
CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the BC Members call on Wednesday, January 23rd, 2019. In the interest of time, attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect Room and the phone bridge.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for the transcript, and keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid background noise.

With this, I'd like to turn it over to our BC Chair, Claudia, to begin. Claudia, please go ahead.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Hi, Chantelle. Welcome, everybody, to the BC call. In the interest of time, I will leave the floor to Steve for the policy calendar.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Claudia. Chantelle is going to load the policy calendar. I sent this e-mail around yesterday to all of you. If you didn't receive it, e-mail me during the call and I'll send it again.

We've only had one public comment filed since our last BC member call, and we filed that yesterday. It was a comment on a supplemental initial report issued by the Policy Development Process group (or PDP group), who's looking at the next round of gTLDs and what kind of procedures should be used in GNSO, particularly for top-level domain names.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

There's a subgroup called Work Track 5 that's looking only at the geographical top-level domains to the right of the dot. That was, it turned out, a rather controversial part of the last round. A lot of you know dot-patagonia, dot-amazon. It was dot-[spa]. And, a handful of other domain names at the top level, which had geographical significance but didn't necessarily involve a clear geographical term per the guidebook.

I want to thank a handful of volunteers, led by Statton Hammock. But, Andrew Mack. Vivek was fantastic help. So was Chris Wilson and Marilyn. I worked with all of them over the past couple of weeks on a very challenging comment. That's the one we filed yesterday. It was challenging because there were as many as 80 different questions, proposed recommendations, and proposals that we tried to comment on. That was filed, and thanks again.

I also want to thank Vivek in particular, who volunteered to fill the long empty spot of the BC representative on the PDP for Subsequent Procedures. So, Vivek, Chantelle is assisting in getting you on the official e-mail list of that PDP. You'll probably then begin to get e-mails on that that will target either Work Track 5 or the other tracks that are in there. So, we look to Vivek to give us some reports on how those PDPs are going.

Let me turn to the open public comments. There are seven open right now. I'm really pleased and proud of you all because for five of the seven we already have volunteers at work on the comment. That's a fantastic testament to the volunteer nature of this group.

Any of you who look at these comments that already have volunteers, this is a great opportunity to respond to the e-mail I circulated earlier, where I included the volunteers. We are happy to have other folks volunteer to join these drafting teams, in advance of them circulating a draft to the full BC, which we'll always do within seven days to spare before the comment period closes.

The two comments that we do need a volunteer on are number five, which is the amendment to the IANA naming functions contract. As you know, when the U.S. did the IANA transition, ICANN had set up multiple entities inside of ICANN, and they have a contract under the IANA naming functions. There's an opportunity to comment on amendments that are being proposed.

Do we have any volunteers in the BC who might want to sign up for that? This is number five on the list on the screen in front of you: IANA functions.

All right. I'll dig into the archives of where we commented last time on this contract and see whether that could be used to entice someone to step back up.

The other one we need a volunteer on is number seven. It's an initial report that was just issued on the Customer Standing Committee. Again, this is created as a result of the transition. The customers of the IANA functions, the registrars and registries, have a standing committee that evaluates whether the IANA functions are being performed in a way that is satisfactory to customer demands. So, there's been a report on the effectiveness of that committee. Those comments don't close until

the end of February, so we'll have some time to gather volunteers on that.

I then have a section in here on the report where we list the ongoing saga of trying to modify ICANN's WHOIS policies and contracts to comply with GDPR while preserving the ability of using WHOIS to prevent fraud and abuse. That is an ongoing struggle, since we have – Margie? If Margie is still on the line – thank you, John Berard, for volunteering on that.

Margie, while you're still on the line, let me ask you to report on the tempest in Toronto last week, where you and Mark attended.

MARGIE MILAM:

Hey, Steve, it's Margie. I'm sorry. I'm going to be driving, so it might be hard for me to say much. Perhaps you can elaborate. But, I did send the BC list the latest draft of the final report. We're on schedule to file the report on February 1st.

Unfortunately, what we've done is essentially defer to Phase II a lot of issues that are important to the BC, just because of the timing. And, there's very much a mindset in the EPDP group that, in order to make the May 31st – end of May – deadline, the report has to get published by February 1st in order to enable to public comment and other things necessary to get the policy adopted.

It was a pretty tough week. We worked hard with our colleagues both on the [IBC], the ALAC, and the GAC to try to push on issues that are important to the BC. Made some traction, some not.

Steve, I suggest probably the best thing to do is to perhaps set up a separate call with those interested in going issue by issue to work through the compromises and get a better understanding of where we landed. But, with that, I got to start driving, so, Steve, I'll hand it back to you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thanks, Margie. I hope you could stay on the line to listen to this. So, I am interested to know what you and Mark think the next step will be. Will there be a broad consensus call for the full final draft, [or it'll] be a separate consensus calls for each recommendation proposal? And, do think there's still time to make significant edits to the final report?

I know you're driving, so if you can't handle that, I understand.

MARGIE MILAM:

The issue of consensus hasn't been agreed on yet, so there's different takes on what consensus should be and whether it's an issue by issue perspective or the whole report. So, we really don't know.

In Toronto, we weren't making official consensus calls, but they were taking the pulse of the group, kind of instant polls, if you will. So, I don't believe [Kurt] [inaudible] and staff have given us a clear direction on what that means.

But, the one thing I wanted to share with the BC was that there are folks, especially in the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group, that were trying to minimize the influence of the BC members by essentially saying

that, if it wouldn't pass under the GNSO voting threshold at the council level, we wouldn't be able to essentially [affect] the consensus vote.

Fortunately, Alex Deacon and others – ALAC and myself – were able to at least share an alternative view on how to determine [consensus], meaning that you do look at the various constituencies and not just focus at the high level of the supporting organization level. I believe that that view gained some traction, which is why I think we were able to effectively make arguments in Toronto. [We're] supported by the ALAC and the GAC and sometimes the SSAC.

So, Steve, I don't know what your perspective is on that issue, but at the moment, it's really not clear how the consensus vote will take place.

Then, some things are open for discussion, things where we didn't reach firm agreement on. Others are not. I think the document I circulated with you that staff created is color-coded, so there are some areas where we could still impact the final language. [For other areas], it's probably not likely [without] a carefully crafted compromise.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Margie, thanks for that update. We're going to turn to Mark next, our other representative on the EPDP. [As you want to note], the council rules for voting exclude the votes of ALAC, GAC, and SSAC, who are parts of this EPDP. If they register views that align with the BC and IBC, while that may not influence a council vote, it will be very evident to the Board. When Council makes a recommendation that ignores the votes not just of the BC and IBC but the GAC, ALAC, and SSAC, we have a much

better chance of getting the Board to put its stamp on any proposals and recommendations that come through.

The key, though, is for us to get the GAC, SSAC, and ALAC to consolidate and articulate positions that they have in a way that, when it comes to consensus call votes, they show that there are five groups, not just one or two, on the PDP that don't agree with where the NCSG and Contracted Parties want to drive this thing.

Mark, I'll turn it to you next to give you perspectives on your time in Toronto.

MARK SVANCAREK:

Thanks, Steve. Well, one of the things that surprised me was – and Margie to confirm or deny, I guess – I perceived a new willingness of the Contracted Parties to work with us on some things. In the past, I think they've always held us at arm's length. The perspective had been, "Let's redact everything. It will be the best path to success." Now, I think there's a growing awareness of what that would actually mean in terms of their own costs: simply redacting things, [because] in the magic solution – because you're going to start getting requests, and you'll have to staff to deal with those requests.

I was talking to Alan Woods from Donuts. He's the only person at Donuts that's authorized to make disclosure, give permission for disclosures. He starting to think about now what will that mean. What's the volume going to be? He doesn't know. Will he have to staff up? He doesn't know.

So, it seems like they were more willing to play with us. I think the moderation was pretty good. There were some wrinkles to it. Sometimes there were a little inconsistencies, but I don't think it was ever – in previous times, the moderation, I think, has been not always in our favor. I think it was more in our favor this time, so that was good.

[inaudible] at one point, and during the break, he harangued the moderators for, like, a solid ten minutes, although this was immediately following me laughing in his face about some stupid proposal he had made. So, he was wound up at that point anyway.

I think most of the compromises we made were pretty good. There were a lot of things that we were not going to get, and I think where we landed was reasonable, given the circumstances.

So, I thought it was a mostly successful meeting, exhausting but pretty good.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Mark and Margie, for all the work you put in and all the travel and hours that it's taking to do this. I'll note that these disclosure requests, like the one you just described, will be with us with or without a unified access model. Not everybody would ever qualify to be an accredited party under UAM, so we'll always have to have the ability for registrars and registries to honor disclosure requests under GDPR 61F.

So, I think we're making some progress on that. Alex Deacon has been a huge help to move that along.

I did note on the list this morning that the NCSG is taking note of the fact that ICANN org is driving us towards having a unified access model for accredited entities to get required responses from registrars.

Stephanie [Perrin] is very nervous about that and registered her concerns today on the list because that is taking things to ICANN org, it's legal team, and the technical study group that's currently determining how RDAP could be used if we should ever arrive at a model where accredited entities get blessings from the data protection administrators. ICANN can then require the registrars to respond. That's all in Phase II of the EPDP, but it's in Phase I of what ICANN org is doing right now.

That's all I had for policy calendar for public comments. Are there any questions for Mark?

Channel 2 on this agenda, which I'll scroll to right now, covers what Council is doing. There hasn't been a council meeting since our last call. Their last council meeting we discussed on our previous call. The next council meeting is tomorrow, the 24th of January.

Now, neither Marie nor Scott could be on today's call, so I briefly summarized what's on the agenda right now. There are no motions on the council agenda, but there are three discussion items I wanted you to be aware of.

They're going to discuss whether Council is going to file its own comment on three open public comment periods. They're going to discuss a backup plan in case the EPDP were to fail, and they're going to discuss: leadership of Council had a proposal for what to do on the IGO

and INGO. That's the intergovernmental organizations and international non-governmental organizations.

With that, I'd like to turn over to Barbara Wanner to cover Channel 3, which is the work we do for the CGS, or Commercial Stakeholders Group. Barbara, I've scrolled your section up to the screen. Take it away.

BARBARA WANNER:

Okay. Thanks a lot, Steve. Basically, again, we're focusing on preparations for the CSG meetings in Kobe. I come back to, again, your thoughts and inputs concerning questions that we might propose, particularly to the Board in our joint meeting with them, and the other CSG constituencies and our meetings with Becky and Matthew, and, in particular, how we want to focus our meeting with the Contracted Party house.

A couple things came to the fore in our call yesterday, our [CSGX Com] call yesterday, one of them being that we did agree that we would continue the format that we've done in the past several ICANN meetings of devoting the first 40 to 45 minutes of our meeting with the Board to sort of combine CSG engagement with the Board, focusing on EPDP and the uniform access model.

The last time around, we kind of had our wrists slapped because we seemed to be asking questions for the sake of posing questions.

So, we can go about this in a couple of ways. You can e-mail me the questions that you feel we should address in that 45-minute session with the Board, focusing on the EPDP and UAM. We can convene a

conference call, perhaps involving CSG representatives on the EPDP to determine how to streamline and make those questions more coherent. Or, you can leave that task to the [CSGX Com]. We will convene again on the 12th for the express purpose of making sure that we've developed a set of coherent questions for the Board that isn't duplicative among the constituencies.

I've also proposed specific BC topics to raise with them during the 15 minutes that we will have to engage separately with the Board. If you have any better ideas or would like to [have me elaborate] on what I proposed, again, please contact me directly.

If you feel that we aren't making appropriate use of these opportunities for engagement, not only with the Board but with Xavier in our CSG open meeting, then, really, I invite you right now to step up and offer your thoughts as to what topics we should cover.

What I've provided is really for the purpose of getting the wheels going, getting the wheels in motion, and perhaps stimulating people's thinking. But, if you feel that we haven't made good use of that time, then now is your time to step up and provide alternative questions for us to consider.

Finally, Cherine has asked all of the SOs and ACs to give thought to a couple of different questions. Steve has included them as bullet points on the last page of the policy calendar. He wants all of the SOs and ACs to go to Kobe, prepared to offer four suggestions, three concerning what the Board, ICANN org, and the community should do to prepare for successful implementation of strategic plans, financial planning, and

so forth. Then ... let's see – oh, how ICANN might reach out to form alliances and partnerships with other organizations in pursuit of some of those strategic objectives.

So, I need your thoughts on how we might address those questions because we're going to be expected to step up and offer them at Kobe. I have a couple of ideas, and I'm willing to share them with the group.

So, Steve, if it's okay with you, why don't I just do a separate follow-up e-mail to BC-Private, focusing on these two bullet points. I'll propose my thinking on how we might address one of these bullets and then invite comments from everyone else.

How do people feel about that?

Okay. Steve says, "Good." Then, that's it from my report. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Barbara. That's it for the policy calendar. Marilyn Cade, you have a question?

Cannot hear you, Marilyn.

MARYLIN CADE:

You can now.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

We do now.

MARILYN CADE:

Thanks. Barbara, thank you so much for this. When I read this, what's encouraging me is the challenges that ICANN is receiving from, in particular, the Contracted Parties, questioning their engagement – and from in the NCSG as well, which I'm seeing in the GNSO SO Budget Working Group from Ayden in particular; significant challenges about why ICANN is engaging with external entities.

I will just mention a couple that I think present significant threat to ICANN if we're not engaged as ICANN, and that is the ITU but also maybe too much focus on the ITU and not enough positive engagement in UNESCO and in UNCTAD but also keeping a careful, watchful eye on what's going on at the U.N. in the cybersecurity area.

Do you have any hint for what – does this seem to be the direction that they're concerned about? Or, are they concerned about trying to re-strengthen their relationship with other groups, such as ISOC, IETF, etc.?

BARBARA WANNER:

You know, Marilyn, I have no idea. This just came from Cherine, and then Chantelle very kindly forwarded it to us. I have the same thought as you concerning the importance of continuing to engage at the ITU. I think the point you make about the other organizations also is important, particularly at the U.N. General Assembly, which of course is Veni's remit to cover developments up there pertaining to cybersecurity.

So, I would encourage us to continue to make those points. I have no idea how to read this. This is exactly what came from the Board. So, I'm taking it at face value. If you feel that we should also make mention of

the importance of continuing to work with ISOC and IETF and so forth, we can certainly add that, too. But, I think we should address this as broadly as we want to. That's just my thought.

Also, Jimson did our supplementary budget proposal concerning GAC CSG meeting. I know he'll talk about that in his segment, but I just thought I'd mention that. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

No other questions or hands up, so we'll go to Claudia to pick up the agenda.

CLAUDIA SELLI:

Thank you very much, Steve. I wanted to mention a couple of items. First of all, our BC open meeting, because we haven't [picked] the speakers. So, I just wanted to ask the group to send to Chantelle and to myself names of people who want to be invited at our BC open meeting, noting that we are inviting Xavier and Warren also at the CSG open meeting. So, please get that to us. Otherwise, we will go ahead with our thinking.

Second thing: we had issued last week the request for interest for budget allowance to attend Kobe. In fact, what happened is that the [X Com], the [inaudible] that we had here, Mark – \$7,000 U.S. for an outreach meeting in Kobe. But, finally, we are organizing two outreach meetings that, later on, Jimson will be describing. But, we are not using much of this funding because everything is being sponsored by ICANN and other associations.

So, [inaudible] of the membership, and we received some applications. [X Com] will be taking a decision probably today, and we will be communicating that to the group as soon as possible.

With that – I don't know. I'm not on the Adobe Chat, so I cannot see if there are hands up or questions. So, Chantelle, please tell me. But, otherwise, if there are no questions, I would then leave the floor to Jimson.

JIMSON OLUFUYE:

Okay. Thank you very much, Claudia. My pleasure to [inaudible] welcome new member [inaudible]. [inaudible] lives in Brazil, and he's going to be represented by [inaudible]. [inaudible] we're happy that you're here now [inaudible] welcome.

The second thing is talking about the ICANN 64 [inaudible] BC. For the first time, this year we'll be organizing two important [inaudible] in Japan during ICANN 64. As the Chair mentioned, we have outreach planned for Tokyo, and also for Kobe. [inaudible] will be coming up on March 8th. [inaudible] prospective participants, members, willing to be there who express interest in [inaudible] funding [inaudible]. So, [inaudible] will be discussing the business [today as part of their mission].

With regard to the details of planning and outreach results, I'm going to [inaudible] to give us some detailed, up-to-date information for the planning for the [inaudible] event, and also for the Kobe event on the 15th. [inaudible]

Marilyn Cade:

Thank you, Jimson. Well, first of all, I really want to thank everyone who has contributed so far to helping us to put this plan together. We've gone quite a long way, including starting out with thinking we wouldn't have sufficient attendance to stop in Tokyo.

But, we've been very fortunate, and I'm very, very pleased that, through the strong support of yourself and Claudia and Steve and [inaudible] and also Microsoft, through indication of interest, as well others, we have a partnership with [Katoh-san], who will be featured as a respondent in the BC newsletter. [Katoh] was with [inaudible] when we worked together [as industry found] the BC]. He stepped up, along with Yumi, who is the liaison from JPNIC, to helping us to organize a several-hour event at extremely low cost to us. We are being hosted by [J], which is a Japanese association that focuses on innovation and technology issues.

[inaudible] at the event and kick off. We have a revision where most of the cost is being borne by ICANN and by [J], which is very fortunate for us. There will be a several-hour event in the afternoon on the 8th. Right now, we have a speaker from ICANN, John Crain, as well as a segment that will be chaired by Claudia. We just had a new proposal in from Yumi and [J], proposing that they take a 60-minute session to present issues of concern to Japanese business, which would be a great learning opportunity for all of us and also helps to justify why they're bringing their members together with us.

In order to travel to Tokyo, I will pose again to the list that, just for you interested, you can choose multiple destinations so that you fly into Tokyo, take the train from Narita airport into Tokyo proper. We are getting the name of a hotel close to the site, recommended by the organizer. BC members might be interested in staying at the same hotel. We'll have a luncheon preparation session and then we'll go to the session.

We do have an opportunity, as I said – and we have one volunteer already from Microsoft – to join Claudia and Steve in providing brief comments. Then, we will have the reception, and then we will be able to take a late evening train to travel to Kobe. The cost of the train is about \$138 U.S. to take the train to Kobe. Then, you can fly out of Kobe, direct back to your location.

So, for those of you who are interested and willing to make that stopover, just an FYI that it is feasible to do within the logistic planning.

In Kobe, we are partnering with the ISPCP. Claudia and I had a planning call with Chris Mondini and the leadership of the ISPCP. That event is on Wednesday afternoon. It is at a location nearby to the venue. It's not at the venue. We have our own 30- to 45-minute segment, which will have introductory comments from [Kato], just three minutes introducing why business believes ICANN is important. He's asked me to draft his comments. I've already given him an initial draft.

Then, the panel would include two speakers from the BC. The topic that the ISPCP is very supportive of is the issue of security, stability, and

resiliency. They will provide one speaker, and we can provide two speakers.

Then, we will have an opportunity for brief comments from Claudia as our Chair and also from Steve as our Vice-Chair for policy, reinforcing the importance of the particular areas that we focus on.

Then, we will extend an invitation of interest for those attending to consider membership in the BC. There'll be about 100 to 115 attendees. This is because a particular association has relocated their membership meeting to Kobe. So, it gives us an opportunity to engage with a few of the attendees who will be qualified to become BC members, as well as with association staff.

We also have a special guest at the reception. The officers of the Japan IGF, which includes a couple of businesses and others, but also a representative of the government who will come to the reception as a special gift.

I'm really hoping to hear from anyone who—

JIMSON OLUFUYE: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Sorry. I was just going to say, Jimson, I'm really hoping to hear from anyone who's willing to make that additional stopover in Tokyo so that we can try – we need to provide brief bios of everyone from the BC who's coming so that we can have those translated.

JIMSON OLUFUYE:

Okay. Thank you very much, [Marylin]. I don't know if there's any questions, but let me also note that, as part of the preparation, we have our outreach [inaudible] ready. [inaudible] fact sheet [inaudible] translated to Japanese by staff [inaudible] as well as part of the material for the outreach.

So, I think we can have that list together by next week or so so we can have a group of members that want to be at Tokyo outreach for good information flow. We could have a list for that so information can readily be passed across to those members who will be in Tokyo. So, by next week, I hope we can begin that list so we can share information with those concerned.

Next is [inaudible] appreciate ICANN staff for all the [inaudible] outreach committee and [this] in general for the Tokyo event. I really appreciate the intervention they've made so far.

Next on the agenda with regard to my section is the draft ICANN FY20 budget. It's under review or consideration by the Finance Committee, and we'll have a draft by the next call.

But, in two days' time, we'll be filing an additional budget request. Yes, I mentioned the budget request at the last meeting, but I'll just go over it again, just as a reminder about what we are putting in. We're putting in our usual leadership development funding support. The leadership development funding encourages potential leaders to be at ICANN meetings as part of strategy to get to know how the BC works at [ALAC] meetings. Then, they're encouraged to be part of leadership of the BC.

So, we had a number of members benefiting from this leadership development funding during the ICANN 64. Though we are adjusting, we are proposing that they should be adjusted [inaudible] to the ICANN meeting region because, so far, I think for the last two years, [inaudible] restricted to ICANN meeting regions.

For example, we have the utilization from this funding [inaudible]. For example, in ICANN 63, there was no application to use it. [inaudible] we could get potential leaders from Latin America or Africa that could benefit [from the funding].

Then, the [inaudible] meeting is on continued support for outreach materials. As many of you know, ICANN prints our newsletters. We do the design, but ICANN does the printing. So, we [inaudible]. We need to continue.

Also, we are putting in, for IGF 2019, a workshop on [government]. We [don't] believe that there's a lot of dynamic activities in organizations outside of ICANN, [inaudible] have some connection with ICANN to [inaudible] Internet, a voice to the invisible, that [inaudible] platform, [inaudible] discussing the issue of the GDPR and many of the governments are coming up to erase such a fiction as well or [admission.] [inaudible] shut down, so this has some effect on business. So, [inaudible]. So, picking a request to enable some of officers to organize a workshop. If the workshop turns out not to be approved, we can have it be [inaudible] for [inaudible] platform [inaudible] to be heard at that global conference [inaudible].

Then, the last one is for the GAC to [inaudible] planning for [inaudible] during ICANN 65 because ICANN 65 still be within FY19. So, we'll be looking into ICANN 66/67 to request to be applying for meetings during ICANN 65 and ICANN 66 and 67.

We skipped the [inaudible] intercessional this year based on request. You can recall that BC actually made its position clear that we would prefer that the funding for the Non-Contracted Parties house intercessional is used to strengthen the fellowship and [inaudible] and order [inaudible] community [inaudible] ICANN [inaudible].

Based on that plan, we will support the intercessional community. So, that will be coming into our comment [inaudible] budget comment, the [names] of the [inaudible] professional.

In the same way, the CROP will have this year – we're also putting that the CROP be increased to [inaudible] level in FY20. So, they expect us to comment on [inaudible] and on CROP to be embedded in BC FY20 comments for the ICANN budget.

So, that is it from me for now. As I said, we send in the additional budget request by Friday. [inaudible] in terms of budgetary comments. [inaudible].

So, if there is no questions, [inaudible] back to Claudia, the Chair, for the rest of the meeting. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Thank you, Jimson. Claudia, we may have lost you on the line.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Sorry. I'm sorry. I was talking and I—

STEVE DELBIANCO: Are there any other—

CLAUDIA SELLI: I was on mute. Yeah, sorry. I was on mute. So, no, I was just saying that, basically, if there are other questions the members would like to bring forward before we close the meeting. I'm not on the Adobe, so I'm not able to see if there are in that. But, please, speak up in case.

If not—

STEVE DELBIANCO: [inaudible], Claudia.

CLAUDI SELLI: Okay, perfect. So, we can adjourn the meeting. Our next meeting will be on the 7th of February, if I'm not mistaken. We will talk then. Thank you very much, everybody, for joining. Chantelle, we can adjourn the meeting.

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Thank you, operator. Thank you, Claudia. Operator, you may now stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]