CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the BC Members Call on Wednesday, March 25, 2020. In the interest of time, attendance will be taken via Zoom. I'd like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking and to keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid background noise. At this time, I'd like to turn it over to our chair, Claudia Selli, to begin. Claudia, please go ahead.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Hi, everybody. Can you hear me all right? Hello? Okay. So, thank you very much, everybody, for being on the Business Constituency call. And thank you for participating and with that, I'm going to give the floor to Steve for starting with the usual policy calendar. Thank you, Steve. The floor is yours.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Claudia. I'm now going to share the actual policy calendar that I emailed to all of you yesterday. It's in the Zoom room and you can see it there. I'll start with the very top. Since our last call, we have filed two comments. On March the 12th we filed our commend on the second Security, Stability, and Resiliency review. We call it the SSR2. A big thanks to Denise, Michelle, and Scott McCormick who're on that review team. And then we had a fabulous work by Susan Kawaguchi, Roger, Mason, Ben, and Yusuph Kileo who came up with an extensive comment that we filed early prior to the deadline, so that Denise and Scott and their team can start to analyze it.

The second thing we filed was on March the 23rd. This was just Monday of this week. We responded to the EPDP—that's the Expedited Policy Development Process—on how to handle registrant data in the post-GDPR world. You know that Mark Švančárek and Margie Milam who are on the call lead our effort as representing us on that EPDP team. So while they continue to go through the bi-weekly calls, Mason Cole and Drew Bennett of Disney stepped up to the plate and drafted an extensive BC comment. It's roughly 19 pages, and I got a link to it on the Business Constituency website which is the best place you can do to learn what we said. It is extremely challenging. In fact, it's unreadable if you try to go to the ICANN link where they've got it in a giant spreadsheet where each cell is a particular answer given to a comment that was filed by a group.

Those comments are open through the end of May because of an addendum that we will publish probably tomorrow. But I did think it was important for us to get our comments in on time. And I hope that will steer things towards staff and the EPDP team starting to review the comments that we submitted. So later in this call, Mark and Margie will talk about the current state of play on the EPDP. But let me callout Mason and Drew for the hard work you put into that comment. Well done.

All righ. There are currently five open public comments that are relevant to us. There are two others on some of the variance for non-Latin scripts. Very technical comments that we typically don't file on those.

But the first one is up on the 31st of March, just a week from now. It has to do with the NextGen program at ICANN. We put together a

significant comment in September, thanks to Mark Datysgeld, who is a participant in the NextGen program. And Mark says that ICANN came back with modifications to the proposal that in may respects adopted what it was that the BC had in mind. So, we circulated Mark's draft comment which is due in a week. It's Attachment 1 to the policy calendar. Mark, I see you there on the call. I can display your comment and give you an opportunity to point to anything in particular in there that you think you want your fellow BC members to pay attention to. I'll display it and, Mark, turn it over to you for a moment.

MARK DATYSGELD: Thank you very much, Steve. So as far as this comment is concerned, it really was very positive in terms of what it's accomplishing. Just to recap so that everybody is on board,the NextGen program aims to integrate the academic community with ICANN and it's saying that younger people, people who normally wouldn't have as much of a chance on the fellowship because that program is so high stakes of say the selection process is so involved.

So, for this particular comment, what we are achieving is that, for instance, during the application process if you have a look at that, we wanted something that makes a lot more sense than just writing an essay type of thing, because a lot of technical candidates were being left out due to the fact that they are not great essay writers but maybe they have relevant work—maybe they have good engineering work—that was being left out.

When I was part of the selection committee for this program that often happened. You have a good prospect who has meaning full work done but that person can't work a good essay and gets left out of the program. So, the fact that we are moving towards that direction is very good.

As I mentioned before, the selection committee will be better than the selection committee for the Fellowship as well and we will get to share the GNSO position with the NCSG so that we don't have to be in a dispute with them per se.

Something that I've been fighting for years, to be honest with you, is a mentoring kit, something that actually instructs people on how to work together with these kids. And that has been mentioned by name as well which is very good because they don't need the same approach as the fellows. It's much less of a shotgun approach. It's a more tailored thing that needs to be done. I've been in that position as well and definitely we need something more specific, and I would highlight that specifically in answer to our comments about this program not bringing in enough business people, that ICANN has started to include that language so all the pressure that we put on the Fellowship comment on the NextGen comment, I think it's starting to pay off our insistence because they are starting to address by name on their calls that they will hook up with business participants. And that makes me very happy because it seems that all the pressure we put on this is starting to pay off.

So just some general comments. I think this went pretty well in terms of all the effort we put into making this program more viable for business candidates. And back to you, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Mark, thanks for that. I've displayed the comment on the screen. BC members, do you have any questions or edits you want to suggest to Mark since this will be filed before we have our next call?

I'm looking for hands. I'm seeing none. Mark, thank you again for drafting and being attentive to this. It's not a program that the rest of us are familiar with, and because of that, I am very grateful for you taking the leadership role on this. Thank you.

I'll get back to the policy calendar now and turn to the next item on the list. We're going to be filing that in seven days. You have a copy of it. You need to get back to Mark and me if you have any edits.

The next is this Name Collision Analysis Project, which is a study by the SSAC and a consultant to try to figure out whether the next round of gTLDs needs to be restricted in the kinds of names they come up with so they don't collide with internal IT API calls. This was a big deal with things like DotOffice and DotMail the first time around, and I think we've resolved many of those concerns but we'll be attentive to it in the next round. BC does not have any volunteer who stepped up for that particular comment. We have been active on this past. Stephanie Duchesneau from Google has been very helpful on the last comment.

Do I have any volunteers who understand this topic well enough that would want to volunteer? I currently see a hand from Mark SV. Go ahead, Mark.

MARK SVANCAREK:	It was just a hand volunteering.
STEVE DELBIANCO:	You're the best. Awesome. So, Mark, I'll work with you on that Name Collision Project because it's due in about a week. Are there any other BC members that have any expertise in this area that could help Mark and I on the Collisions? You've got a couple of strong players that can help us through that on Collisions. Anyone else? Mark, it doesn't have to be a long comment. I'll work with you on it offline. Thank you again for stepping up.
MARK SVANCAREK:	No problem. I'll take a look at the last one we did a couple of years ago, so it should to be okay.
STEVE DELBIANCO:	Excellent. Thanks, Mark. You're the best. Next one up. This is for Lawrence Olawale-Roberts and Andrew Mack. Thank you for volunteering again to do a BC comment on the latest interation of ICANNs strategy for the Middle East and the adjoining countries. And it's a five-year strategic plan. They put this together for different regions of the world. Andrew and Lawrence, that's due the third of April. It would be good to circulate your draft in the next couple of days. Is that something that you two guys can commit to do?
ANDREW MACK:	We can. We'll get it done.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Yes, we will. We will see that we have something soon.

STEVE DELBIANCO: All right. Thank you very much for volunteering. Anyone else what to join Lawrence and Andrew? I don't think it will be too extensive a comment. Thank you, guys, very much. It's only about a 10- or 15-page report. Okay. Thank you.

Next one up. Community Travel support guidelines. These are published by ICANN. And they have to do with the way that ICANN will accept requests and grant funding for travel for eligible recipients. The BC makes extensive of this and we commented extensively on the guidelines that were last published in July of 2018.

So, the new guidelines, to a small extent ,they do reflect what we had asked when it comes to things like visas, wire transfers, and how to cancel and substitute. I want to thank Jimson and Mark, Lawrence and Arinola for volunteering to draft. And just yesterday Jimson circulated his initial observation that the latest iteration from ICANN is pretty good about reflecting what we had said.

So, you'll see on the screen I reflected four areas where Jimson suggests that ICANN is pretty much listening to us. And that's a good start. So, Jimson I do think we should comment on this even if it's only to say, "Thank you ICANN for listening." But I will turn it over to you and Mark, Lawrence and Arinola. Is there anything else you want to say on those travel guidelines and whether you will get a draft to us soon? Thank

you, Jimson, for providing it in writing and we'll look forward to your draft in the next week.

We also have number five on here. The PDP that's been going on for a long time on the Review of All the Rights Protection Mechanisms in all gTLDs, not just new gTLDs. It's got a comment period that closes at the end of April. And this is looking at services that BC members use like Rapid Suspension, Trademark Clearinghouse, the Sunrise, and the Trademark Claims Service which we were instrumental in getting on the new gTLD program but also this Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution Review Procedure.

Now we last commented gosh, five years ago on this. This has been going on a long time. And I want to thank Chris Wilson, Waudo, and Jay Chapman for the work you guys did on that. We need some volunteers to take a look at their Phase 1 Initial Report. Take a look at what the BC said last time, map it onto what they've done, and make some comments.

For this, the BC has got to comment since we were a leader at many of these RPMs. So, I'm looking at the BC members on the call, including Jay—thanks for being there. Can we get some volunteers that will take a look at this? I know it's a long report, Zac. It's 147 pages. It's exactly right. Do we have a couple of volunteers that can help the BC on this? Jay, thank you so much for stepping up. Any other BC members? Regrettably, Zac will come in too. Thank you, Zac. Anyone else want to join? What about Marie? This is something you know a lot about. Would you be willing to help with this? Fantastic. All right, that's three star players on that one. They've got a lot of time. Great. Thank you.

So let me go now to the big EPDP project where ICANN has attempted to modify its WHOIS policies in response to the GDPR. I said earlier that Mark Švančárek and Margie Milam lead us on that. We have calls every week that go for two hours. We had one yesterday. I back them up as an alternate. I was able to step in yesterday and win a few small battles on the addendum. But Margie and Mark, I want to turn to you to update your colleagues and take their questions on the current state of play for the EPDP. Mark or Margie.

MARGIE MILAM: Sure. I'll go ahead. Can you hear me okay?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yes.

MARGIE MILAM: Okay. Excellent. Yes, as Steve mentioned, we just filed a public comment, and thank you to the BC members that contributed to that because it was quite detailed. And then we immediately jumped into publishing an addendum—which I don't know the timeline but it's any day now—to cover the additional issues that were differed to Phase 2.

But unfortunately, I'm not sure that the issues are ones that were addressed properly at least from my perspective. One of them we did have a small win on and that related to the Purpose 2 which is the purpose for processing the data as it relates to ICANN organization. And fortunately, we were able to get a purpose that tracked what the European Commission said should be allowable in its letter to ICANN.

As you may recall, when the Phase 1 report was published, the Purpose 2 was considered not properly drafted because it conflated the two different purposes—ICANN's purpose for collecting the data and processing it versus third-party access for legitimate purposes. What we actually did was split those into two. We have a separate purpose for third-party access and then the small win that we have is that the ICANN purpose which is essentially to process it as it relates to the security and stability of the DNS. Tracking the language from the bylaws is the purpose that will be in the addendum. So at least from that perspective, ICANN can have access to the data for implementing policies, for SSR related activities, compliance, that sorts of things.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Margie, are we—

MARGIE MILAM: The other area where we didn't seem to lose was in the area of further refining the policy as it relates to natural versus legal persons data. And as you may recall the GDPR applies to the data of natural persons. And one of the criticisms that we've had over this policy and the temp spec is that it goes beyond what is required because it also redacts the data of legal persons.

We actually did receive some guidance from Bird & Bird on how you could actually make the distinction between the natural person and a legal person. And we have some promising recommendations from this memo on how the policy could be updated to make that distinction. But unfortunately, our collogues on the EPDP do not want to discuss that

issue further at this time. A lot of it relates to the notion that we're running out of time and they want to finish this by the end of June. And also, that several groups feel that regardless of the legal advice received from Bird & Bird that they would never be comfortable making a legal person distinction. And so, I think the addendum as it stands is going to send it back to the GNSO of the issue of a legal versus natural person and then the GNSO will try to figure out what to do.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Margie, will you take a quick interruption on that if you don't mind?

MARGIE MILAM: Sure.

STEVE DELBIANCO: So, when you got off the call and I took over as alternate, we had a pretty duked up battle on legal persons. And I tried to say that the legal memo makes it clear that we may draw that distinction. We may publish legal person information. I said that the addendum should reflect the fact that it is legally possible and if we are not going to accept the BC's edit to the addendum, I said let's go on record—let's put it in writing—that the contract parties and majority of the EPDP acknowledge that they may disclose but they don't want to. And I really tried to make them uncomfortable, to go on record and say that they prefer not to publish legal person data.

I think politically that's dangerous for them because it would indicate that legal entities that are attempting to defraud people online that we're just not going to publish because it's just too much work.

While they pushed back on that it ended up accepting only a small part of the edits that we drafted that you had put together that night before. And when it came to the purpose statement, as you recall the purpose statement that was an asterisk where the NCSG noted their disagreement with the purpose statement. And you where on the call when Becky Burr got into that whole discussion of whether that purpose for ICANN would include third-party access as part of the processing that they do.

So, we got to an extensive debate between Milton and me on that on yesterday's call and NSCG ended up withdrawing their little asterisk notation to that and inserting one word to say that it was the ICANN purpose.

So, we'll discuss this on the prep call later today. But we are going to have a battle on our hands because Milton seems to believe that the way that the ICANN and Becky Burr have written that purpose, that it does not include third-party use. We didn't win on that one yet. And then I'll turn it back over to you. Thank you.

MARGIE MILAM: Great. Thank you, Steve, for covering. And as you can see it's a very detailed discussion and debate we're having on these issues. But at least from the BC perspective, the area of legal versus natural and the

Purpose 2, depending on where we land on it, is something that we're going to want to submit comments on when we have the opportunity.

I think it might be worthwhile to at least identify volunteers for working on that comment when it's ready for publication. And then essentially so you all know, we're pushing to publish it so that we get the public comments closed in early May so that we can publish our final report in June and wrap up our work. That's where we are. And I'll pause and see if Mark wants to add anything.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Will the addendum get a second comment period on the addendum as opposed to the first report?

MARGIE MILAM: Yes. Yes, there will be. But I think it's that same extended date you were referencing. I think it's on May 3rd.

STEVE DELBIANCO: May 3rd. I think it's May 3rd. Mark?

MARK SVANCAREK: I had a clarifying question before I got started, which is with all the dates for public comments that have passed and also the public comment for the addendum, is it correct to think that certain stakeholder groups will be submitting substantially more public

comments in that second deadline as opposed to doing it all in the first one as we've done? Did I hear that correctly?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yes. And I hear that the registries were doing it that way.

MARK SVANCAREK: Right. So, anybody who has ears on what's happening in the registries, just assume that they're looking at the comments that we've done and are adjusting their comments, possibly modifying them in order to respond to use. So, if you can give us any heads up on that would be helpful. Margie covered everything. Steve covered everything.

I just wanted to make a clarification about this whole legal natural thing. It may seem strange that we're fighting about this because legal people don't have rights under the GDPR. Why would we be arguing about this? Of course, it's legal to publish their data. I could talk about the use cases too.

The issue is how do you know that someone is, in fact, a legal person? And we have always maintained if they tell you they are a legal person, they're a legal person. And the counter-arguments have been what if they didn't understand what the checkbox meant or what if a legal person declares themselves a legal person but then populates the fields with the personal data of their employee?

The regulation has ways of working around these things. Right? However, we have contracted parties who are scared of everything. Scared of making a mistake and being punished for it. And we have

NCSG just generally looking for ways to make the whole thing harder and slower and more expensive. And so, they have latched onto this. And the legal feedback that we've got was about not whether or not you could publish this data since clearly, you can, but how you can take an attestation from a registrant saying, "I am a legal person," and apply that in a way that is lawful. So that is the kind of feedback that we have.

It still comes up against the obstacle that if you're a contracted party and you would be forced to put systems in place to handle different types of registrants, they just don't want to do that. That's the main objection. So even if they had good legal coverage, they still would be opposed to doing it. And NCSG would still oppose it for the reasons I already stated. So, if you wonder about how they could object to these things, it's because there is this additional complexity. It's not always as straight forward as it seems.

Another thing is that we've been talking about automation a lot. Are those the use cases you're mentioning Margie? We've been trying to put forward a number of use cases that would be easy to automate—that would be appropriate to automate and ways to automate. And there is a document that is also out for review that we created in the BC and the IPC. There's been a lot of discussion on it.

I think we mentioned at the last meeting that we do have progress on UDRP, URS, law enforcement within the same jurisdiction. But a lot of pushback on everything else. So, it's still not clear that we'll get any built-in day one automation except at a super optional level on a case-by-case registrar basis, so that's something to keep an eye on as well. The system will not have very good throughput unless it is increasingly

automated. So that's something that we're very concerned about. I think that's it for me.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay. Thank you, Mark. Any questions for Mark and Margie on the EPDP? Margie, Mark thanks again for all the work you're putting into that and I guess I will talk to you on the prep call tonight.

Let me now turn to Council, channel 2 in the policy calendar. Scott and Marie, there's not too much that happened at the last Council meeting. But let me turn it over to you.

MARIE PATTULLO: Hi, Steve. First up, can I just say from everybody in Europe please look after yourself rest of the world and stay at least a couple of meters away from everybody. Nobody will take it personally at this moment.

As you say, Steve, not an awful lot happened. And to be blunt not an awful lot is happening. I circulated a couple of messages—one about data accuracy. As you'll remember, this was discussed at the last Council and we've been pushing—we, the BC—have been pushing for some time the idea that it seems somewhat peculiar to spend so much time and so much effort on the process for being able to collect, collate, use data when you know that data is not accurate. Helped massively by Margie, we were trying to ensure that data accuracy was looked at in the EPDP Phase 2. We've been pushed back a lot on that. I've sent around to you guys the latest communication that we have from Council Chair, where in eessence, he's making it clear that, "Yep ,data accuracy

is important but we're not going to do it in the EPDP. We'll think about doing it in the small groups at some point." I've sent that email through to you. Of course, if you have comments let me know.

The only other one is something that I do actually need your action on please, and that, again, I sent to you. Again, it refers to the EPDP but this one is about both parts of the Phase 1 that affect current consensus policies. So current things that are already happening within the DNS. So that's called Recommendation 27. What the Council leadership and staff have done is put together a priority list for how those things should be looked at. They want us to discuss it at our Council meeting in April, on 16 April. It's a long text but I have sent it to you and we'd be really grateful if you could let us know your thoughts on that. And unless there are any questions or anything I've missed, Steve, that's it for me.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Marie. Anything to add, Scott? And is there anyone else who has questions for our Councilors? Margie's hand is up. Go ahead.

MARGIE MILAM: Thank you so much for fighting on the accuracy question. I know it puts you guys in a difficult position. But just to share the background for the BC so they understand what the issue is, we originally had pushed into Phase 2 taking a look at the accuracy requirements to see if they're satisfactory, if they actually satisfy the obligations under GDPR. And we actually had Georgios, who is the member from the European Commission on the EPDP, tell the EPDP group that if we do not address accuracy we put the entire policy at risk, because as one of the

important components of GDPR that there be accurate information. And we actually had legal questions that we where posing to Bird & Bird to elaborate on that and how we could amend the policies. But the contracted parties and NCSG did not want to address it further, and so that's why it went to the Council, and despite all of these statements, the Council decided not to proceed with the EPDP looking at accuracy. But there will be an additional group I think formed to figure out what to do with the accuracy question.

So, for Marie and Scott, one of the things that if we can keep that high priority that that work gets kicked off quickly. My biggest concern is that it will just get pushed off to the side and delayed and delayed and delayed and we'll never address the accuracy question. So that's my ask to you guys and to thank you for all the work you did on that issue.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Marie?

MARIE PATTULLO: No [tool] Margie. As I put in the chat, there was no problem. It was the right position to take. I'm still on a personal level bewildered that anyone would think anything else. I'm very happy that the IPC did weigh in on the list as you know because they didn't in the Council meeting, which was a little concerning. And I will most certainly ensure that we do keep pushing for this. As you see in Keith's mail, he talked to the establishment to some kind of group. Well, then let's establish it. I will certainly do my best to keep that out there. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Marie, could you join the prep call today? It's at 5:00 PM East Coast time in the US. It's the one hosted by Brian King. It's a prep call for tomorrow's EPDP but it would be good to weave in your thoughts on Council and accuracy.

MARIE PATTULLO: If you send me the link.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay. Any other questions for Council? Okay. Hearing none, I'm going to scroll it down. Now Barbara Wanner was unable ... There you are, Barbara. You did join the call. So why don't you take over on Channel 3.

BARBARA WANNER: Thanks, Steve. I'm just literally on the call. Basically, I don't have a lot to report. Can everyone hear me?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Perfectly. And I have the display on the screen of what you had listed for us on your side.

BARBARA WANNER: Okay. We're sort of in limbo here, related in part to the COVID-19, but also we're trying to set up a process of dialogue with the NCSG to determine how we want to proceed with the Board Seat 14.

There has been some outreach by Dean Marks who is leading up our CSG effort to Stephanie Perrin on the NCSG. And we haven't heard back from Stephanie yet. So that continues. And I'll keep everyone apprised of when we're able to get some sort of discussion lined up with them.

We also have to determine who we want to support to succeed Keith Drazek then Rafik. I know we talked about this on earlier calls but depending on who we support to succeed Keith will probably determine who we support for the vice chair. That is to say, if we support Keith's replacement from the CSG, then the vice chair seat will again go to the NCSG. So that's kind of it. That's where we are. Nothing much has changed. Thanks, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Barbara. Questions for Barbara? And then I note we will discuss a little bit more about the general elections calendar since we have Council elections coming up this year. Things to do on NomCom, and for that, I will turn it back over to Claudia.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Okay. Thank you. Sorry I was on mute. Jimson, why don't you go and give us an update on operation and finance, please?

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Hi, Claudia. Just to note, we are calling Jimson out on the phone.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Okay. Thank you. And maybe meanwhile I don't know if there are questions from members?

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Hi, Claudia. Can you hear me?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Okay, Jimson. Please you can go ahead.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Okay. Well, greetings, everyone. I hope you all are keeping well and [inaudible] I trust. I also apologize about my voice for this call. It may be a little bit [inaudible] but I'll do my best. You know the internet these days in our area is really busy. So much traffic.

Yes. The meeting item I'd like to talk about is with regard to the upcoming election that Steve so rightly mentioned. We are going two positions coming up for election and that is the position of the BC GNSO Councilor and the Nominating Committee, NomCom. The timeline is as follows.

We plan to begin the process fully on May 1st, by the first of May this year, and we project that it will end by the 5th of June of this year. So, the elections will run simultaneously. And the meeting period will start for two weeks initially, May 1st until [inaudible] the 15th of May. And then on [inaudible], we have positions for candidate statements, and that is by [inaudible] 26th of May. And then are discussions [inaudible] the candidates for Wednesday 27th of May.

Then confidential electorate voting for the candidates on Thursday the 28th of May until the 4th of June, just one week. And then the outcome will be announced on behalf of the ExCom by the [inaudible].

The successful person will take his or her place by the ICANN 69 AGM in Hamburg. Hopefully, the issues around COVID-19 will have been resolved by that time.

Well, the [inaudible] will be effective for two years. That is 2020 to 2022 and the two Nominating Committee positions just usually for a year period and will be conducted in line with our BC charter, only for members in good standing that would be eligible and encourage] to stand for election. So if you have somebody in mind, please begin to prepare and plan to relay to that person. And then once the details are fully communicated and the timeline begins, then we can go ahead to starting the nomination.

I would like to say that the details, because there is much there [inaudible] I will just summarize by saying that we will get you full details in the mailing list. And please go through and take notes for the timelines.

So again, it's only those members that are fully paid, and I would like to congratulate every one of us, every BC member at this point have been fully paid with the exception of just maybe one or two that [inaudible] that are long-standing members. So I want to thank all the BC members for staying in good financial standing with us. So with that, the BC [selection commission] is quite good and we tend to keep it up at to that level.

So that is with regards to the election process. I don't know if you have any questions, but rest assured that it will be sent to the list shortly. Thank you.

CLAUDIA SELLI: Thank you, Jimson. Are there questions for Jimson? Does any member have any other business or any questions or anything to raise? Okay. I don't see or hear anything. Just to say, please everybody stay safe in this time. And we've going to hear each other in two hours. Thank you, everybody, for participating actively. And we can stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]