantee or assure that such electromagnetic spectrum concessions would be renewed "since it produces a disproportionate [violation] of the constitutional right to free competition and access to the use of electromagnetic spectrum under equal conditions". That is what they said back in 2001

Now the constitutional court's reasons is very solid as well andit is also very rational. It said that in this field free competition is imposed by force of circumstances producing a positive result and improvement in the quality of public activity and services. You heard Claimants tell you
that back in the early 2000s that the internet and
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so forth was in its infancy, it was just starting to grow. What foresight the Constitutional Court had. It realised that this particular asset, unlike mining, unlike any of the other comparisons the Claimant tried to make, this is a very dynamic sector. It is very mobile, it is moving very quickly, and the court had the foresight to realise that in that environment you cannot simply assume you are going to have an automatic renewal for another ten-year period of time.

In point of fact therefore, not only did MinTIC have a legal standard to apply, but it was actually the constitutional law which prohibited automatic renewals of such a unique concession. This was the established law well before the initial concession was even granted to Neustar, and Neustar knew, or should have known, that an expectation to the contrary was unconstitutional. They knew that.

So all this talk about they had expectations that this would be renewed back in 2001, you heard about all the sophisticated lawyers they get for all these contracts, every time they do one of these contracts, they should have known and they should have done their research that under the
state of the law they could not just expect an 14:28 automatic renewal, and by the way we will see further that in fact they knew they couldn't expect an automatic renewal.

Now another witness that Colombia has put forward and that you will hear from this week is Ivan Castaño, who was directly involved in the decision not to renew. And Mr Castaño, among other relevant matters, explains in his declaration that he personally informed Neustar that the renewal was an option, an alternative, not a guarantee, not a certainty. In short, Neustar knew nothing was being guaranteed at all times, and you will not find one single document referenced by Claimant contrary to that. Not one.

But don't rely on our witnesses. The documents also evidence a clear and transparent process with no guarantees. This is an email between MinTC and Neustar appearing at R-0007, where the Vice-Minister of MinTIC expressly reiterates that renewal is only an alternative and that any decision would be made to find the best condition under which the .co domain needed to operate in the coming year.

Now this is a document that they have
referenced before but when you read this document, 14:30 and I will leave it to the Tribunal to read this document carefully because we do rely and we want you all to relyon the evidence, that document makes clear the position of Colombia which was consistent throughout and transparent throughout

Again, the evidence that MinTIC never committed to Neustar that there would bean automatic renewal is clear, which again was totally consistent with the state of the law as seen in the Constitutional Court's ruling which we just reviewed.

In fact, the documentary evidence shows that Neustar itself knew the renewal process was not automatic. Here now in front of you you have the March 2019 letter from Neustar from.co at exhibit C-0032 for the record where Neustar clearly acknowledges that the renewal of a contract is not automatic.

That should be enough to decide this case. Neustar knew that MinTIC had every right not to renew the concession and as such was in its own right to open a new public bid to grant a new contract to the best offeror in accordance with the current market conditions. Period. Full stop.
Apparently recognising the weaknesses in $14: 31$
their grounds for alleged violation of FET, Neustar
also tries to allege a general claim of
discriminatory conduct by MinTIC. They
discriminated against us. And once again, though,
on that allegation we see there are no documents, no
witnesses, and again no evidence, so let's put in
front of you what is the evidence that exists with
regards to any sort of discriminatory conduct.
The witness statement of Ms Trujillo
explains that the .co domain cannot be compared with
any other telecom contracts.
First, it is a unique asset, as I have
already mentioned, which is a public interest under
the Constitution, so it is simply not correct to
compare the concession for.co with other telecom
concessions generally the way they have tried to do.
Second, precisely because it is the domain
market, the contractual terms need to be shorter.
As the internet market evolves and changes
constantly the state must have leeway to adaptto
those changes. That is exactly what you saw that
even the Constitutional Court back in 2001
recognised was the state of play when it comes to
the dot domain. So even if it is true that MinTIC
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$14: 31$ their grounds for alleged violation of FET, Neustar also tries to allege a general claim of discriminatory conduct by ManTIC. They discriminated against us. And once again, though, on that allegation we see there are no documents, no witnesses, and again no evidence, so let's put in front of you what is the evidence that exists with regards to any sort of discriminatory conduct.

The witness statement of Ms Trujillo explains that the .co domain cannot be compared with any other telecom contracts.

First, it is a unique asset, as I have mpare the concession for.co with other telecom

Second, precisely because it is the domain market, the contractual terms need to be shorter. As the internet market evolves and changes constantly the state must have leeway to adapt to hose changes. That is exactly what you saw that recognised was the state of play when it comes to the dot domain. So even if it is true that MinTIC

1
renewed 10 or 20 concession contracts for other 14:32 telecom services -- again no expert on this point -there is just a conjecture made by Claimants we have looked at a bunch of contracts, and here is one that we see that got renewed, so therefore we don't know why ours wasn't renewed That seems to be the argument. Well, that is not evidence. What we know is we are not comparing apples with apples here. The Tribunal needs to see if there is going to be discrimination, it has to be apples to apples.

Now Neustar's fourth and final allegation to support a claim for arbitrary acts by Colombia is that it somehow acted in bad faith. That is always a favourite of all claimants in these cases, right, because it wanted to grant the concession to a specific other company, bad faith argument. And usually you'll see investors try to come up with some colourable argument to show bad faith and motivation and so forth, even if a claimant it is not their burden to show motive, but here once again the lack of evidence is deafening. There is no evidence. Other than a bunch of hearsay news articles, when you look at the memorials, that is what they attach, of unsubstantiated gossip, Neustar puts forward not a single shred of factual
documentation to support its outrageous claims. It 14:34 shows a picture of the Minister sitting in some public seminar session where perhaps some other competitors were there as well, and that supposedly is the showing of bad faith and discrimination and everything else.

The allegation itself, by the way, is nonsensical, because given that Neustar accuses Colombia of refusing to negotiate because it had the intention of installing Afilias as a concessionaire. Who is Afilias? Afilias is another American competitor. How is that possible? How does that create this discrimination claim under the Treaty, when they are saying that somehow we tried to favour another American competitor in the process. Even if it is true, which by the way they were never able to prove, there is no evidence to support that, it is a ludicrous claim and it is unsupported and it is meritless.

Now Colombia's witness, Ms Trujillo, also confirm that the public bid process was transparent in accordance with local law and therefore could not have been in bad faith. Ms Trujillo testified through her witness statement that the general approach was to include quite high requirements in
their bidding process for good reason, to ensure
that the best operators for the global domain would be considered. Butthat at the same time they wanted to ensure the process would be competitive and bring various interested parties to participate. All of the documents we have submitted evidence exactly that. They evidence that the process was not only open, but was intending to bring in new competitors to the game to see who would be the best ones to provide the services. And by the way, the Claimant puts too much on the financial issues, and of course we don't disagree with them why they do that. They do that because it is so dramatically different from what they got away with for ten years under the original contract.

But that wasn't the only factor. The tender, members of the Tribunal, was also important for the purposes of establishing the whole new administration process that was going to be conducted by Colombia now moving forward in this. It is not just the financial differences. In fact, the differences in results that you saw my partner show you in the last two years is as a result of all of that work to create the whole new administrative process. That was also part of the tender with not
only Neustar, but with all of the other potential $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14:36 }\end{aligned}$ competitors.

Now Neustar, by the way, fully participated in this bidding process. There is no question about that. They don't want to talk about that. They only want to talk about one letter, one response that they didn't get for a certain number of weeks or a month. That is what they want to talk about. They don't want to talk about the fact that they participated fully in the bidding process. So much so that they actually submitted over 40 pages, 40 pages of observations and comments on thedraft 2020 Terms of Reference to MinTIC. These can be found at R-0045, R-0046 and R-0047.

Worst yet, not only did they participate, not only were they part of the process throughout, but they won. Can I just stop for a moment and let's all think about that? They won. I can't think of an investment treaty case that I've ever had where the investor comes here after winning and is still claiming an investment dispute, and frankly I will tell you my own speculation, since the Claimant's got to speculate for two hours, I'll tell you my own speculation: they kind of got stuck with this investment treaty case.

You heard from my partner the real reasons they brought it. They brought it for intimidation factor, they brought it to see if they could try to leverage to get a better deal from Colombia. But guess what? They had filed it. It is there. In fact, ICSID had to call them up and say hey, it has been six months. Are you going to move forward with this case or not? And they're like oh god, I guess we're going to have to. Let's bring out Teddy and let's try to have Teddy tell that story. It is a great story; let's tell that story. So that is what really happened in this case. That is my two minutes of speculations, and I will go back to the real evidence in this case.

PRESIDENT: (microphone not switched on)
MR GONZALEZ: Well, yes, but I would like a little bit of latitude, just if you may,
Mr Chairman, and I promise that I will wrap up as quickly as I can.

As I said, they have not shown that minimum standard and we have shownthat there was a legitimate purpose, there was a legal standard, no discrimination and everything acting at all times in good faith.

So, let's go back to our roadmap with
regards to due process and onceagain let's look at 14:38 what the legal standard is that is required. What must be found is a gross and flagrant disregard for the basic principles of fairness and due process. That is what must be found.

What is Neustar's claim? Neustar claims that Colombia did not provide a rationale as to why there was no negotiation to renew andthe public bid tender process lacked transparency. That is their allegation. You can see that on the screen

Again, no documents, no evidence, no witness.

Now, what we know is that Neustar again participated in that process at all times. Beyond that, Colombia had no obligation to explain to anyone, by the way, because the public process is a public tender process, but in fact Colombia had no obligation to explain to anyone why it ultimately chose to exercise its contractual rights not to renew the concession, although even that process was in fact public. So they were completely transparent as to the decision process, but somehow Neustar still complains. There simply is no evidence of any violation of due process and they lose on that right.

Back to our roadmap, the third last one
here is the lack of legitimate expectation. In this there was a lot of talk about this so, if you will indulge me a minute, I will talk a little bit longer on this issue with regards to their lack of any expectation.

What you have to show again for this particular claim is that there in fact was a specific representation made by the government that you rely upon for purposes of the treaty, and the reliance on that particular representation results in an investment and then you have some basis to argue that there was a breach by the government with regards to that specific representation that the government made.

Now, what does Neustar allege here? Neustar simply alleges without any support again that it could and should have expected the Contract to be renewed and for MinTIC to negotiate the extension. That is what they say. As usual no evidence whatsoever to support this allegation.

In short, Neustar fails to point to any basis for any specific representation. You are not going to see in the memorials anywhere tied to this notion of other than the lawyers telling you we just
had an expectation. Where is that expectation?
14:41
Because I showed you document after document that the basis was there wasn't any right. The Contract was clear, it said "may", not "shall". So there was no basis for representation. Without any specific representation by the government there cannot be reliance and without reliance there is no actual investment that could be made.

Now, my mentor taught me many years ago that the first thing you do in every case, every case, it doesn't matter whether it is a government case, commercial case, go read the contract. And the first thing I always do in every single case is I go and read the contract from page 1 to the last page. Painfully American lawyers tend to draft really long contracts - I wish they would draft them shorter but they do -- but I read them because that is what my mentor taught me to do.

Words matter, members of the Tribunal. Words matter. And in fact Claimants told you that they were going to explain away these words, but they didn't, and these words are clear. These words say that the renewal in theevent it occurs -- in the event it occurs. Okay? It is'may", it is not 'shall'. Initially this is our reference, let me
advance, the words were clear. It said "the agreed terms may be renewed in the manner and terms established by the legislation"; may be renewed. And may be renewed if those termscan be the same, and as you heard Laurent explain to you, even the Contract what it anticipates is it has to be able to be renewed on the same terms and conditions. Once you have to get away from that because of differences in financial factors, other
administrative issues, you can no longer renew that contract.

By the way, they knew that. I will briefly go through this again. They knew that in 2014. When they took over they themselves created a contingency for this because they knew it was contingent. They knew it was not guaranteed, that they didn't have that right, they simply had a possibility, and they provided for that in terms of how they were going to pay for it, so we don't know because they wouldn't give us discovery on any of this, but I will assure you, members of the Tribunal, they never paid for this. They never paid for this because that contingency didn't happen the way it happened

Now whether they still had to pay it as
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a result of the five-year contract they received, 14:43 I don't know that because they didn't tell me. That is why they defined, by the way, the very careful lawyers who draft these long contracts, they did that also in their contract. They talked about a qualified renewal. Notice that even the qualified renewal, even they anticipated back in 2014 that it may not be the exact same renewal. It might be a slightly different renewal and that is why they defined it that way. So they knew. They knew all along.

What you have from us, what you have from Colombia is you have the strength of the Contract, the law, the judicial decisions, the internal and external communications and you have the witnesses that you have heard from through witness statements and that you are going to hear furtherfrom. What do you have from Neustar? You have nothing. You have none of this evidence. You havegreat stories to tell, but that is all you have.

I amgoing to skip through 10.3 and 10.4 given time, but all I have to tell you there is that for 10.3 and 10.4 you have to show it is in like circumstances. You have show that in like circumstances and they do not do that. They don't
show that it is part of the same sector. They don't show it is in direct competition with one another, they don't show that the regulatory framework and policy objectives apply, and they are the same and without that, that's what you need. You have to have apples to apples. Their claims don't have that.

Here is what we have. You have different sectors, you have our domain, and look at all the other sectors that they try and refer to, none of them having the same conditions that we have in ours. We have a different entity. We have MinTIC They are comparing it to multiple different other entities, and you also have a different scope. This is a global dot domain asset, globally, different from everything else that we are talking about. There is no same similar one to compare it to. You can't do the apples to apples. This is truly an apples to oranges.

On the nationally based discrimination, I have already said enough about this. To me it is just baffling how you can even argue this whenthe only reference they make as to any other competitor being brought in was an American competitor. So don't see where that is. They also don't said, they were ultimately the prevailing party on the award, so again there is no basis here for either a 10.3 or 10.4 claim.

Lastly, and I will skip through these other claims, there is no support for any of these claims. We don't even agree with them that th $₫$ are allowed to address the Swiss-Colombia BIT, it doesn't apply. The points are there in my PowerPoint so we can dispense with those

I will come to the end now. What I have to say like I said at the beginning, and you have heard it from Colombia directly, and I think from all counsel at this table, this case baffles us it baffles us from both the substantive level, the factual level and even the procedural level. I have never had a case - I have had a case where the other side just don't show upand we've had witnesses on one side, that kind of case -- I have never had a case where a claimant brings a case and doesn't show up with experts, fact witnesses, evidence, document support and still thinks they are going to have the right to essentially a claim -well, we don't know because they don't want to argue about the quantum yet-- but they claimsomehow it
is hundreds of millions of dollars.
This case has no jurisdiction, it has no merits, and frankly what this case now is about is this Tribunal doing the right thing, sending a powerful message to investors that says if you are going to bring an investment treaty case under this Treaty make sure you have a basis for it. Don't bring frivolous cases because if you bring a frivolous case, this Tribunal has the authority and the power under the ICSIDArbitration Rules to award all the fees and costs to Colombia, which well it should. As you heard from Colombia, they still have to go through, because we all know as lawyers here that it doesn't matter whether a case is frivolous or not. If a case gets this far you still have to go through all of the huge expense and cost, not only fees for years of this case, but also the cost to be here in front of you, it is the same. It is the same as if it was a valid case with merits.

This case of all cases is a case that deserves that this Tribunal awards this. So what we ask in conclusion is that you dismiss these claims both for jurisdictional grounds and alternatively because they lack any merit and you award all fees and costs to Colombia.
name is David Bigge and $I$ am the chiefof investment arbitration in the Office of International Claims and Investment Disputes within the Office of the Legal Adviser at the US Department of State. Pursuant to article 10.20.2 of the US-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement, or the TPA, I will make a brief submission on behalf of the United States addressing questions of treaty interpretation arising out of the Claimant's Reply dated July 29, 2022.

As is always the case with our non-disputing party submissions, the United States does not take a position here on how the interpretations offered apply to the facts of the case. In addition, no inference should be drawn from the absence of comment on any issue not addressed.

I will address first the TPA parties' agreement with respect to the interpretation of article 10.16 of the TPA relating to the submission of a claim to arbitration. Second, I will address the TPA parties' agreement with respect to article 10.4 relating to the Most Favoured Nation protection, and, third, I will address the role of the United States' submissions in the interpretation
of the TPA
I begin by addressing article 10.16. As
you know, a state's consent to arbitration is paramount. Given that consent is the cornerstone of jurisdiction in investor-state arbitration, it is axiomatic that a tribunal lacks jurisdiction in the absence of a disputing party's consent to arbitration.

The parties to the US-Colombia TPA
consented to arbitration pursuant to article 10.17 which provides in relevant part that "each party consents to the submission of a claim to arbitration under this section in accordance with this agreement".

Pursuant to article 10.17, the parties to the US-Colombia TPA did not provide unconditional consent to arbitration under any and all circumstances. Rather, the parties have only consented to arbitrate investor-statedisputes under Chapter Ten, section B, where an investor submits a "claim to arbitration under this section in accordance with this agreement".

Article 10.16 authorises a claimant to submit a claim for arbitration either on its own behalf or on behalf of an enterprise of the

Respondent that is a juridical person that the $\begin{array}{r}189 \\ 15: 10\end{array}$ Claimant owns or controls directly or indirectly.
10.16.2 requires, however, that "at least 90 days before submitting any claim to arbitration under this section a claimant shall deliver to the Respondent a written notice of its intention to submit the claim to arbitration, called the notice of intent."

Article 10.16.2 further provides that "this notice shall specify (a) the name and address of the Claimant and, where a claim is submitted on behalf of an enterprise, the name, address and place of incorporation of the enterprise (b) for each claim the provision of this agreement, investment authorisation or investment agreement alleged to have been breached and any other relevant provisions; (c) the legal and factual basis of each claim; and, (d) the relief sought and approximate amount of damages claimed."

A disputing investor that does not deliver a notice of intent at least 90 days before it submits a Notice of Arbitration, or Request for Arbitration, fails to satisfy the procedural requirements under article 10.16.2 and therefore fails to engage the Respondent's consent to
arbitrate. Under such circumstances a tribunal will 15:12 lack jurisdiction ab initio. A Respondent's consent cannot be created retroactively. Consent must exist at the time a claim is submitted to arbitration.

Procedural requirements in article 10.16.2 are explicit and mandatory, as reflected in the way the requirements are phrased, that is 'shall deliver", "shall specify". These requirements serve important functions, including to provide a party time to identify and assess potential disputes, to co-ordinate among relevant national and sub national officials, and to consider, if they so choose, amicable settlement or other courses of action prior to arbitration.

Such courses of action may include preservation of evidence or the preparation of a defence. As recognised by the Tribunal in Merrill and Ring v Canada, the safeguards found in article 11.19 of the NAFTA, the NAFTA's counterpart to article 10.16 notice of intent requirement, "cannot be regarded as procedural niceties". The Tribunal continued 'they perform a substantial function which, if not complied with, would deprive the Respondent of the right to be informed beforehand of the grievances against its measures and from

```
pursuing any attempt to diffuse the claim'.
I am quoting here from paragraph 29 of the Merrill and Ring decisionon the motion to add a new party dated January 31, 2008.
I will now turn to article 10.4 which requires each party to accord investors of another party and their investments treatment no less favourable than it accords in like circumstances to investors or investments of investors of any other party or of any non party with respect to the establishment, acquisition, expansion, management, conduct, operation and sale or other disposition of investments.
To establish a breach of the obligation to provide most favoured nation (MFN) treatment under article 10.4, a claimant has the burden of proving that it or its investments first were accorded treatment; second, were in like circumstanceswith identified investors or investments of a non party or another party; and, third, received treatment less favourable than that accorded to those identified investors or investments. I will briefly discuss the first and third components
With respect to the first component of the MFN standard, the Treaty clearly refers to treatment
```

[^0]1 "right to adopt or maintain any measure that accords 15:16
2 differential treatment to countries under any bilateral or multilateral international agreement in force or signed prior to the date of entry into force of this agreement".

Mr President, members of the Tribunal, I will end my remarks by addressing the weight due to the US views on matters addressed in a non-disputing party submission.

States parties are well placed to provide authentic interpretations of their treaties, including in proceedings before investor-state tribunals like this one. The United States consistently include non-disputing party provisions in its investment agreements, including the TPA to reinforce the importance of these submissions in the interpretation of the provisions of these agreements, and we routinely make such submissions. Article 31 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties recognises the important role that the states parties play in the interpretation of their agreements. Although the United States is not a party to the Vienna Convention, we consider that Article 31 reflects customary international law on treaty interpretation. Particularly 31(3) states
that in interpreting a treaty "there shall be taken 15:18
into account, together with the context(a) any subsequent agreement between the parties regarding the interpretation of the treaty or application of its provisions, and (b) any subsequent practice in the application of the treaty which establishes the agreement of the parties regarding its interpretation".

Article 31 is framed in mandatory terms. It is unequivocal that subsequent agreements between the parties and subsequent practice of the parties shall be taken into account. Thus, where submissions by both TPA parties demonstrate that they agree on the proper interpretation of a given provision, the Tribunal must, in accordance with Article 31(3)(a), take the subsequent agreement into account. Moreover, the TPA parties' concordant interpretations may also constitute subsequent practice under Article 31(3)(b).

Investment arbitration tribunals have agreed in the context of nordisputing parties' submissions under the NAFTA that submissions by the NAFTA parties in arbitrations under Chapter Eleven may serve to form subsequent practice. Specifically I would point you to paragraph 158 of the Mobil v

Canada decision on jurisdiction and admissibility
dated July 13, 2018, as well as paragraphs 103, 104, and 158 through 160 of that decision for context. I also refer you to paragraphs 188 to 189 of the award on jurisdiction in Canadian Cattlemen for Fair Trade dated January 28, 2008

To sum up this point, whether the Tribunal considers that the interpretations presented by the TPA parties as a subsequent agreement under Article 31(3)(a) as subsequent practices under Article 31(3)(b) or both on any particular provision, the outcome is the same. The Tribunal must take the TPAparties' common understanding of the provision of their treaty into account.

Finally, Mr President, I would just emphasise that the United States stands by the interpretations set forth in its written submission, although we did not address all of those issues today. With that final observation, I close my remarks. I thank the Tribunal for this opportunity to present the views of the United States on these important interpretative issues.

Thank you.
PRESIDENT: Thank you very much, Mr Bigge. The Tribunal hasn't any direct questions for you at
this stage but we hear your submission. We thank 15:21
you both for your oral presentation and also for your written submissions which were received some time ago. That is appreciated. You are welcome, of course, to stay online and to continue following these proceedings.

I turn to counsel, now. Do you have any rebuttal following the submission that we heard from you? First of all, Mr Baldwin?

MR BALDWIN: Yes, we do, Mr President.
PRESIDENT: Those should be kept short, to a maximum of 15 minutes, if we can. We have both your points that were made earlier, and we have your slides, and we have the transcript, so let's hear fromyou --

MR GOUIFFĖS: Mr Chairman, you have just said there would be rebuttal, but you remember we discussed that during the procedural hearing recently. It is a bit strange that Claimant has asked to speak again straight after wehave made the presentation. This has been decided by the Tribunal in the PO4, so we abide to that. It doesn't say rebuttal, it says 'may present clarification after the opening statement up to a maximum of 10 minutes', which is now 15 minutes, so there isfive
minutes to make presentation on the US'
presentation. 'These comments should not be responsive to the arguments presented in the opening statement." That is what is written in the Procedural Order so it can't be rebuttal straight away.

PRESIDENT: Well, it is not meant to bea rebuttal but if there are commentsthat are made by one side that wish to respond, not responding in detail, there will be an opportunity to do that on Wednesday, but rather if there is something that wants to be clarified or to come back on that in the short term, in 10-15 minutes, including comment on what we have heard from the United States' counsel. Mr Baldwin?
Claimant's Rebuttal
by Mr Baldwin
MR BALDWN: Thank you, Mr President.
We will deal with the rebuttal, as you say, in connection with closing statements, and we will have quite a bit. I can fully understand why the Respondent side didn't want a rebuttal after their opening but there are some things that I think do need to be clarified that would be helpful If you go to slide 22 of Respondent's
presentation, there was much made of the fact that 15:24 after the new concession started in 2020 the numbers raised, but I think to make this clarification, Mr President, the new concession didn't start until October 2020, so the numbers from 2020 would be more than 75 per cent due to the earlier concession.

So I just wanted to make that known, that there was a lot of talk about look what happened in 2020, it jumped up so much, but this would have been under the old concession, so I wanted to state that Another clarification would be with respect to slide 19 -- as I say, we will have more of these when we get to Wednesday -

MR GONZÁLEZ: Sorry to interrupt, if counsel is making a clarification, I would like a full clarification. Does he have details as to how much of that in terms of the total bar results there for 2020, how much is he claiming occurred before October 2020? Because that would be the clarification, not what he just said.

MR BALDWM: Well, it was the representation of the Respondent, Mr President, that these numbers were attributable to the new concession, and we can show that more in detail on Wednesday, so it was their statement. If they have
the breakdown, we would appreciate seeing it, but it $15: 26$ is certainly not the breakdown we have, and I would also point out at that point, we didn't own .co is that right, in October of 2020 -- we did, sorry. I have to rethink it.

PRESIDENT: You will provide that on Wednesday morning?

MR BALDWN: Well, it might involve new evidence, but we didn't make the statement, but the clarification is the timing of the 2020 and what happened during that time

But while we are on the subject, if you look at slide 19 from Respondent's deck, thiscan be a clarification from Respondent, but it lists these what they call ITU recommendations, and much was made of this today too, for example the 70 per cent being an ITU recommendation, and I followed the rabbit trail down to the Counter-Memorial paragraph 129 and then to the exhibit, which is C-67, and it appears that that's not an ITU recommendation but actually information from Respondent, so we might get clarification on that, since the slide refers to these as ITU recommendations.

When you look at C-67, and you look at the

[^1]clarifications or comment on the US submission.
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PRESIDENT: Thank you. Mr Gouiffès?
Respondent's Rebuttal
by Mr Gouiffès
MR GOUIFFÈS: Mr Chairman, yes. We just have one clarification, I would say, around Security Services LLC and what was said this morning in the presentation at various stages.

We were told for the first time that this is a portfolio company of Golden Gate Capital, and then at the beginning Kevin Hughes was presented here in this room as the former general counsel of Neustar who remains general counsel of Security Services LLC. It is unclear whether he is still general counsel of Neustar or just general counsel of Security Services LLC. On his Linkedln profile he appears as general counsel still of Neustar but it is unclear.

And linked to this there was another thing said that Mr Hughes was the original "representative in the Request for Arbitration which sits down as the client's representative now'. All these questions around Security Services LLC and the only person - physical person -- of course we have no witnesses on the other side in this case-- just to
express our real concern that we have in front of us 15:31
slowly a claimant which is a nutshell and we want to be sure we don't have a nutshell, and that is why I said upfront in my introduction that any award from this Tribunal should be against Neustar Inc, which of course started this Request for Arbitration. It could be against Security Services LLC if it is just a change of name or another company. I am not clear. Again, you will remember we had that after the document production exercise and I explained already what it was.

But the question here is this is quite important for us that we get these clarifications because otherwise it is like they are trying to bet anything here in this case without putting anybody and if they lose, Colombia will lose too anyway because we are faced with a nutshell on the other side, and a lot of indications on what has happened in parallel to this arbitration shows us this direction including the timing of the Request for Arbitration, or many things which have happened here linked to the memorial. So this is quite important.

And linked to this, to the Tribunal, we would like to obtain clarifications from the other side that section 5.10 of the UPA, that is the
unredacted part which everybody can see in this arbitration, means indeed that if an award was rendered against Neustar, Neustar could go after Security Services LLC to recover its costs if that were to happen.

All these things we would like to have clarifications from the other side. We are worried on this side that they are just making a bet here and if they lose there is no risk for them. So that is all these questions in one for clarifications.

I think that is the only question we have. That is it, Mr Chairman. And we have no questions from the clear presentation of the US. Thank you.

MR BALDWN: Mr President, I would just point counsel to exhibit C-135, is that correct, which provides - it is already an exhibit in the record -- provides many of the clarifications that he talked about, including Golden Gate Capital, its role as the former owner, its role as the owner of Neustar Security Services. So I think Mr Gouiffès might find several clarifications in that document.

PRESIDENT: Let me make this suggestion. To the extent that you can have another look at C-135 that has just been suggested, and if counsel can -- Mr Baldwin, if you can provide some
answers to some of the questions to the satisfaction 15:34
or at least to inform the Respondent, otherwise
tomorrow morning, I would suggest, if Respondent
wishes to make specific applications for orders, the
Tribunal will consider them and we will hear you
make specific applications, we will hear from
Claimant in response, and if necessary the Tribunal
will consider what orders to make.
MR GOUIFFÈS: Mr Chairman, thank you for
saying this. I went short from saying by the end of
this procedure on Wednesday; maybe, I thought the
clarification will come on Wednesday, but if they
come earlier, good. If not, we are late in the
process, but a security for cost order might make
sense against the other side. Of course there is no
risk that Colombia will not pay as a state, but as
Security Services LLC we are not sure.
PRESIDENT: As I say, Respondent is
welcome to make applications of the kind that it
thinks are appropriate, and after hearing from
Claimant the Tribunal will decide what, if any,
orders to make.
MR GOUIFFÈS: Understood, Mr Chairman.
PRESIDENT: Verygood. Are we ready to
hear our first witness?

MRIVÁN DARIOCASTAÑO PÉREZ
PRESIDENT: Good afternoon, Mr Castaño. Welcome to this Tribunal. I think you have been here during earlier sessions so you know who everybody is. You have in front of you a statement. Could you please read that out into the record?

MR CASTANO: Should I say my name?
PRESIDENT: Your name, please, and then read that into the record.

MR CASTANO: My name is Iván Castaño. I solemnly declare upon my honour and conscience that I shall speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

PRESIDENT: Thank you very much. We have one statement from you. It is dated
24 February 2022 Can you confirm that everything you say in that statement is correct to the best of your knowledge and belief?

MR CASTANO: I confirmthat.
PRESIDENT: Is there anything you want to change?

MR CASTANO: I don't want to change anything.

PRESIDENT: Very good. Thank you.
MR GOUIFFÈS: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

I will ask a few questions, as we agreed, for ten minutes direct, to Mr Castaño. I will do this in English despite him I think having his statements in Spanish.
Examination by Respondent
by Mr Gouiffès
MR GOUIFFÈS: Mr Castaño, before the other party starts with cross-examination, could you please describe your academic background and experience, in particular as regards to the .CO domain, please?

MR CASTANO: I amgoing to answer in Spanish, so I will give you a moment to put your headsets on.

With regards to my academic and professional background, with regards to the .CO domain, I am an electronic engineer. I graduated from the National University of Colombia. I then went to Canada and studied at the University of Toronto and got a Master's degree in Telecommunications Engineering. Then I started working in the public policy sector and I got a degree in telecommunications and data, so I thought it was important to have an academic background in the field.
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So in terms of my experience and academic 15:40
background, that is that. Professional experience I spent more than five years in the department supervising state contracts before joining MinTIC. I also had ten years' experience working in science technology innovation and information technologies communication.

On top of that I already had two years of experience working in MinTIC when I became the director for IT industry development, so I was familiar with the internal workings of MinTIC.

MR GOUIFFÈS: Thank you, Mr Castaño. So you just explained you were appointed director of development of the information technology industry in August 2018. Could you please explain what were your responsibilities in relation to the .CO domain from that point on?

MR CASTANO: So from August 2018 when I became a director I had three main functions or roles in terms of the. CO domain. My first function was to supervise the 019 contract, the concession contract, that was given to. CO Internet SAS, so I met frequently with the contractor to get reports and to make sure that the Contract was being performed appropriately.

I also had to make sure that it was
15:42 properly resourced in terms of supervision and sought to always guarantee that the contract was being properly performed by the contractor, so that was one of my roles, to supervise the performance of the 019 contract.

By law, the direction of IT industry development was also charged with providing support to the vice minister and the MinTIC in anything related with the administration, the operation and the maintenance policies for the .CO domain. We further participated in the advisory committee of the co domain. In some scenarios, the technical secretariat of that committee fell on me as I was director of the IT industry development.

MR GOUIFFÈS: In your witness statement you tackle MinTIC's decisions not to renew the 2009 contract. Could youdescribe what were the reasons for which MinTIC decided to launch the new tender, please?

MR CASTANO: Yes, of course. Within our department one of our functions was to carry out technical analysis, while there was another department tasked with legal analysis, the General Secretariat. And we conducted this analysis

1
together with the International Telecommunications
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Union as well as an external adviser who was hired specifically to help us in the building of the analysis, so as to better help us as a government to make well informed decisions, and we started to evidence some elements. The first was thatin 2009, the internet world was one thing and it was a very different thing in 2018 when we started to consider the different alternatives we had before us as a government in order to be able to guarantee or better operate the .CO domain, so as a result of all of these changes we saw on the one hand a need to take a much more active role on behalf of Colombia before international institutions such as ICANN since, up to that date, it was theconcessionaire which represented Colombia, and we also by that time felt there had been some important changes in the financial component and that led us to the conclusion that if there were substantial changes in the industry, such as the administrative side, the technical side and the financial side, the only alternative we had before us was to launch a new tender, which was the only alternative we had since negotiating an extension became impossible under Colombian law.

[^2]```
of his statement?
PRESIDENT: It is not marked?
MR BALDWN: No. It is fine. You can leave it at the desk. (Same handed) And my colleague, Mr Innes, is going to bring a bundle to the witness.
Cross-examination by Claimant
by Mr Baldwin
MR BALDWN: Good afternoon, Mr Castaño. Thanks for being here to participate in this.
You are currently not employed for the Respondent, for the Colombian government, is that correct?
MR CASTANO: I am currently employed by a company, or an entity, publicly owned, but I'm not a state official. But I am an employee of a one hundred percent publicly owned entity.
MR BALDWMN: I didn't get that translation. I don't know if it went to a different channel.
THE INTERPRETER: You should hear me on channel 1.
MR BALDWN: I hear you now. Could you please repeat?
MR CASTANO: At the moment I work for an
```
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[^3]because I was originally a contractor in 2016, and $\mathbf{1 5 : 5 1}$ then I became the deputy director for sectorial digitalisation. I then was given the role of the director for the development of the IT industry

MR BALDWN: Who gave you that role, to be director of the IT industry?

MR CASTANO: I was appointed by the Minister, Sylvia Constaín.

MR BALDWN: Did you know
Minister Constaín before that? Or was that the first time you met her, when she offered you the job?

MR CASTANO: When she joined the Ministry I was the deputy director for the development of the IT industry development, and when she joined as Minister I met her, and then the opportunity arose for me to step into the directorship, but I didn't know her when I was a director but rather the deputy director, which was kind of a role that I had assumed under the previous government.

MR BALDWN: And in paragraph 4 of your witness statement you said that you became the director of development of IT in August 2018. Do you remember when in August 2018 it was?

MR CASTANO: The exact date I don't recall
but it must have been in the last weeks of August -- 15:53 sorry, 2016. Do you mean when I was hired? I was hired in 2016, in mid August, and then when I was appointed the director for IT industry development in 2018 it was the last week of August

MR BALDWN: Thank you. Going back to your witness statement, you say in paragraph 3 "I held various positions as an engineer and project leader at several companies, before carrying out consulting assignments for various entities of the Colombian state in the field of information technologies".

Approximately how many companies do you think you worked for after your studies in Toronto and before you began consulting for MinTIC, and when I say MinTIC I mean the Ministry of Technology and Information Communications?

MR CASTANO: The first was a company that developed technology solutions, Pactelwas its name. Then secondly I went to Social Prosperity. And then I worked at the Environment Ministry in sustainable support, then I was in planning, and then after that I went to the ITC Ministry, MinTIC, and I was working on science, technology and innovation, and then I was offered the opportunity to be a technical
support engineer for Johnson \& Johnson Medical, not 15:55 so much in telecommunications though, and when I was in Toronto I had the opportunity to work part time for a telecommunications firm who back then was called Manitoba Telecommunications Services. So those are the companies where I had occasion to work and provide my professional services before joining MinTIC.

MR BALDWN: I amtrying to understand what your role was at those earlier positions. Was it more of a project manager? Was it more of a technical person? Was it an engineer? Some combination?

MR CASTANO: Well, between Johnson \& Johnson, MTS Allstreamand Pactel my role was more of an engineering and of a technical nature, but when $I$ joined the public sector it was a kind of a mix of both technical roles as well as management and project management and administration. From when I joined Social Prosperity, the Environmental Ministry, and when I was in planning, in MinTIC, for example, like I said when you asked me about my academic background, I was working on issues related to formulating and evaluating public policies for government agencies, which is a very important role,

[^4]
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For example the General Secretariat would have more
 to do with contractual issues, whereas theLegal Office would be focused on dealing with claims or procedural issues and legal representation of the Ministry.

MR BALDWN: The interpreter translated, interpreted something as being "political', a political question or a political issue. Was that part of your answer?

MR CASTANO: I don't -- no.
MR BALDWN: So--
THE INTERPRETER: That should have been "policy". I apologise. Not "political policy".

PRESIDENT: I suggest you read back from the transcript what he said and ask him to confirm or to clarify it.

MR BALDWN: I would, but I am also happy to take his answer that he didn't say "political" and the Interpreter has confirmed that. I just wanted to be sure. I can read it back. I am fine with that.

MR GOUIFFÈS: There isn't "political" here.

THE INTERPRETER: It would have been
"policy position" rather than "political position".

MR BALDWN: It says - I will read it -218
it is 15.58.33, and it says "or did have at that time, when I was there, have two departments responsible for or establishing the Ministry's political positions." So it does in fact say that, but I accept that it was supposed to be" "policy". Thank you very much for that.

MR CASTANO: What I amtalking about, it is the official position of the government. The formal official position.

MR BALDWIN: To let you know, Mr Castaño, that your voice suddenly changed in my ear!

So when you would go to one of these legal officials, whether it was a contract or a regulatory issue, would you go and ask them and they would give you the answer? Would you email them? How did you communicate with them with the questions that you had?

MR CASTANO: Well, let's say that there is not only one way of communicating of course in this kind of work. Sometimes -- sometimes - of course we send emails and in other situations when we meet for working meeting, working session, we are all together and even in some cases there were several lawyers, you know, to review some kind of a specific
issue. In some other cases it could be a chat.
There was not an only communication line in order to talk, to communicate, within our team in the department.

MR BALDWN: Would you send them requests for opinions on a legal question? If you had a legal question and it was of some importance, would you send them a request for their opinion on that legal position?

MR CASTANO: Well, let's say, as I was saying, yes, sometimes I could send an email, or even I could call somebody and ask them to come, or ask a lawyer to come, telling him or her well, I am doubtful concerning this issue, what do you think, what could be the position? Let me know your thoughts. And sometimes you had also the possibility - as I was saying, maybe we could have a legal opinion from the lawyer in the different ways and communication modalities for our interaction in our work.

MR GONZALEZ: Mr President, I don't want to interrupt the flow of questioning but we are very close to the line here on privileged information. I suspect that was just a general sort of process question and I don't have a problem with
that, but I want to make sure that the witness is
$\underset{16: 03}{220}$ reminded that with regard to actual communications with legal counsel, internal or external, that is privileged and no-one has waived privilege here and he is not to answer questions that actually ask for divulging of privileged information.

PRESIDENT: Mr González, let's see. He is being asked at the moment about his use of counsel.

MR GONZALEZ: Understood. I want to make sure that we don't violate the privilege and go beyond that line.

PRESIDENT: If there is what you consider a violation, no doubt you will let us know.

MR GONZALEZ: I definitely will.
MR BALDWN: Mr Castaño, can you describe what -- when you arrived as the director of IT in late August, the last week of August in 2018, how many people in MinT1C were working to manage or supervise or work with the 2009 concession by .CO Internet? How many people?

MR CASTANO: Well, directly supporting the contract's supervision there were two people

MR BALDWN: Could you tell me the names of those two people? And I am asking when you arrived. They may have changed during the year that
you had this role. Could you tell me the name of ${ }_{16: 05}^{221}$ those two people and what exactly they did at the Ministry?

MR CASTANO: Well, there were two engineers. I don't remember exactly their names now, but their role, their main role, was basically to receive the reports that were prepared by .CO Internet and then to make an assessment, let's saya basic assessment of the information within those reports, and to be in constant contact, even more than me as a supervisor, with .CO Internet SAS concerning any situation, any circumstances that could arise concerning the operation of the domain.

Their roles were mostly technical.
I would say also operational as regards the implementation of the Contract

MR BALDWN: Prior to August 2018, did you have experience with registry services or operation of domains? Like a countrycode top-level domain, like the .co?

MR CASTANO: Concerning operation of the domain, is that your question? About operation of the domain, if I had experience in domain operation?

MR BALDWN: I will make it broader and then maybe we can narrow it down if we need to. But
the broader question is did the roles you describe, ${ }_{16}{ }_{16} 220$
because there were several, after your college in Toronto, your master's in Toronto and before you started doing the consulting at theMinistry in 2016, you described several jobs. Did any of those jobs or one before that involve working for a registry company that was managing internet domains?

MR CASTANO: No.
PRESIDENT: Mr Baldwin, lam sory to interrupt. Can I ask a question? Mr Castaño, you answered counsel a bit earlier and you referred to "technical" and "operational". Can you explain the difference between technical, in your view, and operational?

MR CASTANO: Well, concerning the support that we had with the two contractors, is that your question?

PRESIDENT: Yes.
MR CASTANO: So the difference was, in my view, the difference is that something that is operational is something that is recurring,
repetitive, so we don't necessarily need to have an in-depth process of analysis or interpretation. It is something that is operational, could be similar to a repetitive operation. It is something

## technical but repetitive

PRESIDENT: Sorry to have interrupted,

## Mr Baldwin.

MR BALDWMN: No. Thank you.
I appreciated the question, Mr President.
Mr Castaño, so you had no experience in the registry domain. If we could turn to your witness statement, paragraph 5, please, just to confirm the first sentence of paragraph 5 confirms that your role from August 2016 with MinTlC until August 2018 did not involve domains at all, right?

MR CASTANO: Yes, you are right
MR BALDWN: And you say in the second sentence, and I amgoing to read the English, but you understand both English and Spanish but please read along in the Spanish, the second sentence, 'When I assumed the position of director of development of the IT industry in August 2018, I therefore started to familiarise myself with this topic as the supervision of the 209 contract became part of my responsibilities'.

First question: what do you mean by "the topic". The English word here is "topic". I could look up what the Spanish is, but the English word is 'topic". What do you mean, familiarise yourself
with this topic?
224
MR CASTANO: Well, concerning the contract for the domain .co. That is what I meant there. That is the topic.

MR BALDWIN: So the topic is the 2009 concession. Did that familiarisation also include getting to understand the technical aspects of the registry business, or some of these other issues relating to domains?

MR CASTANO: Yes. Both
MR BALDWN: So could you tell me what then you did to familiarise yourself? And I am really looking at August, September, maybe even October, but during thosefirst three months what did you do to familiarise yourself with that?

MR CASTANO: Well, what I did at that time to familiarise myself with the execution of the implementation of that contract of .co was a review of the latest reports, supervision reports of the Contract. I also reviewed the minutes of the advisory committee of the domain.

I also requested meeting with the contractor in order to better understand the main issues or the main points in the execution of that contract, and I started also reviewing by myself
some issues related to ICANN, what was the $\begin{aligned} & 225 \\ & \text { 16:11 }\end{aligned}$ relationship we had to have with this kind of entity, but we could say that the main activity, the main task, you know, everything, it was for the familiarisation were those that I just mentioned

MR BALDWN: And when you say getting familiar with ICANN, you said that that related to the relationship between the concessionaire, MinTIC, and ICANN, or general topics related to that?

MR CASTANO: Well, in a general way I would say the way in which ICANN established its model, the multistakeholder model, and how we could understand that kind of functioning.

MR BALDWN: How do you feel the people, these two persons, or whoever the previous person in your role was that was kind of overseeing the 2009 concession from MinTIC, how do you think they were doing before you arrived? Do you think they were performing well? Doing a good job? Or not doing a good job?

MR CASTANO: Well, at that time I think I can say it was a very good performancefor what we were concerned, what we got, since August 2018, but, you know, what had been done earlier between 2009 and 2018, I think we should talk to the persons who
were supervising themselves those contracts
MR BALDWNN: What do you believe they did wrong, or could have done better?

MR CASTANO: No, that was not what I said. I just saw some supervision reports. I was comfortable with some of them, but I cannot judge. I don't know. I couldn't assess if it was very good, excellent, or it could have been better. I could not assess that.

MR BALDWIN: If you turn to paragraph 7 of your witness statement the first sentence says "In general, I also noted that MinTIC's technical oversight capacity was limited", and then you go on in the same sentence to say "there was a great reliance on the information provided by .CO Internet and MinTIC's technical capacities were relatively limited'", and there is more that goes on.

Can you explain what you meant by that first paragraph? What is the deficiency that you believe you saw?

MR CASTANO: I think that one of the, let's say, issues with regards to the reliance on the information provided by.CO Internet is that, while we were paid 7 per cent of the sales, of the proceeds, we did not have another information

[^5]to clarify and respond to the requests of our
16:16
President. So those tasks were repetitive, were
recurrent, and let's say there was not much added
value by the technical supervision, and that is what
I was intending to say when I said that capacity
within the Ministry was limited and could have been
improved.

MR BALDWN: What did you do to change that in the yearthat you were there?

MR CASTANO: Well, during that year we did several things. Among them we hired more staff in order to develop some activities that were less operational, a little bit more strategic. We also hired lawyers in order to help us to validate and to better understand the development and the implementation of the Contract, and even if on the one hand we had to supervise the domain .co, we also had to participate in ICANN events.

I don't know how that was done by the previous administration, but I decided to attend personally ICANN events, so I had the opportunity to be there. That was in March, let's see, maybe 2019 I attended an ICANN event in Japan because precisely what we wanted was a better understanding of all those issues related to the registry of the domain,
and more specifically the country code TLDs, and $\underset{16: 18}{229}$ that is why we started to develop thosenew
activities, always in relation to the supervision of
the contract.
MR BALDWN: Do you recall when the ICANN
event in Japan was?
MR CASTANO: It was March 2019.
MR BALDWN: And the law firm you referred
to was Durán \& Osorio. Is that correct?
MR CASTANO: No, sir.
MR BALDWN: What was the name of the law
firm that you hired?
MR CASTANO: It was not a law firm. They
were lawyers in order to support the process, the
contract supervision process. I think it wasJuan
Camilo Cuenca was one of the persons who was hired,
but Durán \& Osorio was not the law firm hired to
support the provision of the Contract 019
MR BALDWN: Were you involved in the
hiring of the lawfirmDurán \& Osorio?
MR CASTANO: No, sir.
MR BALDWN: Do you know who selected the
lawfirm?
MR CASTANO: No, sir.
MR BALDWN: Do you know what the law firm
was asked to do? ..... 230

MR CASTANO: What was asked of Durán \& Osorio, do you mean?

MR GONZALEZ: Again, that is very close to the line in terms of privileged information. If counsel wants to rephrase the question that is fine, but I believe that question as asked will elicit privileged information. I will instruct the witness not to answer.

MR BALDWN: I will ask in another way -actually, were you involved at all with that contract of the work they were doing? Notwhat you were doing but were you involvedwith the work that Durán \& Osorio were doing?

MR CASTANO: I was involved with Durán \& Osorio concerning the review and assessment of some elements in order to take a decision on the extension or the non extension of contract 019. However, it was a legal issue, so the more specific topics, the more specific issues of the contract processes with Durán \& Osorio were managed by the General Secretariat of the Ministry.

MR BALDWIN: Is that Ms Trujillo?
MR CASTANO: Yes.
MR BALDWIN: In paragraph 8 of your
witness statement you state soon after you were $\begin{gathered}\text { 16:21 } \\ \text { 231 }\end{gathered}$
named the director of development of the IT industry, the question of the future of the .CO domain started to arise given that the term of the 2009 contract was due to expire on 6 February 2020. Do you see that? Do you remember when you first heard about this contract expiration of the 2009 concession?

MR CASTANO: Well, I don't recall exactly what was the date but I think it was very soon after I took that post as director.

MR BALDWN: Do you recall who raised it with you? Who mentioned it?

MR CASTANO: I think it was via the report that had been submitted by the previous government concerning the pending issues, and that was one of the pending issues that should have been reviewed by our team.

MR BALDWN: And you are referring to the July 2018 report?

MR CASTANO: Yes. That is correct.
MR BALDWN: And what did you do when you read that report and saw the statements that were made in the report about the expiration of the 2009 concession? What steps did you take?

[^6]$\underset{16: 25}{233}$ that the best option, the best alternative, is to launch a new tendering process, and that document said that that was the best option, but in any case, in any way, that should have been a very careful exercise as a manager, and of course it was a relevant issue for all the Ministry, so it is not only the supervision of the implementation of contract 019; it was a larger issue, because .co is a public asset, a state asset, so we started to review and to examine which were the possibilities, what was the best option, what was the best for Colombia, and we started to get some information and to have some more robust information than that preliminary report prepared by the previous government, and that is why we started that process of hiring some people, some experts, that could devote more time to analyse those issues. And also we started hiring experts from the ITU in order to better understand the technical part and what were the inputs that were necessary in order to take the best informed decision, and the best decision for the Colombian state.

MR BALDWN: So in the early process you said that in your view this July 2018 report was
preliminary. That is your view, right?
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MR CASTANO: Yes, sir.
MR BALDWN: And you stated that you then took other steps after that to make up your mind. When you first looked at the 2018 report, did you consider that the extension of the 2009 concession was a possibility? I am asking whether it was a possibility, not whether it was your first choice. Did you consider it as a possibility?

MR CASTANO: Yes, sir. We did
MR BALDWN: And you said that if it was to be extended, there would have to be some changes, correct?

MR CASTANO: No, sir. I didn't say that.
MR BALDWIN: So you considered the possibility of extending it as it was, extending it on the same terms?

MR CASTANO: No. What I considered is that there was a possibility of extending it, but I did not consider what should have been the terms and conditions. That was not considered.

MR BALDWIN: You testify, and we can look at this in your statement, about the dynamism, I think in Spanish it is 'dinamismo', of the
internet, and that that needed to factor into terms


MR CASTANO: Yes, sir.
MR BALDWIN: And you testified earlier that it was that dynamic nature of the internet that required some changes to an extension of the concession. Do I have that right?

MR CASTANO: Yes. But you are asking me if I had reached that conclusion after reading that preliminary report by the national government, and that was not the case. That was not correct

MR BALDWIN: Well, thank you for that clarification. When did you reach that conclusion, that there would have to be changes because of the dynamism of the internet?

MR CASTANO: After the submission of the report of the ITU experts, and in the process that we were carrying on with them, it became clear, and with the reports or interim reports we had with them

15

[^7]evidence in this case. We are going to take a $\begin{array}{ll}15 & \text { 16:32 }\end{array}$ minute break. You are welcome to get a coffee or something to drink outside. Please do not discuss this case or your evidence with anybody

MR CASTANO: That is fine. Can I use the toilet?

PRESIDENT: You can use the toilet as well. Very well. We will break for 15 minutes.
(Short break from 4.31 pm to 4.45 pm )
PRESIDENT: Mr Baldwin, please proceed
MR BALDWN: Thank you. Before the break we talked about the ITU reports. You said there were at least two. Do you think there might have been three or more?

MR CASTANO: I don't recall the exact number of reports.

MR BALDWN: That is fine, but you said it was the report that made you understand or led you to the conclusion that if there was an extension there would have to be changes to the concession. Do you remember was it the February 2019? The May 2019 report?

MR CASTANO: No. There was a preliminary report, I believe, and in fact we had some working sessions, some in-person sessions working with the

1
2

ITU experts in Bogotá, and also as I mentioned 16:47
before we had an in-house team that was also doing
its own analysis of how the industry was evolving
MR BALDWN: Is that in-house teammade up
of the same people you describe? Are you talking
about the advisory committee?
MR CASTANO: No. No. I amtalking about for example Adriana Arcila.

MR BALDWN: And she worked as a consultant, is that correct?

MR CASTANO: Yes, that is right
MR BALDWN: What was Adriana's background?

MR CASTANO: Adriana, as far as I understand, is a systems engineer, and I think she has a Master's from MIT and she worked for a long time on information technology issues.

MR BALDWN: You stated it was the preliminary ITU report that led you to the conclusion that the extension would have to involve changes to the concession, just so we wrap that issue up.

MR CASTANO: We commissioned the ITU to provide us with advice as to how to find the best technical alternative for the administration of the
.co domain, so neither the ITU nor the team of 16:49 advisers that we had were in a position to recommend -- or not -- changes to the contract. They didn't have the authority to do that. So in the ITU report what we began to see was a change in terms of the dynamics of the sector, and we were seeing things changing in terms of the financial remunerations, if you like, that were changing in the sector, and that's what the in-house analysts were looking at.

I know I am repeating myself, but considering that although an extension was an option, it was an option to make important changes to it and that is what led us to decide as the advisory committee for the .co domain to recommend that a new tender be launched, so it wasn't just or wasn't because the ITU had explicitly said that we would need to re-negotiate the consideration, or because the preliminary report said so, it was because it is what we began to observe from different sources that led us to take that decision within the advisory committee on the 18th and 19th of March 2019.

MR BALDWIN: I was asking a different question but I think it is better if we move on. So
let's go to the last thing you said which was the 16:51
advisory committee. In paragraph 6 of your witness
statement you state that 'I also joined the .co
domain advisory committee, a MinTIC body officially
tasked with advising the Ministry on .co domain
policy." Do you know when you joined? Did you join
the advisory committee right when you started
working in August of 2018?
MR CASTANO: Yes.
MR BALDWN: Do you remember when the
first meeting was?
MR CASTANO: I don't remember exactly when
that first meeting was.
MR BALDWIN: You stated several times
"we'. For example I said at line 16.27 .26 'I am
asking whether it was a possibility, not whether it
was your first choice. Did you consider a
possibility", talking about the extension, and you
said 'Yes, sir, we did'. You said 'we' several
times throughout this. When you say "we", who are
you talking about?
MR CASTANO: The advisory committee.
MR BALDWI: And what was your role in the
advisory committee?
MR CASTANO: In the advisory committee the
advisory committee. In paragraph 6 of your witness statement you state that 'I also joined the .co donain advisory commitee, a MinTC body officially pask " Do youking the advisory committee right when you started working in August of 2018?

MR CASTANO: Yes.
MR BALDWIN: Do you remember when the
MR CASTANO: I don't remember exactly when
MR BALDWIN: You stated several times
"we'. For example I said at line 16.27.26 'I am , whether it was a possibility, not whether it possibility", talking about the extension, and you said 'Yes, sir, we did'. You said 'we'" several times throughout this. When you say "we", who are you talking about?

MR CASTANO: The advisory committee.
MR BALDWIN: And what was your role in the
MR CASTANO: In the advisory committee the
role was to, as its name indicates, advise the ${ }_{16: 53}^{241}$

Ministry on matters related to administration and
policy surrounding the .co domain as well as being the technical secretariat for the Committee

MR BALDWIN: That was the role of the committee. What was your role, to role. What was your role?

MR CASTANO: As the director of the IT industry development my role was to submit and present information of a technical nature which would help or facilitate the discussions going on with regards to the administration of the domain, so with regards to the administration or management of the .co domain.

MR BALDWN: So you spoke at these advisory committee meetings, you offered up information to help the Committee, is that right?

MR CASTANO: Yes, that is correct.
MR BALDWN: And did you vote as well on the Committee? When the Committee had a vote, did you vote?

MR CASTANO: As the technical secretary I believe that I did not have a vote

PRESIDENT: Did the advisory committee make decisions on a vote?

MR CASTANO: No.
PRESIDENT: Thank you.
MR BALDWIN: How did the advisory committee make decisions, following up on another good question here? How did the advisory committee make decisions?

MR CASTANO: Well, generally speaking the decisions were by consensus.

MR BALDWN: And they would be reflected in the minutes that a decision had been taken?

MR CASTANO: Yes.
MR BALDWN: It is called an advisory committee. So was the role to advise the Minister or was the role to actually be involved in making policy?

MR CASTANO: The role of the advisory committee, as you have quite well remarked, in order to reflect its role, so to speak, was to make recommendations as an advisory body to the highest authority in the Ministry, which would have been in this case the lady Minister, but as such the advisory committee didn't take decisions, let's say binding decisions. What the advisory committee would do is to advise on a course of action, a path to follow, but its function was not to take

## decisions on behalf of the Ministry.

MR BALDWN: Often in committees you might have that one person that refuses to agree to things. If you had, you know, ten people that wanted to provide some advice or make it advice but the one person that didn't, would the minutes reflect that that advice-- would that advice have been given to Madam Minister?

MR CASTANO: If that were to happen, yes. If that occasion were to arise, then the answer to your question is yes.

MR BALDWN: Were you involved in the exclusion of .CO Internet from the advisory committee?

MR CASTANO: In what sense?
MR BALDWN: In December of 2018 there was a decision made to exclude .CO Internet from participation in that advisory committee meeting, and that it would only be allowed to participate, meaning .CO Internet and its representatives, if they were invited specifically to a meeting, and I am wondering if you were involved in that decision?

MR CASTANO: Well, I agreed with the decision to exclude domain.CO from the previous

## advisory committee. <br> 244

MR BALDWN: But do you know whose decision was it to make to exclude .CO from the previous advisory committee?

MR CASTANO: I don't remember exactly. What I do recall is that I was in agreement with that decision to exclude .CO Internet SAS, taking in to account that the extension was just one alternative open to us, but also taking into account that it was also possible to launch a new tender process and that those mechanisms would be discussed within the framework of that advisory committee, so it was important, given those discussions, that there be impartiality maintained. To use a word we have heard a lot today, to ensure candour and transparency, and to avoid that maybe a potential participant in a new tendering process would be given some privilege and so I agreed, given that in that forum matters related to a potential extension or not, or the launching of a new tendering process were to be discussed, that that was a matter that would be discussed purely between government officials and government representatives

MR BALDWIN: In your view that it was appropriate to exclude.CO Internet from the
previous advisory meetings, did you come to that 17:00 view-- I will start again

When you came to the view that it was okay to exclude. CO Internet from these previous advisory committee meetings, had you examined whether or not .CO Internet had a right to be there under the concession, or some other rule or law?

MR CASTANO: No.
MR BALDWN: Have you since that time been made aware of whether or not .CO Internet had a right to be there?

MR CASTANO: Yes.
MR BALDWN: And when was that? When did you become aware of that?

MR CASTANO: Well, by that time I had actually left the Ministry.

MR BALDWN: Was it in-
PRESIDENT: I am sorry, could you ask the intermediate question? You asked him-- you said to him when was that, but before that, when he looked up, when he reached that view, what was the decision he took as to whether they had a right You asked the question did he check whether they had a right to be there

MR BALDWN: I assumed that was done - it
was after he left the Ministry.
17:01
PRESIDENT: I am not going there. You asked him a question and he said no, he had not, and then you asked him and he said yes, he did so. So what is the answer? Are you going to put that question to him?

MR BALDWN: Certainly I can. You say at one point you formed a view as to whether or not it was appropriate for .CO to be excluded. What was the view that you arrived at --

PRESIDENT: My understanding was, and maybe I will put the question.

You were asked the question was there some basis on which they had the right to attend that committee, did you check that, and you said no, you didn't, but then you said you checked it, you did review it, but it was after you left. The question is when you reviewed that, what did you review and what was the conclusion you reached?

MR CASTANO: Okay. Well, the conclusion that I reached was that there had been some confusion with regards to how the Committee was structured because in the past traditionally big contracts, public sector contracts, have an operational committee attributed to them, and so we
reviewed and looked back over the minutes of the .co $\quad \begin{aligned} & \text { 17:03 }\end{aligned}$
domain advisory committee meetings prior to my arrival, and what this committee did was to review the operations report and it was a committee dedicated to doing contract supervision. So by giving it the name advisory committee to the operations committee, which usually is responsible for the state public contracts, so this naturally implies that the person performing the contract, the contractor, should be on that committee. But because this committee wasnamed advisory committee, it generated - I don't know if you can call it really a confusion, but it gave rise to that difference.

So as we had a committee tasked with advising, not to supervising the execution of the contract or the operating committee, the contractor did have the right to be on the operations committee, which for purposes of the execution of this contract was the advisory committee of the .co domain.

PRESIDENT: Thank you.
MR BALDWN: So along those lines do you think it would be helpful to have the entity that was managing and operating the concession be part of
the discussion to provide advice to Madam Minister?
$\underset{17: 05}{248}$
MR CASTANO: No, Idon't
MR BALDWIN: And why is that? Why do you
not think it is helpful for the entity that is doing all the work to be part of the advice given to the Minister?

MR CASTANO: Well, I say no for two reasons. One because the information with regards to the operation of the .co domain was my responsibility as the director for the IT industry development, as a member of the advisory committee, and, secondly, because of what I said before. Having the current operator there at a time when you are assessing whether or not the concession should be extended or discussing the possibility of launching a new tendering process could have been perceived by other parties as giving them an advantage because they are sitting at the table advising the Minister, giving advice to the Minister, and therefore in some way or another they could kind of steer the advice that they are giving and the input they are providing might benefit them Or, on the other hand, they may also have beenseen to be having access to information yet to be made public which again could be considered to be
advantageous to them if there was a tendering 17:07 process to the detriment of other potential bidders.

MR BALDWIN: Mr Castaño, the advisory committee did more than just discuss the tender, isn't that correct? Didn't they discuss other aspects to give advice to the Minister?

MR CASTANO: Yes.
MR BALDWIN: So I will tell you, as somebody who sits on boards, if it is about my re-election to the board or some other matter I am not allowed to participate, I have to leave. Was there a mechanism by which, when those issues of the tender and other issues were discussed, that .CO Internet could be asked to leave during those parts of the discussion? Did you consider that as a possibility?

MR CASTANO: Well, I think in fact what happened, or the decision with regards to the composition of the committee, it was decided to invite.CO Internet SAS to be present when the matters for discussion were to include their involvement. They would be invited tocome and sit in on the Committee.

PRESIDENT: While you are hesitating, Mr Baldwin, we agreed we wouldsit until 5.30 and

I indicated the Tribunal would show a little $\begin{aligned} \text { 17:08 }\end{aligned}$
flexibility if necessary, but we shouldn't need to, bearing in mind it has been a long day for everybody, so it is now by my clock almost ten minutes after five and I don't think we should go on further than very much after 5.30.

MR BALDWN: Mr President, I would totally agree with that. I have already been thinking about it. I will tell you that I would have questions that would go after 5.30 and then of course there would be potential for re-direct or Tribunal questions, but I can also tell you with a very good degree of certainty, absent something odd happening, that we will have no problemgetting through the remaining portion of Mr Castaño's examination tomorrow, plus the cross of the last two witnesses. I don't anticipate any. So I don't think there is any need to go longer today. But I may still have questions.

PRESIDENT: But how much longer do you think you will be with Mr Castaño?

MR BALDWIN: It depends on the answers a little bit and where we end up going --

PRESIDENT: It also depends on the questions!

```
MR BALDWIN: Thank you. But my suggestion 17:10
would be that we end at 5.30, even a little bit before if that was better, just because I don't see us tomorrow needing the full day for the other two examinations plus whatever is remaining of Mr Castaño's examination, so that would be my advice, to stop at 5.30 today. I will have some questions left but I don't think it makes sense for us to go later when we are going to have no problem -
1 PRESIDENT: Do you think you need more than an extra ten or 15 minutes?
MR BALDWN: I think so, yes.
MR GOUIFFĖS: As long as we are finished as agreed with the cross-examination tomorrow evening from the other side, we got it now, how it is organised now is absolutely fine for the Tribunal -
PRESIDENT: Let's aim to finish around about 5.30, give or take a couple of minutes, the way your examination goes.
MR BALDWN: Thank you. That sounds good.
So is it your position, you were in your role from August 2018 to August 2019. Is it your position that the only time. CO was excluded during
```

[^8]and above the extension, because that was for the $\begin{aligned} 25: 13\end{aligned}$ most part the subject for discussions, and because of the importance of the issue, the brunt of the conversations of the committee had to do with assessing whether or not there was a possibility of extending the contract, or whether a new bidding process, a new tender process, would be launched

MR BALDWN: It is your position that the brunt of every advisory committee meeting until you left in August 2019, that the brunt of all of those meetings was about whether to extend the concession or to do a tender?

MR CASTANO: Yes.
MR BALDWN: How often did those advisory committee meetings meet?

MR CASTANO: As many times as was necessary.

MR BALDWN: Can you try to recall more specifically? Was it once a month? Once every two months? I realise it could vary but if you could give it some average.

MR CASTANO: Well, that is why I said that it was as many times as necessary, but I can say that we had meetings every two months at least.

MR BALDWN: If we could go back to

paragraph 9 of your witness statement, please, this | 17:15 |
| :--- |
| 154 | is again talking about the dynamism of the domain industry, so it is the second bullet point on there, you state in here that in 2012 ICANN initiated a process for the attribution of additional gTLDs, which is generic top-level domains, which resulted in the creation of hundreds of new gTLDs which could compete with ccTLDs, and that was what you referred to as the dynamism of the internet. Could youjust explain for us what that means that ICANN did in 2012?

MR CASTANO: Yes, of course. Well, the dynamism was not due only to that. This was only one of the elements, one of the topics, that it was important to address, but in orderto answer more specifically your question, what ICANN did in 2012 was to empower and to allow the creation of generic domains, because for instance thedomain .co, as has been explained by the Claimants and by us, that domain has a very peculiar characteristic, it is associated with a world cooperation or com, or commerce, so if you have a generic domain you have the possibility of having. Travel or something else. So if we have, let's say, a tourist business, maybe it is not important orit is not advantageous
for me to buy a name that is .cobut I may be 17:17 $\begin{array}{r}255\end{array}$
interested in buying the domain .travel. In addition, before there was the possibility, or rather it was beneficial to have a domain .co. If I have for instance a business called Love and I want to buy the domain love.com it is possible that that one has already been bought by somebody, but if I am looking for the domain love.co, for instance, it is possible that that one is still available. This was the advantage of the .co domain. But now I could have the possibility of buying the domain love.love because we have those generic domains, so some businesses have started to implement their own web. Let's say for instance if you are IBM, you have not only .com but.IBM, so it is the generic domain that is associatedto the brand, so that was not possible earlier than 2012 So until 2012 we could only have the generic .com, .net, .org, or the country codes, et cetera, but since 2012 it was possible to have those new generic domains, and of course that could have an impact, positive or negative, on the market. But it is important to recognise that kind of development, technical development, like the one I am mentioning here.

[^9]already know whether or not it was positive or 17:21 negative, because these were events that happened six years earlier, right?

MR CASTANO: Well, yes, but what was relevant and important for us to understand that difference as regards the 2009 contract. This is a difference. Because in 2009 there were no generic domains. I mean when that contract was adjudicated there were no generic domains.

MR BALDWN: I guess what I am trying to understand, and this will be the last question on this topic, but you only give this example as the evolution and the dynamism, so I am just wondering why you decided to include that example of a 2012, where the results had already been seen and how they would affect -- did you feel that that 2012 action by ICANN was a reason to have further participation or to change the terms of the concession? That is what $I$ am trying to understand. What was the reason for putting it in? Was there some reason why you thought that would change how you should treat an existing contract and an existing concessionaire?

MR CASTANO: As I tried to explain, that was only one example. We had been discussing and we found other examples, but what we wanted also to
decided in December 2018 to modify the role and 17:25 composition of the advisory committee."

Here you made the decision to use the - I think it's the pasiva refleja, the passive form, to talk about "it was decided". Why did you decide to use "it was decided"? Is it because you didn't know who made the decision to change the advisory committee? I amcurious.

MR CASTANO: I am not sure I understood your question, sir.

MR BALDWN: You state, and I can read the Spanish, but you state in the English translation says, "under the leadership of Minister Constaín it was decided" to change the role. I wonder why you said "it was decided". Did the Minister, did she decide it?

MR CASTANO: I don't know, sir. I don't know.

MR BALDWN: Okay. I was wondering about that.

Mr President, this might be, if it is okay with you, a good place to stop, and we can start tomorrow. I will say again that I don't see us having any problems with getting through the rest of the witnesses on a normal day, but I would like to
discuss and to check was how the industry had 17:22
evolved and changed, and that evolution and those changes, and the changes were introduced by ICANN in 2012, did not exist when that concession was granted in 2009. So for us, for me in this case, that is why I included it in my witness statement, because I think it is relevant. And what is relevant is that it shows that, between 2009 and 2018 or 2019
there were several changes, important changes, in the industry, and that is why I am mentioning the word "dynamism".

And there is something else. We also had applications, apps, that do not necessarily use a domain in an explicit way. So it is to show how those changes, technical changes, because those are technical changes, how those technical changes impact the situation, and we thought it was relevant to show that, and at least to show one example, one instance of those changes that had an impact on the industry evolution between 2009 and 2018 or 2019

MR BALDWN: I said I wasn't going to ask any more questions about it, and $I$ am sticking with it, so let's move to paragraph 12 of your statement, please. The first sentence says "Accordingly, under the leadership of Minister Constaín, it was
hold Mr Castaño over because I have more questions. 1260
PRESIDENT: Very well. We will hold you
to making sure that you do finish tomorrow within
the same normal time, if we can.
MR GOUIFFĖS: I think you said we were all
due, of course we want to be sure that the agreement
we had, that everything is finished by
cross-examination by tomorrow--
PRESIDENT: We can never guarantee things
but I think it is very important, we said we would
try to do that and that is our aimis to be able to
finish the witnesses tomorrow.
Very good. Now, Mr Castaño, you are still
giving evidence, and I will remind you that whilst
you are giving evidence there should be no
discussions with anybody about this case. Please,
you should not be talking to counsel for the
Respondent, nor should you be talking to your
colleagues about this case. If you want to talk to
anybody about a football game, I don't think anybody
is going to object to that, but I want your
assurance that you will keep yourself to yourself in
respect of what is going on in this hearing.
We will start tomorrow morning at 9.30,
and we will carry on from there. Is there anything
that either side wishes to raise other than that, $\begin{aligned} \text { 17:28 }\end{aligned}$
from the Claimant's side?
MR BALDWN: Not fromthe Claimant's side
PRESIDENT: From the Respondent's side?
MR GOUIFFES: Nothing, thank you
PRESIDENT: That leaves to me to thank our court reporters, our translators, and of course our Tribunal secretary who keeps us well marshalled, and also to our technician, who I see is still here, to make sure everything works, and to wish you all a good evening. See you tomorrow morning. Thank you.
12 (The hearing was adjourned at 5.28 pm )

|  | 238/23 240/9 240/12 240/22 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MR AUBRY: [1] 210/25 | 240/25 241/8 241/18 241/22 <br> 242/1 242/7 242/11 242/16 243/9 | $\text { .biz [3] } 18 / 823 / 525 /$ |
| MR BALDWIN: [117] 8/2 11/5 | 242/1 242/7 242/11 242/16 243/9 | .co [234] 14/3 14/11 16/20 |
| 11/14 11/21 12/13 12/24 13/11 |  | 18/5 18/5 18/11 18/11 18/15 |
| 89/15 196/10 197/18 198/21 |  | 18/18 18/20 18/23 19/3 19/12 |
| 199/8 203/14 211/3 211/9 211/18 |  | 22/2 22/22 23/15 23/18 23/21 |
| 211/23 212/4 212/7 212/14 |  | 23/21 24/4 24/6 24/11 24/23 25/2 |
| 212/22 213/5 213/9 213/21 214/6 | MR GONZALEZ: [5] 177/16 219/21 | 25/3 25/7 25/19 25/22 26/12 |
| 215/9 216/2 216/5 217/6 217/11 | 220/9 220/14 230/4 | 26/18 26/23 27/4 27/8 27/17 |
| 217/17 218/1 218/11 219/5 | MR GONZÁLEZ: [2] 158/20 198/14 | 27/18 27/20 28/10 28/15 29/2 |
| 220/15 220/23 221/17 221/24 | MR GOUIFFÈS: [26] 8/18 11/8 | 29/8 29/10 29/13 31/3 31/14 |
| 223/4 223/13 224/5 224/11 225/6 | 11/19 11/22 12/5 12/11 12/19 | $31 / 2532 / 1232 / 1332 / 1533 / 4$ |
| 225/14 226/2 226/10 228/8 229/5 | 95/9 95/20 96/11 96/17 104/14 | 33/10 33/15 33/25 34/11 35/5 |
| 229/8 229/11 229/19 229/22 | 104/19 196/16 201/5 204/9 | 35/14 36/6 36/7 36/11 36/22 37/8 |
| 229/25 230/10 230/23 230/25 | 204/23 205/25 206/7 | 41/9 41/6 38/19 38/6 37/23 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 231/12 231/19 231/22 233/24 } \\ & 234 / 3234 / 11234 / 15234 / 22 \end{aligned}$ | 208/16 210/1 217/22 251/14 | 41/21 42/23 44/19 45/1 45/17 $\text { 49/10 50/5 50/17 72/18 } 73$ |
| 235/10 235/18 236/3 236/7 | /5 261/5 | 79/11 80/10 83/18 85/10 85/12 |
| 236/11 236/23 237/11 237/17 | MR PERALTA: [1] 9/14 | 86/1 86/15 87/2 87/9 91/12 91/14 |
| 238/4 238/9 238/12 238/18 | MS BALDWIN:[2] 12/4 54/13 | 91/16 91/17 98/1 98/3 98/10 |
| 239/24 240/10 240/14 240/23 |  | 98/18 98/18 98/23 104/22 104/23 |
| 241/5 241/15 241/19 242/3 242/9 |  | 104/24 105/4 105/14 105/18 |
| 242/12 243/2 243/12 243/16 |  | 105/23 105/25 106/2 106/7 |
| 244/2 244/24 245/9 245/13 |  | 107/12 107/16 107/21 107/25 |
| 245/17 245/25 246/7 247/23 |  | 108/6 108/7 108/22 108/25 109/2 |
| 248/3 249/3 249/8 250/7 250/22 | 10 | 109/6 109/8 109/20 109/21 |
| 251/1 251/13 251/22 252/6 253/8 | 186/3 186/10 186/14 186/19 | 109/22 109/23 109/25 110/7 |
| 253/14 253/18 253/25 256/1 | 195/24 196/11 197/7 199/6 2 | 110/21 111/8 111/12 112/11 |
| 256/16 257/10 258/21 259/11 |  | 113/5 113/6 114/15 117/22 |
| 259/19 261/3 |  | 118/23 119/6 119/13 119/15 |
| MR BIGGE: [6] 9/9 9/16 186/7 | 210/24 211/2 217/14 220/7 | 120/17 121/6 122/2 123/12 |
| 186/18 186/21 186/24 | 20/12 222/9 222/18 223/2 | 125/24 126/14 126/23 127/7 |
| MR CASTANO: [102] 205/7 205/10 | 236/17 236/25 237/7 237/10 | 128/1 128/3 128/18 128/22 129/4 |
| 205/19 205/22 206/12 207/18 |  | 129/16 129/21 130/13 131/3 |
| 208/21 210/7 211/14 211/25 | 250/20 | 131/25 132/7 132/22 135/10 |
| 212/6 212/10 212/21 212/25 |  | 149/16 149/19 149/20 149/23 |
| 213/7 213/13 213/25 214/18 | 260/9 261/4 261/6 | 151/21 153/20 154/14 156/20 |
| 215/14 216/4 216/9 217/10 218/8 | THE INTERPRETER: [4] 211/2 | 163/10 170/23 171/16 172/11 |
| 218/19 219/10 220/21 221/4 | 217/12 217/24 252/4 | 172/16 199/3 206/10 206/16 |
| 221/21 222/8 222/15 222/19 |  | 207/16 207/20 207/22 208/11 |
| 223/12 224/2 224/10 224/16 | 133/20 | 208/13 209/11 210/4 210/6 210/7 |
| 225/10 225/21 226/4 226/21 | '21[1] 133/20 | 210/18 212/19 220/19 221/7 |
| 228/10 229/7 229/10 229/13 |  | 221/11 221/20 224/3 224/18 |
| 229/21 229/24 230/2 230/15 | $16 / 2$ | 226/15 226/23 227/3 227/6 |
| 230/24 231/9 231/14 231/21 |  | 227/11 227/17 228/17 231/3 |
| 232/1 234/2 234/10 234/14 |  | 232/11 232/13 233/9 239/1 |
| 234/18 235/9 235/14 235/22 |  | 239/15 240/3 240/5 241/3 2 |
| 236/5 236/9 236/14 237/5 237/15 |  | 243/13 243/17 243/20 243/25 |
| 237/23 238/7 238/11 238/14 |  | 244/3 244/7 244/25 245/4 245/6 |


| .co... [19] 245/10 246/9 247/1 | 10.16.2 [4] 189/3 189/9 189/24 | $15 \text { June } 2021 \text { [1] 135/25 }$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 247/20 248/9 249/13 249/20 | 190/5 | 15 September [1] 74/15 |
| 251/25 252/7 252/16 252/20 | 10.17 [2] 188/10 188/15 | 15-minute [3] 95/7 95/21 186/10 |
| 254/18 255/1 255/4 255/10 | 10.18 [10] 57/2 57/5 58/8 64/9 | 15.58.33 [1] 218/2 |
| 256/13 256/15 256/24 256/25 | 64/20 65/17 83/12 143/9 145/21 | 1500 [1] 43/3 |
| .CO's [1] 24/7 | 146/20 | 158 [3] 55/17 194/25 195/3 |
| .com [9] 18/7 18/17 19/23 19/24 | 10.18.2 [1] 63/11 | 16.27.26 [1] 240/15 |
| 25/5 25/18 107/10 255/15 255/18 | 10.18.3 [1] 62/25 | 160 [1] 195/3 |
| .edu [1] 107/11 | 10.20.2 [1] 187/5 | 1600 [1] 43/5 |
| .fr [1] 107/13 | 10.3 [7] 68/3 145/15 160/20 | 17 [3] 10/25 37/18 67/5 |
| .IBM [1] 255/15 | 160/24 182/21 182/23 184/4 | 17 March 2019 [2] 36/22 87/1 |
| .net [1] 255/19 | 10.4 [11] 68/3 145/15 160/20 | 176 [1] 122/8 |
| .org [2] 107/10 255/19 | 160/24 182/21 182/23 184/4 | 18 [3] 10/25 50/18 119/20 |
| .se [1] 107/13 | 187/23 191/5 191/16 192/5 | 18 March [1] 136/20 |
| .the [1] 125/24 | 10.5 [4] 68/1 145/15 160/20 | 18 September 2019 [2] 58/3 |
| .travel [2] 255/2 256/15 | 160/22 | 134/13 |
| .tv [2] 19/1 108/8 | 10.7 [2] 68/5 68/7 | 188 [1] 195/4 |
| .uk [1] 107/13 | 100 [3] 26/18 45/13 91/2 | 189 [1] 195/4 |
| .us [2] 18/8 23/23 | 103 [1] 195/2 | 18th [1] 239/22 |
| 0 | 104 [1] 195/2 1082/2015 [1] | $\begin{aligned} & 19 \text { [5] } 87 / 5125 / 8157 / 23198 / 12 \\ & 199 / 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| 0007 [1] 170/19 | 10G [1] 61/21 | 19 March 2019 [2] 119/21 120/13 |
| 0032 [1] 171/17 | 11 December 2001 [1] 20/8 | 19 per cent [1] 127/7 |
| 0045 [1] 176/14 | 11.19 [1] 190/19 | 1920s [1] 46/24 |
| 0046 [1] 176/14 | 113 million [1] 14/12 | 1926 [2] 46/5 46/7 |
| 0047 [1] 176/14 | 113.7 million [1] $26 / 21$ | 1991 [4] 18/22 19/13 19/16 |
| 0124 [1] 20/16 | 114 million [3] 112/13 113/6 | 107/25 |
| 019 [6] 207/21 208/6 210/9 | 113/11 | 1998 [1] 108/3 |
| 229/18 230/18 233/9 | 115 [1] 42/21 | 1999 [1] 24/2 |
| 1 | 12 [4] 95/11 96/1 114/17 258/23 | 19th [1] 239/22 |
| 1 December 2021 [3] 74/2 137/25 | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & 12 \end{aligned}$ | 2 |
| 141/3 | 126 [1] 79/25 | 2 April 2009 [1] 109/13 |
| 1 per cent [3] 26/19 105/23 110/3 | $129 \text { [1] } 199 / 19$ | 2 pm [1] 95/14 |
| 1,000 [1] 27/19 | $13 \text { [2] 75/18 195/2 }$ | $2,000 \text { [1] } 34 / 9$ |
| 1,500 [2] 125/19 125/21 | 13 August 2009 [1] 109/20 | 2.3 million [2] 25/9 133/3 |
| 10 [2] 173/1 196/24 | 13 December 2019 [1] 83/6 | 2.49 pm [1] 186/13 |
| 10 April [1] 37/20 | 13 million [1] 133/18 | 2.5 million [1] 28/3 |
| 10 January 2020 [1] 123/17 | 13 September 2019 [1] 70/17 | 2.85 [1] 133/5 |
| 10 June 2022 [2] 136/20 141/9 | $133 \text { [1] 112/25 }$ | 20 [6] 10/25 95/17 95/25 96/1 |
| 10-15 [1] 197/13 | $135 \text { [2] 203/15 203/24 }$ | 96/2 173/1 |
| 10-C [1] 82/21 | $136 \text { [1] 74/21 }$ | 20 September 2018 [2] 31/23 |
| 10-G [2] 62/18 144/24 | $14 \text { [1] 75/18 }$ | 119/6 |
| 10-year [1] 98/6 | $14 \text { March [1] 136/25 }$ | $200 \text { million [1] } 25 / 17$ |
| 10.14 [2] 69/1 69/16 | 14 March 2014 [2] 112/9 112/19 | 2000s [1] 169/1 |
| $10.16 \text { [14] 66/8 67/1 67/16 68/20 }$ | 14 November 2019 [1] 60/3 | 2001 [14] 19/19 19/22 20/1 20/6 |
| 69/2 69/22 70/2 143/6 147/14 | $15 \text { [9] 10/24 10/25 95/11 196/12 }$ | 20/8 20/24 21/6 21/6 21/24 168/4 |
| 148/1 187/20 188/2 188/23 | 196/25 197/13 237/1 237/8 | 168/7 168/19 169/22 172/23 |
| 190/20 | $251 / 12$ | 2002 [2] 20/24 108/11 |


| 2 | 58/3 59/19 60/3 69/13 70/12 | 154/23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2006 [3] 22/1 22/14 108/18 | 70 | 23 March 2007 [1] 109/2 |
| 2007 [2] 108/20 109/2 | 72/17 76/10 77/23 82/11 83/2 | 23 million [1] 133/ |
| 2008 [5] 108/20 109/3 109/7 | 83/6 87/1 98/14 105/1 105/22 | 23 September 2019 [1] 69/13 |
| 191/4 195/6 | 120/13 121/5 121/12 121/1 | [5] 57/16 58/23 58/25 |
| 2009 [66] 21/2 21/7 22/17 22/21 | 120/13 121/5 121/12 121/19 | 62/10 |
| 22/23 25/7 25/11 51/15 85/20 | 1 | 2] |
| 98/3 98/6 98/11 102/3 103/23 | 132/23 133/3 134/13 134/17 | 234 [2] 57/23 58/10 |
| 104/24 105/23 109/13 109/18 | 134/20 135/7 154/8 154/23 163/1 | 238 [1] 48/6 |
| 109/20 110/6 110/7 110/8 111/17 | 163/12 165/12 171/16 228/22 | 24 [2] 22/23 50/18 |
| 112/15 113/9 113/13 113/21 | 229/7 236/6 236/6 236/10 236/13 | 24 February 2020 [2] 126/12 |
| 114/12 115/7 115/8 115/14 120/6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 237/21 237/22 239/23 251/24 } \\ & 252 / 15 \text { 253/10 256/22 258/8 } \end{aligned}$ | 155/1 |
| 123/17 123/19 127/9 132/16 | 252/15 253/10 256/22 258/8 258/20 | 24 January 2020 [2] 131/3 154/13 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 132 / 21 \text { 133/14 133/18 134/8 } \\ & 146 / 6148 / 13149 / 3156 / 10 \end{aligned}$ | 2020 [53] 13/14 60/5 73/6 73/9 | 25 [3] 67/22 67/23 125/21 |
| 157/10 157/23 158/12 163/5 | 79/2 79/11 80/5 80/16 80/22 83/5 | 25 February 2022 [1] 141/7 |
| 163/12 208/17 209/6 212/18 | 98/20 102/4 105/24 114/13 122/4 | 25 million [2] 125/19 126/2 |
| 220/19 223/20 224/5 225/16 | 123/10 123/12 123/17 123/19 | 25 October 2022 [1] 141/ |
| 225/24 231/5 231/7 231/24 234/6 | 125/22 126/9 126/12 126/20 | 260 [1] 51/10 |
| 257/6 257/7 258/5 258/8 258/20 | 128/4 129/19 130/19 131/3 | 261 [1] |
| 2010 [7] 14/8 18/14 24/25 25/18 | 131/12 131/25 132/1 132 | 265 [1] 54 |
| 98/1 104/23 111/6 | 132/10 133/19 135/7 146/5 | 266 [2] 51/10 54/ |
| 2012 [11] 254/4 254/11 254/16 | 148/14 148/15 150/6 151/22 | 27 [3] 1/21 7/1 163/18 |
| 255/17 255/18 255/20 256/20 | 154/13 155/1 155/5 156/20 | 27 December 2018 [1] 33/10 |
| 256/23 257/14 257/16 258/4 | 176/13 198/2 198/5 198/5 198/9 | 27,000 [4] 18/14 25/1 25/20 28/ |
| 2014 [18] 14/12 26/17 83/18 | 198/18 198/19 199/4 199/10 | 28 [1] 195/6 |
| 98/11 104/25 105/23 105/24 | 231/5 | 28 November 2022 [1] 74/23 |
| 112/2 112/8 112/9 112/19 112/20 | 2021 [11] 70/3 72/8 74/2 132/16 | 29 [2] 187/10 191/ |
| 113/4 113/20 114/1 126/7 181/14 | 135/23 135/25 136/7 137/25 | 29 July [2] 74/14 140/1 |
| 182/7 | 141/3 151/17 157/14 | 29 July 2006 [1] 108/18 |
| 2015 [3] 132/21 132/22 200/3 | $\begin{gathered} 2022 \text { [15] 74/15 74/23 129/25 } \\ 136 / 20 ~ 137 / 20 ~ 138 / 12 ~ 140 / 11 ~ \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29 \text { July } 2022 \text { [2] 137/20 157/17 } \\ & 297 \text { [1] 52/18 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 2016 [8] 212/12 212/13 212/17 | 136/20 137/20 138/12 140/11 | 297 [1] 52/18 |
| 213/1 214/2 214/3 222/5 223/10 | 141/7 141/9 141/18 141/19 | 3 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2017[2] 29 / 11142 / \\ & 2018[52] \\ & 20 / 22 \end{aligned}$ | $2023 \text { [3] } 1 / 217 / 113 / 1$ | 3 April [1] 8 |
| 29/22 30/12 30/24 31/1 31/23 | 2030 [2] 113/18 146/12 | 3 April 2020 [7] 79/2 80/16 98/20 |
| 32/1 33/10 36/5 36/9 38/22 49/1 | 21 [3] 100/15 121/12 130/1 | 126/20 129/19 148/15 151/22 |
| 86/7 93/14 114/6 114/9 114/15 | 21 April 2021 [1] 135/23 | 3 December 2018 [2] 36/5 36/9 |
| 116/22 117/4 119/6 119/22 163/7 | 21 February 2008 [1] 109/3 | 3 February 2014 [1] |
| 163/12 166/8 166/16 195/2 | 21 May 2019 [2] 121/5 121/19 | 3 January 2020 [1] 123/1 |
| 207/15 207/18 209/8 212/19 | $22 \text { [1] 197/25 }$ | 3 million [3] 133/4 133/6 133/ <br> 3 October 2022 [1] 74/15 |
| 213/23 213/24 214/5 216/7 | 22 May [1] 131/25 <br> 22 October 2021 [4] 70/3 72/8 | $3 \text { September } 2009 \text { [1] 110/7 }$ |
| 220/17 221/17 223/11 223/18 | 151/17 157/14 | $3.01 \text { pm [1] 186/13 }$ |
| 225/23 225/25 231/20 233/25 | $227 \text { [1] 48/ }$ | $30 \text { [3] 87/7 97/14 97/19 }$ |
| 234/5 240/8 243/16 251/24 | $23 \text { [1] } 134 / 25$ | 30 July 2008 [1] 109/7 |
| 256/25 258/8 258/20 259/1 | 23 December [1] 71/6 | $30 \text { March [1] 37/6 }$ |
| 2018/2019 [1] 119/20 | $23 \text { December } 2019 \text { [6] }$ | 30 October 2019 [1] 59 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2018/early [1] } 256 / 21 \\ & 2019 \text { [63] } 36 / 2237 / 137 / 641 / 5 \end{aligned}$ | 77/23 134/17 134/20 135/7 | $31 \text { [9] 191/4 193/19 193/24 }$ |


| 3 | 649 [1] 80/6 | abided [1] 152/9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 31... [6] 193/25 194/9 194/16 194/19 195/10 195/11 | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { 67 [2] 199/20 199/25 } \\ \text { 6th [2] 130/4 130/5 } \end{array}$ | ability [2] $15 / 1243 / 7$ able [24] $9 / 2313 / 421 / 1724 / 9$ |
| 315 [1] 52/18 | 7 | 25/12 25/15 33/15 35/16 41/10 |
| ```33 [1] 67/23 350 million [3] 99/1 148/20 149/6 36 per cent [1] 127/6 39.6 [1] 58/9 3rd [1] 130/4``` | 7 August [1] 31/13 <br> 7 August 2018 [1] 31/1 <br> 7 February 2010 [2] 24/25 111/6 <br> 7 June 2019 [3] 70/12 70/21 <br> 82/11 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 122/14 122/17 138/7 140/17 } \\ & \text { 140/19 140/22 174/16 181/6 } \\ & \text { 209/10 260/11 } \\ & \text { about [120] } 13 / 1814 / 1814 / 25 \\ & 15 / 915 / 916 / 816 / 1718 / 118 / 5 \end{aligned}$ |
| 4 | 7 per cent [4] 110/23 165/15 | 19/21 20/15 20/20 22/5 22/10 |
| 4-17 [1] 67/5 | 166/19 226/24 | 24/15 28/18 28/24 29/18 29/21 |
| 4.1 [1] 54/5 | 70 per cent [7] 42/19 42/21 | 29/24 29/25 31/17 31/22 32/16 |
| 4.31 pm [1] 237/9 | 125/19 125/21 199/16 200/1 | 33/5 33/6 34/19 35/1 35/2 35/18 |
| 4.45 pm [1] 237/9 | 200/2 72 per cent [2] 42/24 125/2 | 35/22 35/23 36/12 37/18 38/9 |
| 40 [5] 67/2 69/19 123/12 176/11 | 72 per cent [2] 42/24 125/2 | 38/22 39/11 40/13 40/21 41/2 |
| 176/12 | 75 [2] 154/11 155/1 | 41/23 45/5 47/5 47/8 48/15 50/13 |
| 43 [1] 23/17 | 75 per cent [2] 125/25 198/6 | 50/20 51/5 52/18 54/2 54/10 56/3 |
| 45 [2] 97/7 97/10 | 7th [1] 13/ | 82/15 89/10 89/20 89/25 90/13 |
| 49 [1] 27/16 | 8 | 90/13 90/16 91/8 94/7 97/20 |
| 5 | 80 [2] 25/10 91/3 | 140/19 156/22 162/15 163/4 |
| 5 May [1] 130/18 <br> 5 May 2019 [1] 131/ | $\begin{aligned} & 800-1,000 \text { [1] 27/19 } \\ & 88 \text { [1] 163/19 } \end{aligned}$ | 163/6 163/8 163/15 165/18 |
| 5 May 2020 [1] 131/12 | 9 | 176/9 176/9 176/18 179/3 182 |
| 5 May they [1] 131/7 | 9 July [1] 136/17 | 183/16 183/21 184/25 185/3 |
| 5 October 2020 [1] 132/1 | $9 \text { July } 2021 \text { [1] 136/7 }$ | 198/8 200/19 203/18 215/22 |
| 5 September 2022 [1] 141/18 | 9 March 2020 [1] 135/7 | 218/8 220/8 221/22 231/7 231/24 |
| 5.10 [1] 202/25 | 9.30 [1] 260/24 | 234/23 237/12 238/6 238/7 |
| 5.19 [1] 112/25 | 9.31 [1] 7/1 | 240/18 240/21 249/9 250/8 |
| 5.2 [1] 42/17 | 9.32 [1] 12/4 | 251/20 252/18 252/23 253/11 |
| 5.28 pm [1] 261/12 | 9.40 [1] 12/22 | 254/2 256/6 256/8 256/10 256/20 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 5.30 \text { [6] 249/25 250/6 250/10 } \\ & 251 / 2251 / 7251 / 20 \end{aligned}$ | 90 [2] 189/4 189/21 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 258/22 259/5 259/19 260/16 } \\ & 260 / 19 \text { 260/20 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 5.4 [1] 43/1 | $\begin{aligned} & 90 \text {-day [1] } 71 / 3 \\ & 91 \text { [1] } 40 / 9 \end{aligned}$ | above [2] 133/10 253/1 |
| 50 million [1] 121/16 | $93 \text { [4] 40/10 94/11 133/8 163/11 }$ | abrupt [1] 38/5 |
| 50 per cent [1] 133/8 | 93 per cent [15] 34/21 34/24 | absence [2] 187/16 188/7 |
| 500,000 [1] 23/3 | 34/25 94/16 94/17 98/4 103/6 | absent [2] 144/8 250/13 |
| 54 [1] 64/1 | 110/22 110/25 111/2 115/23 | absolute [1] 124/2 |
| 6 | 119/16 124/13 127/8 132/6 | absolutely [7] 10/18 112/23 |
| ```6 April [1] 81/1 6 April 2020 [1] 80/22 6 February 2020 [3] 114/13 123/19 231/5``` | $\begin{aligned} & 99 \text { [2] } 26 / 20103 / 16 \\ & 99 \text { per cent [3] } 14 / 12109 / 25 \\ & 112 / 11 \\ & 99.9 \text { per cent [1] } 227 / 15 \end{aligned}$ | $251 / 17$ <br> absurd [2] 45/15 92/5 <br> absurdity [1] 78/9 |
| 6 March 2020 [1] 155/5 | A | abuse [21] 76/24 77/24 78/4 |
| ```6 million [2] 113/1 113/10 60 [1] 28/6 64 [2] 29/9 64/1``` | ```ab [1] 190/2 ab initio [1] 190/2 abide [2] 38/11 196/22``` | $\begin{aligned} & 78 / 21 \text { 79/15 80/7 81/3 83/13 } \\ & 83 / 2584 / 899 / 24100 / 6139 / 19 \\ & 152 / 4152 / 10152 / 21152 / 23 \end{aligned}$ |



## A

adviser... [4] 87/1 187/4 209/2 216/22
advisers [2] 216/11 239/2
advising [5] 85/25 165/20 240/5 247/16 248/19
advisory [53] 29/10 36/6 36/8 37/2 85/18 85/20 85/24 87/5 109/2 117/7 117/22 118/5 120/13
208/12 224/21 238/6 239/15
239/22 240/2 240/4 240/7 240/22
240/24 240/25 241/16 241/24 242/3 242/5 242/12 242/16 242/19 242/22 242/23 243/13 243/18 244/1 244/4 244/12 245/1 245/4 247/2 247/6 247/11 247/20 248/11 249/3 252/1 252/8 252/25 253/9 253/14 259/2 259/7
affect [5] 43/7 73/3 142/23 200/21 257/16
affected [1] 61/3
afford [1] 52/3
Afilias [39] 16/23 35/9 37/13
37/15 41/2 41/4 41/13 41/20
41/22 42/2 42/4 42/6 42/7 42/11 $42 / 1642 / 2143 / 544 / 244 / 544 / 8$ 44/10 44/13 44/14 44/23 44/23 50/8 50/13 50/19 51/24 121/24 124/17 124/19 125/4 125/17 126/5 126/16 174/10 174/11 174/11
after [65] 10/12 20/24 21/25 22/1 22/14 25/2 29/2 31/8 33/14 37/4 37/20 37/21 43/23 43/25 49/6 68/13 73/2 73/7 73/9 79/3 79/6 83/7 83/21 96/25 97/21 98/24 105/25 117/15 125/23 139/15 141/6 141/8 142/11 142/19 148/16 149/18 154/12 154/16 155/5 155/12 166/3 176/20 180/2 186/8 196/20 196/23 197/22 198/2 202/10 203/3 204/20 214/14 214/22 222/2 231/1
231/10 232/6 234/4 235/15
235/22 246/1 246/17 250/5 250/6 250/10
afternoon [4] 99/16 160/21 205/2 211/9
afterwards [5] 105/4 108/21

135/16 138/9 150/12
again [60] 8/7 8/24 13/12 21/5
23/3 24/14 25/10 33/13 35/18 38/11 38/20 48/21 50/19 59/13 60/6 70/17 71/8 77/20 79/12 80/6 82/9 86/17 100/11 106/13 113/6 113/22 116/5 119/24 120/6 121/25 122/6 127/16 155/10 155/14 159/21 162/10 167/10 167/22 167/23 171/7 171/9 172/5 172/7 173/2 173/20 178/1 178/11 178/13 179/7 179/17 181/13 184/3 196/20 202/9 210/17 230/4 245/2 248/25 254/2 259/23 against [21] 34/7 82/2 83/17 84/1 99/4 99/6 99/7 99/8 99/9 105/6 138/16 139/9 139/22 157/5 172/5 190/25 202/5 202/7 203/3 204/15 227/1
Agencia [1] 4/5
agencies [1] 215/25
agency [7] 8/21 9/1 97/2 100/13
165/9 256/12 256/12
aggravate [1] 58/16
aggravation [1] 59/10
aggressive [1] 97/23
ago [4] 62/11 164/5 180/9 196/4
agree [10] 27/1 47/3 95/5 116/11
124/7 139/6 184/7 194/14 243/3 250/8
agreed [22] 29/8 50/1 59/21 79/6 84/7 96/21 101/20 101/25 115/22 115/25 151/23 153/17 154/3
181/1 194/21 206/1 227/7 227/16 243/24 244/18 249/25 251/15 agreement [40] 17/1 26/24 29/12 53/1 53/6 73/5 74/20 74/23 78/15 79/1 80/5 80/7 80/9 90/19 90/20 90/21 111/17 112/10 129/20 143/1 143/24 144/1 144/2 144/3 150/7 187/6 187/19 187/22 188/14 188/22 189/14 189/15 193/3 193/5 194/3 194/7 194/16 195/9 244/6 260/6
agreements [9] 79/6 138/12
192/14 193/15 193/18 193/22
194/10 227/8 227/9
Ah [2] 130/17 131/9
ahead [2] $13 / 795 / 5$
aim [4] 10/20 96/1 251/19 260/11 air [1] 83/17
airport [1] 130/21
alert [1] 9/18
align [1] 122/9
all [126] $7 / 38 / 1210 / 410 / 10$ 10/17 10/24 11/23 13/21 14/5 15/19 16/1 16/11 16/13 19/24
21/21 25/17 25/18 27/13 29/4 $31 / 2133 / 1733 / 1734 / 435 / 135 / 2$ 37/20 39/11 39/13 42/16 44/9 $45 / 2446 / 147 / 147 / 347 / 1247 / 15$ 48/10 50/7 52/17 57/1 66/24 68/9 70/11 72/11 77/3 82/1 90/17 90/18 90/25 99/2 102/16 104/7 109/15 111/3 112/6 112/21
117/11 117/16 124/17 128/12 128/20 128/24 128/25 129/6 129/6 130/5 137/2 137/16 142/24 143/22 144/3 144/17 148/11 148/23 149/5 150/18 152/20 156/18 156/21 159/22 161/21 165/23 167/15 167/16 169/20 169/22 169/23 170/13 171/4 173/14 175/6 175/23 176/1 176/18 177/23 178/14 182/10 182/20 182/22 183/9 184/14 185/11 185/13 185/16 185/20 185/24 188/17 195/18 196/9 200/19 201/22 203/6 203/10 209/11 216/3 218/23 223/11 227/25 228/24 230/11 232/19 233/7 248/5 253/10 260/5 261/10 all possible [1] 10/17
allegation [13] 102/21 121/24 124/16 162/9 162/19 166/1 167/6 168/5 172/6 173/11 174/7 178/10 179/21
allegations [14] 55/9 77/25 78/10 102/6 117/10 117/10 117/12 120/22 145/15 145/16 149/13 151/19 155/23 162/17
allege [5] 62/9 145/9 161/25 172/3 179/16
alleged [18] 61/25 62/13 64/18 65/14 68/17 81/5 88/3 126/5 137/21 141/11 142/5 145/2 145/13 162/2 172/2 189/15 192/22 200/22

## A

allegedly [3] 66/5 82/19 99/1 alleges [2] 166/25 179/17
allocate [1] 116/12
allow [6] 27/2 43/9 44/10 51/3 53/12 254/17
allowed [8] 41/7 44/2 53/13
112/13 164/10 184/8 243/19 249/11
allowing [1] 93/7
allows [2] 40/24 145/21
Allstream [1] 215/15
almost [9] 19/5 28/3 79/7 82/13 91/4 111/3 133/4 138/11 250/4
alone [2] 63/5 64/19
along [3] 182/11 223/16 247/23
alongside [1] 120/19
already [26] 33/8 65/11 65/21
70/19 73/20 77/14 79/13 84/2
96/13 115/25 116/22 118/24
120/2 137/7 151/20 158/21
164/20 172/14 183/21 202/11
203/16 207/8 250/8 255/7 257/1 257/15
also [118] 10/3 10/23 12/15 14/10 14/14 19/1 24/12 26/12 27/22 43/14 45/7 48/18 51/15 51/19 52/6 53/24 54/4 54/25 55/16 56/21 59/8 64/8 75/8 75/15 77/17 78/25 86/2 86/13 91/13 91/20 94/9 97/3 97/19 99/8 109/11 116/2 135/2 138/4 138/5 139/17 144/16 146/6 146/17 147/8 147/11 147/25 148/1 148/4 149/11 149/22 150/2 150/6 150/12 150/21 151/1 151/10 156/5 156/10 156/16 159/5 159/7 159/11 159/18 159/20 162/14 164/22 165/6 166/5 166/25 167/17 168/21 170/17 172/3 174/20 175/17 175/25 182/5 183/14 183/25 185/17 192/21 194/18 195/4 196/2 199/3 207/5 208/1 208/8 209/16 210/2 210/19 216/22 217/17 219/16 221/15 224/6 224/20 224/22 224/25 226/12 227/6 228/13 228/17 232/15 232/16 233/18 238/1 238/2 240/3 244/9 244/10 248/23

250/12 250/24 252/24 257/25 258/12 261/9
alter [1] 160/7
alternative [12] 18/17 25/4
170/11 170/21 209/22 209/23
227/18 227/22 232/23 233/2
238/25 244/9
alternatively [1] 185/23
alternatives [1] 209/9
although [11] 7/15 38/2 61/1 68/6 87/16 104/15 105/12 178/20 193/22 195/18 239/12
ALVARO [2] 5/5 9/14
Alvaro Peralta [1] 9/14
always [9] 28/23 84/11 173/13
180/13 187/11 200/10 208/3 210/16 229/3
am [82] 7/1 7/7 7/16 8/3 8/4 9/11 9/12 9/18 9/20 9/20 9/21 12/4 18/2 34/23 38/11 39/24 45/21 53/4 54/9 54/14 56/22 73/22 78/8 89/20 95/15 98/21 107/18 111/20 114/3 114/7 116/9 116/19 118/24 118/24 120/21 123/8 125/8 127/2 134/2 134/20 135/22 136/15 159/10 182/21 186/21 187/1 191/2 202/9 206/12 206/17 211/14 211/16 212/15 215/9 217/17 217/20 218/8 219/13 220/24 222/9 223/14 224/12 234/7 235/3 236/10 238/7 239/11 240/15 243/22 245/18 246/2 249/10 252/4 255/8 255/24 257/10 257/13 257/19 258/10 258/22 259/8 259/9
AMALIA [1] 5/13
amazing [1] 159/12
AmecFoster [1] 148/6
amendment [5] 27/2 112/14
123/17 132/3 132/3
American [7] 9/7 111/14 112/17
174/11 174/15 180/15 183/24
amicable [1] 190/13
among [4] 52/11 170/8 190/11 228/11
Amorrortu [2] 64/10 64/23
amount [6] 68/18 84/8 85/8
133/16 134/8 189/19
amounts [2] 65/15 83/13

ANA [7] 4/6 5/12 8/20 97/1 97/8 99/11 152/5
analogy [2] 153/12 153/13
analyse [3] 144/15 164/23 233/18
analysed [1] 165/19
analyses [1] 120/7
analysis [11] 61/13 163/17 163/25
164/7 208/23 208/24 208/25
209/4 222/23 227/24 238/3
analysts [1] 239/9
Andes [3] 19/14 19/15 108/3
Andrew [3] 130/17 131/9 131/17
ANDRÉS [1] 4/10
ANN [1] 5/10
annex [5] 61/21 62/18 82/21
144/23 192/24
announce [1] 87/2
announced [10] 37/7 78/13 80/22
87/7 99/13 120/13 130/4 131/21 131/21 155/14
announcement [7] 37/5 37/18
38/5 120/18 154/20 155/13
155/17
announcing [1] 98/23
another [34] 9/22 12/9 14/25
34/10 35/8 43/1 48/19 71/2 97/19 112/20 123/16 124/12 137/4
137/22 169/11 170/5 174/11
174/15 183/2 191/6 191/20 192/4
192/11 198/11 201/19 202/8
203/23 208/23 226/25 230/10
232/22 232/23 242/4 248/20
answer [13] 34/8 89/7 106/14
206/12 212/16 217/9 217/18
218/16 220/5 230/9 243/10 246/5
254/15
answered [2] 16/1 222/11
answering [1] 161/16
answers [3] 106/15 204/1 250/22
anticipate [1] 250/17
anticipated [3] 95/12 182/7
186/15
anticipates [1] 181/6
any [110] 10/9 16/23 28/8 30/17 32/6 47/22 50/12 54/19 61/14
61/15 63/22 63/22 63/24 64/4
65/5 70/5 77/17 79/17 87/22
87/23 87/25 88/2 89/7 93/8 94/24
94/25 97/16 99/23 102/20 110/13



## B

back... [26] 130/14 132/19 159/21 160/23 161/20 161/24 163/5 163/12 165/5 168/4 168/19 169/1 169/21 172/23 177/13 177/25 179/1 182/7 186/11 197/12 214/6 215/4 217/14 217/20 247/1 253/25
back-end [2] 23/24 26/20
background [12] 17/11 93/15 97/7 97/9 104/21 104/22 206/9 206/16 206/24 207/2 215/23 238/13
backtracked [1] 77/7
bad [9] 46/21 51/16 74/10 126/25 173/13 173/16 173/18 174/5 174/23
baffles [2] 184/14 184/15
baffling [1] 183/22
BALDWIN [36] 3/8 3/9 6/3 6/4 6/5 6/12 6/19 8/4 8/6 11/4 13/8 13/10 18/3 22/4 54/10 54/12 54/14 89/8 89/12 89/14 89/19 89/19 89/21 90/16 94/23 94/24 196/9 197/15 197/17 203/25 211/8 222/9 223/3 236/17 237/10 249/25
bar [1] 198/17
BARBOSA [1] 4/10
based [21] 14/21 32/1 42/5 42/9
47/23 53/23 58/8 64/2 84/21 85/4 87/14 87/15 87/24 88/2 102/6 119/22 147/22 148/6 167/1 167/2 183/20
bases [1] 81/11
basic [3] 16/25 178/4 221/9
basically [10] 107/18 107/23
109/5 111/22 111/23 118/14
153/14 162/7 221/6 232/16
basis [29] 19/3 35/5 60/6 63/9
65/24 67/15 68/14 68/21 69/15
76/17 82/25 83/3 106/23 124/23
130/15 134/1 149/6 159/7 167/20 168/1 179/12 179/23 180/3 180/5 184/3 185/7 189/17 200/2 246/14 be [272]
be considered [1] 73/15
bear [2] 56/11 111/17
bearing [1] 250/3
bears [3] 48/13 48/19 77/24 became [12] 16/2 21/10 29/19 31/3 207/9 207/19 209/24 210/14 213/2 213/22 223/20 235/24 because [157] 7/21 9/23 12/2 17/7 17/8 17/12 19/2 20/16 26/6 27/10 29/2 30/8 30/18 32/20 34/18 34/22 38/6 39/7 39/9 45/14 45/18 49/12 49/17 49/25 59/21 64/5 64/7 66/4 70/1 72/22 73/17 78/9 80/3 83/1 83/20 84/1 90/9 92/25 95/10 95/22 108/8 109/4 111/1 113/23 114/10 114/12 115/2 116/16 116/24 117/11 117/25 118/1 121/25 123/18 124/6 125/6 126/24 128/9 128/20 130/4 130/9 131/14 134/15 134/22 135/6 135/10 135/18 136/6 136/22 138/5 138/19 140/3 141/10 141/21 142/3 142/22 142/24 144/21 145/19 145/23 146/4 147/2 147/11 147/13 148/25 149/25 150/5 150/9 152/4 156/5 156/12 156/25 157/1 157/2 158/5 158/11 161/19 163/9 164/16 165/4 166/2 166/15 167/5 167/15 171/3 172/18 173/15 174/8 174/9 175/13 178/16 180/2 180/17 181/8 181/15 181/20 181/23 182/2 184/24 185/8 185/13 185/24 198/19 200/7 202/14 202/17 212/15 213/1 222/2 227/11 227/18 228/23 233/9 235/20 239/17 239/19 239/20 246/23 247/11 248/8 248/12 248/18 251/3 252/11 252/22 253/1 253/2 254/18 255/12 256/2 256/11 257/2 257/7 258/6 258/15 259/6 260/1
become [3] 90/18 108/7 245/14 becomes [1] 30/22
been [119] 9/23 13/25 14/2 14/15 15/19 19/1 20/4 20/18 22/7 23/8 24/2 24/5 25/11 28/15 29/9 31/19 31/21 35/3 36/23 37/24 41/25 43/12 43/14 45/18 50/23 50/24 50/25 52/25 53/18 59/22 66/5 70/4 70/8 76/3 76/6 78/6 88/12 89/25 90/1 96/21 96/22 100/14

101/3 103/15 104/1 122/17 123/14 123/20 124/20 125/15 128/10 129/2 129/5 129/10 130/3 131/1 131/10 131/10 131/21 131/21 131/22 132/10 132/19 133/8 136/7 136/19 137/15 138/19 139/8 139/22 144/1 150/19 151/23 152/12 152/14 152/15 152/25 153/18 153/21 155/22 155/24 161/7 165/18 174/23 177/7 189/16 196/21 198/9 203/24 205/3 209/17 210/14 210/16 214/1 217/12 217/24 225/24 226/8 228/6 231/15 231/17 233/5 234/20 237/14 242/10 242/20 243/8 245/9 246/21 248/16 248/23 250/3 250/8 252/13 252/14 254/19 255/7 257/15 257/24 before [97] 7/17 8/6 10/9 12/1 15/1 17/14 22/21 22/23 24/3 $31 / 2032 / 532 / 1336 / 2238 / 19$ 48/15 58/4 60/4 63/2 63/22 66/16 70/24 71/3 72/1 74/18 78/12 78/15 78/19 80/25 81/22 85/6 93/16 96/19 97/25 98/24 100/20 103/3 103/3 111/4 111/11 120/7 120/9 122/12 124/6 126/4 126/8 132/4 134/25 134/25 136/2 136/2 136/3 136/4 142/11 142/18 144/13 145/3 145/10 145/12 145/16 146/24 147/4 147/15 151/23 153/21 154/5 155/6 157/8 157/24 158/1 168/7 168/8 169/16 171/1 186/4 189/4 189/21 193/12 198/18 206/7 207/4 209/9 209/14 209/22 213/10 214/9 214/15 215/7 222/3 222/6 225/18 237/11 238/2 245/20 248/12 251/3 255/3 256/8
beforehand [1] 190/24
began [7] 14/8 25/3 25/4 30/24 214/15 239/5 239/20
begin [1] 188/2
beginning [11] 7/11 24/25 124/23 127/19 127/23 149/15 149/23 150/1 150/7 184/12 201/11
behalf [16] $3 / 24 / 25 / 19 / 15$ 29/12 109/6 111/13 111/16 133/1

## B

behalf... [7] 149/23 187/7 188/25 188/25 189/12 209/13 243/1
behalf of [1] $9 / 15$
Behar [1] 118/11
behaviour [1] 138/11
behind [5] 7/9 9/1 32/11 102/7 127/21
being [41] 15/6 16/6 18/15 18/16 18/20 25/6 29/4 29/5 31/7 35/13 35/14 35/16 37/8 50/17 55/7 84/13 84/15 90/13 91/20 92/23 101/1 102/23 113/24 145/16 164/6 165/19 170/12 183/24 192/2 199/17 200/6 207/24 208/4 211/10 217/7 220/8 232/17 241/3 252/10 252/12 252/23
belief [1] 205/18
believe [22] 9/7 9/12 13/20 22/8 24/8 28/6 28/7 30/23 31/9 31/11 35/19 40/11 48/11 105/16 139/7 156/3 200/4 226/2 226/20 230/7 237/24 241/23
believes [2] 39/16 103/18
below [2] 109/20 216/21
beneficial [3] 74/2 75/16 255/4
benefit [7] 17/3 89/11 125/3
126/4 153/3 156/11 248/22
benefited [2] 120/2 124/12
benefiting [1] 100/19
benefits [1] 17/4
BERNAL [1] 4/17
best [18] 117/1 119/23 122/10 127/10 128/23 170/22 171/24
175/2 175/9 205/17 233/2 233/2
233/4 233/12 233/12 233/22
233/22 238/24
bet [2] 202/14 203/8
better [18] 29/7 92/17 93/7 104/1 116/24 122/20 138/18 177/4 209/4 209/11 224/23 226/3 226/8 228/15 228/24 233/20 239/25 251/3
between [36] 1/7 7/12 17/1 27/18 42/2 42/3 50/18 51/24 57/1 71/9 84/24 85/9 90/22 98/2 106/6 109/24 113/7 113/22 121/1 123/10 126/18 130/17 136/16 136/20 136/25 154/6 170/19

194/3 194/10 215/14 222/13
225/8 225/24 244/22 258/8 258/20
beyond [4] 87/14 146/14 178/14 220/11
Bezsonoff [7] 127/25 128/4 128/8 128/14 130/18 130/19 131/17
bid [12] 24/6 29/14 43/10 43/17
44/2 44/14 44/17 45/4 51/4 171/23 174/21 178/8
bidder [10] 16/22 16/24 22/25
24/7 35/9 40/24 40/24 41/1 44/2 44/4
bidders [5] 42/16 44/25 45/1
249/2 252/12
bidding [7] 44/12 44/24 102/4
175/1 176/4 176/10 253/6
bids [1] 24/6
bifurcated [1] 136/8
bifurcation [3] 136/9 136/18
138/1
big [3] 12/1 20/4 246/23
BIGGE [8] 5/5 6/10 9/10 186/16
186/19 186/23 187/1 195/24
bigger [1] 153/18
biggest [1] 28/16
bilateral [1] 193/3
billboards [1] 27/8
billion [1] 133/16
binding [2] 113/17 242/23
bit [30] 9/19 11/24 30/4 38/12
53/4 54/6 56/23 68/25 69/14
89/11 93/3 95/18 96/7 106/6
114/25 116/9 131/24 150/14
177/17 179/4 184/8 186/2 186/15
196/19 197/21 222/11 228/13
250/23 251/2 256/2
blatant [2] 50/11 136/23
blindly [1] 78/20
blip [1] 25/19
block [1] 81/24
blue [2] 105/14 132/15
blunt [1] 93/22
board [7] 36/6 36/8 75/4 75/9
76/8 76/11 249/10
boards [1] 249/9
body [3] 118/16 240/4 242/19
Bogotá [3] 111/4 157/25 238/1
bolster [1] 73/13
book [1] 137/11
boom [2] 19/23 132/24
booming [1] 22/16
both [30] 7/13 7/16 10/4 17/2
26/11 39/22 43/13 47/2 53/16
53/17 53/19 59/17 59/20 63/18 71/5 75/11 75/19 82/19 102/1
128/2 184/15 185/23 192/25
194/13 195/11 196/2 196/12
215/18 223/15 224/10
bottom [3] 105/13 110/16 135/21
bought [2] 26/20 255/7
brand [1] 255/17
breach [14] 61/25 62/5 62/15
68/14 80/20 87/18 87/24 103/9
145/2 145/9 146/18 150/14
179/13 191/14
breached [6] 69/16 87/23 88/5
147/8 148/10 189/16
breaches [4] 68/16 101/12 145/13 148/7
break [14] 10/23 95/7 95/21
95/24 96/4 162/1 186/10 186/13
236/20 236/21 237/2 237/8 237/9 237/11
breakdown [2] 199/1 199/2
brief [3] 61/7 61/10 187/7
briefed [1] 86/14
briefly [4] 45/21 100/1 181/13 191/22
briefs [1] 160/11
brighter [1] 166/22
bring [15] 65/1 71/25 77/14
128/23 140/9 167/14 167/18
175/5 175/8 177/9 185/6 185/8
185/8 200/23 211/5
bringing [1] $81 / 20$
brings [1] 184/20
broaden [1] 82/6
broader [3] 17/24 221/24 222/1
broadly [1] 59/11
broken [2] 38/12 162/4
brought [17] 25/21 44/18 44/19
57/12 82/1 84/1 139/8 139/22
145/16 146/1 158/1 167/11
167/18 177/2 177/2 177/3 183/24
brunt [3] 253/3 253/9 253/10
building [1] 209/3
bullet [5] 112/14 121/5 235/5

| B |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ```bullet... [2] 254/3 256/19 bunch [2] 173/4 173/22 bundle [1] 211/5 burden [11] 5/10 5/10 77/24 78/4 141/21 142/2 161/22 162/21 167/24 173/20 191/16 bushes [1] 31/15 business [20] 10/19 27/19 54/3 74/5 74/7 78/17 80/15 80/24 90/14 103/2 103/6 105/25 106/4 107/22 129/21 141/2 150/15 224/8 254/24 255/5 businesses [2] 110/2 255/13 buy [4] \(26 / 6\) 255/1 255/6 256/5 buying [3] 113/5 255/2 255/12``` | 145/8 146/21 147/19 148/12 149/14 154/4 154/6 154/13 157/11 157/23 163/11 163/18 163/24 164/13 176/13 176/17 177/19 178/10 181/4 181/10 183/22 184/10 186/4 186/6 186/16 186/16 186/18 192/5 196/12 197/21 198/24 199/13 200/13 203/1 203/23 203/25 203/25 205/16 210/5 211/3 217/20 220/15 221/25 222/10 222/12 225/22 226/18 234/22 235/2 237/5 237/7 246/7 247/12 250/12 253/18 253/23 256/13 256/22 259/11 259/22 260/4 260/9 | 60/19 62/22 67/10 69/17 72/6 76/5 76/20 77/6 77/9 84/13 84/14 87/22 88/18 89/23 89/25 90/1 91/1 91/6 91/15 91/16 93/9 93/21 94/12 94/14 97/13 97/20 99/22 99/24 100/4 100/10 100/17 102/22 102/24 103/20 104/12 107/6 107/16 113/1 113/11 124/18 139/18 143/5 143/16 143/17 145/23 146/3 148/9 151/13 152/20 153/6 153/12 157/11 158/23 159/3 159/7 159/12 160/2 160/14 171/20 176/19 176/25 177/8 177/12 177/14 180/10 180/11 180/12 180/12 180/13 184/14 184/17 |
| C |  | 184/17 184/19 184/20 184/20 |
| C-0124 [1] 20/16 <br> C-120 [1] 132/16 <br> C-133 [1] 112/25 <br> C-135 [2] 203/15 203/24 <br> C-136 [1] 74/21 <br> C-27 [1] 163/18 <br> C-67 [2] 199/20 199/25 <br> C-9 [1] 108/20 <br> calendar [1] 95/12 <br> call [7] 38/15 114/22 161/20 177/6 199/15 219/12 247/12 <br> Calle [2] 109/23 110/1 called [8] 18/6 35/9 131/4 189/7 215/5 242/12 255/5 256/12 calling [2] 9/20 9/20 calls [2] 38/15 56/18 came [10] 16/11 16/12 31/8 40/22 44/12 93/16 118/13 126/7 136/3 245/3 <br> CAMILO [3] 4/6 8/25 229/16 campaign [3] 30/23 30/24 31/6 can [113] 7/17 10/7 13/13 17/19 25/22 27/16 32/10 39/9 42/13 47/4 47/6 48/9 52/11 55/16 60/9 61/12 65/5 65/10 66/23 67/2 67/19 68/10 72/13 75/6 75/16 85/24 87/20 88/11 89/23 95/18 103/13 103/16 104/18 106/21 107/20 109/9 112/1 113/12 115/14 115/14 116/13 117/14 117/23 123/9 125/8 126/3 126/15 | 176/18 183/18 197/5 <br> Canada [3] 190/18 195/1 206/19 <br> Canadian [1] 195/5 <br> candour [11] 33/2 47/9 47/15 <br> 47/16 48/25 50/4 52/7 52/12 <br> 121/10 130/7 244/15 <br> cannot [18] 10/18 46/22 81/5 <br> 88/12 88/15 116/10 143/14 <br> 143/23 144/2 147/22 160/7 <br> 160/11 169/9 172/11 180/6 190/3 190/20 226/6 <br> capability [1] 21/17 <br> capacities [2] 128/24 226/16 <br> capacity [10] 85/1 85/8 85/16 <br> 85/22 86/18 108/24 111/20 <br> 128/25 226/13 228/5 <br> capital [10] 74/3 75/19 75/24 <br> 106/8 106/11 112/16 128/9 <br> 138/21 201/10 203/18 <br> careful [3] 67/11 182/3 233/5 <br> carefully [1] 171/3 <br> caretaking [1] 48/2 <br> carried [1] 132/5 <br> carry [3] 121/7 208/22 260/25 <br> carrying [5] 26/13 101/3 192/19 214/9 235/24 <br> carrying out [1] 192/19 <br> carves [1] 57/3 <br> case [118] 1/6 13/13 13/21 17/13 <br> 17/14 24/15 24/21 29/16 30/20 <br> 32/7 36/2 37/2 39/18 47/8 48/22 | 185/2 185/3 185/6 185/9 185/14 185/15 185/17 185/19 185/20 185/20 187/11 187/15 201/25 202/15 233/4 235/17 237/1 237/4 242/21 258/5 260/16 260/19 cases [20] 17/18 28/19 39/5 46/25 53/12 64/23 64/24 77/3 92/19 93/5 94/1 94/1 94/3 94/8 158/25 173/14 185/8 185/20 218/24 219/1 <br> CASTAÑO[25] 4/18 6/15 9/4 102/14 111/25 170/7 170/8 205/1 205/2 205/10 206/2 206/7 207/12 210/2 211/9 212/15 218/11 220/15 222/10 223/6 236/25 249/3 250/21 260/1 260/13 Castaño's [2] 250/15 251/6 categories [2] 81/19 82/4 category [1] 15/1 <br> Cattlemen [1] 195/5 causation [1] 67/23 cause [2] 16/17 38/10 caused [1] 68/15 cc [1] 23/4 CCAP [8] 57/15 58/3 58/10 58/23 60/14 61/3 62/3 62/10 ccTLD [3] 23/3 107/12 119/13 ccTLDs [1] 254/8 ceased [1] 142/16 cent [46] 14/12 26/18 26/19 26/20 34/21 34/24 34/25 42/19 |



## C

Claimant's... [46] 63/20 64/16 64/17 64/22 64/25 65/4 66/22 67/7 68/3 68/10 68/25 69/17 69/21 70/21 70/23 71/4 71/13 72/8 73/10 73/25 74/18 75/22 77/22 79/19 81/5 81/17 83/11 83/14 84/5 84/13 87/13 87/18 87/21 88/19 91/6 100/25 105/20 129/13 146/2 158/25 163/23 176/23 187/9 197/16 261/2 261/3 claimants [9] 82/1 156/6 159/24 168/5 168/25 173/3 173/14 180/20 254/19 claimed [3] 68/19 101/1 189/19 claiming [2] 176/21 198/18 claims [73] 5/2 45/22 54/20 55/21 56/14 61/13 62/4 63/22 64/5 65/1 66/20 67/13 67/19 68/9 68/12 68/25 69/4 69/7 69/14 69/15 69/17 70/8 73/19 73/20 74/18 76/2 78/6 81/8 83/14 83/17 83/20 84/22 85/2 85/6 87/13 87/18 88/19 89/1 97/11 97/15 100/25 104/5 139/21 139/24 140/9 141/23 149/8 149/13 149/23 149/24 149/25 150/12 150/16 151/18 155/22 157/7 157/7 157/22 158/1 158/4 159/11 160/9 160/12 160/19 162/6 174/1 178/6 183/6 184/6 184/7 185/22 187/2 217/3
clapping [1] 35/13
clarification [14] 196/23 198/3 198/11 198/15 198/16 198/20 199/10 199/14 199/22 201/6 204/12 212/7 235/19 256/1 clarifications [8] 155/7 201/1 202/13 202/24 203/7 203/10 203/17 203/21
clarified [2] 197/12 197/24
clarify [3] 131/13 217/16 228/1
clarifying [1] 22/18
clause [18] 24/15 24/18 24/19 24/20 24/21 54/5 84/16 88/3 88/8 88/13 88/15 88/20 88/21 144/23 144/25 145/6 145/19 146/16 clauses [4] 27/3 64/25 192/15 192/15
clear [35] 36/16 38/2 58/14 61/18 61/24 66/19 68/11 69/2 71/15 74/13 80/8 85/5 88/12 88/19 100/6 101/12 101/24 103/20 113/20 115/23 131/15 135/6 146/7 150/10 157/3 161/2 170/17 171/5 171/9 180/4 180/22 181/1 202/9 203/13 235/24
clearer [1] 86/25
clearly [13] 46/24 69/18 76/3 76/6 87/14 120/4 132/23 133/12
142/9 144/10 147/2 171/17 191/25
clears [1] 256/16
client [4] 3/5 8/9 76/15 128/11
client's [1] 201/22
clippings [2] 159/19 159/20
clock [2] 89/9 250/4
close [5] 9/25 10/19 195/19
219/23 230/4
closed [1] 164/17
closing [1] 197/20
cloud [1] 74/6
cloud-oriented [1] 74/6
co [7] 2/6 7/12 35/8 42/2 42/3 190/11 210/19
Co-Arbitrators [1] 2/6
co-ordinate [1] 190/11
co-ordinated [1] 7/12
co-ordination [3] 35/8 42/2 42/3 code [12] 18/6 18/9 18/10 23/4 23/6 57/14 107/10 107/11 108/1 108/5 221/19 229/1
codes [1] 255/19
coerce [1] 97/22
coerced [1] 17/6
coffee [1] 237/2
cognizance [1] 232/5
coincidence [1] 129/22
colleague [18] 18/3 54/10 84/2 94/10 96/12 97/10 97/15 106/19 133/1 134/15 138/22 141/5 154/10 156/8 156/17 158/7 158/17 211/5
colleagues [6] 9/13 90/6 93/1
99/18 136/22 260/19
college [1] 222/2
Colombia [126] 1/12 9/2 14/24
17/2 17/3 17/4 18/11 18/21 18/22

19/15 20/21 27/22 36/3 40/18 $42 / 746 / 246 / 352 / 2054 / 666 / 10$ 68/25 69/14 84/7 86/3 86/13 92/2 96/19 97/17 97/21 97/22 98/17 99/3 99/14 101/3 102/18 103/12 103/15 103/17 104/3 105/11 105/13 105/15 108/11 108/23 109/6 109/9 109/10 110/2 110/23 111/14 111/16 114/2 114/5 114/21 116/21 117/1 117/22 118/14 118/21 119/14 120/19 121/10 122/13 122/16 122/21 123/25 125/11 130/2 130/11 131/5 131/16 131/22 132/20 133/21 133/22 139/3 139/9 139/22 141/6 147/5 150/14 152/6 152/9 154/22 155/5 156/25 157/9 158/10 158/21 159/1 159/2 159/17 160/19 161/2 161/23 163/17 164/8 165/20 166/10 167/12 168/3 170/5 171/5 173/12 174/9 175/20 177/4 178/7 178/15 178/17 182/13 184/8 184/13 185/11 185/12 185/25 187/6 188/9 188/16 192/24 202/16 204/16 206/18 209/13 209/16 233/13
Colombia's [14] 8/21 28/16 98/3 100/15 103/25 104/12 139/1 162/6 162/21 164/18 166/25 168/2 168/13 174/20
Colombian [21] 8/25 20/14 23/20 35/21 50/15 57/13 60/17 60/23 64/6 85/11 97/2 105/19 112/16 116/6 120/8 133/16 209/25 211/12 212/3 214/11 233/23
colourable [1] 173/18
column [1] 65/6
com [1] 254/21
combination [1] 215/13
come [24] 7/25 15/5 25/12 91/24
93/13 104/2 105/17 116/1 129/14 135/24 136/1 147/18 147/24 166/16 173/17 184/11 186/11 197/12 204/12 204/13 219/12 219/13 245/1 249/22
comes [8] 28/6 28/7 33/23 40/23 56/21 143/25 172/24 176/20 comfortable [1] 226/6

## C

coming [4] 21/8 123/21 170/24 200/10
commence [3] 33/12 76/9 83/6 commenced [1] 66/16
comment [3] 93/7 187/16 201/1
commentators [1] 73/1
comments [8] 35/1 89/4 123/13
125/23 176/12 197/2 197/8 197/13
commerce [5] 82/20 82/22 111/5 157/25 254/22
commercial [8] 55/23 79/5 80/20 85/16 85/23 86/11 86/24 180/12 commercialisation [3] 20/8 24/3 109/8
commercialise [3] 19/20 20/2 20/6
commercialising [3] 20/5 20/11 21/23
commissioned [1] 238/23
committed [3] 103/12 139/19 171/8
committee [72] 29/10 36/13 37/2 85/18 85/20 85/24 87/5 109/2 117/7 117/22 118/5 120/14 208/12 208/14 224/21 238/6 239/15 239/22 240/2 240/4 240/7 240/22 240/24 240/25 241/4 241/6 241/16 241/17 241/20 241/20 241/24 242/4 242/5 242/13 242/17 242/22 242/23 243/14 243/18 244/1 244/4 244/12 245/5 246/15 246/22 246/25 247/2 247/3 247/4 247/6 247/7 247/10 247/11 247/11
247/15 247/17 247/19 247/20
248/11 249/4 249/19 249/23 252/1 252/9 252/14 252/21 252/25 253/4 253/9 253/15 259/2 259/8
committees [1] 243/2
common [4] 14/23 18/7 90/13 195/13
communicate [2] 218/17 219/3 communicating [1] 218/20 communication [8] 42/1 42/3 101/10 161/15 165/10 207/7 219/2 219/19
communications [11] 20/22 55/19 compliance [1] 69/22 74/4 120/25 135/8 182/15 210/16 210/19 212/11 214/17 220/2
community [1] 28/12
companies [6] 51/4 75/19 79/6 214/9 214/13 215/6
company [29] 15/10 18/18 23/18 23/20 26/23 44/14 44/16 50/16 50/17 75/24 91/18 91/20 105/19 106/10 107/21 110/4 111/14 113/5 115/24 127/10 138/20 141/1 142/16 173/16 201/10 202/9 211/15 214/18 222/7
company that [1] 23/20
comparable [1] 164/24
comparative [1] 67/8
comparators [1] 40/13
compare [5] 172/16 183/17 227/1 227/12 227/19
compared [4] 67/2 127/8 166/11 172/11
comparing [2] 173/8 183/13
comparison [1] 65/6
comparisons [1] 169/5
compatriots [1] 200/11
compensation [2] 103/24 119/12
compete [2] 25/13 254/8
competences [1] 216/25
competent [2] 102/24 158/2
competition [8] 30/10 30/18
49/13 49/18 51/5 168/17 168/22 183/2
competitive [1] 175/4
competitor [8] 35/10 35/10 37/13
37/16 174/12 174/15 183/23 183/24
competitors [4] 37/14 174/4 175/9 176/2
complained [3] 20/15 20/16 20/20
complains [2] 55/22 178/23
complete [6] 10/19 52/6 94/18
94/19 117/10 117/16
completed [4] 73/8 131/3 153/21 154/14
completely [7] 21/2 117/18
117/25 120/24 149/4 167/7
178/21
completion [2] 142/19 154/17
complied [1] 190/23
comply [3] 66/7 67/24 68/1
complying [1] 38/16
component [3] 191/24 192/20 209/18
components [1] 191/23
composed [1] 85/21
composition [2] 249/19 259/2
comprised [1] 66/24
computer [1] $9 / 23$
concept [1] 152/10
concepts [1] 90/5
concern [2] 16/17 202/1
concerned [5] 59/24 116/19
135/22 152/7 225/23
concerning [12] 141/4 141/16
219/14 221/12 221/13 221/21
222/15 224/2 227/7 230/16
231/16 232/11
concession [91] 13/19 13/19 14/7
14/23 17/5 18/13 18/14 22/10
24/14 24/24 24/25 25/2 25/7
25/20 27/2 28/4 28/11 29/24 32/4 32/17 33/12 36/4 36/7 36/15
36/21 37/8 37/24 38/2 39/16 40/2 41/21 41/24 41/25 43/18 49/16 49/19 51/15 52/24 84/16 85/20
86/4 86/9 87/10 87/15 87/23
87/25 88/9 88/21 88/24 91/19
101/11 115/18 117/15 118/2
146/11 146/14 157/16 165/14
166/11 168/8 169/15 169/17
171/22 172/16 173/1 173/15
178/20 198/2 198/4 198/6 198/10
198/24 207/21 210/21 212/19
220/19 224/6 225/17 231/8
231/25 234/6 235/1 235/13
237/20 238/21 245/7 247/25
248/14 253/11 257/18 258/4
concessionaire [8] 22/11 22/19 29/14 174/10 209/15 210/11 225/8 257/22
concessions [6] 52/21 86/23
164/23 168/10 168/15 172/17
conclude [3] 94/20 94/21 158/15 concluded [9] 29/10 63/168/15 80/23 112/10 129/19 141/9 148/15 151/22

## C

concludes [2] 80/3 89/4
concluding [1] 89/16
conclusion [13] 61/5 81/2 116/23 123/16 141/8 185/22 209/19 235/15 235/19 237/19 238/20 246/19 246/20
conclusions [1] 56/25
conclusory [1] 61/17
concordant [1] 194/17
condition [3] 65/5 146/20 170/23
conditional [1] 64/22
conditions [16] 64/19 101/19
110/14 116/13 119/23 120/5
122/9 122/23 124/12 145/25
165/20 168/19 171/25 181/7
183/11 234/21
conduct [14] 77/5 77/12 77/15
84/4 88/14 115/8 115/14 121/23
123/6 124/15 162/6 172/4 172/9 191/12
conducted [5] 79/10 108/21
126/21 175/20 208/25
conducting [1] 127/21
confers [1] 101/23
confidential [4] 7/19 54/3 55/23 150/15
confidentiality [2] 80/21 138/12
confirm [8] 72/11 119/21 174/21
186/5 205/16 205/19 217/15
223/9
confirmed [5] 66/13 122/8 149/11 165/17 217/19
confirms [7] 57/6 57/9 57/23
64/11 79/25 155/21 223/9
conflict [1] 118/3
conflicting [2] 62/20 63/4
confused [2] 110/24 256/17
confusing [1] 256/2
confusingly [1] 77/8
confusion [5] 82/20 82/23 99/23 246/22 247/13
conjecture [1] 173/3
connection [3] 79/21 192/18 197/20
conscience [1] 205/11
conscious [1] 119/9
consensus [1] 242/8
consent [14] 98/7 142/25 143/4

143/10 144/2 144/9 146/21 188/3 consultation [4] 43/22 43/23 188/4 188/7 188/17 189/25 190/2 $43 / 25$ 108/22 190/3
consented [2] 188/10 188/19
consents [1] 188/12
consequences [2] 80/19 124/8
Consequently [1] 56/9
consider [13] 114/14 190/12
193/23 204/5 204/8 209/8 220/12
232/19 234/6 234/9 234/20 240/17 249/15
considerably [1] 98/16
consideration [4] 30/17 61/10 61/12 239/18
considerations [4] 32/1 34/19 53/3 86/2
considered [13] 56/24 60/9 70/4 73/15 73/17 82/12 141/20 175/3 200/16 234/15 234/18 234/21 248/25
considering [5] 66/11 120/6 137/10 239/12 252/24
considers [1] 195/8
consistent [3] 113/15 171/5
171/10
consistently [1] 193/14
Consorcio [1] 126/22
Consorcio.co [2] 126/14 127/5
constant [1] 221/10
constantly [1] 172/21
CONSTAÍN [18] 4/17 9/3 30/22
31/20 37/12 41/4 41/8 41/10
43/21 85/25 102/12 120/19 166/6
166/8 213/8 213/10 258/25
259/13
Constaín's [1] 86/16
constituent [2] 147/23 148/11
constitute [2] 88/4 194/18
constituted [2] 63/3 192/22
constitutes [2] 76/24 153/10
constitution [2] 135/23 172/15
constitutional [8] 168/2 168/3
168/17 168/20 169/3 169/14
171/11 172/23
constructive [1] 66/15
consult [2] 60/1 82/14
consultant [2] 118/9 238/10
consultants [5] 118/8 123/2
164/23 165/7 165/16
consulting [4] 123/4 214/10 214/15 222/4
contact [2] 210/7 221/10
contacts [3] 210/4 210/5 210/21 contained [5] 24/14 144/23 146/18 146/20 192/24
contains [2] 63/16 151/8 contemporaneous [3] 92/11 92/18 93/5
content [2] 46/21 46/23
contention [1] 70/5
contested [3] 28/9 70/10 71/4 contesting [1] 56/5
context [5] 10/22 152/16 194/2 194/21 195/3
continents [1] 27/20 contingency [2] 181/15 181/23 contingent [2] 113/1 181/16 continuation [1] 65/14 continue [11] 80/14 90/19 91/16 101/21 120/14 128/21 129/4 129/8 146/23 147/6 196/5 continued [12] 22/15 27/7 34/6 35/15 38/13 71/1 91/17 142/18 147/7 156/19 164/22 190/22 continues [1] 87/17
continuing [2] 33/22 37/3
continuity [3] 45/18 75/4 93/16
continuous [1] 143/18
continuously [1] 55/5
contract [134] 15/23 26/15 31/18
84/11 84/21 84/24 85/5 85/23
93/14 98/4 98/6 98/11 98/15
101/19 101/23 101/24 102/4
103/23 104/25 110/8 110/9 111/5 112/15 112/20 112/25 113/9 113/13 113/14 113/15 113/18 113/21 114/12 115/7 115/8 115/14 115/18 116/13 119/10 120/1 121/14 123/18 123/19 123/22 124/3 124/10 124/13 127/9 128/4 129/1 129/25 129/25 132/1 132/1 132/10 132/24 133/7 133/15 133/18 133/18 133/19 133/24 134/8 146/6 148/13 148/25 149/4 150/6 150/10 152/9 156/10 156/14 156/20 157/10


| C | 150/24 189/19 | 259/15 259/1 259/5 259/6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| court... [6] 168/13 169/3 169/8 | Dan [4] 8/22 97/15 158/7 158/17 | ] 20/6 |
| 172/23 236/18 261/7 | Dan González [3] 8/22 97/15 | deciding [2] 25/23 36/2 |
| court's [4] 58/6 61/9 168/20 | 158/17 | decision [53] 32/20 32/25 36/3 |
| 171/11 | DANIEL [1] 4/ | 37/23 48/5 53/23 58/19 59/10 |
| courts [2] 145/10 147/4 | DARIO [2] 6/15 205/ | 59/15 60/7 60/15 61/11 86/4 |
| covered [1] 96 | DARÍO [1] | 87/11 100/10 101/8 102/3 102/ |
| covering [2] 66/24 78/ | data [2] 206/23 227/1 | 103/8 104/2 114/5 117/6 117/21 |
| covers [1] 57/15 | databases [1] | 118/5 118/6 120/12 133/2 |
| Covid [1] 12 | date [10] 10/7 72/13 73/ | 138/10 146/8 158/11 167/21 |
| create [4] 82/20 90/23 174/13 | 73/16 73/17 193/4 209/15 213/25 | 168/1 168/9 170/8 170/22 178/ |
| 175/24 | 231/10 | 191/3 195/1 195/3 230/17 233/22 |
| created [5] 28/22 43/24 107/25 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { dated [6] 74/14 187/10 191/ } \\ & \text { 195/2 195/6 205/15 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 233/22 239/21 242/10 243/17 } \\ & \text { 243/23 243/25 244/3 244/7 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 181/14 190/3 | 195/2 195/6 205/15 dates [3] 109/1 123/7 134/3 | 245/21 249/18 259/3 259/7 |
| creating [3] 15/11 44/1 82/23 <br> creation [3] 108/16 254/7 254/17 | dating [1] 56/7 | decision-maker [1] 48/5 |
| credible [1] 165/23 | DAVID [4] 5/5 9/10 76/10 187/1 | decision-making [2] 53/23 117/6 |
| criminal [1] 81/24 | David Bigge [2] 9/10 187/1 |  |
| CRISTINA [1] 4/17 | day [20] 24/10 27/14 27/14 31/4 53/1 71/3 73/9 80/5 117/25 | 46/24 48/3 50/9 63/4 86/24 <br> 102/18 137/25 182/14 208/17 |
| criticised [1] 166/ | 125/19 125/21 126/2 129/23 | 209/5 241/25 242/4 242/6 242/8 |
| criticises [1] 157/ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 130/2 136/2 136/4 168/4 250/3 } \\ & 251 / 4 \text { 259/25 } \end{aligned}$ | 242/22 242/23 243/1 <br> deck [1] 199/13 |
| criticism [1] 93/22 | days[15] 24/22 26/7 29/22 37/4 | declaration [1] 170/9 |
| 251/15 260/8 | 37/4 71/2 87/6 101/13 102/9 | declare [1] 205/11 |
| cross-examination [5] 6/18 206/8 | 106/15 136/3 137/8 137/15 189/4 | decline [1] 139/20 |
| 211/7 251/15 260/8 | 189/21 | decree [4] 200/1 200/2 200/5 |
| crucial [1] 112/21 | de [4] 4/5 4/9 5/13 108/ <br> deadline [1] 126/13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 200/7 } \\ & \text { decrees [1] 200/4 } \end{aligned}$ |
| crystal [1] 58/14 | deafening [1] 173/2 | decrees [1] 200/4 dedicated [1] 247/5 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { crystallised [5] 73/18 83/2 147/12 } \\ & 150 / 20151 / 15 \end{aligned}$ | deal [12] 49/23 51/24 79/7 80/23 | deemed [1] 152/1 |
| Cuenca [1] 229/16 | 104/5 115/4 131/16 134/15 | deeply [1] 152/ |
| Cup [1] 27/11 | 158/24 159/4 177/4 197/19 | defect [3] 64/18 65/7 65/16 |
| curious [1] 25 | dealing [5] 51/17 91/23 106/12 | defective [3] 139/8 147/2 150/22 |
| current [10] 17/17 44/3 102/19 | 163/13 217/3 | defects [3] 63/16 102/22 144/17 <br> defence [10] 8/219/1 66/19 67/7 |
| 113/15 115/18 164/3 171/25 | dealt [1] 120/21 debunked [1] 79/24 | defence [10] 8/21 9/1 66/19 67/7 97/2 100/13 100/14 100/15 |
| 232/21 232/21 248/13 <br> currently [4] 29/14 140 | December [21] 20/7 20/8 33/10 | 190/17 |
| $211 / 14$ | 36/5 36/9 71/6 71/20 72/17 74/2 | defend [3] 99/4 122/15 122/17 |
| customa | 76/10 77/23 83/6 134/17 134/20 | defended [1] |
| 152/12 161/ | 134/25 135/7 137/25 141/3 | efensa [1] 4/ |
| cut [2] 56/11 95/10 | 154/23 243/16 259/ | deficiency [1] 226/19 |
| D | 171/20 204/21 239/14 259/5 | defined [6] 52/6 129/3 144/1 |
| d/b/a [1] 1/9 | 259/1 | 152/14 182/3 182/10 |
| Daimler [1] 143/16 | decided [23] 21/3 33/8 36/8 | definitely [2] 89/20 220/14 |
| damage [7] 28/22 47/21 62/9 | 36/14 37/7 44/17 49/1 60/25 68/6 | definition [2] 70/3 147/19 |
| 62/14 68/15 148/3 148/19 | 87/4 98/17 114/2 168/3 196/21 | definitive [3] 56/19 61/20 145/5 |
| damages [5] 68/18 71/11 87/24 | 208/19 228/20 249/19 257/14 | degree [4] 165/1 206/20 206/23 |


| D |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ```degree... [1] 250/13 del [1] 4/5 delay [2] 31/14 161/16 delayed [3] 86/9 154/20 155/17 delays[1] 12/25 delegated [1] 19/12 deliberately [1] 154/19 deliver [3] 189/5 189/20 190/8 delve [1] 120/20 demonstrate [8] 42/18 43/3 78/1 78/4 79/15 81/3 167/25 194/13 demonstrated [3] 57/21 72/18 235/7 demonstrates [1] 78/9 denial [2] 52/8 52/9 denied [4] 39/11 59/19 144/11 152/3 deny [2] 39/9 39/14 denying [1] 61/5 department [9] 5/2 7/22 9/8 100/13 187/4 207/3 208/22 208/24 219/4 department's [1] 216/10 departments [4] 216/17 216/18 216/23 218/3 depend [2] 54/21 54/25 depending[1] 216/25 depends[3] 84/25 250/22 250/24 deprive [1] 190/23 depth [1] 222/23 deputy[3] 213/2 213/14 213/18 Derains[3] 1/17 2/7 7/6 derive [1] 157/15 derives [1] 143/1 describe [7] 114/4 206/9 208/18 210/5 220/16 222/1 238/5 describe what [1] 220/16 described [11] 28/15 66/17 67/8 68/17 69/19 105/16 111/10 126/8 132/4 135/3 222/5 describing [1] 70/14 description [1] 81/17 deserve [3] 17/12 51/13 236/21 deserved [1] 29/7 deserves [2] 139/19 185/21 designed [3] 44/10 55/10 153/1 desire [2] 31/18 33/11 desk[1] 211/4``` |  | ```246/16 246/18 247/3 247/18 249/4 249/15 253/14 254/10 254/16 257/16 258/4 259/5 259/15 259/15 didn't[51] 15/5 16/19 18/22 21/16 21/18 25/11 25/15 28/21 31/15 34/3 34/4 35/3 35/6 42/24 43/6 43/9 44/13 48/9 49/23 53/25 95/21 110/13 148/23 161/20 163/5 163/22 167/14 167/14 167/18 176/7 180/22 181/17 181/23 182/2 197/22 198/4 199/3 199/9 211/18 213/17 217/18 227/11 227/18 227/22 234/14 239/4 242/22 243/6 246/16 249/5 259/6 Diego [1] 109/23 difference [9] 70/8 79/18 94/7 222/13 222/19 222/20 247/14 257/6 257/7 differences [6] 40/16 53/2 175/21 175/22 181/9 200/22 different [48] 8/8 12/25 17/6 19/7 30/4 30/9 30/16 40/14 45/2 45/7 45/7 45/16 47/5 48/4 49/24 53/4 53/7 88/25 91/20 118/2 120/5 129/2 133/9 140/7 158/25 161/8 163/13 163/16 175/14 182/9 183/8 183/12 183/13 183/14 183/15 192/1 200/15 200/19 209/8 209/9 211/19 216/12 219/18 227/4 232/12 232/13 239/21 239/24 differential [1] 193/2 differently [1] 40/17 difficult [3] 91/23 92/7 157/3 difficulty [2] 9/19 123/25 diffuse [1] 191/1 digital [3] 29/23 86/7 119/14 digitalisation [1] 213/3 diligent [1] 101/14 diligently [1] 102/17 DIMOND [1] 3/9 dinamismo [1] 234/24 direct [5] 62/14 183/2 195/25 206/2 250/11 direction [2] 202/20 208/7 directions [1] 68/19``` |




## E

Eco [3] 46/3 66/10 69/20 economic [5] 30/5 30/12 30/16 115/20 134/1
economically [1] 163/2 economics [8] 30/8 49/11 49/13 49/15 49/17 49/23 49/24 50/2
Economy [2] 29/23 86/7
Eduardo [2] 128/1 128/8
effect [1] 65/13
effectively [2] 54/18 86/21
effects [1] 59/11
effort [3] 15/19 38/13 52/22
efforts [4] 15/14 41/15 101/4 119/14
egregious [1] 46/17
eight [4] 24/5 89/10 124/12 132/4
either [11] 11/3 11/8 54/21 56/4
70/9 92/20 167/18 167/19 184/4 188/24 261/1
el [4] 110/18 130/16 154/9 155/15
elaborate [1] 227/23
election [3] 30/25 145/5 249/10
elections [2] 86/10 114/21
electromagnetic [3] 168/10 168/14 168/18
electronic [2] 11/25 206/17
elements [10] 70/11 129/2 147/23
148/11 153/25 209/6 230/17
232/20 236/2 254/14
Eleven [2] 57/13 194/23
elicit [1] 230/7
eligible [1] 50/16
ELIZABETH [1] 4/9
else [11] 32/25 34/16 53/3 129/11
138/21 174/6 183/16 236/21
236/24 254/24 258/12
elusive [1] 55/7
email [6] 11/16 12/22 12/24
170/18 218/16 219/11
emails [1] 218/22
embarking [1] 82/7
embellishments [1] 56/12
eminent [1] 96/20
Emmanuel [1] 147/20
Emmanuel Gaillard [1] 147/20
emphasise [1] 195/16
employed [2] 211/11 211/14
employee [2] 211/16 212/2
empower [1] 254/17
empowerment [1] 144/8
empty [2] 106/11 122/18
enable [2] 66/14 66/18
encompassed [1] 61/11
end [20] 10/21 16/9 23/24 24/10
25/18 26/20 28/4 44/13 44/24
53/1 117/25 135/1 137/16 141/21 159/23 184/11 193/7 204/10 250/23 251/2
ended [4] 25/7 44/1 51/2 83/9
engage [13] 34/3 34/4 35/5 35/15 38/7 38/16 66/15 77/15 78/14 82/14 82/16 104/8 189/25
engaged [6] 34/2 35/7 50/11 77/4 77/12 83/25
engagement [1] 38/13
engages [1] 76/21
engaging [1] 86/8
engineer [5] 206/17 214/8 215/1
215/12 238/15
engineered [1] 121/2
engineering [2] 206/21 215/16
engineers [1] 221/5
English [9] 110/16 110/19 117/17
206/3 223/14 223/15 223/23
223/24 259/12
enjoy [1] 101/22
enjoyment [1] 54/7
enormous [2] 44/5 44/7
enough [6] 41/11 93/23 93/24
165/24 171/20 183/21
enshrined [2] 136/6 136/19
ensure [7] 66/13 67/12 79/7
104/3 175/1 175/4 244/15
entail [1] 119/11
entered [2] 27/1 132/2
enterprise [4] 14/7 188/25 189/12 189/13
enters [1] 111/5
entire [2] 27/24 90/12
entirely [8] 56/16 61/16 62/4
62/21 73/12 142/2 142/14 143/17
entirety [2] 97/17 147/23
entities [3] 23/13 183/14 214/10
entitled [3] 103/5 110/22 141/22
entitlement [1] 140/9
entity [16] 24/10 31/2 40/4 40/6

137/22 141/14 142/8 144/6
168/13 183/12 211/15 211/17
212/1 225/3 247/24 248/4
entity.law.co [1] 256/4
entreaties [1] 33/14
entreaty [1] 33/13
entry [1] 193/4
environment [2] 169/9 214/21
environmental [3] 28/22 39/9 215/20
envisaged [1] 113/21
equal [1] 168/18
equate [1] 46/16
equitable [2] 161/3 192/16
escape [1] 17/12
essence [3] 21/2 44/17 81/19
essentially [8] 19/17 20/9 21/11
34/11 52/22 54/7 153/17 184/23
establish [4] 33/20 55/10 191/14 192/21
established [9] 23/25 151/5 151/6 152/11 161/9 169/16 181/3 192/6 225/11
establishes [1] 194/6
establishing [4] 175/18 216/19
216/24 218/4
establishment [1] 191/11
Estado [1] 4/5
et [7] 106/8 106/8 107/11 107/21 110/25 130/5 255/19
et cetera [6] 106/8 106/8 107/11 107/21 110/25 255/19
EU [1] 27/22
Eurogas [1] 147/20
evaluating [1] 215/24
even [73] 15/2 15/12 15/20 17/5 17/11 19/25 20/5 20/18 20/24 21/5 21/20 22/1 22/14 23/4 25/19
26/8 29/14 31/8 32/21 34/12
$36 / 1739 / 1841 / 1143 / 1043 / 23$ 43/25 48/15 49/6 53/8 63/2 63/4 69/16 78/2 81/22 83/21 88/2
88/18 109/10 111/12 119/25
121/15 124/19 135/9 141/12 142/20 142/20 149/1 155/3 160/1 161/18 162/20 164/15 167/24 169/17 172/23 172/25 173/19 174/15 178/20 181/5 182/6 182/7 183/22 184/7 184/16 200/6

## E

even... [7] 218/24 219/12 221/10 224/13 228/16 233/1 251/2
evening [2] 251/16 261/11
event [13] 27/19 28/8 64/4 65/2 79/17 94/25 97/16 151/22 180/23 180/24 216/16 228/23 229/6 events [7] 27/5 73/1 154/5 228/18 228/21 256/21 257/2 ever [5] 100/10 158/24 159/4 176/19 216/14
every [10] 25/17 116/17 169/23 171/21 180/10 180/10 180/13 253/9 253/19 253/24
everybody [10] 7/3 7/5 96/6 115/22 163/9 203/1 205/5 236/21 236/24 250/4
everyone [6] 8/3 8/19 12/17 13/11 50/1 96/14
everything [20] 10/19 26/7 32/25 35/12 43/15 95/22 111/2 120/23 124/20 126/4 126/9 134/9 174/6 177/23 183/16 205/16 225/4 232/25 260/7 261/10 evidence [55] 55/8 61/14 65/23 71/14 74/13 78/5 78/23 79/23 80/7 82/8 83/21 92/15 94/2 101/18 102/20 158/8 159/15 159/22 160/8 160/13 160/18 162/15 162/16 162/18 162/22 162/22 162/23 163/21 167/23 167/25 170/17 171/4 171/7 171/13 172/7 172/8 173/7 173/21 173/22 174/17 175/6 175/7 177/14 178/11 178/23 179/21 182/19 184/22 190/16 199/9 209/6 237/1 237/4 260/14 260/15 evident [1] 69/10 evolution [3] 257/13 258/2 258/20
evolved [2] 98/16 258/2
evolves [1] 172/20
evolving [1] 238/3
exact [5] 42/9 126/7 182/8 213/25 237/15
exactly [15] 125/2 131/7 133/5 137/13 145/7 145/11 164/5
165/20 172/22 175/7 221/2 221/5 231/9 240/12 244/5
examination [11] 6/16 6/18 31/11 existence [9] 71/8 88/8 88/15 206/5 206/8 211/7 250/15 251/6 251/15 251/21 260/8
examinations [1] 251/5
examine [1] 233/11
examined [2] 145/14 245/5
example [21] 40/4 40/6 42/16
43/1 58/24 67/14 82/10 92/22
94/15 103/21 107/12 136/15
199/16 215/22 217/1 238/8 240/15 257/12 257/14 257/24 258/18
examples [7] 40/10 48/16 53/21 81/18 107/12 107/14 257/25
exceeded [1] 146/3
excellent [1] 226/8
except [1] 42/16
exception [2] 145/20 145/24
exceptional [1] 78/1
exceptions [1] 192/24
exclude [10] 36/9 85/17 125/3
125/16 243/17 243/25 244/3
244/7 244/25 245/4
excluded [13] 42/15 50/25 68/24
73/19 74/6 117/24 118/1 123/14
135/10 246/9 251/25 252/7 252/16
exclusion [3] 37/16 243/13 252/21
exclusive [1] 109/3
execute [1] 129/1
execution [5] 88/23 224/17
224/24 247/16 247/19
executive [1] 75/10
exemplary [1] 100/9
exercise [6] 101/10 103/1 152/14
178/19 202/10 233/6
exercises [1] 88/5
exert [1] 17/21
exhibit [8] 20/16 74/21 79/25
171/17 199/19 200/3 203/15
203/16
exhibit C-0032 [1] 171/17
exhibit C-126 [1] 79/25
exhibits [3] 55/17 75/17 163/20
exist [8] 25/14 55/12 70/6 82/12
142/16 142/19 190/3 258/4
existed [4] 25/1 70/2 71/15
142/17

143/25 147/19 147/21 147/24 148/12 192/13
existing [2] 257/22 257/22
exists [3] 35/19 35/20 172/8
expansion [1] 191/11
expect [4] 93/18 95/19 170/1 170/3
expectation [9] 14/22 26/14
52/15 52/17 169/18 179/2 179/6 180/1 180/1
expectations [6] 14/16 52/14 52/18 52/19 157/15 169/21
expected [1] 179/18
Expeditions [1] 256/13
Expeditions.travel [1] 256/14
expeditiously [1] 65/11
expense [1] 185/16
expensive [2] 27/11 27/12
experience [17] 14/8 23/1 23/7 23/12 23/14 23/15 43/3 125/14 165/2 206/10 207/1 207/2 207/5 207/9 221/18 221/23 223/6 experienced [2] 23/22 160/16 expert [6] 24/13 81/22 136/13 164/25 167/11 173/2
expertise [4] 21/19 25/21 118/20 122/20
experts [16] 43/23 43/24 43/25 118/8 118/13 118/13 165/6 165/19 167/11 167/17 184/21 216/11 233/17 233/19 235/23 238/1
expiration [3] 132/2 231/7 231/24 expire [5] 98/15 114/13 123/19 123/22 231/5
expired [1] 126/13
expiry [2] 71/3 124/7
explain [19] 16/20 97/11 97/15 104/23 130/6 139/12 139/14 139/16 139/17 140/10 178/15 178/18 180/21 181/5 207/15 222/12 226/18 254/10 257/23 explained [12] 63/25 68/16 71/9 74/1 86/16 108/18 120/9 155/8 164/18 202/11 207/13 254/19
explaining [1] 35/24
explains [3] 150/21 170/9 172/11
explanation [5] 16/23 78/7


| F | 125/24 128/20 133/19 134/13 | fo |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| figure [1] 166/18 | 135/25 136/16 137/23 139/1 | 63/16 65/7 70/16 70/25 218/10 |
| $\text { file [1] } 70 / 13$ | 139/25 140/13 144/17 148/1 | /11 |
| filed [29] 13/14 15/6 55/15 55/1 | 148/23 153/1 153/7 162/2 164/7 | formalised [1] |
| 58/3 58/11 59/22 60/2 60/4 69/13 | 172/13 180/10 180/13 1 | formalities [1] 7/4 |
| 69/25 70/2 70/16 70/25 71/20 | 191/17 191/23 191/24 196/9 201/9 204/25 207/20 209/6 | formally [5] 31/18 36/24 37/23 87/11 151/21 |
| 72/16 72/23 73/7 78/20 79/3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 201/9 204/25 207/20 209/6 } \\ & 213 / 11 \text { 214/18 223/9 223/22 } \end{aligned}$ | formed [6] 18/19 23/19 23/20 |
| 79/13 81/23 82/22 141/7 147/12 148/17 150/4 151/16 177/5 | 224/14 226/11 226/19 231/6 | 82/25 143/2 246/8 |
| filing [8] 72/7 73/25 134/16 137/3 151/23 153/15 154/3 156/2 | $\begin{aligned} & 234 / 5 \text { 234/8 236/7 240/11 240/13 } \\ & 240 / 17258 / 24 \end{aligned}$ | former [4] 97/20 102/14 201/12 |
| final [13] 1/1 27/11 84/9 90/18 | Fir | formerly [1] 1/9 |
| 123/13 125/22 129/15 137/18 | five [12] 27 | formulated [2] |
| 165/11 173/11 195/19 236/6 | 114/3 114/8 128/21 | formulating [1] 21 |
| 236/12 | 196/25 207/3 250/5 | formulation [1] 64/1 |
| finalisation [3] 78/24 79/5 129/16 | $\text { flagrant [1] } 178 / 3$ | fortunate [1] 19/1 |
| finally [11] 23/10 33/15 57/23 | flashy [2] 27/9 27/ | forum [11] 56/19 61/20 63/23 |
| 62/17 80/11 83/24 88/7 122/2 | fla | 84/18 88/8 88/9 88/13 88/20 |
| 139/20 151/17 195/15 | flawed [1] 147/ | 39/24 157/22 244 |
| financial [25] 31/25 32/3 34/16 | fla | forward [12] 9/2 30/19 32/25 |
| 34/19 38/22 42/18 45/8 53/2 | flexibility [2] 10/22 250/2 <br> floor [7] 9/17 97/6 99/11 104/11 | forward [12] 9/2 30/19 32/25 35/25 48/4 91/24 99/22 101/3 |
| $115 / 20115 / 21 ~ 116 / 4 ~ 116 / 11$ $121 / 15123 / 4 ~ 124 / 11 ~ 126 / 22 ~$ | 128/18 138/22 158/17 | 170/6 173/25 175/20 177/7 |
| 149/2 164/1 175/11 175/21 181/9 | flow [1] | found [12] 22/24 36/12 65/ |
| 209/18 209/21 232/16 239/7 | fluid [1] | 103/14 103/15 157/11 164/6 |
| financials [2] 115/17 136/14 | fo | 176/14 178/3 178/5 190/1 |
| find [14] 32/17 40/4 40/6 93/5 | focused [1] 217 | 257/25 |
| 113/12 130/9 150/2 157/23 | fo | founded [3] 57/20 89/24 10 |
| 162/16 170/13 170/22 203/21 | follow [1] 242/25 <br> followed [1] 199/17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { four [5] 61/11 115/5 121/22 } \\ & \text { 126/11 162/4 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 232/12 238/24 | followed [1] 199/17 <br> following [7] 80/25 132/2 139/13 | fourth [3] 71/23 119/19 173/11 |
| findings [1] 65/20 | 143/2 196/5 196/8 242/4 | framed [1] 194/9 |
| 237/5 237/17 251/17 | follows [1] 143/13 | framework [9] 66/20 67/12 68/1 |
| finish [6] 10/20 138/15 212/16 | fo | 5/12 108/17 147/21 183/3 |
| 251/19 260/3 260/12 | football [1] | 10/22 244/1 |
| finished [3] 129/9 251/14 260/7 | For | framing [1] 87/18 |
| finished by [1] 260/7 | footnotes [1] 55/25 <br> force [8] 111/5 132/2 134/7 | France [3] 116/8 116/18 116/20 frankly [5] 106/6 132/22 138/17 |
| finishing [1] 134/2 | force [8] 111/5 132/2 134/7 148/14 156/9 168/23 193/4 193/5 | frankly [5] 106/6 132/22 138/1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { firm [9] 123/2 215/4 229/8 229/12 } \\ & 229 / 13 \text { 229/17 229/20 229/23 } \\ & 229 / 25 \end{aligned}$ | forced [1] 45/17 <br> foreign [4] 46/18 46/20 53/20 | fraud [1] 74/4 <br> free [2] 168/17 168/22 |
| first [80] 7/3 10/10 10/17 15/21 | 112/17 | freedom [1] 111/8 <br> freely [1] 101/25 |
| 18/2 18/12 18/13 21/24 25/5 41/3 | foremost [1] 57/8 | freely [1] 101/25 |
| 45/23 51/13 56/15 57/1 57/8 63/7 | foresight | frequent [3] 15/14 210/3 210/ |
| 63/14 63/20 66/6 78/11 81/20 | foresight [2] 169/3 169/8 <br> fork [2] 144/23 146/15 | frequently [1] 207/23 |
| 84/13 89/18 91/11 98/14 100/17 | form [4] 74/21 74/22 194/24 | Friday [2] 80/23 130/5 |
| $\begin{array}{llll} 105 / 8 & 108 / 1 & 109 / 11 & 112 / 14 \\ 115 / 6 & 119 / 5 & 121 / 22 & 122 / 3 \\ 123 / 5 \end{array}$ | 259/4 | friends [1] 118/17 |

## F

frivolous [5] 158/23 159/3 185/8 185/9 185/14
front [5] 171/15 172/8 185/18 202/1 205/5
FTA [1] 58/18
fulfil [1] 64/19
fulfilled [2] 57/24 60/10
full [9] 99/3 112/15 122/19 128/5 133/15 152/22 171/25 198/16 251/4
fully [6] 79/18 98/10 103/12 176/3 176/10 197/21
fun [1] 256/10
function [5] 93/20 107/3 190/22
207/20 242/25
functioning [1] 225/13
functions [3] 190/9 207/19 208/22
fundamental [3] 81/7 83/10 84/19
fundamentally [1] 87/17 funded [1] 75/18
further [20] 26/22 57/5 57/9
64/16 89/13 97/25 113/10 132/5 147/25 152/3 162/4 162/20 164/16 164/21 170/3 182/17 189/9 208/12 250/6 257/17
furtherance [1] 158/12
future [5] 86/1 86/15 148/7 148/7 231/3

## G

GACOF [1] 123/3
Gaillard [3] 81/12 81/13 147/20
Gaillard's [1] 82/6
gain [8] 77/5 77/10 77/12 77/15
77/16 153/3 153/9 156/11
gaining [2] 76/22 81/21
game [2] 175/9 260/20
games [1] 33/1
Gate [9] 74/3 75/18 75/24 106/7
106/11 128/9 138/20 201/10 203/18
gathered [1] 159/17
gave [8] 22/6 30/3 39/16 45/13
45/14 84/21 213/5 247/13
general [20] 8/11 8/13 75/10 102/14 128/1 172/3 174/24

201/12 201/13 201/15 201/15 201/17 208/24 216/23 217/1 219/24 225/9 225/10 226/12 230/22
generally [9] 13/24 17/24 54/5 152/16 152/24 172/17 212/9 235/3 242/7
generated [1] 247/12
generic [12] 107/9 107/10 254/6
254/17 254/22 255/13 255/16 255/18 255/20 256/6 257/7 257/9 gentleman [1] 128/11
gentlemen [6] 7/3 96/18 102/25
104/9 134/20 166/16
genuine [4] 81/10 81/14 117/21 156/7
get [62] 7/14 9/22 10/16 12/9 13/4 13/25 14/20 14/21 15/1 15/20 18/23 19/1 19/18 22/13 24/21 25/15 28/3 29/6 30/7 30/21 $31 / 1034 / 1334 / 1438 / 1339 / 2$ 47/1 49/5 49/8 49/8 52/4 52/11 96/7 103/1 103/22 103/24 106/3 106/14 106/18 109/11 110/13 111/21 112/9 114/1 116/4 123/1 134/14 136/22 141/25 148/24 167/4 169/23 176/7 177/4 181/8 198/13 199/22 202/13 207/23 211/18 216/9 233/13 237/2 gets [1] 185/15
getting [8] 21/20 71/22 166/18 166/21 224/7 225/6 250/14 259/24
GIC [3] 74/3 75/19 75/25
GIOVANNY [1] 4/10
give [21] 12/14 14/1 16/22 24/19
34/7 34/8 45/13 48/8 49/21 51/21 104/10 128/18 134/22 181/20 206/13 210/25 218/15 249/6 251/20 253/21 257/12
given [21] 42/20 53/21 56/19
58/20 80/19 82/24 134/21 147/19 155/15 174/8 182/22 188/4 194/14 207/22 213/3 231/4 243/8 244/13 244/18 244/18 248/5
giving [7] 236/25 247/6 248/17
248/19 248/21 260/14 260/15
glad [2] $8 / 3$ 127/2
glass [1] 122/19
global [3] 50/18 175/2 183/15 globally [1] 183/15
GMT [1] 7/1
go [68] 7/4 10/9 13/7 16/20 18/2 18/4 21/1 26/6 29/19 30/5 32/7 39/24 44/17 45/25 46/4 48/9 51/8 87/14 89/19 89/21 93/12 94/10 94/12 104/21 105/8 108/16 108/17 114/8 114/23 114/24 115/2 117/3 121/20 121/21 123/8 125/8 129/15 129/17 133/10 134/4 161/24 162/5 162/20 164/12 164/16 165/5 177/13 177/25 180/12 180/14 181/13 185/13 185/16 197/25 203/3 216/10 218/13 218/15 220/10 226/13 235/4 240/1 250/5 250/10 250/18 251/9 253/25 256/18
goal [1] 16/21
$\operatorname{god}[1] 177 / 8$
GoDaddy [30] 73/5 73/10 78/12 80/4 91/20 98/23 105/5 106/1
129/16 129/20 130/1 130/11 130/13 130/17 134/19 150/1 151/21 153/17 153/20 154/2 154/7 154/16 154/25 155/3 155/10 155/16 155/20 156/2 156/21 157/1
GoDaddy's [2] 131/19 135/2
goes [8] 51/18 111/2 114/6
115/19 119/25 133/12 226/17 251/21
going [87] 7/14 7/16 10/10 11/12 11/20 13/25 16/2 16/8 18/1 18/2 18/3 19/24 33/8 33/20 33/24
35/25 37/17 39/24 41/3 45/21
49/3 49/15 50/8 54/9 54/14 56/22 73/22 78/8 91/9 91/10 92/2 95/10 95/16 96/12 96/21 97/18 97/24 106/5 107/18 109/12 111/20 114/4 114/23 114/24 116/1 121/6 122/1 123/8 125/8 127/15 128/6 128/16 136/23 148/24 159/10 162/3 162/16 166/7 166/23 169/10 173/9 175/19 177/7 177/9 179/24 180/21 181/19 182/17 182/21 184/23 185/6 186/20 206/12 210/13 211/5 214/6 223/14 232/19 237/1 241/11

| G |
| :---: |
| going... [7] 246/2 246/5 250/23 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 251/9 258/21 260/21 260/23 } \\ & \text { gold [1] 19/6 } \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |
|  |
| 106/7 106/10 128/9 138/20 |
| 201/10 203/18 |
| gone [2] 37/20 186/1 |
| GONZÁLEZ [7] 4/14 8/22 97/15 |
| 158/7 158/17 158/19 220/7 good [58] 7/2 7/15 8/2 8/18 9/9 |
|  |  |
|  |
| 29/13 34/2 34/5 35/22 38/8 44/7 |
| 45/25 49/25 51/9 51/13 51/19 |
| 52/2 52/15 54/13 60/13 60/16 |
| 60/21 61/9 91/1 93/10 99/16 |
| 103/19 112/6 118/6 121/9 130/8 |
| 132/11 132/21 153/15 175/1 |
| 177/24 200/11 204/13 204/24 |
| 205/2 205/24 211/9 225/19 |
| 225/20 225/22 226/8 242/5 |
| 250/12 251/22 259/22 260/13 |
| 261/11 |
| gorging [2] 34/21 94/17 |
| gossip [1] 173/24 |
| got [25] 13/19 17/5 27/23 45/4 |
| 45/4 49/15 106/14 112/23 118/1 |
| 118/2 118/3 127/10 129/24 |
| 137/16 150/6 159/18 159/18 |
| 173/5 175/14 176/23 176/24 |
| 206/20 206/22 225/23 251/16 |
| Gottdiener [2] 75/7 76/11 |
| GOUIFFÈS [11] 4/13 6/7 6/14 6/17 |
| 8/17 11/7 96/16 201/2 201/4 |
| 203/20 206/6 |
| governing [1] 85/12 |
| government [36] 19/17 20/7 |
| 20/14 20/17 24/3 30/14 42/4 |
| 50/15 85/21 86/2 105/7 108/4 |
| 114/20 130/2 179/9 179/13 |
| 179/15 180/6 180/11 200/1 209/4 |
| 209/10 211/12 212/2 213/20 |
| 215/25 218/9 231/15 232/3 232/3 |
| 232/9 232/17 233/16 235/16 |
| 244/22 244/23 |
| governmental [1] 158/6 |
| grabbing [1] 19/24 |
| graduated [1] 206/17 |
| ant [2] 171/23 173/15 |

granted [5] 39/12 39/13 168/8 169/17 258/4
grateful [1] 13/15
gratitude [1] 7/11
great [6] 29/3 50/1 95/23 177/11 182/19 226/14
greater [1] 166/20
green [1] 106/24
greet [1] 99/18
greeting [1] 99/16
grew [1] 163/10
grievances [1] 190/25
gross [1] 178/3
grossly [1] 47/11
grounded [1] 82/9
groundless [1] 104/5
grounds [6] 59/20 61/6 101/17 159/9 172/2 185/23
group [3] 19/13 141/1 165/11
grow [2] 129/4 169/3
growing [2] 129/8 210/12
grown [1] 164/4
grows [1] 24/23
growth [6] 21/7 25/13 25/15 28/10 39/3 45/9
gTLDs [2] 254/5 254/7
guarantee [5] 168/14 170/11
208/3 209/10 260/9
guaranteed [2] 170/13 181/16
guarantees [1] 170/18
Guatemala [2] 48/21 48/22
guess [3] 177/5 177/8 257/10
guidance [1] 148/1
guided [1] 86/22
guy [1] 112/6
guys [1] 121/18

## H

had [243] 13/18 14/8 15/18 15/19 19/7 19/23 19/23 20/17 20/18 22/7 23/8 23/14 23/15 24/11 25/8 25/11 25/19 26/18 27/1 30/12
$31 / 231 / 1931 / 2132 / 333 / 735 / 6$ $36 / 2337 / 537 / 737 / 2137 / 23$ 39/12 41/12 41/25 42/6 42/7
$42 / 1143 / 543 / 543 / 1444 / 25$
45/18 48/15 49/24 49/24 50/22
50/25 52/14 52/18 52/23 52/24
52/25 59/22 60/20 61/2 61/8

67/12 69/16 70/8 71/10 71/12 73/7 73/18 73/19 73/19 77/6 77/12 78/2 79/3 79/13 83/1 83/7 86/7 90/10 90/12 98/15 99/4 101/18 101/25 102/2 103/2 103/10 104/7 109/18 110/24 111/14 111/19 111/20 111/22 115/7 117/12 117/12 117/14 118/13 120/1 120/18 123/1 123/14 123/20 124/2 124/5 124/7 124/8 124/14 125/20 125/22 126/25 127/8 127/24 130/20 131/10 131/13 131/16 133/4 133/6 133/10 133/22 134/12 135/9 135/25 136/1 137/5 137/11 137/20 139/3 140/24 141/6 141/14 142/21 147/12 148/18 149/1 150/19 151/15 151/19 153/21 154/7 154/21 155/22 156/1 157/9 157/20 158/24 159/4 162/7 162/15 162/24 163/5 164/3 165/1 165/6 165/18 166/3 166/12 166/16 167/1 168/3 169/3 169/8 169/20 171/21 174/9 176/20 177/5 177/6 178/15 178/17 180/1 181/17 181/25 184/17 184/17 184/18 184/20 186/15 202/10 207/5 207/8 207/19 208/1 209/9 209/17 209/22 209/23 210/9 210/13 210/16 210/18 210/19 210/21 213/19 215/3 215/6 216/5 216/8 216/11 216/15 218/18 219/6 219/16 221/1 221/23 222/16 223/6 225/2 225/24 227/5 227/7 227/16 228/17 228/18 228/21 231/15 232/4 232/5 235/15 235/25 237/24 238/2 239/2 239/17 241/20 242/10 243/4 245/5 245/6 245/10 245/15 245/22 245/23 246/3 246/14 246/21 247/15 252/23 253/4 253/24 257/15 257/24 258/1 258/12 258/19 260/7
half [4] 37/1 116/12 122/18 122/19
half-full [1] 122/19
halfway [1] 98/11
hand [19] 30/5 30/5 58/24 59/3
59/14 62/6 75/7 89/8 93/11 96/12

## H

hand... [9] 103/20 115/19 115/19 209/12 216/22 227/20 228/17 232/14 248/23
handed [2] 96/14 211/4 handled [1] 35/21
happen [23] 25/16 25/25 26/3 26/4 26/9 27/2 30/1 30/2 30/3 $32 / 3$ 33/8 35/5 36/1 39/1 40/20 43/19 44/13 48/23 48/24 137/7 181/23 203/5 243/9
happened [33] 20/24 21/6 21/24 21/25 31/23 40/19 40/19 43/19 48/17 90/10 92/17 93/16 104/25 109/1 112/2 112/18 117/20 118/15 123/10 137/24 140/10 145/7 145/11 177/12 181/24 198/8 199/11 202/18 202/21 249/18 256/20 256/21 257/2 happening [19] 19/21 29/19 32/10 33/3 34/13 35/12 41/16 44/8 51/2 92/12 92/19 100/10 118/23 119/17 119/19 134/19 135/16 137/18 250/13
happens [2] 11/1 26/5 happy [5] 45/14 90/7 186/8 217/17 235/3
hard [3] 11/11 11/13 41/22 hardly [2] 61/13 68/10 harm [1] 162/8
has [134] 7/5 14/15 19/1 19/2 19/8 23/5 24/2 24/5 28/15 29/9 37/20 37/22 40/11 43/8 43/12 46/19 47/4 51/8 53/20 54/16 55/2 55/5 56/13 57/21 61/19 62/13 62/17 66/17 68/20 70/4 72/2 72/6 72/19 74/9 74/24 75/3 76/6 76/7 77/14 78/4 78/6 78/6 78/22 81/2 81/9 83/25 84/1 84/2 84/11 85/1 86/21 88/3 89/25 90/1 90/25 92/2 100/14 101/3 102/2 102/20 102/22 104/25 108/7 108/13 110/1 111/8 112/5 112/18 113/24 117/20 118/14 118/20 122/16 123/10 123/20 125/15 131/10 131/20 131/21 131/22 132/9 132/19 135/1 136/7 136/19 137/24 138/16 139/8 139/18 141/21 142/1 142/1 142/16

142/18 143/11 145/2 145/9 146/1 146/22 147/23 149/12 151/6 152/12 152/14 152/15 152/22 152/23 157/5 158/8 158/22 161/7 161/22 166/9 170/5 173/10 177/6 181/6 185/2 185/2 185/9 191/16 196/19 196/21 200/5 202/18 203/24 216/16 217/19 220/4 238/16 250/3 254/18 254/20 255/7
hasn't [1] 195/25
hate [1] $12 / 8$
have [448]
haven't [7] 12/2 12/5 35/18 40/14 130/1 134/21 149/8
having [22] 7/12 7/13 9/19 10/6 13/16 30/3 35/24 37/9 43/3 66/19 97/21 97/22 183/11 186/1 206/3 248/13 248/24 252/13 252/14 254/23 256/15 259/24
he [32] 30/24 30/25 36/18 36/20
37/7 128/15 128/15 130/20
131/11 151/3 160/4 161/20 170/10 198/16 198/18 198/20 201/14 201/17 203/18 217/15 217/18 220/5 220/7 245/20 245/21 245/22 245/23 246/1 246/3 246/3 246/4 246/4
headsets [2] 97/5 206/14
hear [32] 10/10 10/12 11/10 35/1 56/14 65/9 89/3 90/15 102/9 102/24 111/25 128/6 128/19 139/24 158/6 163/6 163/22 164/19 164/21 166/7 170/6 182/17 186/11 186/16 196/1 196/14 204/5 204/6 204/25 211/21 211/23 212/14 heard [38] 13/17 34/20 89/18 89/21 91/7 95/1 110/12 114/10 115/9 117/9 121/25 139/3 142/12 143/15 145/18 158/3 158/21 159/5 159/12 159/16 159/18 159/23 161/18 163/1 163/4 164/20 166/6 168/25 169/22 177/1 181/5 182/16 184/13 185/12 196/8 197/14 231/7 244/15
hearing [15] $1 / 208 / 450 / 7126 / 21$
128/3 136/4 137/6 137/8 160/1

160/1 196/18 200/10 204/20 260/23 261/12
hearings [1] 93/24
hearsay [1] 173/22
heavily [2] 123/15 140/17
held [9] 19/15 19/16 37/1 55/14 80/1 144/5 152/19 157/5 214/8 help [5] 209/3 209/4 228/14 241/11 241/17
helped [2] 118/14 118/20
helpful [3] 197/24 247/24 248/4 her [22] 7/11 8/9 31/5 31/6 31/10 41/11 86/16 117/14 117/15 152/6 164/20 164/21 166/7 166/7 166/8 166/9 166/23 174/24 213/11 213/16 213/18 219/13
here [193] 8/16 9/14 9/21 13/15 13/20 16/11 17/7 17/7 17/8 17/13 18/24 22/2 22/12 28/25 29/1 31/21 35/3 35/4 35/23 38/12 40/1 40/20 45/3 45/22 48/10 48/13 52/25 54/15 57/14 57/16 58/5 58/15 58/24 60/9 61/12 61/22 62/5 62/12 62/22 63/12 64/24 65/22 66/8 66/23 67/4 69/12 70/11 72/14 73/4 73/22 75/12 75/17 76/15 77/6 77/20 77/21 78/2 78/9 78/17 81/18 85/12 85/24 88/11 88/21 91/4 93/23 94/5 96/7 100/6 105/9 105/14 106/16 106/21 106/24 107/8 107/20 108/12 108/14 108/20 109/1 109/12 109/16 109/20 110/15 110/15 111/21 111/25 112/6 112/18 112/24 112/25 114/7 114/15 114/16 117/20 118/9 118/12 118/22 118/25 119/15 120/4 120/11 120/23 121/4 121/5 121/12 121/15 121/22 122/3 122/11 122/12 122/16 122/19 123/7 123/10 123/11 123/18 123/24 124/15 124/25 125/7 126/7 126/15 127/2 127/13 127/18 127/21 127/23 129/22 130/14 130/25 131/11 131/20 132/14 132/17 133/12 133/13 133/14 133/16 133/17 134/2 134/3 134/5 135/4 135/16 135/24 137/7 137/18 142/15







## L

later... [9] 111/25 116/5 120/22 123/1 130/24 131/24 131/24 168/4 251/9
later when [1] 251/9
latest [1] 224/19
latitude [1] 177/17
launch [8] 37/7 114/2 114/5 120/12 208/19 209/22 233/3 244/10
launched [4] 87/9 105/6 239/16 253/7
launching [3] 144/22 244/20 248/16
LAURENT [5] 4/13 141/5 156/8 165/3 181/5
LAVISTA [2] 2/10 7/10
law [70] 14/16 17/20 22/1 22/2 22/7 22/9 30/10 30/18 39/16 46/23 49/13 49/18 51/5 52/19 56/13 56/24 57/6 57/7 57/11 57/20 58/21 60/13 60/16 60/17 60/21 60/23 61/9 62/16 63/19 64/6 67/22 70/7 70/15 70/18 70/23 71/5 71/11 90/5 90/8 90/12 94/19 101/6 108/18 116/6 116/7 120/8 123/2 146/25 152/12 157/16 161/4 169/14 169/16 170/1 171/10 174/22 182/14 193/20 193/24 208/7 209/25 212/3 229/8 229/11 229/13 229/17 229/20 229/23 229/25 245/7
law.co [4] 256/3 256/5 256/5 256/17
laws [1] 85/11
lawyer [2] 219/13 219/18
lawyers [11] 107/7 160/10 160/16
169/22 179/25 180/15 182/4
185/13 218/25 228/14 229/14
lay [3] 47/13 48/6 92/18
layers [1] 164/7
lays [1] 32/9
lead [1] 100/15
leader [1] 214/9
leadership [2] 258/25 259/13
leading [1] 85/15
learn [1] 34/6
learned [1] 106/9
least [17] 20/10 23/1 23/2 30/2 41/18 71/17 91/12 93/1 131/12 138/3 154/7 189/3 189/21 204/2 237/13 253/24 258/18
leave [4] 171/2 211/4 249/11 249/14
leaves [1] 261/6
leaving [2] 41/18 103/3
led [7] 31/6 114/4 209/18 237/18 238/19 239/14 239/21
leeway [1] 172/21
left [14] 7/7 7/9 8/22 9/3 58/6
58/24 89/10 114/17 210/15
245/16 246/1 246/17 251/8 253/10
left-hand [1] 58/24
legacy [1] 74/6
legal [63] 5/2 7/20 8/21 9/1 40/12
47/23 54/22 54/24 60/12 64/10
65/19 67/14 68/13 72/11 78/3
80/19 85/12 96/22 97/2 100/12
100/14 116/3 116/21 116/25
118/11 120/7 123/3 124/8 124/23
142/13 147/21 167/1 167/8
167/10 167/11 167/13 167/20
168/1 169/13 177/22 178/2 187/4 189/17 208/24 216/2 216/5 216/8 216/10 216/10 216/11 216/13
216/22 216/24 217/2 217/4
218/13 219/6 219/7 219/9 219/18 220/3 230/19 232/15
legally [1] 72/24
legislation [1] 181/3
legitimate [12] 47/22 52/14 100/2 101/8 103/8 157/15 162/7 162/24
165/25 166/13 177/22 179/2
length [3] 67/6 67/8 70/19
lengthy [2] 78/14 236/19
less [7] 53/18 93/22 162/25 191/7
191/21 192/22 228/12
let [12] 7/24 10/22 22/15 63/5
140/10 180/25 203/22 218/11
219/15 220/13 232/9 235/4
let's [47] 10/23 10/24 12/18 13/7
18/5 33/5 33/5 57/11 58/1 95/6
96/1 96/2 125/5 129/7 131/8
139/25 161/24 164/16 166/5
167/5 172/7 176/18 177/9 177/10
177/11 177/25 178/1 196/14

216/6 218/19 219/10 220/7 221/8 226/22 227/14 227/15 228/3 228/22 240/1 242/22 251/19 254/24 255/14 256/12 256/13 256/18 258/23
letter [7] 32/14 70/21 76/14 82/11 126/23 171/16 176/6
letters [5] 15/24 25/5 74/14 75/22 92/11
letting [1] 23/9
level [27] 18/6 18/7 18/9 18/10 21/9 23/5 23/6 23/23 25/14 42/19 107/8 107/17 107/20 111/23 119/25 125/12 125/24 135/11 184/15 184/16 184/16 221/19 227/8 227/10 227/14 227/16 254/6
levels [3] 82/2 106/22 124/17
leverage [1] 177/4
Lew [3] 1/16 2/4 7/8
LEÓN [1] 4/6
liability [2] 17/12 150/23
licensed [1] 27/23
life [1] 28/10
light [4] 65/11 65/23 71/14 102/2
like [51] 10/16 10/20 12/13 15/18
19/5 19/6 20/3 23/5 25/6 26/5
27/11 35/1 38/23 39/20 40/2
45/12 48/21 49/23 90/9 90/10
90/18 93/3 94/18 99/18 99/21
100/3 104/9 108/8 131/21 135/12
177/8 177/16 182/23 182/24
184/1 184/12 191/8 191/18 192/4
193/13 198/15 202/14 202/24
203/6 215/22 221/19 221/20
236/20 239/8 255/24 259/25
likely [1] 32/21
likewise [3] 56/3 75/9 83/1
limb [2] 63/14 65/13
limine [1] 144/12
limit [4] 65/5 68/8 124/2 136/14
limited [12] 13/3 46/22 52/8 52/9
64/22 93/13 111/20 143/4 145/24
226/13 226/17 228/6
LINDSEY [1] 3/9
line [13] 7/22 9/13 9/25 38/21
62/10 111/9 119/17 122/22 219/2
219/23 220/11 230/5 240/15
lines [3] 84/12 135/22 247/23

## L

linked [5] 67/18 151/1 201/19 202/22 202/23
LinkedIn [1] 201/16
links [1] 75/23
liquidation [1] 88/24
list [8] 1/22 2/12 3/12 7/4 7/15
47/18 47/20 158/25
listed [2] 39/25 50/15
listen [4] 89/23 127/15 127/17
128/16
lists [1] 199/14
litany [1] 54/17
literally [2] 136/2 136/3
litis [1] 144/12
little [23] 9/19 10/7 30/4 38/12
53/4 56/23 86/19 95/18 96/7
113/16 131/1 131/8 131/11 163/5
177/17 179/4 186/2 186/15
228/13 250/1 250/23 251/2 256/2
live [1] 46/12
LLC [27] 1/9 79/12 79/23 99/8
99/8 101/7 106/4 131/5 135/3
137/23 138/8 138/13 138/17
140/5 140/14 141/1 141/14
142/13 142/17 143/11 201/7
201/14 201/16 201/23 202/8
203/4 204/17
LLOYD [1] 5/10
LLP [1] 3/7
local [6] 57/7 57/11 145/3 145/10 147/4 174/22
logical [1] 78/7
London [6] 8/3 8/16 108/15 127/3 256/12 256/14
long [9] 15/25 89/22 131/10
161/7 180/16 182/4 238/16 250/3 251/14
longer [7] 72/22 117/23 179/4 181/10 186/15 250/18 250/20
longstanding [1] 85/13
look [50] 13/24 14/2 17/5 19/4 21/5 28/20 32/6 32/7 46/5 46/6 47/4 47/12 48/9 57/11 58/1 66/21 90/2 94/13 111/7 114/25 119/5 124/25 125/5 125/10 131/9 143/21 146/7 146/10 147/1 152/16 153/7 161/24 162/3 162/21 165/5 166/5 167/5 173/23

178/1 183/9 198/8 199/13 199/25 199/25 203/23 223/24 234/22 235/2 235/4 235/4
looked [9] 44/15 44/16 46/7
60/22 173/4 200/17 234/5 245/20 247/1
looking [6] 29/20 101/8 111/18 224/13 239/10 255/8
looks [4] 12/13 25/6 39/20 115/16 los [1] 108/3
lose [5] 27/13 178/24 202/16
202/16 203/9
loss [5] 62/9 62/14 148/3 148/7 148/19
lot [20] 14/8 20/1 26/1 26/2 26/2
26/19 32/10 32/11 34/20 90/2
108/13 120/3 163/4 166/7 166/20
166/22 179/3 198/8 202/18
244/15
lots [4] 14/4 25/13 112/22 134/3
Love [1] 255/5
love.co [1] 255/8
love.com [1] 255/6
love.love [1] 255/12
Lovells [5] 4/12 8/23 8/24 104/11 136/1
Lovells' [1] 90/7
low [3] 130/17 131/9 166/11
lower [1] 165/16
Ltd [1] 5/10
LUCAS [4] 4/15 8/24 96/12 118/10
Lucas Aubry [1] 8/24
LUCIA [1] 4/8
luck [1] 98/24
lucrative [1] 101/22
ludicrous [1] 174/18
LUISA [5] 4/17 9/3 102/13 127/19 127/19
Luisa Trujillo [1] 102/13
lunch [4] 95/11 95/14 95/16 96/4

## M

mad [1] 94/17
Madam [2] 243/8 248/1
made [63] 7/13 10/6 13/25 14/2
14/3 16/6 26/10 26/22 27/22
31/17 32/21 35/3 37/5 37/21
37/22 37/24 38/18 49/6 49/8 50/6
50/10 52/16 61/20 79/18 86/3

93/19 94/16 106/21 112/5 117/21 118/5 120/7 120/18 125/6 132/11 133/9 133/22 137/23 137/25 149/8 149/12 150/12 154/24 167/21 168/5 170/22 173/3 179/9 179/15 180/8 196/13 196/20 197/8 198/1 199/16 231/24 237/18 238/4 243/17 245/10
248/24 259/3 259/7
made their [1] 31/17
magic [2] 18/23 167/3
magical [1] 18/21
main [11] 67/7 100/22 110/9
115/5 144/20 207/19 221/6
224/23 224/24 225/3 225/4
mainly [2] 148/10 252/22
maintain [6] 45/9 45/9 72/1 74/18 129/12 193/1
maintained [4] 75/3 192/7 192/18 244/14
maintenance [1] 208/11
make [64] 7/21 9/23 12/1 12/25 15/17 16/19 17/22 20/12 25/22 25/24 26/3 26/8 27/15 34/6 34/24 40/12 45/15 51/25 86/19 90/16 90/24 94/6 94/13 95/25 96/2 97/1 124/2 133/17 136/5 155/3 160/10 169/6 183/23 185/7 187/7 193/18 197/1 198/3 198/7 199/9 203/22
204/4 204/6 204/8 204/14 204/19 204/22 207/24 208/1 209/5 220/1 220/9 221/8 221/24 227/23 234/4 239/13 241/25 242/4 242/6 242/18 243/5 244/3 261/10 maker [1] 48/5
makes [12] 30/2 36/3 69/2 80/8 92/7 124/18 126/10 156/21 157/14 157/17 171/4 251/8 making [19] 7/23 16/4 46/24 48/3 50/9 53/23 91/2 92/15 99/20 107/2 117/6 132/5 132/12 186/20 198/15 200/11 203/8 242/14 260/3
manage [10] 19/16 22/6 22/20 23/19 23/20 43/7 95/18 108/25 109/5 220/18
managed [2] 96/7 230/21
management [11] 47/2 47/3 47/5
52/5 75/4 125/14 191/11 215/18

## M

management... [3] 215/19 216/15 241/13
manager [3] 128/1 215/11 233/6 manages [1] 101/15
managing [4] 20/19 111/13 222/7 247/25
mandatory [2] 190/6 194/9
Manitoba [1] 215/5
manner [2] 107/24 181/2
many [27] 17/19 21/8 21/9 46/2 102/22 106/13 109/15 109/16 110/1 111/11 118/13 118/25 123/21 124/17 132/11 148/21 160/9 164/7 180/9 202/21 203/17 214/13 220/18 220/20 236/11 253/16 253/23
MARCELA [1] 4/10
March [23] 1/21 7/1 30/24 36/22 37/6 37/18 60/5 87/1 87/5 87/7 109/2 112/9 112/19 119/21 120/13 135/7 136/20 136/25 155/5 171/16 228/22 229/7 239/23
marginally [1] 116/14
MARIA [6] 4/6 8/20 97/1 97/8 99/12 152/5
marked [1] 211/2
market [19] 19/9 27/24 80/25 98/15 119/18 119/23 122/22
164/3 164/24 165/17 166/12
166/19 166/21 171/25 172/19
172/20 232/15 232/22 255/22
marketed [3] 18/16 19/1 25/4
marketing [6] 14/5 21/20 26/11
27/21 29/3 74/4
marshalled [1] 261/8
MARTHA [1] 4/8
MARÍA [1] 4/10
massive [1] 134/8
massively [1] 164/4
master's [4] 165/1 206/20 222/3 238/16
material [1] 65/16
materials [2] 55/20 56/2
matter [26] 9/17 13/22 13/22
13/23 14/13 14/13 14/14 15/9 17/24 38/4 45/4 53/13 53/14 63/18 69/1 69/18 84/19 86/12

116/19 160/9 180/11 180/19 180/20 185/14 244/21 249/10
mattered [1] 33/18
matters [5] 170/9 193/8 241/2
244/19 249/21
maximum [5] 108/19 125/12 137/8 196/12 196/24
may [50] 40/2 46/17 46/19 57/24 65/9 84/21 98/7 98/8 110/11 110/13 110/19 121/5 121/12 121/19 122/5 125/2 130/18 131/7 131/12 131/12 131/25 136/1 144/7 145/1 148/7 156/14 158/3 160/6 164/11 165/11 177/17 180/4 180/24 181/2 181/3 181/4 182/8 190/15 194/18 194/24 196/23 210/25 220/25 236/6 236/6 236/13 237/22 248/23 250/18 255/1
May 2019 [1] 236/6
maybe [19] 28/18 39/6 99/8
116/14 118/12 123/11 125/15
129/23 130/23 163/11 204/11 219/17 221/25 224/13 227/3 228/22 244/16 246/12 254/25 me [34] 7/24 9/22 114/7 122/3 127/21 128/19 140/10 160/2 161/20 167/16 179/4 180/9 180/18 180/25 182/2 183/21 186/17 203/22 208/14 211/21 212/14 213/17 215/22 216/13 219/15 220/23 221/1 221/11 224/11 235/4 235/14 255/1 258/5 261/6
mean [11] 50/15 78/21 95/9 161/5 166/24 214/2 214/16 223/22 223/25 230/3 257/8 meaning [5] 23/18 24/20 42/24 243/20 256/7
meaningless [1] 24/19
means [8] 65/6 84/16 88/9 95/13 95/14 122/16 203/2 254/10
meant [3] 197/7 224/3 226/18
meantime [1] 89/7
measure [6] 47/21 48/3 94/14 192/7 192/10 193/1
measures [34] 44/9 56/6 56/18
57/13 57/15 57/17 57/22 57/25
58/2 58/5 58/22 60/10 60/18

60/22 61/4 62/3 62/23 63/24 65/18 68/15 83/12 100/2 100/8 100/19 150/13 190/25 192/17 192/22 200/13 200/13 200/14 200/15 200/20 200/21
mechanism [2] 103/20 249/12 mechanisms [1] 244/11
media [1] 81/21
Medical [1] 215/1
meet [11] 23/11 24/9 33/5 42/24 43/9 44/3 142/2 166/23 210/10 218/22 253/15
meeting [20] 33/16 33/20 36/11 39/6 41/6 41/8 41/14 41/16 85/24 87/5 91/15 218/23 224/22 240/11 240/13 243/18 243/21 252/17 252/17 253/9
meetings [14] 41/9 41/12 85/18 134/12 241/16 245/1 245/5 247/2 252/1 252/9 252/14 253/11 253/15 253/24
meets [1] 37/12
MELISSA [6] 4/14 8/23 97/11
129/18 134/15 138/23
Melissa Ordoñez [3] 97/11 129/18 138/23
member [5] 8/16 23/2 36/7
140/25 248/11
members [15] 9/10 76/8 96/17
99/17 107/13 139/2 140/2 161/6 161/21 167/22 175/17 180/19 181/21 186/25 193/6 memorial [31] 23/17 27/16 28/6 28/13 29/9 39/25 40/8 54/1 54/2 54/8 68/10 70/3 72/8 72/24 76/19 83/15 141/7 149/20 149/25 150/18 151/16 155/19 157/13 157/17 159/19 159/21 162/9 162/9 162/12 199/18 202/22
memorials [2] 173/23 179/24 mention [8] 27/10 30/17 80/18 91/5 154/25 155/3 155/10 210/2 mentioned [17] 18/24 22/12 22/14 38/18 48/19 82/19 94/9 94/10 94/11 154/10 156/8 156/16 172/14 210/8 225/5 231/13 238/1 mentioning [2] 255/24 258/10 mentor [2] 180/9 180/18 mere [2] 161/16 192/13

## M

merely [2] 67/8 87/15
merger [1] 142/15
merit [1] 185/24
meritless [2] 97/16 174/19
merits [10] 18/2 18/3 58/19 60/8
60/19 61/15 137/21 159/11 185/3 185/19
Merrill [2] 190/17 191/3
mess [1] 135/6
message [1] 185/5
met [13] 37/14 37/15 40/25 41/4
41/5 41/12 42/22 66/5 70/11 78/4 207/23 213/11 213/16
Mexico [3] 47/2 47/3 47/5
MFN [6] 53/11 53/17 54/5 191/15 191/25 192/21
Miami [1] 8/22
mic [1] 54/9
Micronesia [1] 18/25
microphone [2] 13/1 177/15
microphones [1] 13/4
mid [4] 114/6 114/6 114/15 214/3
middle [3] 9/4 106/24 143/20
midst [1] 140/21
midway [1] 143/14
might [20] 12/25 28/8 34/24 41/5 51/1 81/14 93/17 95/17 116/16 119/3 182/8 192/10 199/8 199/22 203/21 204/14 237/13 243/2 248/22 259/21
million [25] 14/12 25/9 25/17 26/21 28/3 99/1 112/13 113/1 113/6 113/10 113/11 121/16 125/19 125/21 126/2 133/2 133/3 133/4 133/5 133/6 133/11 133/18 133/20 148/20 149/6
millions [2] 78/16 185/1
mind [9] 19/22 25/10 55/11 56/11 58/1 66/21 111/18 234/4 250/3 mine [1] 19/6
minimum [10] 27/5 45/23 46/22
52/23 67/25 161/4 161/6 161/10 161/23 177/21
mining [3] 28/22 40/10 169/5 minister [43] 29/23 29/25 30/11 30/22 30/22 31/1 31/4 31/7 31/8 31/20 32/2 33/19 37/12 41/4 41/8 41/10 43/21 85/25 102/12 117/13

118/17 121/1 130/21 166/5 166/22 170/20 174/2 208/9 213/8 213/10 213/16 232/4 242/13 242/21 243/8 248/1 248/6 248/19 248/20 249/6 258/25 259/13 259/15
Minister Constaín [11] 30/22 31/20 37/12 41/4 41/8 41/10 43/21 85/25 213/10 258/25 259/13
ministry [33] 16/4 20/21 22/17
32/22 82/20 82/22 86/6 98/16 101/9 102/14 105/11 128/22 129/7 212/10 213/13 214/16 214/21 214/23 215/21 216/16 216/25 217/5 221/3 222/4 228/6 230/22 233/7 240/5 241/2 242/20 243/1 245/16 246/1
Ministry's [2] 216/19 218/4 MinTIC [83] 22/22 27/5 31/2 32/15 33/20 36/19 37/9 37/9 37/22 42/4 59/17 80/5 82/20 82/24 85/16 86/15 87/4 98/16 101/10 102/12 102/15 105/6 105/11 108/21 109/7 109/14 110/7 110/22 111/19 114/13 115/7 115/21 117/5 121/13 122/19 126/21 129/3 131/25 134/7 140/25 142/4 142/6 142/8 146/5 146/10 155/2 155/4 156/9 158/9 162/23 164/24 165/7 165/14 166/12 169/13 170/19 170/20 171/7 171/21 172/4 172/25 176/13 179/19 183/12 207/4 207/9 207/11 208/9 208/19 212/4 212/8 212/13 214/15 214/16 214/23 215/8 215/21 216/6 220/18 223/10 225/8 225/17 240/4
MinTIC's [3] 208/17 226/12
226/16
minute [9] 95/7 95/21 127/17
128/6 129/14 164/5 179/4 186/10 237/2
minutes [31] 10/24 10/25 85/25 89/10 92/11 95/11 95/17 95/25
96/1 96/2 97/3 97/7 97/10 97/14 97/19 99/21 177/13 196/12
196/25 196/25 197/1 197/13

206/2 224/20 237/8 242/10 243/6 247/1 250/5 251/12 251/20 mirrors [1] 55/1
mischaracterisation [2] 54/21 56/20
misleading [1] 142/14
misrepresent [1] 103/7
misses [1] 77/13
misstatement [1] 161/14
mistake [2] 34/24 102/4
misunderstanding [3] 94/18 94/19 100/5
misunderstood [1] 95/20
MIT [2] 165/1 238/16
mix [1] 215/18
Mobil [1] 194/25
mobile [1] 169/7
modalities [1] 219/19 model [6] 109/4 111/10 164/1 165/25 225/12 225/12
modern [1] $46 / 15$
modifications [1] 121/15
modified [2] 36/6 73/20
modify [2] 144/2 259/1
moment [7] 41/2 62/11 124/1 176/17 206/13 211/25 220/8
moments [1] 100/4
Monday [4] 1/21 7/1 80/25 130/5
Mondev [1] 46/13
monetary [1] 103/16
money [8] 14/4 14/14 14/19
15/19 27/12 35/1 35/2 124/22
month [8] 31/8 60/3 117/15
124/6 126/2 131/24 176/8 253/19 months [17] 15/24 32/5 32/13
70/24 71/2 73/7 79/3 83/7 123/21 124/12 132/5 135/8 177/7 224/14 227/14 253/20 253/24
months' [3] 135/13 135/15 148/16
more [61] 21/8 21/9 22/13 32/7 $33 / 133 / 1443 / 360 / 373 / 676 / 4$ 79/3 82/7 96/25 102/7 112/21 119/16 122/21 122/22 131/22 133/6 141/17 142/12 142/20 148/16 149/5 149/21 154/19 155/23 156/18 161/18 165/24 192/8 198/5 198/12 198/24
200/20 200/25 207/3 209/13

## M

more... [22] 212/5 215/11 215/11 215/15 217/1 221/10 226/17 228/11 228/13 229/1 230/19 230/20 232/11 233/14 233/18 237/14 249/4 251/11 253/18 254/15 258/22 260/1
Moreover [6] 62/7 64/21 75/2 85/14 87/13 194/17
morning [37] 7/2 8/2 8/19 9/9
54/13 70/19 95/3 95/22 105/16 106/9 106/20 108/7 108/9 108/12 110/11 110/23 114/11 115/9 121/9 121/25 125/1 130/3 132/9 132/15 134/7 138/20 139/3 142/12 143/15 145/18 159/12 161/18 199/7 201/7 204/3 260/24 261/11
most [15] 18/7 57/18 71/19 103/1 116/25 118/12 158/23 158/23 159/3 159/23 187/23 191/15 200/12 210/21 253/2
mostly [1] 221/14
mother [2] 89/20 89/21
motion [1] 191/3
motivation [1] 173/19
motive [2] 51/21 173/20
motives [2] 51/22 81/5
move [10] 33/9 47/19 113/19
114/1 144/14 147/10 152/2 177/7
239/25 258/23
moving [6] 30/19 66/2 150/25 157/6 169/7 175/20
MR [112] 3/6 3/8 3/8 4/6 4/10 $4 / 134 / 144 / 154 / 185 / 55 / 56 / 3$ 6/5 6/7 6/10 6/12 6/14 6/15 6/17 6/19 8/11 8/17 8/18 9/9 9/16 11/4 11/6 11/7 11/8 13/8 13/10 75/12 76/12 89/8 89/12 89/14 89/16 94/23 95/21 96/11 96/16 96/17 104/19 127/16 139/2 140/1 158/19 158/20 170/8 177/18 186/7 186/16 186/16 186/18 186/19 186/23 186/24 193/6 195/15 195/24 196/9 196/10 196/16 197/15 197/17 197/18 198/4 198/22 200/25 201/2 201/4 201/5 201/20 203/12 203/14 203/20 203/25 204/9 204/23

205/1 205/2 205/25 206/2 206/6 206/7 207/12 210/2 211/5 211/8 211/9 212/15 218/11 219/21 220/7 220/15 222/9 222/10 223/3 223/5 223/6 236/17 236/25 237/10 249/3 249/25 250/7 250/15 250/21 251/6 259/21 260/1 260/13
Mr Baldwin [13] 11/4 13/8 89/8 89/12 94/23 196/9 197/15 203/25 222/9 223/3 236/17 237/10 249/25
Mr Bigge [5] 6/10 186/16 186/19 186/23 195/24
Mr Castaño [17] 170/8 205/2 206/2 206/7 207/12 210/2 211/9 212/15 218/11 220/15 222/10 223/6 236/25 249/3 250/21 260/1 260/13
Mr Castaño's [2] 250/15 251/6 Mr Chairman [17] 8/18 11/8 95/21 96/11 96/17 104/19 127/16 139/2 140/1 158/20 177/18 196/16 201/5 203/12 204/9 204/23 205/25
Mr González [2] 158/19 220/7 Mr Gouiffès [4] 8/17 11/7 201/2 203/20
Mr Hughes [3] 8/11 76/12 201/20 Mr Innes [1] 211/5
Mr Kevin Hughes [1] 75/12
Mr Peralta [1] 186/16
Mr President [16] 9/9 11/6 89/16 186/7 186/24 193/6 195/15 197/18 198/4 198/22 200/25 203/14 219/21 223/5 250/7 259/21
Mrs [4] 89/19 89/19 89/21 90/16
Mrs Baldwin [4] 89/19 89/19
89/21 90/16
MS [32] $2 / 103 / 93 / 94 / 64 / 84 / 9$ 4/9 4/10 4/14 4/17 4/17 5/10
5/10 5/12 5/13 6/4 6/8 18/3 22/4 54/10 54/12 86/16 94/24 138/24 152/5 164/19 166/6 166/7 172/10 174/20 174/23 230/23
Ms Ana [1] 152/5
Ms Baldwin [4] 18/3 22/4 54/10
94/24

Ms Constaín [1] 166/6
Ms Constaín's [1] 86/16
Ms Trujillo [4] 164/19 172/10 174/23 230/23
MST [9] 45/23 46/4 46/9 46/10 46/19 47/6 48/12 49/1 49/2
MTS [1] 215/15
much [40] 9/6 10/1 10/8 15/8
38/7 45/6 45/7 45/16 89/24 90/25
92/14 96/5 104/13 109/12 113/16 113/16 128/20 130/9 142/1 153/18 158/18 163/6 163/22 175/11 176/11 186/3 195/24 198/1 198/9 198/17 198/18 199/15 205/14 209/13 210/24 215/2 218/7 228/3 250/6 250/20 mud [1] 54/18
multilateral [1] 193/3
multiple [5] 62/19 72/25 82/1 139/10 183/13
multistakeholder [1] 225/12 must [25] 64/12 64/14 65/7 76/3 78/21 143/10 147/16 148/3 151/3 151/9 151/11 151/23 151/25 160/14 161/12 167/6 172/21 178/3 178/5 190/3 192/6 192/21 194/15 195/13 214/1
mutual [1] 98/7
my [99] 7/6 7/7 8/5 8/14 8/19
8/21 8/22 8/23 9/10 9/13 9/20
9/20 9/23 9/25 18/3 54/10 54/13
84/2 89/4 89/9 89/20 89/21 90/6
92/25 94/9 96/12 96/18 97/10 97/14 100/14 104/16 105/8
106/19 112/2 112/13 118/22
121/5 121/21 122/3 126/11 129/7 129/15 133/1 134/2 134/15 136/22 137/18 138/14 138/15 138/22 154/10 156/8 156/17 158/7 158/17 159/5 163/21 167/24 175/22 176/22 176/24 177/1 177/12 180/9 180/18 184/9 186/25 193/7 195/19 200/11 202/4 205/7 205/10 205/11 206/15 207/1 207/20 208/5 210/7 210/8 210/22 211/4 215/7 215/15 215/22 218/12 222/19 223/21 241/9 246/11 247/2 248/9 249/9 250/4 251/1 251/6 252/13 252/20

| $\mathbf{M}$ |
| :--- |
| my... [1] 258/6 |
| myself [5] 97/9 223/19 224/17 |
| 224/25 239/11 |
| mysterious [1] 55/7 |
| mystery [1] 55/6 |

## N

Nacional [1] 4/5
NAFTA [4] 46/19 190/19 194/22 194/23
NAFTA's [1] 190/19
naivety [1] 80/14
name [23] 9/10 18/23 54/13
106/18 140/13 140/16 140/20
143/8 187/1 189/10 189/12 202/8 205/7 205/8 205/10 214/19 221/1 229/11 235/7 241/1 247/6 255/1 256/3
named [2] 231/2 247/11
names [4] 118/9 118/20 220/23 221/5
narrow [1] 221/25
nation [2] 187/23 191/15
national [9] 53/10 53/16 86/2
100/13 108/4 190/11 190/11
206/18 235/16
nationally [1] 183/20
nations [2] 118/19 200/12
natural [3] 19/5 19/8 90/14
naturally [1] 247/8
nature [9] 34/17 58/20 139/8
139/23 155/22 157/8 215/16
235/11 241/10
nearly [2] 25/8 67/2
necessarily [5] 46/21 112/16 143/4 222/22 258/13
necessary [12] 7/20 10/21 108/24 120/8 122/15 137/9 141/21 204/7 233/21 250/2 253/17 253/23
necessity [1] 122/8
need [21] 7/21 14/6 46/16 60/23
95/10 104/14 117/17 130/7
159/25 162/13 165/12 172/19
183/5 197/24 209/12 221/25
222/22 239/18 250/2 250/18 251/11
needed [3] 49/11 170/23 234/25 needing [1] 251/4
needs [6] 16/25 30/5 30/16 159/24 161/2 173/9
Neer [2] 46/5 46/25
nefarious [3] 16/18 56/3 82/15
negative [3] 255/22 256/24 257/2
neglected [2] 20/25 21/2
negotiate [16] 15/18 31/25 32/16
32/18 34/1 34/10 40/7 40/8 48/14
49/15 52/24 115/11 149/1 174/9 179/19 239/18
negotiated [1] 84/7
negotiating [3] 78/12 130/10 209/24
negotiation [14] 15/3 30/5 30/13 30/15 30/16 35/17 41/19 48/16 85/23 115/20 116/4 130/7 131/9 178/8
negotiations [20] 33/22 34/3 34/4 34/5 35/23 36/14 38/8 38/14
78/14 78/19 78/24 80/17 82/15
86/8 90/19 115/22 121/10 130/8 154/6 156/2
neither [2] 101/5 239/1
Neustar [159] 1/9 1/9 8/10 8/11
8/13 14/2 14/8 15/7 23/13 23/22 24/12 25/8 25/21 26/10 26/17 27/7 27/18 29/2 31/14 32/12 33/4 33/10 34/21 35/11 35/15 36/23 37/16 38/6 38/10 38/19 41/10 42/23 43/5 50/12 51/3 51/17 51/20 74/8 74/15 74/24 75/3 75/4 75/8 75/11 75/11 75/14 75/16 75/18 75/23 76/12 76/15 87/10 90/10 91/13 94/15 97/21 98/2 98/10 98/22 99/7 99/10 101/7 103/1 105/5 105/21 106/4 106/7 109/5 109/24 110/2 111/24 112/4 112/9 112/12 113/4 113/8 113/22 123/23 125/3 125/16 127/25 128/15 129/19 130/17 130/20 131/6 132/5 132/20 133/1 133/7 134/6 137/1 138/13 138/16 140/7 140/13 140/23 141/2 141/13 142/14 142/18 144/16 144/22 145/11 146/4 147/3 147/12 148/18 151/16 151/19 151/25 153/19 154/7 154/9 154/14 154/19 155/7 155/16 155/18 157/14 157/17 160/9 160/15

161/22 162/6 162/8 164/1 166/3 166/25 168/7 169/17 169/17 170/10 170/12 170/19 171/8 171/14 171/16 171/17 171/21 172/2 173/24 174/8 176/1 176/3 178/6 178/13 178/22 179/16 179/17 179/22 182/18 201/13 201/15 201/18 202/5 203/3 203/3 203/20
Neustar's [16] 23/25 37/12 48/18 74/4 74/6 74/25 75/7 79/24 145/14 146/9 147/1 157/12 166/1 166/13 173/11 178/6
Neustar/.CO [1] 27/18
never [23] 16/1 34/2 34/6 34/9
34/15 34/16 43/8 48/17 61/25
77/8 90/10 91/8 93/2 103/9
143/11 149/7 171/7 174/16
181/22 181/22 184/17 184/20 260/9
new [67] 9/21 13/19 16/6 16/12 38/9 40/22 40/22 44/25 45/4 45/5 91/18 105/1 109/21 114/2 114/5 114/20 114/24 115/2 115/3 115/8 115/14 116/24 117/4 117/12 118/2 118/17 118/17 120/12 129/1 129/2 129/24 132/24 142/10 144/6 148/24 150/12 164/12 164/14 171/23 171/23 175/8 175/18 175/24 191/3 198/2 198/4 198/23 199/8 208/19 209/22 229/2 232/3 232/9 232/16 232/23 233/3 236/2 239/16 244/10 244/17 244/20 248/16 253/6 253/7 254/7 255/20 256/17
New York [1] 9/21
news [3] 159/18 159/20 173/22
next [14] 14/20 20/9 24/22 29/22 43/18 96/20 99/21 100/3 101/13 102/9 144/14 147/10 150/25 152/2
nicely [1] 121/11
niceties [1] 190/21
Nicolai [7] 127/25 128/4 128/8 128/14 130/18 130/19 131/17
Nicolai Bezsonoff [7] 127/25
128/4 128/8 128/14 130/18
130/19 131/17
no [160] 1/6 8/7 11/14 14/13

| N |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| no... [156] 14/13 14/14 23/11 24/20 33/13 34/8 44/11 50/3 57/1 59/21 61/2 61/3 63/3 63/4 64/11 65/3 65/24 68/20 70/1 70/20 72/22 76/17 79/18 79/23 80/8 80/16 83/3 83/20 85/9 89/3 100/5 101/12 101/12 102/7 102/8 104/4 106/14 107/13 107/16 107/22 112/15 113/23 116/12 117/23 121/18 123/17 124/18 124/23 126/10 126/15 126/18 130/20 132/13 132/18 132/19 133/10 136/13 137/16 139/12 139/14 139/16 140/2 142/4 142/7 142/9 144/17 144/21 147/8 148/6 149/10 151/1 151/15 154/24 155/3 155/10 156/1 158/7 159/7 159/11 160/9 162/7 162/12 162/14 162/18 163/14 167/1 167/8 167/19 167/20 167/23 168/7 168/7 168/13 170/18 172/6 172/6 172/7 173/2 173/21 174/17 176/4 177/22 178/8 178/11 178/11 178/11 178/15 178/17 178/23 179/20 180/5 180/7 181/10 183/17 184/3 184/6 185/2 185/2 187/15 191/7 192/5 200/25 201/24 203/9 203/12 204/15 211/3 212/6 216/4 217/10 220/4 220/13 222/8 223/4 223/6 226/4 229/10 229/21 229/24 234/14 234/18 237/23 238/7 238/7 242/1 245/8 246/3 246/15 248/2 248/7 250/14 251/9 256/9 257/7 257/9 260/15 <br> No 3 [1] 112/15 No 4 [1] 123/17 no-one [1] 220/4 nobody [3] 17/21 49/3 49/4 Nominet [2] 126/15 126/16 non [17] 5/1 6/9 57/9 65/19 137/2 141/25 148/5 186/22 187/12 191/10 191/19 192/4 192/11 193/9 193/14 194/21 230/18 <br> non-disputing [10] 5/1 6/9 57/9 65/19 148/5 186/22 187/12 193/9 193/14 194/21 |  | 128/13 128/15 128/16 130/12 134/19 138/25 139/10 143/15 145/18 147/10 147/18 148/9 150/25 151/2 152/2 152/10 157/20 158/3 159/10 160/21 161/8 162/11 163/4 166/15 166/25 168/20 170/5 170/25 171/15 173/11 174/20 175/20 176/3 178/13 179/16 180/9 181/25 184/11 185/3 186/12 191/5 196/7 196/25 201/22 211/23 221/6 236/20 250/4 251/16 251/17 255/11 256/13 260/13 <br> nowhere [1] 86/24 number [15] 13/3 66/24 92/1 97/13 125/12 125/13 126/1 132/22 139/6 158/25 163/20 176/7 216/11 236/15 237/16 numbers [5] 107/5 198/2 198/5 198/23 227/2 <br> numerous [5] 70/4 91/7 149/12 152/13 152/13 <br> nutshell [3] 202/2 202/3 202/17 <br> 0 <br> object [1] 260/21 <br> objected [1] 81/16 <br> objection [16] 56/15 63/10 63/15 <br> 66/9 71/23 76/18 84/9 84/12 <br> 139/25 140/1 143/17 144/5 <br> 147/10 150/25 152/2 157/7 <br> objections [20] 18/4 54/18 55/4 <br> 56/10 56/22 63/8 66/3 72/5 89/5 <br> 89/23 90/3 90/25 91/3 136/10 <br> 139/1 139/4 139/5 139/11 144/15 158/16 <br> objective [2] 58/14 165/23 <br> objectives [1] 183/4 <br> obligation [11] 39/21 52/24 53/14 <br> 87/15 145/3 145/10 150/11 <br> 157/10 178/15 178/18 191/14 <br> obligations [7] 38/11 38/17 59/11 <br> 88/6 88/16 103/13 192/19 <br> observation [1] 195/19 <br> observations [2] 155/6 176/12 <br> observe [1] 239/20 <br> obstructive [1] 124/4 |






| P |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| preliminary... [11] 66/4 69/1 119/20 148/9 232/2 233/15 234/1 235/16 237/23 238/19 239/19 prematurely [2] 69/25 153/15 preparation [4] 121/22 122/4 123/5 190/16 prepare [1] 66/19 prepared [2] 221/7 233/15 prerogative [1] 158/13 present [25] 13/12 17/13 31/16 33/19 41/11 88/10 97/6 97/24 100/4 104/12 104/21 105/3 107/23 141/22 144/25 148/9 151/13 153/11 155/17 159/10 159/25 195/21 196/23 241/10 249/20 <br> presentation [23] 7/23 11/11 12/22 16/9 89/8 91/6 93/1 94/22 96/9 96/13 109/13 133/2 138/14 158/16 159/24 163/22 196/2 196/21 197/1 197/2 198/1 201/8 203/13 <br> presentations [1] 94/7 <br> presented [21] 17/14 18/16 19/5 25/4 54/17 70/9 94/3 103/4 103/9 106/19 108/6 108/9 134/6 137/12 140/15 150/16 150/18 151/17 195/8 197/3 201/11 <br> presenting [2] 54/14 55/2 preservation [2] 58/25 190/16 preservations [1] 59/25 preserved [1] 74/19 preserving [3] 58/12 146/2 146/15 president [50] 1/16 2/3 9/9 9/16 11/6 11/14 16/12 16/12 36/17 36/25 37/6 37/21 37/22 38/3 48/1 50/8 51/25 75/10 86/13 87/1 87/7 89/16 99/17 117/12 118/17 120/19 120/24 121/1 121/2 124/21 125/16 127/25 128/14 160/3 186/7 186/18 186/24 193/6 195/15 196/10 197/18 198/4 198/22 200/25 203/14 219/21 223/5 228/2 250/7 259/21 presidential [7] 16/6 32/22 37/5 37/10 86/10 86/25 114/21 presiding [1] 7/8 | 134/9 <br> pressurise [1] 105/6 <br> presumably [1] 83/20 <br> presupposes [1] 147/20 <br> pretending [1] 85/3 <br> pretty [4] 31/5 36/16 38/2 159/1 <br> prevailing [1] $184 / 2$ <br> prevent [6] 30/10 30/19 59/10 <br> 62/20 88/16 102/23 <br> prevented [1] 141/10 <br> preventing [1] 103/19 <br> prevents [3] 49/14 49/18 76/1 <br> previous [13] 48/16 133/7 133/23 <br> 213/20 225/15 228/20 231/15 <br> 232/2 233/15 243/25 244/4 245/1 <br> 245/4 <br> previously [4] 22/7 26/19 101/20 102/13 <br> price [2] 112/12 165/15 <br> prima [1] 61/9 <br> prima facie [1] 61/9 <br> primary [1] 81/20 <br> principle [1] 152/11 <br> principles [2] 62/15 178/4 <br> prior [7] 27/17 80/16 190/13 <br> 193/4 221/17 236/12 247/2 <br> private [1] 41/7 <br> privately [1] 41/12 <br> privilege [3] 220/4 220/10 244/18 <br> privileged [5] 219/23 220/4 220/6 <br> 230/5 230/8 <br> probably [10] 20/4 31/10 44/15 <br> 44/16 134/4 134/5 149/25 150/5 150/9 158/22 <br> problem [9] 12/21 13/18 21/15 <br> 116/17 121/18 130/20 219/25 <br> 250/14 251/9 <br> problems [1] 259/24 <br> procedural [16] 11/17 59/20 60/7 <br> 61/6 96/22 97/6 97/9 97/23 <br> 104/20 184/16 189/23 190/5 <br> 190/21 196/18 197/5 217/4 <br> Procedural Order [2] 11/17 197/5 <br> procedure [4] 57/14 129/17 <br> 137/19 204/11 <br> proceed [6] 11/9 12/18 32/25 <br> 95/7 186/14 237/10 <br> proceeding [8] 13/16 47/17 63/1 | proceedings [58] 8/5 56/17 56/20 59/2 61/25 62/9 62/13 62/19 62/24 63/4 65/12 65/15 65/25 72/4 72/7 72/12 74/12 76/7 79/2 79/16 81/4 81/9 84/3 88/10 99/25 105/5 134/9 135/12 135/13 139/15 140/4 140/6 140/22 143/14 144/7 144/19 144/22 145/12 145/20 146/3 146/23 147/4 147/6 147/7 149/2 149/9 151/7 151/9 153/3 153/20 153/23 155/18 156/11 156/19 156/22 156/24 193/12 196/6 proceeds [13] 98/5 110/22 110/24 111/1 115/24 124/13 127/6 132/6 132/8 133/7 133/21 166/10 226/25 process [130] 29/20 30/13 33/21 33/21 34/14 35/17 37/4 37/11 37/19 44/1 47/10 47/15 48/22 48/23 48/24 48/25 49/6 49/7 50/5 50/20 52/4 52/5 52/7 52/9 52/13 59/5 59/7 76/20 76/25 77/24 78/5 78/22 79/15 79/22 80/7 81/3 83/5 83/5 83/13 83/25 84/8 87/2 87/8 98/19 99/5 102/5 105/1 105/2 108/22 109/14 114/3 115/8 115/15 116/24 117/6 119/2 119/3 120/15 121/3 121/17 121/23 122/4 122/5 122/25 123/6 124/16 126/12 127/14 127/22 129/23 131/9 131/15 131/18 139/19 146/6 148/14 148/25 152/5 152/10 152/23 152/25 153/11 153/13 156/5 164/13 164/13 164/15 164/17 164/18 164/21 170/18 171/14 174/15 174/21 175/1 175/4 175/7 175/19 175/25 176/4 176/10 176/16 178/1 178/4 178/9 178/14 178/16 178/17 178/20 178/22 178/24 204/14 219/25 222/23 229/14 229/15 232/24 233/3 233/16 233/24 235/23 236/2 244/11 244/17 244/20 248/16 249/2 253/7 253/7 254/5 <br> processes [2] 86/22 230/21 produce [1] 157/4 |




| R |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | ```relationship [3] 111/13 225/2 225/8 relatively [3] 65/10 132/23 226/16 relay [1] 90/4 released [4] 236/4 236/5 236/8 236/12 relevance [2] 47/4 135/1 relevant[24] 8/12 15/4 22/4 47/12 55/24 80/2 94/2 97/9 104/20 105/21 107/6 110/9 130/25 131/20 137/1 170/9 188/11 189/16 190/11 233/7 257/5 258/7 258/7 258/17 relevantly [1] 57/19 reliance[5] 179/11 180/7 180/7 226/15 226/22 reliant [2] 227/5 227/16 relied [2] 152/12 227/10 relief [9] 57/3 57/7 58/20 62/7 68/17 145/22 146/1 146/9 189/18 relieved [2] 65/9 89/3 rely [10] 88/12 92/10 143/16 159/20 170/16 171/3 171/4 179/10 227/5 227/17 remain [1] 76/11 remained [3] 68/9 79/23 155/4 remaining [3] 14/11 250/15 251/5 remains [8] 8/13 67/10 75/15 75/24 79/8 106/9 106/10 201/13 remarked [1] 242/17 remarks[2] 193/7 195/20 remedies [1] 64/18 remedy [2] 17/16 84/4 remember [18] 10/5 10/23 121/8 125/2 127/1 132/3 136/1 196/17 202/9 213/24 221/5 231/6 235/2 235/3 237/21 240/10 240/12 244/5 remembers [1] 112/21 remind [3] 7/17 10/4 260/14 reminded [2] 135/19 220/2 reminds [1] 160/2 remote [3] 4/7 5/4 161/19 removed [1] 126/1 remunerations [1] 239/8 Renco [1] 64/23 render [1] 24/19``` |

## R

rendered [4] 138/9 138/10 168/9 203/3
renew [24] 26/15 30/9 51/15 101/11 102/3 115/7 115/14 116/13 134/7 146/6 150/11 156/9 157/10 158/11 162/24 164/9 164/11 165/12 170/8 171/22 178/8 178/20 181/10 208/17 renewal [36] 14/22 30/6 98/12 99/1 109/17 110/14 113/2 113/8 113/12 113/12 113/13 113/21 115/17 119/10 121/14 124/1 124/2 124/5 137/2 146/13 156/13 156/16 164/10 169/10 170/2 170/4 170/10 170/21 171/9 171/14 171/18 180/23 182/6 182/7 182/8 182/9
renewals [1] 169/15
renewed [17] 36/21 98/7 98/8 110/11 110/19 117/16 168/12 168/15 169/21 173/1 173/5 173/6 179/19 181/2 181/3 181/4 181/7
renewing [1] 166/13
RENGIFO [1] 4/17
renounce [1] 63/22
reorganised [1] 117/6
repeat [4] 8/7 106/20 211/24
252/5
repeatedly [4] 55/6 62/17 84/20 94/6
repeating [2] 48/13 239/11
repetitive [5] 222/22 222/25
223/1 227/25 228/2
rephrase [1] 230/6
replace [1] 74/11
replaced [1] 143/14
replete [1] 144/16
replied [1] 48/17
reply [12] $32 / 15$ 48/6 51/11 52/17
64/1 73/21 74/1 74/14 77/2
137/20 140/12 187/9
report [43] 29/20 29/22 29/25
31/8 32/2 38/22 86/6 103/16
114/10 114/11 115/1 116/22 119/22 122/6 122/6 122/7 165/11 200/8 231/14 231/20 231/23 231/24 232/1 232/2 232/2 232/5 232/6 232/9 232/12 233/15

233/25 234/5 235/16 235/23 236/4 236/6 237/18 237/22 237/24 238/19 239/5 239/19 247/4
reported [3] 75/21 165/17 227/3 reporter [2] 41/15 50/14 reporters [7] 5/9 10/3 11/18 12/14 99/19 236/18 261/7
reporting [2] 44/7 44/8 reports [16] 44/22 81/22 163/16 164/14 207/23 221/7 221/10 224/19 224/19 226/5 235/25 235/25 236/12 236/15 237/12 237/16
represent [4] 17/9 17/10 87/17 96/19
representation [8] 179/9 179/11 179/14 179/23 180/5 180/6 198/22 217/4
representations [1] 90/24
representative [8] 3/5 8/9 76/13
76/15 99/14 128/11 201/20 201/22
representatives [6] 7/22 154/9
155/15 243/20 244/23 252/8
represented [1] 209/16
reprisals [1] 92/4
reproduced [1] 81/18
Republic[5] 1/12 96/19 97/17 105/10 105/13
reputational [1] 45/19
request [77] 9/22 9/24 32/16
33/25 33/25 55/16 56/18 57/12
58/2 58/4 58/8 58/11 58/22 59/14
59/21 60/2 60/4 60/6 60/10 60/12
61/6 61/8 62/3 62/7 62/23 63/5
63/21 64/8 64/13 64/17 69/3 69/7
69/12 71/7 71/19 72/13 72/16
73/2 73/7 73/15 73/16 73/18
75/17 76/14 78/20 79/4 79/13
83/4 83/12 87/24 87/25 97/16
99/11 103/4 105/22 134/13
134/17 135/9 145/13 146/9 147/13 148/17 149/17 150/3 150/4 150/8 150/16 153/16 154/12 154/16 154/24 161/16 189/22 201/21 202/6 202/20 219/8
requested [9] 33/12 42/17 59/4

59/15 68/18 141/17 146/4 212/23 224/22
requesting [2] 149/3 149/5 requests [4] 58/15 210/20 219/5 228/1
require [2] 22/25 90/25
required [14] 23/16 27/15 43/2
48/16 49/5 51/21 62/2 67/15
92/23 126/17 148/19 161/9 178/2 235/12
requirement [16] 42/22 42/25
54/3 60/11 60/12 60/17 63/10 65/16 66/1 146/18 146/19 147/8 147/15 147/17 151/8 190/20
requirements [20] 42/13 50/14
57/18 57/24 61/22 64/2 66/4 66/7
66/12 66/25 68/2 116/3 116/21
148/10 155/10 174/25 189/24 190/5 190/7 190/8
requires [3] 82/21 189/3 191/6
research [1] 169/25
reservation [1] 65/3
reserve [1] 64/25
reserved [1] 192/25
resided [1] 38/3
resolution [10] 22/17 22/24 62/1 67/13 80/6 81/11 81/15 84/18 111/4 156/7
resolutions [2] 22/8 38/14
resolve [2] 82/17 216/8
resource [4] 19/6 19/8 22/3
101/15
resourced [1] 208/2
resources [3] 103/25 104/4
128/24
respect [22] 20/12 35/16 50/12
59/16 63/23 64/16 67/14 67/24
71/11 75/1 86/4 86/23 88/22
141/23 187/19 187/22 191/10 191/24 192/3 192/20 198/12 260/23
respected [2] 17/23 17/25
respectfully [1] 100/9
respond [3] 10/15 197/9 228/1
responded [1] 32/13
respondent [171] 1/13 4/2 6/16 8/1 10/12 13/17 15/8 15/15 17/9 17/18 20/25 21/13 21/22 22/15 23/8 24/16 24/18 26/24 27/3 28/8


## S

safe [2] 25/22 25/25
safeguards [1] 190/18
safety [1] 43/15
said [74] 8/6 12/15 17/1 27/4 30/4 30/12 32/2 41/4 42/15 79/6 93/21 102/11 108/12 114/12 118/24 120/6 122/11 124/22 125/1 130/1 130/23 131/6 131/7 143/22 143/24 160/4 160/4 164/5 164/11 165/14 166/5 168/11 168/19 168/22 177/20 180/4 181/1 183/21 184/2 184/12 196/17 198/20 201/7 201/20 202/4 213/22 215/22 217/15 225/7 226/4 228/5 233/4 233/25 234/11 237/12 237/17 239/17 239/19 240/1 240/15 240/19 240/19 245/19 246/3 246/4 246/15 246/16 248/12 252/11 253/22 258/21 259/15 260/5 260/10
sail [1] 27/17
sake [1] 45/25
sale [31] 73/5 73/8 73/10 78/16 80/12 80/16 80/18 80/21 90/16 90/17 90/17 98/23 105/4 112/10 129/16 129/20 129/25 130/11 150/1 151/20 153/17 153/20 154/2 154/16 154/18 154/21 154/22 155/3 155/11 155/13 191/12
sales [4] 90/17 90/18 226/24 256/25
same [46] 31/4 39/13 46/19 63/6 64/23 68/9 69/18 71/20 75/15 76/8 80/5 82/18 96/14 100/18 116/9 116/13 116/17 124/11 129/23 130/2 130/18 130/19 131/6 132/15 137/13 146/17 155/5 157/19 162/9 165/12 175/3 181/4 181/7 182/8 183/1 183/4 183/11 183/17 185/18 185/19 195/12 211/4 226/14 234/17 238/5 260/4
Same handed [1] 96/14
Santoyo [2] 128/1 128/8
SAS [7] 207/22 210/8 210/19 210/19 221/11 244/7 249/20

SAS's [1] 252/21
satisfaction [2] 128/5 204/1 satisfy [4] 60/12 63/16 155/9 189/23
saw [13] 132/15 151/13 158/24 159/19 165/3 165/6 172/22 175/22 200/17 209/12 226/5 226/20 231/23
say[82] 13/1 17/5 17/10 34/21 35/3 46/6 49/16 51/6 51/7 89/19 93/2 94/6 104/6 110/8 114/10 116/10 120/4 120/4 121/12 123/14 125/10 125/15 126/3 126/6 128/7 129/9 130/14 130/24 131/7 133/6 134/6 137/4 137/20 148/16 159/16 167/7 167/12 167/14 177/6 179/20 180/23 184/12 196/22 197/20 198/12 200/12 201/6 204/18 205/7 205/17 214/7 214/16 216/6 217/18 218/5 218/19 219/10 221/8 221/15 223/13 225/3 225/6 225/11 225/22 226/14 226/22 227/14 227/15 228/3 228/5 234/14 240/20 242/22 246/7 248/7 253/23 254/24 255/14 256/11 256/12 256/13 259/23 saying [29] 33/5 40/2 41/17 45/3 45/12 46/10 53/4 94/15 100/22 115/10 116/22 119/15 133/2 136/15 138/15 154/8 154/9 174/14 204/10 204/10 219/11 219/17 227/20 235/2 235/3 256/3 256/3 256/4 256/17
says [26] 27/17 33/23 39/7 39/8 39/9 46/2 47/2 49/14 50/19 87/4 115/12 115/13 115/17 119/12 122/19 131/11 156/14 185/5 196/23 218/1 218/2 226/11 233/1 235/6 258/24 259/13
scale [1] 80/15
scandalous [5] 115/25 117/11
137/24 138/4 138/5
scenario [3] 116/25 142/15
142/16
scenarios [1] 208/13
scenes [1] 32/12
schemes [2] 153/1 153/7
science [2] 207/5 214/24
scope [7] 45/8 59/13 67/20 88/20 88/25 146/4 183/14
screen [11] 11/12 11/15 12/16 62/12 63/12 64/25 66/23 72/14 81/19 88/11 178/10
SEC [2] 75/23 80/20
second [22] 37/1 63/9 65/10 65/13 73/23 81/23 84/15 107/17 107/20 110/21 117/3 135/15 153/2 160/3 172/18 187/21 191/18 223/13 223/16 235/5 254/3 256/19
secondly [3] 148/18 214/20
248/12
secret [8] 35/7 36/3 41/16 51/24 80/12 90/16 90/17 90/18
secretariat [6] 2/9 208/14 208/25 217/1 230/22 241/4
secretary [8] 2/10 7/10 9/18 75/11 102/13 216/22 241/22 261/8
secretly [1] 20/17
section [13] 22/5 42/8 42/13
42/17 43/1 62/1 67/17 188/13
188/20 188/21 189/5 202/25
233/1
section 5.10 [1] 202/25
section 5.2 [1] 42/17
section 5.4 [1] 43/1
Section 6 [1] 42/8
sections [1] 112/25
sector [11] 22/3 39/22 40/9 40/10 169/7 183/1 206/22 215/17 239/6 239/9 246/24
sectorial [1] 213/2
sectors [3] 39/23 183/9 183/10
secure [6] 25/22 25/25 29/11
33/16 153/2 153/7
security [46] 1/9 1/9 8/10 8/14 14/5 19/10 21/19 26/12 43/15 $74 / 774 / 874 / 1674 / 2475 / 375 / 9$ 75/12 75/15 75/23 76/12 76/16 99/7 99/8 101/7 106/4 106/5 135/3 137/23 138/8 138/13 138/17 140/5 140/14 140/25 141/14 142/13 142/17 143/11 201/7 201/14 201/16 201/23 202/7 203/4 203/20 204/14 204/17



| S |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ```SOPHIA [1] 5/12 sophisticated [1] 169/22 sorry [9] 109/15 112/8 198/14 199/4 214/2 222/9 223/2 245/18 252/4 sort [7] 32/20 34/5 45/17 141/1 149/6 172/9 219/24 sorts [1] 152/24 sought [6] 16/15 38/10 81/9 81/24 189/18 208/3 sounds [1] 251/22 source [1] 227/22 sources [2] 227/18 239/21 sovereign [7] 85/1 85/8 85/13 85/19 85/22 158/10 158/13 sovereign's [1] 161/10 space [1] 133/3 Spanish [14] 97/4 99/15 110/15 110/18 127/16 127/17 127/18 206/4 206/13 223/15 223/16 223/24 234/24 259/12 spanned [1] 67/2 spare [1] 12/23 speak [6] 10/6 12/19 97/3 196/20 205/12 242/18 speaking [2] 10/5 242/7 special [1] 131/4 specialised [2] 110/4 165/9 specific [22] 23/1 67/19 88/4 113/7 120/20 134/24 139/18 143/4 143/9 145/24 151/8 158/9 173/16 179/9 179/14 179/23 180/5 204/4 204/6 218/25 230/19 230/20 specifically [10] 69/13 69/14 160/18 194/24 209/3 229/1 232/12 243/21 253/19 254/16 specifics [1] 100/4 specified [1] 109/16 specify [4] 69/7 143/7 189/10 190/8 spectre [1] 55/5 spectrum [2] 168/15 168/18 spectrums [1] 168/10 speculate [1] 176/23 speculation [7] 78/23 81/4 102/7 148/6 176/22 176/24 192/9 speculations [1] 177/13``` | 149/5 <br> spend [2] 56/22 109/12 <br> spent [6] 14/4 27/12 90/2 91/2 <br> 91/3 207/3 <br> spin [6] 73/25 90/9 90/11 140/15 142/18 142/19 <br> spin-out [6] 73/25 90/9 90/11 140/15 142/18 142/19 <br> spoke [1] 241/15 <br> sponsored [1] 27/18 <br> spun [1] 74/7 <br> Square [1] 27/8 <br> squatting [1] 19/25 <br> SRS [1] 24/4 <br> stable [1] 29/11 <br> staff [1] 228/11 <br> stage [3] 7/19 114/9 196/1 <br> stages [4] 108/2 114/3 114/8 201/8 <br> stake [1] $72 / 23$ <br> stand [1] 94/5 <br> standard [16] 45/23 46/5 46/22 <br> 67/25 161/4 161/6 161/11 161/15 161/23 167/1 167/2 169/13 <br> 177/21 177/22 178/2 191/25 <br> standards [2] 47/23 192/16 <br> standing [15] 24/10 71/25 72/22 <br> 73/17 73/24 74/18 77/14 112/3 112/4 135/2 151/2 151/3 152/1 153/15 153/19 <br> stands [1] 195/16 <br> start [18] 18/1 25/11 27/19 28/16 33/21 38/20 95/17 96/2 105/9 106/22 128/25 139/25 160/22 198/4 212/8 245/2 259/22 260/24 start-up [2] 27/19 28/16 started [37] 21/9 24/24 25/3 25/20 34/14 34/14 38/25 78/12 89/11 99/10 105/22 109/14 114/14 133/1 138/14 154/7 198/2 202/6 206/21 209/5 209/8 212/11 212/12 212/17 212/18 222/4 223/19 224/25 229/2 231/4 232/8 233/10 233/13 233/16 233/19 240/7 255/13 <br> starting [5] 25/20 30/23 95/14 160/25 169/2 <br> starts [4] 108/18 122/5 132/25 |  |



## S

sure [27] 9/12 12/25 16/19 17/22 25/24 27/23 95/15 96/2 98/21 116/9 120/21 124/2 129/24 134/1 134/20 185/7 202/3 204/17 207/24 208/1 217/20 220/1 220/10 259/9 260/3 260/6 261/10 surprised [1] 34/23
surprises [1] 101/12
surrounding [2] 152/7 241/3
survive [1] 104/18
suspect [1] 219/24
suspend [2] 59/1 146/5
suspension [3] 59/5 59/5 59/6
sustainable [2] 164/2 214/21
sustained [1] 81/6
Sweden [1] 116/9
Swiss [5] 54/6 68/25 69/14 150/14 184/8
Swiss-Colombia [5] 54/6 68/25 69/14 150/14 184/8
switch [1] 12/20
switched [1] 177/15
SYLVIA [5] 4/17 9/3 102/12
120/19 213/8
Sylvia Constaín [4] 9/3 102/12 120/19 213/8
system [3] 106/18 106/23 118/16
systems [2] 13/2 238/15

## $T$

table [5] 125/7 133/14 149/14 184/14 248/18
tackle [2] 122/1 208/17
tactics [1] 97/23
take [35] 14/18 20/10 20/17
20/22 28/2 59/12 59/17 87/6 95/6 95/11 97/5 97/14 97/18 100/3 100/9 114/5 118/6 122/14 130/12 186/4 186/10 187/13 194/16 195/13 209/13 217/18 230/17 231/25 233/21 236/20 237/1 239/21 242/22 242/25 251/20 taken [24] 20/17 35/14 48/3 55/2 58/19 71/1 85/8 85/14 85/15 85/17 86/14 86/17 101/3 101/8 103/8 144/7 158/9 158/12 186/15 194/1 194/12 200/14 210/14 242/10
takes [6] 21/18 26/1 26/1 26/2 26/9 166/17
taking [10] 20/11 31/6 31/19 59/12 59/17 73/1 101/4 232/20 244/7 244/9
talk [28] 14/17 16/8 18/5 22/5 28/18 29/18 29/21 32/16 32/18 33/5 33/6 41/2 54/2 54/10 91/7 162/15 169/20 176/5 176/6 176/8 176/9 179/3 179/4 198/8 219/3 225/25 259/5 260/19
talked [10] 22/10 29/24 35/18 38/22 48/14 50/13 51/5 182/5 203/18 237/12
talking [28] 13/18 18/1 28/24 35/22 35/23 40/17 45/5 89/20 90/13 90/13 107/24 119/24 140/19 163/8 165/18 168/7 183/16 218/8 238/5 238/7 240/18 240/21 252/17 254/2 256/6 256/8 260/17 260/18
talks [3] 29/25 35/8 47/5
task [2] 225/4 227/25
tasked [3] 208/24 240/5 247/15
tasks [2] 128/25 228/2
taught [2] 180/9 180/18
team [10] 8/16 11/23 99/19 129/7
159/5 219/3 231/18 238/2 238/4 239/1
technical [43] 9/19 12/21 21/18 24/12 25/21 26/2 40/25 42/8 42/12 43/6 43/15 44/4 50/14 107/3 110/3 118/10 118/15 125/9 128/24 208/13 208/23 209/21 214/25 215/12 215/16 215/18 221/14 222/12 222/13 223/1 224/7 226/12 226/16 228/4 233/20 238/25 241/4 241/10 241/22 255/24 258/15 258/16 258/16
technician [1] 261/9
technologies [3] 165/10 207/6 214/12
technology [9] 101/9 110/4 207/6 207/14 212/11 214/16 214/19 214/24 238/17
Teco [1] 48/21
TEDDY [4] 3/8 8/4 177/9 177/10
Teddy Baldwin [1] 8/4
telecom [5] 39/22 165/8 172/12 172/16 173/2
Telecommunication [3] 105/12 117/8 118/7
telecommunications [8] 22/3 98/17 206/21 206/23 209/1 215/2 215/4 215/5
telecoms [1] 40/9
tell [19] 40/17 157/3 159/2 163/4 163/6 168/25 176/22 176/23 177/10 177/11 182/2 182/20 182/22 220/23 221/1 224/11 249/8 250/9 250/12
telling [8] 32/18 32/18 92/14 92/16 166/19 167/16 179/25 219/13
tells [1] 53/9
ten [29] 22/12 26/16 43/12 45/5 50/23 97/22 101/20 103/2 108/20 110/10 119/25 120/1 120/2 122/18 124/14 129/5 133/15 133/23 152/9 164/4 166/4 169/11 175/14 188/20 206/1 207/5 243/4 250/4 251/12
ten-year [3] 45/5 110/10 169/11 tend [1] 180/15
tender [92] 21/3 22/22 22/24 $33 / 2133 / 2436 / 2436 / 2537 / 4$ 37/7 37/19 38/10 40/22 40/23 $40 / 2341 / 142 / 542 / 642 / 642 / 7$ 42/10 42/12 42/15 44/1 44/10 $44 / 2545 / 545 / 545 / 645 / 1649 / 12$ 49/20 50/21 50/23 51/8 79/21 80/10 83/5 83/5 87/2 98/18 98/20 105/1 105/2 108/19 109/11 114/2 114/6 115/8 115/15 116/15 116/24 119/2 120/10 120/12 120/15 121/7 121/17 121/20 121/23 122/4 122/5 122/25 123/3 123/4 124/16 124/19 126/11 127/14 129/23 131/15 131/18 146/6 148/14 148/25 155/9 164/12 175/17 175/25 178/9 178/17 208/19 209/23 239/16 244/10 249/4 249/13 252/2 252/9 252/10 252/18 253/7 253/12
tendered [1] 162/14
tendering [7] 87/8 232/24 233/3
244/17 244/20 248/16 249/1

## T

tenders [1] 42/11
term [8] 27/4 87/23 98/7 98/14 110/10 133/15 197/13 231/4
terminate [1] 80/9 termination [1] 88/23
terms [66] 14/14 14/15 15/10 17/6 43/2 43/9 43/13 43/14 45/8 50/24 51/3 51/6 51/7 51/8 64/9 69/10 74/19 74/23 79/6 81/10 85/19 101/14 109/18 113/14 114/22 115/20 116/4 116/11 118/2 121/8 121/15 122/22 123/9 123/13 124/9 124/11 125/22 137/19 138/11 142/5 149/2 151/23 157/16 164/10 165/3 165/13 172/19 176/13 181/2 181/2 181/4 181/7 181/18 194/9 198/17 207/1 207/20 208/2 227/7 230/5 234/17 234/20 234/25 239/6 239/7 257/18
testified [3] 166/9 174/23 235/10 testify [2] 112/1 234/22
testimonial [1] 102/20
testing [1] 98/24
than [35] 10/25 43/3 53/19 60/3 73/6 76/5 79/3 81/10 86/25 93/7 102/7 131/22 133/6 138/21 148/16 156/7 162/25 165/16 165/24 173/22 179/25 186/15 191/8 191/21 198/6 200/21 207/3 217/25 221/11 233/14 249/4 250/6 251/12 255/17 261/1
thank [57] 8/2 8/17 9/6 9/25 10/1 10/2 13/11 89/5 89/9 89/15 94/20 94/23 94/24 96/3 96/5 96/11 104/10 104/12 104/13 104/19 128/19 129/6 129/6 129/7 138/25 158/18 158/20 186/1 186/3 186/12 186/24 195/20 195/23 195/24 196/1 197/18 201/2 203/13 204/9 205/14 205/24 205/25 207/12 210/1 210/24 214/6 218/7 223/4 235/18 237/11 242/2 247/22 251/1 251/22 261/5 261/6 261/11
thanks [2] 103/16 211/10
that [1361]
that I [1] 95/19
that's [3] 183/5 199/20 239/9 their [67] 7/25 12/14 18/18 18/23 21/15 24/1 24/4 30/10 31/17 31/18 32/15 43/7 43/15 43/24 49/22 50/1 64/1 65/1 85/22 90/11 91/2 91/21 92/21 92/23 93/1 94/21 103/4 104/1 108/5 118/9 124/13 125/7 135/9 149/17 149/20 149/25 150/3 154/24 159/19 160/10 162/9 162/10 162/12 167/8 169/25 172/2 173/20 175/1 178/9 179/5 182/5 183/6 191/7 193/11 193/22 195/14 197/23 198/25 210/20 216/25 219/8 221/5 221/6 221/6 221/14 249/21 255/14
them [64] 7/17 25/18 30/10 30/19 32/13 33/17 33/17 36/9 39/13 39/16 39/25 41/5 43/9 48/9 73/22 81/18 87/19 91/12 91/23 92/3 92/4 92/7 93/18 94/15 94/16 95/3 104/12 109/15 109/15 111/2 116/11 118/18 131/16 139/11 157/5 159/16 163/6 163/11 164/11 175/12 177/6 180/17 180/17 183/11 184/7 200/10 203/9 204/5 210/10 210/22 218/15 218/16 218/17 219/5 219/8 219/12 226/6 228/11 235/24 235/25 246/25 248/17 248/22 249/1
themselves [9] 21/13 21/14 23/11 87/21 149/1 157/12 159/15 181/14 226/1
then [106] 7/19 7/25 8/14 8/23 9/24 10/11 10/13 11/9 18/3 36/11 40/3 40/9 49/16 49/24 53/15 67/18 67/22 68/17 68/23 69/24 70/16 71/1 71/2 71/12 73/13 77/7 78/18 79/9 80/3 81/8 85/21 87/7 95/1 95/7 95/17 97/5 97/8 97/8 97/10 97/14 104/23 105/1 105/2 105/11 105/18 106/3 106/18 107/17 111/19 118/6 119/12 122/24 123/6 124/9 125/20 125/22 126/1 126/16 127/23 129/17 133/18 134/12 134/16 136/6 136/20 139/13 139/17
141/3 145/4 149/24 150/5 150/8

156/20 160/1 160/23 163/16 167/4 179/12 186/11 199/19 200/14 201/11 205/8 206/18 206/21 213/2 213/3 213/16 214/3 214/20 214/20 214/22 214/22 214/25 215/4 221/8 221/25 224/12 226/13 232/15 232/22 234/3 243/10 246/4 246/16 250/10
theories [1] 54/22
theory [2] 81/12 82/7
there [259] 10/13 11/2 11/5 12/25 13/3 14/22 15/12 16/14 16/17 17/3 18/8 18/8 18/8 18/14 18/21 20/1 20/4 23/9 23/11 24/6 24/9 25/14 25/16 28/7 28/9 28/23 29/12 29/20 30/12 30/15 31/19 31/21 31/24 32/5 32/19 32/24 34/8 36/5 36/11 36/23 37/14 38/12 39/14 39/18 40/7 40/13 40/24 41/17 42/1 42/2 43/5 44/5 44/7 47/7 48/10 48/22 48/24 49/17 50/2 50/25 51/21 52/11 52/12 53/1 56/3 57/1 63/3 64/11 65/23 70/5 70/6 71/15 71/22 75/25 77/16 78/21 79/22 80/8 80/16 82/15 83/2 83/20 85/9 90/20 91/10 92/2 92/3 93/23 93/24 96/8 100/5 101/12 102/7 102/8 107/22 108/19 110/12 111/3 111/21 113/7 113/22 114/3 115/13 117/20 118/3 119/2 119/3 120/7 120/25 121/6 121/10 121/18 125/18 125/25 126/6 126/18 129/12 132/18 132/19 133/8 133/24 135/4 135/7 135/19 136/13 136/23 139/12 139/14 139/16 140/2 142/4 142/7 142/8 142/20 142/21 144/17 144/21 146/17 147/8 147/14 147/16 149/10 149/22 150/1 150/6 150/10 151/1 151/9 152/21 153/13 154/19 155/19 156/5 158/5 158/7 159/7 159/11 162/18 163/14 167/20 167/22 168/1 171/8 172/6 173/3 173/9 173/21 174/4 174/17 176/4 177/5 177/21 177/22 178/8 178/23 179/3 179/8 179/13 180/3 180/4 180/6 180/7

## T

there... [77] 182/22 183/17 184/3 184/6 184/9 194/1 196/17 196/25 197/8 197/10 197/11 197/23 198/1 198/8 198/17 200/18 200/18 201/19 203/9 204/15 205/20 208/23 209/17 209/19 216/18 216/21 217/22 218/3 218/19 218/24 219/2 220/12 220/22 221/4 222/2 224/3 226/14 226/17 228/3 228/9 228/22 232/17 232/18 232/22 234/12 234/19 235/20 237/12 237/13 237/19 237/20 237/23 243/16 244/14 245/6 245/11 245/24 246/2 246/13 246/21 248/13 249/1 249/12 250/10 250/17 252/16 253/5 254/3 255/3 257/7 257/9 257/20 258/9 258/12 260/15 260/25 260/25
There's [1] 167/19
therefore [25] 42/22 51/8 61/3 65/8 69/22 71/7 73/12 76/17 127/4 127/10 127/10 137/10 143/3 143/13 144/11 146/15 148/4 151/25 153/22 169/12 173/5 174/22 189/24 223/19 248/20
these [153] 8/5 11/12 14/4 14/10 16/4 16/5 16/5 16/13 26/7 27/7 27/11 27/14 28/19 35/22 39/5 39/25 40/1 40/8 40/13 40/15 40/18 40/19 47/10 47/12 47/13 48/11 50/9 51/10 52/21 54/20 54/25 55/9 56/2 56/11 56/20 57/18 57/24 58/1 59/13 61/10 61/24 63/6 64/24 67/18 67/20 67/23 70/10 73/21 74/12 76/4 76/7 78/8 79/2 80/13 81/4 81/7 81/17 82/4 82/9 83/20 84/3 90/3 90/14 90/23 90/24 90/25 91/9 91/24 92/10 93/5 93/25 94/1 95/2 100/3 102/5 106/15 107/14 112/1 113/14 115/21 117/10 117/16 118/25 121/4 121/18 122/12 122/13 128/12 135/22 139/10 140/4 140/6 140/15 144/22 148/9 149/9 149/14 149/24 149/25 150/15 150/19 151/22 151/24

153/5 153/19 153/23 155/23 156/6 156/11 156/19 156/21 156/22 156/23 157/5 157/21 157/25 158/4 162/16 163/24 169/23 169/24 173/14 176/13 180/21 180/22 180/22 182/4 184/5 184/6 185/22 190/8 193/16 193/17 195/21 196/6 197/2 198/13 198/23 199/14 199/23 200/19 201/22 202/13 203/6 203/10 209/12 218/13 224/8 225/15 241/15 245/4 252/1 257/2 they [380]
they're [1] 177/8
thing [28] 20/3 21/24 21/25 34/6
34/9 43/18 45/6 46/11 48/19 89/18 90/11 94/11 95/6 104/16 110/21 111/3 115/16 124/5 133/5 137/4 145/8 180/10 180/13 185/4 201/19 209/7 209/8 240/1
things [36] 12/8 14/6 27/9 29/5 32/11 35/22 37/17 38/19 38/23 39/1 40/16 47/12 52/12 92/12 105/3 106/20 114/11 117/16 119/23 124/18 127/4 130/12 130/14 130/22 131/2 134/5 134/13 160/5 197/23 202/21 203/6 216/15 228/11 239/7 243/4 260/9
think [84] 11/25 13/21 13/23 14/25 16/17 16/21 16/25 17/15 19/19 19/21 21/6 21/7 28/1 29/21 35/4 36/16 39/18 40/21 44/15 $45 / 1047 / 347 / 1047 / 1248 / 10$ 50/6 51/1 51/21 89/20 89/23 89/24 90/1 90/6 91/19 93/9 94/1 94/25 95/24 96/12 104/14 108/6 108/9 126/18 156/22 166/17 166/22 176/18 176/19 184/13 197/23 198/3 203/11 203/20 205/3 206/3 214/14 219/14 225/17 225/18 225/21 225/25 226/21 229/15 231/10 231/14 234/24 236/9 237/13 238/15 239/25 247/24 248/4 249/17 250/5 250/17 250/21 251/8 251/11 251/13 256/2 258/7 259/4 260/5 260/10 260/20
thinking [4] 47/8 119/3 250/8

256/10
thinks [2] 184/22 204/20
third [18] 65/6 66/2 74/12 74/16
81/25 104/25 112/2 116/2 118/22 121/23 124/15 127/6 179/1
187/24 191/20 191/23 192/20 227/12
this [615]
THOMAS [2] 3/8 8/15
Thomas Innes [1] 8/15
thorough [1] 163/25
those [76] 10/2 13/2 15/15 26/13 27/9 27/10 41/12 45/10 47/16 48/3 48/4 49/1 51/3 52/16 53/18 58/10 61/22 65/2 75/5 85/7 85/8 89/24 91/4 91/22 92/6 113/15 120/5 162/5 164/14 165/4 165/5 167/3 172/22 181/4 184/10 191/21 195/18 196/11 200/13 200/15 215/6 215/10 216/23 220/24 221/2 221/9 222/5 224/14 225/5 226/1 227/2 227/9 227/19 227/21 228/2 228/25 229/2 232/8 233/18 236/2 244/11 244/13 247/23 249/12 249/14 252/8 252/13 253/10 253/14 255/12 255/20 258/2 258/15 258/15 258/16 258/19
though [13] 17/5 20/18 29/15
31/9 34/12 36/17 48/15 52/23
162/20 167/24 172/5 200/6 215/2
thought [5] 41/23 204/11 206/23 257/21 258/17
thoughts [2] 89/16 219/16 thousand [1] 34/7
threat [1] 156/8
three [35] 9/2 16/7 16/10 49/6 71/2 73/6 79/3 81/13 81/17 81/19 82/4 83/7 93/19 102/10 106/15 106/21 107/14 109/1 110/9 111/21 122/12 125/5 125/6 125/9 126/13 135/8 135/13 137/11 148/10 148/16 160/23 162/2 207/19 224/14 237/14
threshold [1] 161/9
through [51] 7/4 16/2 18/2 18/4 21/1 32/7 33/10 38/4 39/24 46/1 48/9 48/9 55/4 56/11 56/23 77/11 78/8 81/3 89/19 89/22 90/10

## T

through... [30] 93/12 94/10 94/12 97/23 98/11 104/21 107/18 108/17 114/8 121/22 123/8 125/7 134/4 134/8 151/20 156/11 162/5 166/9 174/24 181/13 182/16 182/21 184/5 185/13 185/16 192/8 192/13 195/3 250/14 259/24
throughout [11] 8/12 33/3 76/7 112/7 128/10 149/13 163/21 171/6 171/6 176/16 240/20
throw [1] 54/18
thus [3] 63/16 68/20 194/12
thwart [1] 83/5
tie [1] $167 / 3$
tied [2] 159/15 179/24
Tiempo [3] 130/16 154/9 155/15 time [93] 13/20 14/7 15/19 15/25 18/13 19/21 19/25 21/5 21/10 21/11 29/2 29/2 29/19 31/12 33/4 35/10 38/6 41/16 44/12 45/7 46/11 55/15 56/23 72/16 77/1 79/12 80/2 90/2 92/13 95/6 95/18 96/2 97/4 100/19 102/13 109/12 109/23 111/9 113/20 115/23 119/4 120/24 123/7 127/3 127/22 130/8 133/10 134/4 134/20 136/9 136/16 136/22 137/23 140/13 148/23 149/11 150/20 150/20 151/4 151/9 151/12 151/14 151/19 154/3 165/5 165/18 169/11 169/23 175/3 182/22 190/4 190/10 196/4 199/11 201/9 209/16 213/11 215/3 216/17 218/3 224/16 225/21 233/18 236/22 238/17 245/9 245/15 248/13 251/25 252/16 252/16 256/22 260/4
timeline [5] 32/7 32/9 56/4 77/19 154/5
times [12] 13/17 27/8 29/21
33/23 161/21 170/13 177/23
178/14 240/14 240/20 253/16 253/23
Times Square [1] 27/8
timing [6] 96/6 134/24 156/1
156/2 199/10 202/20
TLDs [7] 107/9 107/9 107/10

107/10 107/11 107/15 229/1 tourist [1] 254/24
today [38] 7/14 10/9 10/17 14/18
16/9 46/22 54/15 54/20 56/10 75/13 76/12 91/4 96/19 106/1 108/15 110/10 112/1 112/5 126/3 130/13 136/12 136/13 137/17 141/24 142/3 145/16 159/24 160/11 160/17 162/10 163/1 195/19 199/16 200/22 236/19 244/15 250/18 251/7
together [5] 91/25 129/8 194/2 209/1 218/24
toilet [2] 237/6 237/7
told [13] 41/25 49/10 130/3 132/8
132/10 137/9 138/19 158/22
159/15 162/13 180/20 201/9 232/17
tolerated [1] 153/25
tomorrow [13] 10/19 10/21
117/13 204/3 250/16 251/4 251/15 259/23 260/3 260/8 260/12 260/24 261/11
too [16] 8/19 8/24 12/23 28/18 30/4 34/18 39/10 49/1 53/2 94/10 109/12 118/6 135/14 175/11 199/16 202/16
took [17] 18/19 19/17 20/9 21/25 25/15 31/13 32/13 36/20 90/7 102/18 117/5 163/11 181/14 231/11 234/4 236/17 245/22 top [15] 18/6 18/7 18/9 18/10 21/9 23/5 23/6 23/23 25/14 106/25 107/8 110/16 207/8 221/19 254/6
top-level [9] 18/6 18/7 18/10 21/9
23/6 23/23 25/14 221/19 254/6
topic [8] 223/20 223/23 223/23
223/25 224/1 224/4 224/5 257/12
topics [3] 225/9 230/20 254/14
ToR [1] 125/20
Toronto [5] 206/20 214/14 215/3
222/3 222/3
TORs [1] 42/17
total [4] 109/3 111/10 198/17 236/15
totally [5] 114/12 115/12 124/25 171/9 250/7
touch [1] 45/21
touches [1] 232/15
tourist [1] 254/24
towards [1] 16/9
towards [1] 16/9
TPA [65] 17/1 17/4 17/8 46/2 55/14 56/6 57/2 58/9 60/2 61/14 61/16 61/21 62/1 62/5 62/15 62/25 63/12 64/3 66/5 66/8 67/1 68/7 68/21 69/1 69/2 70/14 71/16 72/10 75/25 77/15 82/13 82/19
82/21 84/6 87/18 88/17 143/5 143/6 143/9 144/24 145/3 145/10 145/14 145/21 146/19 147/14 147/17 147/25 148/19 151/2 151/7 151/11 187/6 187/18 187/20 187/22 188/1 188/9 188/16 192/25 193/15 194/13 194/17 195/9 195/13
trade [4] 17/1 28/14 187/6 195/6 traditionally [1] 246/23
trail [1] 199/18
training [1] 216/3
transaction [9] 74/5 78/13 112/23 140/15 142/11 155/2 157/1 157/2 157/2
transactions [7] 56/7 80/15 90/15 125/19 125/21 136/25 157/5
transcript [3] 42/9 196/14 217/15 transfer [11] 79/11 79/20 131/3 137/22 141/12 141/18 142/21 142/22 154/14 155/7 155/9 transferred [4] 140/25 142/4 142/7 142/8
transformation [1] 119/14
transition [2] 31/9 31/12
translated [1] 217/6
translation [4] 104/15 129/9 211/19 259/12
translations [1] 10/6
translators [2] 10/4 261/7
transparency [6] 33/1 47/9 50/4 52/6 178/9 244/16
transparent [5] 36/1 170/17
171/6 174/21 178/21
transparently [2] 102/16 165/21
TransUnion [3] 74/5 141/3 157/2
travel [3] 254/23 256/10 256/11
treat [4] 46/17 46/19 53/15 257/21
treated [3] 29/7 40/16 53/18
treaties [2] 193/11 193/20

## T

treatment [21] 14/15 24/16 45/24 53/10 53/16 67/25 161/3 161/4 161/6 184/1 191/7 191/15 191/18 191/20 191/25 192/2 192/9 192/12 192/16 192/23 193/2 treaty [28] 54/7 76/2 84/14 84/22 84/25 85/4 87/14 88/5 89/1 142/25 152/18 159/3 159/8 160/20 161/1 174/13 176/19 176/25 179/10 185/6 185/7 187/8 191/25 193/25 194/1 194/4 194/6 195/14
treaty-based [2] 85/4 87/14 tremendously [1] 163/10
trend [1] 232/21
tribunal [115] 1/15 2/2 2/10 7/9
7/12 9/10 11/17 17/14 46/3 46/13 55/1 55/16 56/13 63/2 63/6 63/23 66/3 66/11 66/12 67/19 69/5 69/11 69/20 72/1 73/11 74/19 81/23 83/23 85/6 87/20 87/25 94/21 96/18 96/20 97/3 97/17 97/25 98/25 99/6 99/17 100/21 102/23 103/11 104/23 105/21 107/14 108/14 110/10 110/15 112/21 113/25 114/4 123/9 127/14 134/23 135/21 135/23 136/7 136/17 137/12 137/14 138/5 138/9 138/16 139/2 139/20 140/2 141/11 141/20 143/23 144/1 144/4 144/8 145/4 145/17 146/24 152/20 152/21 153/12 156/4 160/16 161/5 161/21 166/17 167/22 171/2 173/9 175/17 180/19 181/22 185/4 185/9 185/21 186/25 188/6 190/1 190/17 190/21 193/6 194/15 195/7 195/12 195/20 195/25 196/21 202/5 202/23 204/5 204/7 204/21 205/3 250/1 250/11 251/18 261/8
Tribunal's [5] 55/11 88/16 97/12 142/23 200/23
tribunals [12] 46/2 65/2 70/4 72/25 84/20 88/11 143/21 152/16 152/19 161/8 193/13 194/20 tried [13] 40/12 52/25 55/5 60/1 77/10 103/7 134/7 153/14 155/4

169/6 172/17 174/14 257/23 tries [3] 30/8 160/9 172/3 trigger [1] 76/13
triggered [4] 144/22 145/8 145/19 146/16
true [5] 34/22 82/18 132/20
172/25 174/16
TRUJILLO [10] 4/17 9/4 102/13
127/19 127/20 164/19 172/10
174/20 174/23 230/23
truly [2] 140/3 183/18
trustworthy [1] 29/11
truth [4] 124/24 205/12 205/12 205/13
try [19] 10/22 10/24 10/24 13/5
34/13 35/15 38/13 38/20 87/17
103/1 156/9 161/25 167/4 173/17
177/3 177/10 183/10 253/18 260/11
trying [18] $23 / 834 / 1038 / 738 / 16$ 54/18 82/16 82/23 82/24 97/24 143/16 156/6 156/12 158/4 168/6 202/14 215/9 257/10 257/19 turn [7] 54/9 96/9 160/23 191/5 196/7 223/7 226/10
turning [2] 13/6 76/18
Tuvalu [1] 18/24
TV [1] 19/3
tweet [1] 86/25
two [67] 12/11 15/24 18/12 24/2 24/6 25/5 27/5 32/5 32/13 37/4 37/4 44/25 45/1 51/12 70/24 84/12 87/6 87/11 89/10 89/17 96/20 96/23 105/3 106/16 108/21 111/22 115/7 115/13 119/23 123/11 126/22 127/1 127/24 129/15 130/14 137/8 137/10 137/11 137/14 144/20 152/24 153/5 154/4 163/16 166/17 175/23 176/23 177/12 207/8 216/16 216/18 216/23 218/3 220/22 220/24 221/2 221/4 222/16 225/15 227/21 236/19 237/13 248/7 250/16 251/4 253/19 253/24
type [3] 52/10 76/20 100/10 types [3] 50/9 81/14 153/5

## U

UK [5] 3/8 3/9 116/8 126/15 126/16
ultimate [2] 74/2 91/21
ultimately [9] 16/20 20/20 53/1 98/19 126/16 135/10 137/12 178/18 184/2
Ultra [1] 24/1
umbrella [2] 88/3 192/14
UN [3] 118/16 118/19 165/9 un.org [1] 107/20
unable [1] 78/6
unanswered [2] 15/23 15/25
unbeknownst [1] 32/12
UNCITRAL [2] 9/21 93/23
unclear [6] 49/7 79/14 86/11
106/8 201/14 201/18
uncommon [1] 78/13
uncomplicated [1] 77/19
unconditional [1] 188/16
unconstitutional [1] 169/19
uncover [1] 78/6
under [110] 17/8 22/6 24/20
42/21 46/19 49/1 54/4 55/14 56/6
57/12 58/2 58/18 60/1 60/17
60/23 61/6 61/14 61/16 61/20
62/2 62/3 62/5 62/24 64/9 64/12
66/25 67/15 67/25 68/5 68/7
68/25 69/1 69/5 69/12 69/14
69/17 69/19 70/1 70/14 71/23 74/19 74/24 75/15 76/4 77/15 79/24 82/12 83/12 84/6 84/12 87/18 88/17 88/19 89/17 98/4 104/24 116/6 116/7 120/8 127/9 132/9 141/19 143/5 145/3 145/10 145/15 145/20 146/24 147/14 147/17 150/7 150/10 150/13 151/2 151/11 157/23 164/1 164/10 164/15 165/13 166/10 168/18 169/25 170/23 172/14 174/13 175/15 185/6 185/10 188/13 188/17 188/19 188/21 189/5 189/24 190/1 191/15 192/19 193/2 194/19 194/22 194/23 195/9 195/10 198/10 209/24 213/20 245/6 258/25 259/13
undermined [1] 72/10
understand [18] 99/23 100/6


| V | vote [5] 241/19 241/20 241/21 | 35/20 51/16 53/15 64/23 65/5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| very... [59] 101/24 104/13 106/8 | 241/23 241/25 | 89/25 89/25 90/14 91/1 101/ |
| 108/17 116/5 123/1 128/19 133/9 | W | 102/17 111/7 117/24 124/10 |
| 135/3 135/19 138/3 139/7 140/12 | wait [2] 80/24 186/8 | 152/17 163/3 168/7 170/2 172/17 |
| 141/4 141/15 145/24 146/7 148/4 | waited [1] 32/5 | 174/7 174/16 175/10 176/3 |
| 149/15 150/9 151/8 154/2 158/18 | waiting [1] 212/15 | 178/16 181/12 181/24 182/3 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 16 \\ & 16 \end{aligned}$ | waive [1] 147/5 | 182/10 190/6 218/20 225/10 |
| 186/3 195/24 204/24 205/14 | waived [3] 54/1 147/3 220/4 | 225/11 230/10 233/5 248/20 |
| 205/24 209/7 210/16 210/24 | waiver [21] 63/10 63/15 63/20 64/19 64/17 64/12 64/9 64/5 | 251/21 258/14 |
| 215/25 218/7 219/23 225/22 | 64/22 65/4 65/5 65/16 66/1 | ways [2] 47/6 219/19 we [604] |
| $\begin{array}{ll}226 / 7 & 230 / 4 \\ 233 / 5 ~ 236 / 1 & 236 / 103232 / 1 ~ 237 / 8 ~ 250 / 6 ~\end{array}$ | 143/11 143/12 146/18 146/22 | we're [1] 177/9 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 233/5 236/1 236/23 237/8 250/6 } \\ & 250 / 12 \text { 254/20 260/2 260/10 } \end{aligned}$ | 147/1 147/2 147/8 | we've [1] 184/18 |
| $260 / 13$ | wake [1] 114/21 <br> walk [1] 126/18 | weaknesses [1] 172/1 |
| via [1] 231/14 | walk [1] $126 / 18$ <br> walked [1] 98/22 | web [1] 255/14 |
| vice [12] 29/23 29/25 30/11 32/2 | walking [2] 56/23 159/17 | website [2] 26/6 26/8 <br> websites [3] 19/25 20/1 21/8 |
| 33/19 75/10 86/6 127/25 128/14 170/20 208/9 232/4 | wall [1] 54/19 | Wednesday [7] 95/3 197/11 |
| 170/20 208/9 232/4 <br> Vice-Minister [5] 29 | want [44] 7/10 12/1 12/7 12/8 | 198/13 198/25 199/7 204/11 |
| 33/19 170/20 232/4 | 12/19 17/22 25/24 27/13 33/6 | 204/12 |
| Vice-President [2] 127/25 128/14 | 116/6 120/20 121/9 127/17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { week [5] 137/11 137/16 170/6 } \\ & 214 / 5220 / 17 \end{aligned}$ |
| video [5] 127/13 127/19 127/23 128/6 128/17 | 130/14 131/14 131/18 134/5 | weeks [3] 87/11 176/8 214/1 |
| videotape [1] | 136/5 136/11 160/21 160/22 | weight [1] 193/7 |
| Vienna [2] 193/19 193/23 | $\begin{aligned} & 171 / 3176 / 5176 / 6176 / 8 \text { 176/ } \\ & 184 / 24 \text { 197/22 202/2 205/20 } \end{aligned}$ | welcome [7] 7/3 8/3 96/5 196/4 204/19 205/3 237/2 |
| Vienna Convention [2] 193/19 193/23 | 205/22 219/21 220/1 220/9 255/6 <br> 260/6 260/19 260/21 | well [94] 9/13 10/2 11/12 11/15 |
| view [13] 40/15 54/1 137/7 222/13 222/20 233/25 234/1 | wanted [26] 15/8 15/18 15/23 | 11/16 15/16 15/25 16/3 17/5 24/15 31/12 31/19 33/22 39/7 |
| 222/13 222/20 233/25 234/1 | 16/19 19/20 20/2 21/13 21/14 | 40/18 52/20 73/9 89/24 91/10 |
| $246 / 10$ | 23/6 26/17 27/6 29/18 40/4 40/7 | 102/17 104/18 111/19 113/3 |
|  | 41/24 45/25 94/6 166/2 173/15 | 122/15 125/18 141/24 144/7 |
| views [3] 41 | 175/4 198/7 198/10 217/20 | 144/20 145/7 147/1 147/19 |
| violate [3] 47/6 49/2 220/10 | 228/24 243/5 257/25 | 149/17 151/5 152/3 152/11 154/2 |
| violated [4] 53/6 160/19 161/10 | wants [3] 17/21 197/12 230/6 | 158/21 161/6 161/9 161/19 163/7 |
| $161 / 23$ | warm [1] 99/16 | 165/7 168/21 169/16 173/7 174/4 |
| violation | was [61 | 177/16 184/24 185/11 193/10 |
| 162/1 168/16 172/2 178/24 192/5 | was February [1] 236 | 195/2 197/7 198/21 199/8 209/2 |
| 220/13 | was March 2019 [1] 229/ | 209/5 210/7 212/25 215/14 |
| violatio |  | 215/18 216/9 218/19 219/10 |
| violative [1] 53/16 | wasn't [16] 13/4 16/4 18/15 | 219/13 220/21 221/4 222/15 |
| virtue [1] 70/15 | 41/11 121/2 173/6 175/16 180/3 | 224/2 224/16 225/10 225/19 |
| vis [2] 138/4 138/4 | 239/16 239/17 258/21 | 225/21 227/10 228/10 231/9 |
| vis-à-vis [1] 138/4 | waste [6] 13/20 47/2 47/3 47/4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 235/18 236/21 236/24 237/8 } \\ & 237 / 8241 / 3241 / 19242 / 7 \text { 242/17 } \end{aligned}$ |
| visible [1] $12 / 16$ | 52/5 103/25 | 243/24 245/15 246/20 248/7 |
| voice [1] 218/12 | wasted [1] 21/1 | 249/17 253/22 254/12 257/4 |
| voluntatis [1] 142/24 | way [45] 19/11 23/11 24/17 24/20 | 260/2 261/8 |


| W | $\text { 4] } 24$ | 238/12 239/5 239/9 239/14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| well-founded [1] 89/24 | what [239] 10/16 17/22 18/6 | 239/20 240/23 241/6 241/6 |
| well-known [1] 52/20 | 18/17 19/21 21/6 25/23 27/6 | $24$ |
| went [11] 15/11 15/23 15/24 | 35/4 39/8 39/11 39/20 40/21 | 246/5 246/9 246/18 246/19 247/3 |
| 90/10 95/22 125/1 204/10 206/19 | 41/24 43/19 44/8 45/4 46/1 46/ | 248/12 249/17 254/8 254/10 |
| 211/19 214/20 214/23 | 47/1 49/3 49/4 50/6 56/18 56/24 | 254/16 256/13 257/4 257/10 |
| were [191] 15/17 15/24 16/1 16/6 | 59/4 81/10 91/9 92/9 92/10 92/12 $92 / 1792 / 19 ~ 93 / 9 ~ 93 / 16 ~ 94 / 16 ~$ | 257/19 257/19 257/25 258/7 $260 / 23$ |
| 18/14 19/24 19/25 21/8 24/6 24/7 | 92/17 92/19 93/9 93/16 94/16 95/12 95/15 101/1 103/10 104/25 | 260/23 <br> what's [4] |
| $\begin{array}{llll} 25 / 16 & 28 / 1 & 28 / 21 & 29 / 3 \\ 31 / 21 & 33 / 15 & 35 / 7 & 37 / 14 \\ 37 / 14 \end{array}$ | 107/7 107/6 106/20 106/24 | 137/18 |
| 37/17 38/7 41/10 42/5 42/11 43/5 | 107/24 108/6 108/12 109/1 | whatever [9] 16/15 16/18 112/18 |
| 45/10 45/11 49/13 50/5 52/1 | 109/19 109/19 110/6 110/14 | 116/6 122/7 124/22 127/3 160/5 |
| 52/16 52/21 53/2 53/2 69/16 72/7 | 11 |  |
| 74/19 78/19 80/8 81/22 85/15 | 114/15 114/25 115/12 116/19 116/21 117/20 118/12 118/14 | whatsoever [3] 124/18 167/2 |
| 86/17 88/18 90/7 90/9 91/14 | $\begin{aligned} & 116 / 21117 / 20118 / 12118 / 14 \\ & 119 / 19119 / 21121 / 4121 / 18 \end{aligned}$ | 179/21 <br> when [137] 10/23 10/24 12/19 |
| 91/15 92/6 95/13 101/11 101/12 | 122/11 122/11 122/16 122/18 | 13/4 17/4 19/4 20/2 21/2 21/22 |
| 101/19 102/10 108/4 109/15 <br> 112/12 114/11 115/10 118/4 | 122/19 123/10 123/22 123/24 | 23/10 25/7 25/20 25/23 33/23 |
| /6 120/7 120/25 121/8 123/14 | 124/3 127/12 127/18 128/5 128/7 | 34/10 40/22 41/16 44/12 |
| 123/15 124/4 127/4 127/4 127/9 | 128/15 129/21 130/25 131/7 | 47/24 48/22 49/8 51/6 71/18 |
| 132/10 136/2 136/6 137/7 137/10 | 131/20 132/8 132/13 132/17 | 71/19 72/23 78/15 85/4 89/19 |
| 138/7 140/17 140/18 140/19 | 133/23 134/6 134/19 135/6 | 89/24 90/7 90/10 90/11 92/21 |
| 140/22 141/10 141/15 146/13 | 135/14 135/16 138/14 140/10 | /10 106/3 109/11 111/7 1 |
| 148/10 148/12 148/24 149/3 | 140/22 141/4 141/24 142/12 | 13/4 114/2 116/9 118/23 122/15 |
| 149/5 149/22 150/15 150/16 | 145/7 145/11 155/23 156/1 | 126/6 127/2 129/24 130/20 |
| 150/18 156/15 161/19 162/8 | 157/3 159/13 160/14 160/16 | 130/21 131/5 134/23 136/12 |
| 163/13 163/17 165/19 165/21 | 160/17 161/5 161/25 162/2 | 137/5 140/11 140/17 141/1 |
| 165/21 166/11 167/1 167/15 | 163/5 164/5 164/6 164/8 165/ | 145/11 146/7 146/9 147/12 |
| 167/17 174/4 174/16 176/16 | 165/18 165/20 166/5 166/23 | 147/18 148/2 151/14 151/1 |
| 178/21 180/21 181/1 181/19 | 167/5 167/25 168/19 169/3 172/8 | /10 154/23 155/1 155/ |
| 184/2 191/17 191/18 196/3 | 172/22 173/7 173/24 175/14 | 171/1 172/24 173/23 174/1 |
| 196/13 198/23 201/9 203/5 | 176/8 177/5 177/11 178/2 178/2 | 181/14 183/22 198/13 199/25 |
| 207/13 207/15 208/18 209/19 | 178/5 178/6 178/13 179/7 179/ | 200/17 207/9 207/18 209/8 |
| 210/3 210/5 210/13 216/23 | 179/20 180/18 181/6 182/12 | 210/14 212/8 213/11 213/13 |
| 6/25 218/24 220/18 220/22 | 182/12 182/17 183/5 183/8 | /15 213/18 213/24 214/2 |
| 221/4 221/7 221/14 222/2 225/5 | 184/11 185/3 185/21 197/4 | 214/3 214/15 215/2 215/17 |
| 225/17 225/18 225/23 226/1 | 197/14 198/8 198/20 199/10 | 215/20 215/21 215/22 216/1 |
| 226/16 226/24 227/2 227/3 227/5 | 19 | 218/3 218/13 218/22 220/1 |
| 227/16 228/2 228/2 228/9 228/12 | 204/8 204/21 207/15 208/18 | 220/24 223/17 225/6 228/5 229/5 |
| 229/14 229/19 230/11 230/12 | 215/10 216/25 217/15 218/8 | 231/6 231/22 232/6 232/8 2 |
| 230/13 230/13 230/14 230/21 | 219/14 219/15 220/12 220/16 | 5/19 236/3 236/7 240/6 240/7 |
| 231/1 231/23 233/11 233/20 | 221/2 223/22 223/24 223/25 | 240/10 240/12 240/20 241/20 |
| 233/21 235/24 236/12 237/13 | 24/1 | 5/3 245/13 245/13 245/20 |
| 239/2 239/6 239/8 239/10 242/8 | 225/1 225/22 225/23 225/24 | 245/20 245/21 246/18 248/13 |
| 13/9 243/10 243/12 243/21 <br> 3/22 244/21 246/13 249/13 | 226/2 226/4 226/18 226/19 228/4 228/8 228/24 229/11 229/25 | 249/12 249/20 251/9 252/1 <br> 252/17 256/2 256/11 256/17 |
| 249/21 251/23 252/10 252/23 | 230/2 230/12 231/10 231/22 | 257/8 258/4 |
| 256/17 257/2 257/7 257/9 258/3 | 231/25 232/10 232/16 233/12 | here [42] 13/3 22/7 34/12 36/ |
| 258/9 260/5 | 233/12 233/20 234/18 234/20 |  |


| W | 145/16 145/21 146/19 146/20 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 52/21 54/6 55/11 | 147/22 148/1 148/20 149/7 | 138/18 144/20 150/21 156/22 |
| 70/6 76/21 77/4 77/9 81/23 81/25 | 150/16 150/21 150/25 152/8 | /1 163/11 173/6 175/12 178/7 |
| 93/2 112/15 119/1 132/5 135/24 | 152/17 153/1 153/3 153/17 | /18 182/3 182/9 197/21 202/3 |
| 142/16 149/2 158/25 170/20 | 153/23 153/24 154/5 156/1 | 229/2 233/16 248/3 248/3 253/22 |
| 171/17 174/3 176/20 180/1 | 156/24 157/22 158/22 159/2 | 256/9 256/10 257/14 257/20 |
| 183/25 184/17 184/20 188/20 | 162/3 164/1 164/10 165/8 165/12 | 258/6 258/10 259/5 259/ |
| 189/11 194/12 215/6 250/23 | $\begin{aligned} & 165 / 15 \text { 169/14 170/23 171/5 } \\ & 171 / 9171 / 11172 / 14174 / 16 \end{aligned}$ | widely [3] 75/21 152/15 153/8 wild [1] $82 / 7$ |
| 252/9 257/15 | 185/11 188/11 190/23 191/5 | $\text { wilful [1] } 161 / 12$ |
| eby [1] 33/2 | 192/8 194/6 196/3 196/25 199/19 | will [184] 7/19 7/ |
| wherever [1] 96/8 | 200/7 201/21 202/2 202/6 202/21 | 9/24 10/12 10/13 |
| whether [39] 38/1 39/17 60/20 | 203/1 203/16 208/19 209/16 | 13 |
| 76/24 76/25 84/25 92/22 93/5 | 209/23 212/1 213/19 215/2 | 17 14/20 15/3 16/7 |
| 95/2 95/3 138/16 148/24 152/21 | 225/11 227/1 227/12 227/19 | 21/1 22/5 |
| 152/22 157/9 180/11 181/25 | 233/11 240/1 241/10 242/20 | 24/21 26/7 28/18 29/21 |
| 185/14 195/7 201/14 218/14 | 246/14 247/7 247/19 248/25 | 30/21 31/10 32/6 32/19 |
| 234/7 234/8 240/16 240/16 245/5 | 249/12 254/6 254/6 254/7 | /7 34/8 36/10 40/17 41/2 43/2 |
| 245/10 245/22 245/23 246/8 | while [13] 10/18 20/25 33/4 | /8 54/19 54/19 55/3 70/6 73 |
| 248/14 252/6 252/23 253/5 253/6 | 55/22 58/17 60/1 67/5 86/6 | 89/7 89/11 89/17 |
| 253/11 256/23 256/23 257/1 | 163/16 199/12 208/23 226/2 | 94/25 95/2 95/7 95/11 95/16 97/1 |
| which [208] 7/5 7/19 10/4 14/7 | 249/24 | /2 97/3 97/4 97/5 97/11 97/13 |
| 14/11 14/23 18/9 19/1 19/13 22/4 | whilst [2] 163/10 260/1 | 97/15 99/6 99/9 99/14 100/1 |
| 22/9 24/11 27/23 30/20 32/1 32/2 | whims [1] 39/3 | 100/7 100/25 101/13 102/9 |
| 34/22 35/19 36/1 36/11 40/25 | who [60] 7/17 7/23 8/6 8/15 8/20 | 104/2 104/4 104/10 105/3 105/1 |
| 41/2 42/19 44/25 47/20 51/16 | 8/25 9/8 24/8 33/19 35/9 35/10 | 106/14 111/25 113/18 |
| 55/18 57/12 57/15 58/5 58/15 | 43/12 48/2 77/14 91/11 91/ | /4 116/11 116/11 116/ |
| 59/15 61/21 62/5 63/11 63/12 | 92/6 92/13 93/4 101/6 102/10 | 7/3 117/13 120/21 122/25 |
| 66/10 67/4 67/21 72/11 74/7 | 102/12 103/21 111/14 111/25 | /18 128/23 128/25 129/13 |
| 74/20 77/5 77/6 78/24 79/25 | 112/1 112/5 114/2 | 132 |
| 81/14 90/25 92/19 95/6 95/12 | 127/24 128/14 130/19 136/8 | 4/15 138/25 139/11 139/12 |
| 95/22 96/13 96/20 96/22 97/1 | 140/3 141/13 159/24 161/22 | 139/15 139/17 13 |
| 97/21 97/23 98/1 98/4 98/7 98/16 | 164/19 164/25 166/8 170/7 | 158/6 160/23 162/4 162/20 |
| 99/10 100/17 101/15 102/23 | 174/11 175/9 182/4 201/13 205/4 | 162/21 163/19 163/21 164/1 |
| 103/16 103/25 105/3 105/4 | 209/2 213/5 215/4 225/25 229/16 | 164/21 167/24 170/2 170/6 |
| 105/10 105/11 105/15 105/15 | 229/22 231/12 231/13 232/5 | 170/13 171/2 176/22 177/13 |
| 105/18 105/19 105/21 105/22 | 240/20 249/9 259/7 261/8 261/ | 7/18 179/3 179/4 181/1 |
| 105/25 106/1 106/12 106/22 | whoever [1] 225/1 | 1/21 184/5 184/11 186/3 |
| 107/4 108/18 110/1 110/4 110/11 | WHOIS [1] 23/2 | 6/10 186/11 186/12 186/14 |
| 111/10 112/20 112/25 114/3 | whole [8] 27/24 | 7/7 187/18 187/21 187/24 |
| 114/11 116/3 119/12 120/12 | 157/8 168/8 175/18 175/24 | /1 191/5 191/22 193/7 197/1 |
| 121/8 121/20 122/8 123/5 123/8 | 205 | 7/19 197/21 198/12 199/6 |
| 123/9 125/2 125/7 125/20 125/23 |  | 202/9 202/16 204/5 204/5 204/6 |
| 126/7 126/25 129/15 130/9 | whom [1] | 4/8 204/12 204/16 204/21 |
| 130/15 130/16 130/22 133/9 | whose [1] 244/2 | 6/2 206/13 218/1 22 |
| 134/5 134/9 135/3 136/18 136/19 | why [52] 13/19 16/20 16/23 17/7 | 220/14 221/24 230/7 230/8 |
| 137/4 137/6 137/8 137/11 137/15 | 17/20 33/6 35/2 35/3 35/25 40/16 | 230/10 237/8 245/2 246/12 249/8 |
| 138/6 138/10 139/19 140/5 140/7 | 48/11 50/2 50/3 77/13 86/12 <br> 107/15 98/20 100/22 108/14 | 250/9 250/14 250/21 251/7 |
| 141/9 142/7 143/1 143/21 144/23 |  |  |


| W | 257/13 259/19 | 124/21 128/7 129/10 132/17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
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    accorded to different investors. If the Claimant accorded with respect to an investor or investment of a non party or another party in like circumstances, no violation of article 10.4 can be established. In other words, the Claimant must identify a measure adopted or maintained by a party through which that party accorded more favourable treatment as opposed to speculation as to how a hypothetical measure might have applied to investors of a non party or another party.

    A party that does not accord treatment through the mere existence of provisions in its other international agreements, such as umbrella clauses or clauses that impose autonomous or fair and equitable standards. Treatment, according by a party, could include however measures adopted or maintained by a party in connection with carrying out its obligations under such provisions.

    With respect to the third component of an MFN claim, a claimant must also establish that the alleged nonconforming measures that constituted less favourable treatment are not subject to the exceptions contained in annex 2 of the US-Colombia TPA. In particular, both parties reserved the

[^1]:    70 per cent, it refers to a decree of the government $\quad$ 15:27 as the basis for that 70 per cent. Decree $1082 / 2015$. It is not an exhibit but it is one of Respondent's decrees, so -- but I don't believe it has anything to do with ITU. But the decree is not in the record even though it is referred to as being ITU's, which would be odd because it is a decree, not a report.

    Lastly, with regard to the US submissions, we appreciate them coming to the hearing, always good to see my compatriots making arguments, I would say that the discussion of most favoured nations in measures, in how those measures can be actionable if they relate to measures taken by the state, then those measures are different. I would ask that that be considered.

    And when we looked at the slide we saw there was a discussion - in that slide there was a discussion about how these are all different - but the focus of the US was more on the measures and how the measures affect the investor rather than some of the alleged differences highlighted today, so I would just bring that to the Tribunal's attention and highlight that part of the US' submission.

    With that, Mr President, we have no more
    
    

[^2]:    MR GOUIFFÈS: Thank you. One last 15:46 question for you, Mr Castaño. You also mention in your witness statement that you were in frequent contacts with .CO Internet as part of your role. Can you please describe how were your contacts with .CO Internet, please?

    MR CASTANO: Well, my contact with .CO Internet SAS, as I mentioned earlier, was in my role as the supervisor of the 019 contract, and we had to meet with them in person to receive information directly from the operator, from the concessionaire, with regards to how the domain was growing, the activities that were going on, any steps that had been taken by the operator, and when I became director of IT industry development, until I left that post the communications had always been very open and fluid, so once again as a supervisor of the contract I had frequent relations with .CO Internet SAS. I also had communications with CO Internet SAS regarding their requests for the extension of the concession, but most of the contacts that I had with them was within the framework of my role as supervisor of the contract.

    PRESIDENT: Thank you very much.
    MR AUBRY: May I give the witness a copy

[^3]:    entity which is one hundred percent state owned, but
    212
    I'm not a government employee, according to Colombian law.

    MR BALDWIN: You don't work for MinTIC any more?

    MR CASTANO: No, sir. I do not
    MR BALDWN: Just for clarification purposes, when did you start working for MinTIC generally?

    MR CASTANO: For the Ministry of Information and Communications Technology I started working in August of 2016, so I started working for MinTC in 2016.

    MR BALDWN: And if you hear me pause, Mr Castaño, it is only because I am waiting for the answer to finish.

    You started in August 2016 and you stated that you started working on the contract, the 2009 concession for .CO Internet, in August of 2018, is that right?

    MR CASTANO: Yes, that is correct.
    MR BALDWIN: Was that a change you requested or was that something someone asked you to do?

    MR CASTANO: Well, it was a promotion

[^4]:    obviously.
    MR BALDWN: Do you have any legal training at all?

    MR CASTANO: No.
    MR BALDWN: If you had a legal question, let's say in your job with MinTIC, particularly from August 2018, your job as the director of IT, if you had a legal question, how would you resolve it?

    MR CASTANO: Well, to get a response to a legal question I would go to the department's legal advisers. We had a number of legal experts that would advise on different projects and they would provide me support in reviewing legal documents and in understanding the regulatory aspects if ever I had a question from the management side of things. However, the Ministry in any event has two departments, or did have at the time when I was there, have two departments responsible for establishing the Ministry's political [interpretation corrected from 'political' to 'policy', see below] positions, and there would be a legal adviser on the one hand and also the Secretary General. Those were the two departments responsible for establishing the legal positions of the Ministry, depending on what their competences were.

[^5]:    against which we could compare. We could not know
    if the numbers of sold registries were those that were reported by .CO Internet. Or maybe it was different. We could not check that.

    So we were reliant, we had to rely on the information provided by .CO Internet, and also we had the terms agreed by contract concerning agreements on the level of service, and the service rates. So in those agreements on the service rate or level, we relied as well on the information that was provided by .CO Internet, because we didn't have a third party with which we could compare.

    For instance, to know if during the last months, let's say, the level of availability in the servers was 99.9 per cent, let's say, if that was the agreed level. So we were reliant, we had to rely on the information provided by .CO Internet because we didn't have alternative sources with which to compare those data

    And, on the other hand, as I was saying, the two contractors that supervised those contracts, as they didn't have any other alternative source of information, or to make some kind of elaborate analysis, of course it was a kind of operational and repetitive task. That is all they could do in order

[^6]:    MR CASTANO: The report was a very
    232
    preliminary report. It was a report by the previous government for the new government, and in fact they had the opportunity to work with the Vice-Minister who submitted that report, but I had cognizance of that report only after, when I was appointed as a director for the development of the IT industry. That is when I started addressing those issues. And the report was intended to let the new government know what was the situation, situation that could arise concerning the domain .CO, and more specifically in that report you find different issues, different aspects of the domain .CO. On the one hand you have issues that are related to the market. Then it also touches legal questions and also financial questions, so basically what the new government is being told is there is a possibility, there is a possibility to extend, but if you are going to extend it is very important to consider all the elements that should be updated, taking into account the current situation and the current trend of the market, and then there is another choice, another possible alternative, and that one is a new tendering process with the possibility of updating everything.

[^7]:    we understood that it was very important to include 16:30
    those elements within the new process .
    MR BALDWIN: Do you recall when the ITU report was released?

    MR CASTANO: The last one was released in May 2019, the final report. May 2019.

    MR BALDWN: Do you recall when the first one was released?

    MR CASTANO: I think it was February of 2019 but I am not absolutely certain

    MR BALDWN: And, if you recall, how many reports of the ITU were released, prior to the final one, in May of 2019?

    MR CASTANO: I don't recall. I don't recall the total number of reports that the ITU issued, or published

    PRESIDENT: Mr Baldwin, we took advantage of our court reporters and interpreters earlier today with two lengthy opening statements and slides. I would like to take a break now. They deserve a break as well as everybody else. Is this a convenient time?

    MR BALDWIN: It is very convenient, and I would appreciate it as well as everybody else.

    PRESIDENT: Mr Castaño, you are giving

[^8]:    these advisory committee meetings was when the issue
    252 of the tender or the extension of the contract was discussed?

    THE INTERPRETER: I amsorry, could you repeat the question please?

    MR BALDWIN: Yes. I asked whether it could be possible to have excluded. CO Internet representatives from those portions of the advisory committee meetings where the extension or tender were being discussed, particularly the tender, because you said that that could be seen by other bidders as being unfair.

    My question is, you having been at those committee meetings and having been in that role until August 2019, is it your position that from your time there, the only time that .CO was excluded from a meeting is when that meeting was talking about the tender or the extension of the contract? Is that your position?

    MR CASTANO: My position is that .CO Internet SAS's exclusion from the Committee was mainly because of the conversations or discussions that were being had about whether or not to extend the contract and considering also that if the advisory committee was discussing other issues over

[^9]:    MR BALDWIN: Just one clarification,
    256
    because I think it was a little bit confusing. When you are saying law. co, you are saying name of the entity.law.co, so it is a double. Or are you saying law.co is the one you would buy. Just law.co. Okay. So you are not talking about generic domains meaning the extension, the last $2,3,4,5$, the dot something? You are talking about before the dot?

    MR CASTANO: No. That is why I was thinking about dot travel or dot fun. And why? Because when I say, if I have for instance a travel agency and the agency is called, let's say, London Expeditions, let's say, .co. Now what I can do is to have London Expeditionstravel. Instead of having .co, we have .travel.

    MR BALDWIN: That clears it up. I was confused when you were saying law.co would be a new one. Let's go to this. So you are writing in this paragraph 9 the second bullet point, you are writing about something that happened in2012, and you are relating events that happened inlate 2018/early 2019, so by that timeyou understood, I can see that in 2012 whether somebody would be wondering whether it would be positive or negative for the .co -sales of the .co domain. By late 2018 you would

