

ICANN

**Moderator: Chantelle Doerksen
May 10, 2018
10:00 am CT**

Operator: Recordings are started.

Chantelle Doerksen: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the BC Members call on Thursday, May 10, 2018. In the interest of time attendance will be taken by the phone bridge and the Zoom chat room.

I'd like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes, and to keep your microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

With that I will turn it over to Claudia Selli to begin. Claudia please go ahead.

Claudia Selli: Thank you very much Chantelle and welcome everybody to the BC call. In the interest of time I will leave the floor to Steve so that we can start with the policy calendar. Steve over to you.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you Claudia. The policy calendar was emailed on Tuesday and then I sent an update this morning to reflect the latest version of our draft letter to

the board, and another item that could require some member input that Marie had passed along.

We have two comments filed since our last call. On the 7th of May we commented on the draft final report of the independent review of the NomCom, so we call it the NomCom 2 review since it's the second of these reviews.

They're required every five years as part of the ICANN bylaws where the board has to contract with an external evaluator to assess whether any of the ACs and SOs is still fulfilling an effective purpose, and whether its processes and structure can be improved to increase its effectiveness.

So this is for the Nominating Committee where the BC has three members currently active: Zahid, Cheryl and Jay Sudowski. And we thank Lawrence Olawale-Roberts for drafting a BC comment and thank Marilyn Cade for some edits that she provided.

I had to hurry to do a lot of the cleanups and consolidate that into a cohesive comment and we submitted it on the 7th of May. Thanks again for your help with that.

On the 5th of May we also filed comment on proposed revisions to ICANN's bylaws in one specific area, and that is the area of how the GNSO exercises its powers under the Empowered Community provisions that we added to the bylaws as a result of the IANA transition and enhancing ICANN accountability.

The BC was a leader in that entire process and did structure the bylaws in a way that enhanced the community's ability to hold the board accountable to the community.

When we did so we anticipated that GNSO would speak through its constituencies and stakeholder groups, but in a process that's taken most of the last two years GNSO Council asserted that Council would speak for the GNSO, and we fought that battle bravely but did not have the votes to prevail.

So Council will exercise GNSO's authority for the Empowered Community and in our comment we reiterated why we thought Council should not have that role; that the GNSO constituencies themselves should have the role.

I want to thank Barbara Wanner for helping me draft that and I'm glad we got it in on time. I'll watch the participant list to see if anyone raises their hand. Otherwise I'll move briskly through this.

I know that it's different than Adobe so a lot of you are not as familiar, but there is a participants list and if you click on the Participants in Zoom there's a place in the bottom left where you can click on the raised hand and I'll watch for that. Thank you.

All right, moving on to the current open public comments I only have three to cover so this will go relatively quickly. The first is a – the accountability transition has a Workstream 2.

It's well into our second year. We were trying to develop enhancements to accountability and transparency that were not necessary to implement prior to the transition of late 2016/late 2017.

So what we've done here is published a massive report of all of the Workstream 2 recommendations. There's nine sets and it's an effort to only ask community whether some of these recommendations are inconsistent with each other, like they clash versus something being done for human rights could clash with another that's being done in transparency.

So I have asked Andrew Mack, Barbara Wanner, Jimson, Alan and Denise all of whom were participants to examine their respective sections of the report and look for clashes.

I myself dove in and looked and didn't see any particular problems, so my recommendation to all of you is that we provide a brief comment from the BC saying quote, "The BC is not aware of any material inconsistencies between recommendations, and we believe the CCWG accountability has met the requirements of the bylaws for Workstream 2 and should deliver its recommendations to the board and chartering organizations for approval," and that step then would occur early this summer.

Are there any objections to my recommended course of action on that? Great. I'll proceed that way. That comment is due, let's see, the 11th of May.

It's due tomorrow so I'll be putting that in as a quick email comment from the BC. Thanks Marie. Hearing a phone ring. It's the Verizon conference bridge if somebody can...

Steve DelBianco: Okay great. Thank you. The second one is an initial report on the Customer Standing Committee. These comments close June 1 so we have a little time but I do need a volunteer.

This is a relatively easy one and it has to do with the charter for one of these new organizations we created as a result of the ICANN IANA transition. The Customer Standing Committee is the customers of the IANA functions for names and numbers, and that Customer Committee has a charter and its charter sort of steps into the shoes of the U.S. Commerce Department's NTIA for the first 18 years of ICANN's life.

Now the review that has come in recommends only minor changes to the charter regarding these remedial action procedures. It was recommendations prepared by Interisle.

No, Interisle did the other – the root server one. But this particular set of charter changes are easy to understand, so I would look for a BC member to volunteer to assess and draft the BC comment on this initial report.

Looking for a hand or somebody to mention in the chat; again relatively easy. My guess is that an hour to two hours of work is all it would take to read through that and give the BC a recommended comment, but even an easy one for a new member of the BC.

Okay no volunteers. Then we go to the next one. It's the final set of open public comments. It's on the draft final report for another of these ACs and SOs that I said gets reviewed every five years.

This is a report of the Root Server System Advisory Committee. We usually abbreviate that as the RSSAC. Interisle Consulting did the review. This is a very competent group of technical experts who did some great work on domain name collision several years ago.

Now the recommendations are relatively straightforward. They want the RSSAC to engage more transparently with the rest of the ICANN community, because few of what – few of us actually understand what’s happening in the RSSAC since they don’t publish as much of what they’re up to.

They need volunteers to draft a BC comment. Do we have any BC members with familiarity to the Root Server System Advisory Committee? This is all about the security and stability of the distributed set of root servers that are used to propagate the root table to ISPs around the world for purpose of resolving domain names and email addresses and Web traffic.

Looking for a volunteer, and again I believe this is a one to two hour volunteer commitment. Are we sure Zoom is working? I’m not seeing any volunteers coming up.

Okay. All right. The only other policy item before we turn to Channel 2 is the ever-present issue of ICANN’s changes to WHOIS in a way that it believes must be done to comply with the GDPR.

We’ve talked about this on every call and every meeting for approximately the past 11 months, and things are coming to a head this weekend. The ICANN Board will vote on the 12th of May on management’s proposal of a temporary policy, and temporary policies are those that a board alone can approve with a majority and that policy then takes effect.

It has to be renewed periodically but it’s meant to be temporary and should be replaced by a bottom up community-driven process called a PDP. That temporary policy is undoubtedly going to include the Calzone Model or Interim GDPR Compliance.

It's going to hide the true email address of the registrant from public WHOIS along with several other fields, and it will have no provision for third party private sector access to the non-public WHOIS fields.

We are joining our colleagues at the Intellectual Property Constituency to lobby the ICANN Board to come up with a commitment that this temporary policy include the deployment of an accredited access model such as the one that Margie, Denise, Tim Chen, Mason, Paul, Zack, Alex and others on the BC have been working on so hard for the past several months.

So that letter – the draft letter as of last night's edits is Attachment 2. I'll open that and I also want you to pay attention that we'd like to submit comments on Version 1.4 of the accreditation model as well, and Zack has been fantastic at coming up with some draft edits for that.

I'm going to open that BC letter to the board and display that for purposes of a discussion on this call to see if there are any final edits. We want to send this in the morning.

I hope it's visible on the screen. At this point I'd like to invite Margie, Mason, Denise, Paul, Tim, Zack, Alex, any of you have worked on this letter to talk to us about sections that you believe deserve some discussion with your BC colleagues. I'll take a queue on that. Just raise your hand or speak up.

Margie Milam: Steve it's Margie. Can you hear me?

Steve DelBianco: Perfectly. Go ahead Margie. Thank you.

Margie Milam: Sure. And I'm sorry. I'm driving. I just wanted to alert the BC that there's one section and Steve I don't know if you can go to it. It's a new section that

I discussed on the list yesterday and it relates to the GAC – the consideration of the GAC communiqué.

And my understanding is that the board intends to defer consideration of the GAC communiqué as it adopts the interim specification, and I think it's really important for the BC to comment on that.

And so the reason I wanted to raise that was that it's a new addition, and so if everyone could take a look at that I think it'd be an important thing for the BC to comment on.

Steve DelBianco: Margie thank you. I've moved the Zoom screen to the bottom of Page 2 where that section is present. BC members are aware of the board's effort to defer an answer to the GAC by claiming that the ultimate policy would honor GAC advice.

I agree with you. It's the board being too clever by half here. Unfortunately I don't know that the GAC has I guess the strength of commitment to stand up to this scorecard tactic that the board is using.

So I have highlighted that on the screen. Are there any questions for Margie on that particular section of our letter? Margie while I have you on the line I wanted to mention that we've made a lot of great progress on coming up with RDAP, Registry Directory Access Protocol, which is a federated access to WHOIS non-public fields that occurs whether they're Thick or Thin.

So I'm curious about the very final paragraph where it was added to complete the transition of .COM and .NET from Thin to Thick in addition to RDAP since the – one of the purposes of RDAP and the recent VeriSign that pushed

it so hard was that it eliminates the need to move hundreds of millions of records from Thin to Thick.

So why would we do both when RDAP seems to be the way we were going to proceed? Margie, Mason, anyone?

Margie Milam: Sure. Is Tim Chen on the call because those were in response to Tim's concerns and I can certainly talk about them if Tim's not on?

Steve DelBianco: Tim? Tim please? We don't hear you. Speak up. Tim, not hearing you. Tim thank you. Tim is saying in the chat that he'll send out a rationale for that.

And the most important question is if we're going to put all our eggs in the RDAP basket, why do we want to push for the completion of Thin to Thick for .COM and .NET?

And the second question would be does it matter what order we go in? It's my belief that RDAP can work with the Thin since it goes to the registrars to pick up the data and there's – then let's get RDAP done first because RDAP is the secret way for us to get non-public WHOIS access.

So Tim thank you for listening to the call. I'll look for an email from you after the call because I'm questioning whether it makes sense for us to have both in there.

And full disclosure – VeriSign is among the NetChoice members but they didn't bring this to my attention. I spotted it in the draft but wanted to bring it to your attention.

Margie Milam: And Steve it's Margie. If I could comment...

Steve DelBianco: Go ahead.

Margie Milam: ...I mean, I do believe Thick is an important change. What I was trying to do in the letter or what we were trying to do was really highlight the high priority ones, because there's all sorts of asks we have and I'm trying to focus on the ones that are most important so that we can make impact and not be diluted by a lot of, you know, other ones that are perhaps less important although, you know, I do support the move to Thick.

The reasoning I believe that Tim mentioned is that if you think about it there are so many registrars and so many registries that it makes it much more efficient to go at the registries, and then historically the registries tend to be, you know, more compliant if you will.

There's fewer of them because most of them are managed through a backend registry, so the number of entities that you have to go to in our servers in order to get the data is far less than if it's in a federated distributed model.

So the – so that – I believe those were some of their issues raised by Tim and I certainly agree with them. I just – in my view, you know, I was trying to really focus on the high priority ones but I was happy to include it when I heard others agreeing with Tim's position on that.

Steve DelBianco: That's right. So I'll take it as a to-do to confirm that RDAP does not require Thick, and when I confirm that I'll send it to the list and let everybody consider that.

We have some time before tomorrow morning when I'd like to send that letter into the board, and since it's federated access the sheer quantity of registrars or registries isn't really so much of an issue for us.

The users of RDAP – it can certainly be an issue for those who are hosting the RDAP. Okay great discussion. Appreciate that very much. I wanted to go to Channel 2 in the policy calendar.

I'll put the policy calendar back up on the screen and turn things back over to Susan and Marie, our Councilors.

Susan Kawaguchi: Thanks Steve. This is Susan Kawaguchi and Marie jump in in anything I've forgotten. We only had two motions/drafts meeting. One was to approve the comments on the GAC communiqué that went to the board, and the other which was very touching was a tribute to Stephane Van Gelder.

And Rafik wrote a very nice motion and in that motion he discussed, you know, he added all the fine points about Stephane and how much he'll be missed and how much work he did in the community, and that was delivered to Stephane's family so that was nice.

The Security and Stability and Resiliency or the SSR2 Review Team is going back to work. I think they're scheduling a meeting in July and I just double-checked that Scott McCormick is now a member of the team so we're moving forward there.

The RDS PDP - I'm on – I'm a Vice Chair on that again and lots of discussion with council leadership on how to move forward in light of the interim policy and having to come up with a policy within 12 months.

You know, it's quite a big hurdle so we're trying to think outside of the box. We'll see what happens. The RDS PDP Working Group will not be meeting in Panama and – because we're anticipating, you know, changes either to that working group or if it – there is envisioned by council a new sort of paradigm for the working group.

And then Marie you provided a nice report after the last council meeting. Is there anything you'd like to add?

Marie Pattulo: Thanks Susan.

Susan Kawaguchi: Otherwise that's all I have.

Marie Pattulo: No I don't have anything to add to the report itself, but I would like to highlight the first point that Steve has put into the policy agenda. There's a survey on SurveyMonkey until the 18th of May about the consensus policy implementation framework.

Now if you click on the survey it's pretty short but my concern is that it could be a review for the sake of reviewing reviews. If you look at some of the questions in there (unintelligible) should it be by standard cycle?

I would say yes but what concerns me more is who should be able to request or trigger a review, and it includes the suggestion of the public. Now I know that there are – I'm trying to be as little cynical as I can be here but I know there are certain members of the community who was – who specialize in keeping us as slow as possible by obfuscating and gerrymandering as much as possible.

And to me a review of a review by the public anytime they feel like it could be tricky, so I would encourage anyone that has an opinion on that to take five minutes out of their time and fill in the survey. Thank you. Back to you Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you. We'll jump now to Channel 3, which is the supporting discussion through our CSG liaison Barbara Wanner. And Barbara I have the link to the latest block schedule for ICANN and then a list of the cross-community sessions including the one we're doing with the IPC. Over to you.

Barbara Wanner: Great. Thanks very much Steve. I can be very brief - just provide some information on who the CSG has invited to their open meetings in Panama. Just to let everybody know on the 25th of June, which is the Monday meeting, the CSG closed session from 9:00 to 10:15 will be with Theresa Swinehart's group on the multi-stakeholder strategic initiatives exercise.

So we will – on – we will participate in that on Monday. Immediately following that on Monday from 10:30 to 12:00 we will meet with the GNSO-appointed ICANN Board members, Becky and Matthew, and also with Sarah Deutsch to hopefully enable more engagement with regret – with respect to GDPR WHOIS.

And then on Wednesday we will have the CSG open meeting from 12:00 to 1:15. This will be over the lunch hour and we have invited Goran to participate in that discussion with us and I'm open to topics for discussion.

You know, obviously we will want to press him further on GDPR WHOIS. So any other topics that you feel are timely and important on which to engage with Goran, I'd be grateful you can just shoot me an e-mail separately. So that is what we have in store for CSG meetings.

Then just in terms of old business, just to let everyone know that the CGS anyway has signed off on the procedures for selecting a board seat 14. We accepted an amendment offered by Wolf-Ulrich that simply clarified that the two votes from the Noncommercial Stakeholders Group and the Commercial Stakeholders Group that would determine the candidate must represent 60% of the house vote. So with that additional text, the CSG has forwarded it to the NCSG and we're awaiting their feedback.

So that's it from me. That's my report this time. Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Claudia, back to you.

Claudia Selli: Thank you, Steve. And I just wanted to touch on the ICANN 62 activities for BC. So we sent out - Chantelle sent out the request for a meeting with - the registrars. We are inviting (Keith) and (Graeme Buntun) and yes, I don't remember who else. But in any case, we sent out these for the BC open meeting.

Then we also reached out to Theresa for the strategic initiative and we were looking as well as the Monday at 3:00 until 4:45 for - to engage with that meeting.

And then the final information that I wanted to give concerns also a couple of spots that were available for members to participate in. One was the CROP funding and we had two seats. So one was already been allocated and the second one was free for which I sent out the request of interest, went to Gabriela Szlak, and congratulations Gabriela. So she will be participating as well in our outreach in Panama.

And the second funding opportunities that we had concerned the onboarding program. We had two persons apply for an extra spot that we had. So the first one went - the first spot that we had went to Omar. And the second one that was available, we had two participants. Unfortunately, one of the participants didn't have a VISA to travel to Panama and so Marilyn Cade was the only eligible candidate. So this spot went to her.

And that's it concerning the funding program that we had running. And then it's over to Jimson. Thank you.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay. Thank you very much, Claudia. This is Jimson Olufuye speaking. Let me begin with a quick review. You've been informed that we've been working on the BC FY19 budget proposal. The full detail will be coming up shortly but I can give you some review of FY18 budget pro forma thus far.

I reported in San Juan it is the case that the BC FY18 budget pro forma has been positive. Income which is primarily be from membership was fully paid up. We have 13 new members thus far, four resigned, giving the current membership of 73. And that is a 14% growth thus far, 14% growth. And our account balance is about \$175K.

Total income around \$41K, a 20% decrease over that of FY17, which is due to reduction in - the fee reduction policy that we started in FY18. You can remember in March 2017 we decided to reduce our fees.

Total expenditures thus far, \$28K. And that is lower than what we projected. But once we have this approval for the research to be conducted in Lat Am, in Latin America, then that will be adjusted.

With the (current FY19) information budget, and we're still working on the fees with (concerns) with 70% discount for members from developing nations, according to UN categorization standard. And we also assumed the ICANN secretarial support will continue. We don't have details of what ICANN will cut yet but we are watching out. And also assumed that we will continue to outsource our invoicing and banking and Web maintenance services.

Well, I as I said - just mentioned we're looking at various options maybe to replace services that would be cut by ICANN. And we're looking at leadership development, and we have a BC version.

Usually, ICANN give us two slots for leadership development by meeting. We could decide to fill out the two but in this case, different - the two being non-BC members won't be BC members that is dedicated, committed to policy work and the - except the committee who make the decision on that - this on criteria, defined criteria.

And the second seat would go to a non-BC traveler spot of our strategy to boosting membership. And this particular initiative has been working really because we've received increased membership through that effort.

Then and the last thing is CROP. We know CROP is very popular. CROP is a program of outreach that would enable members to conduct outreach in their region or outside their region. So we're looking at the finance committee. We're looking at how we can replicate this for BC in case it is caught by ICANN. And we could be looking at two out-of-region CROP or three in-region CROP so of course, using the coach class rates, you know, for flights and hotel.

And you can also recall that you approved the fourth officer's travel to ICANN's 63, 64, 65. So that is approved. So that will be - and did that in the plan or FY19.

And consigning new membership - the new members, I would like to thank Andrew Mack and Outreach committee...

Claudia Selli: Jimson. Jimson, sorry to interrupt you but I see that two members have their hands up, Steve and Gabriela. Just for you to know.

Jimson Olufuye: Oh, okay. All right. Thank you for that, Claudia. So maybe we'll take - I don't know who is first. Maybe we'll take Gabriela. Gabi?

Gabriela Szlak: I'm sorry. It's just a hand for after Jimson finishes, that's fine. Thank you.

Steve DelBianco: Jimson, it's Steve.

Jimson Olufuye: And Steve?

Steve DelBianco: Yes, thank you, Jimson. I just wanted to ask you, this is something we discussed in San Juan, but what is the balance in the BC's reserve funds at this time?

Jimson Olufuye: Yes. I actually mentioned it. I said it was \$175K, \$175,000.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you.

Jimson Olufuye: That is what we have balance now.

Steve DelBianco: Thank you.

Jimson Olufuye: All right. So I will say that I would like to really appreciate Andrew Mack and the outreach committee for their work in bringing about three to five new members. Once they pay, they will be announced in our next meeting.

In the meantime, from the LookingGlass Cyber Solutions, their acquisition of Cyveillance, they have replaced Cyveillance in the BC. And I note that Kristin Doan, the new representative for LookingGlass is on this call.

So I would like to say welcome to you Kristin. Chantelle, the secretariat, will have sent some material to you. If not, she will send those materials to you, to enable you to get quickly connected with how we function in the BC, some resources that will provide more information about our work we do.

And on the FY19 invoices, if you have yet to receive your FY19 invoice, I do expect it before the end of this week. We are experiencing some glitches which have been corrected. And we expect invoices to fully go out, if not today, before the end of the week.

So I'd like to say thank you. That will be all from me for now. So maybe Gabriela and the other (unintelligible) that want to (unintelligible). Gabi? Gabi, over to you.

Gabriela Szlak: Oh, awesome. Can you hear me?

Jimson Olufuye: Yes, please.

Gabriela Szlak: Excellent. Sorry, I was just muted. So first of all, I want to thank everyone about the CROP funding and I'm happy to see you all soon in Panama.

I just want two minutes to comment on a call that we had this week together with Andy Mack and also with a guy named Marcelo Burman. And he's the CEO of Grupo Cerca, which is an organization that is based in the Panama region. This is about the idea of organizing an outreach event with the help of this work. We have worked together with this group in the past at eCommerce Institute and organized events in Panama so I thought this was a great contact.

And so we asked them if they were willing to help us with organizing something with the local business community and they were willing to do so. They also have an IT magazine that is the only IT magazine in the region. And so he also offered this to give us the chance to write an article inviting some general to the ICANN meeting or talking about the BC or even about our event.

And I want to have the BC of course feedback on this. We will have an outreach call next week. Probably we will discuss this as well. I already reach out to Chris Mondini and Rodrigo de la Parra. And I asked them if they were on board in this. They said yes. So having a call tomorrow. And so I will send afterwards an e-mail with more details and ask for your feedback and whatever you have to add.

I know that there was a very successful event in San Juan. This time, this persons said that for the Panama audience we will need something more formal with probably speakers. So I will send all of this on the e-mail list and ask for your feedback.

On the other hand, there's a voting right now on the study proposal that it's about actually bringing more sustainable participation from the global south to our group, to the BC. And so I'm hearing the goal and you can ask me any

questions about this proposal or on list or privately, whatever you need. I'm here and happy to answer any questions on this. Thank you.

Jimson Olufuye: Okay. Thank you, Gabi. And if there's any financial information for the outreach phone call in Panama, please let us know specifically after your call tomorrow. Steve?

Steve DelBianco: Thank you, Jimson. It's a question for Gabi, Mark or Andrew Mack. Those of you who submitted this proposal that's on the screen right now, I get the sense, having read it carefully, that this is not to recruit one, two or ten particular members. It's not an outreach event.

It's a proposal to come up with recommendations to change the way we do the outreach we do to get new members in Latin America and Caribbean. And I think you're suggesting that you believe it's likely that the way in which the members from those regions will participate could be a little different than it is today or perhaps different than it is for others and that you're endeavoring to come up with a proposal on how we would maximize the recruitment, retention and activity of Latin American/Caribbean members.

So if I have that right, let me know. And also let me know whether if the membership approved this expenditure of \$25,000 from our \$175K reserve funds, would you be able to complete a substantial part of the work when we convene in Panama? Thank you, Gabi.

Gabriela Szlak: Yes, thank you for the comments, Steve. Regarding the first issue, yes, you captured exactly what we want to do. And this is basically something that came out due to my own experience participating at ICANN and trying to get more members from my region. I have worked so hard on this and I have been

just not successful. And I don't think this was because of that events were not attractive or the things that we do didn't match.

The work that we do, the way we do it, it's so different from our ways of working and the different resources that companies reserve for this type of activity. So the idea is to go a little deeper and understand how we can find a model that can be sustainable for our region in terms of participation.

This is like a personal thing for me. I want to really understand how to make our region more active at ICANN because everything that we do... Of course there are things that are a little bit, I don't know if in English you have this word endogamic. About ICANN, like we talk too much about ourselves and about our processes. But at the same time, many of these processes really end up with policies that really affect most of the businesses in my region.

So not having their voices here is something that I really think we should change. And I think it's going to be better for us to have a group that really represents the world or at least more voices from different countries and different perspectives.

Regarding your question about if we are going to get it done... And of course if someone else has or if you want to me talk a little more about this, I can add anything. But regarding if we're going to get it done before Panama, I think that what we really want to do is to take advantage of the Panama meeting for some interviews.

And so we really want to have for Panama everything that is like proprietary work to get there with the right questionnaires, the right interviews, the right people that we want to ask questions, not only from the ICANN meeting. I mean, we want to talk also with local. And I think that we are going to be able

to do some part of the delivery and have of course feedback. What we want to do there is deliver something that will help us...

Also, BC members are very, very important for us in terms of finding new models for participation because you are the ones that know how we work. And you are the ones that can think about different models as well. So I think the meeting will be very important for us in terms of... That's why I really want to go there and be there this time.

I don't think we're going to finish for Panama because this was supposed to start on April, if you see the timeline and everything. But - so we are late already in the, yes, thing for that. But of course, we are going to get there with a lot - most of the preparation work ready and everything that we need to have done to get to those interviews prepared and ready and then to be able to analyze everything that we got.

This is not the only - like the idea is not to only have interviews in Panama of course. We're going to have lot of other interviews also by phone and in some communities we'll have personal interviews. But we are going to take advantage of that opportunity. Thank you.

Claudia Selli: Thank you, Gabi. And just to remind everyone that the voting is ending on the 11th of May, end of business. I think Chantelle has sent a reminder to everyone. So just take the time to do that.

And I don't know if there are other points that members want to raise or other questions?

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts: This is Lawrence. Please, I would like to be on the queue. I'm on the audio bridge only.

Claudia Selli: Sure. The floor is yours.

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts: Thank you. This is Lawrence for the records. Thank you, Gabi, for - and the rest of the team for coming up with this very innovative idea. I'm sure that to a large extent it will trickle down to seeing that we are able to onboard more companies from your region.

You know, we - you mentioned also that proposal (unintelligible) is going to be focusing on the global south. Africa is a key player in that region and I believe that most of the things that you have identified, we also have such challenges within our region here.

Is there any plan in what you're doing to cover - there will be... Maybe a better way to put it is at the end of the date, the solution that you're going to be putting forward to the BC, will it need to be adaptable to regions outside Latin America? Thank you.

Gabriela Szlak: Thank you so much for the question. And of course, it's very important for us to come up with a study that can be replicated in other regions and also there resulting and the new participation, I think that will be really relevant for the global south in general. And what we can do is kind of make a follow-up action to add some particularities. Of course, it's not the same concepts and it's a different continent, whatever.

But these are things that are affecting all the global south currently in terms of participation and in terms of constraints that we have. And so I think that this will be very useful. I cannot say it will be directly applicable but I'm sure we can of course replicate parts of the body, go deeper as well and use all that we have... If we really do it and we got the opportunity to do this research and

bring up - came up with some results, then of course we can use those to help in general the global south. And of course, we will need local people from Europe, from Africa, from different countries to be leading this second part of the study. Thank you.

Lawrence Olawale-Roberts: Thank you.

Claudia Selli: Anyone else from the audio bridge have questions? No. I don't see any other hands up.

So the next meeting is going to be held on the 24th of May. And if there are no other points, I will close the call.

Chantelle, I think we can adjourn the call. And thank you very much, everybody, for participating into the BC call.

Chantelle: Thank you, Claudia. Operator, you may now stop the recording. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and enjoy the rest of your day.

END