YESIM NAZLAR:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the Board Candidate Evaluation Committee (BCEC) 2017 Selection Call, taking place on Thursday, the 6th of October, 2016, at 05:00 UTC.

On the call today, we have Julie Hammer, Fatimata Seye Sylla, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Gunela Astbrink, Jordi Iparraguirre, Yrjö Länsipuro, and Vanda Scartezini.

We have received apologies from Eduardo Diaz.

From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Ariel Liang, and myself, Yeşim Nazlar.

Finally, I would like to remind everyone to state their names before speaking for the transcript purposes. Over to you, Julie. Thank you very much.

JULIE HAMMER:

Thank you, Yesim. The first item on our agenda is our meeting time. I gather that this meeting time is not a good one for everyone, and I think those who have joined were very inconvenienced. Vanda has suggested that we look at rotating meeting times. So my query to you is, do you want to do a Doodle every week for the meeting time? Or do you want to go to an approach where we rotate meeting times between agreed hours?

For example, the CCWG Accountability had meetings rotating from 06:00 UTC to 12:00 UTC to 19:00 UTC. That was for a global

membership group, so I'm wondering whether that is the sort of thing that you would like to do, or whether some of you would prefer a fixed time each week. Could I please ask for everyone's comments and reactions to that, please?

Fatimata? Fatimata, please go ahead.

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: I think I would go for the rotation to accommodate everybody as we're in different places of the world. So we would have to make sacrifices if the time is not the one that we'd prefer [for everyone], but rotating will give everyone the chance to participate and not miss two meetings in a row. [inaudible].

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you, Fatimata. Vanda, I know you've expressed a view that that is what your preference would be. Can I ask by raising your hand in the Adobe Connect – those of you there – who would support rotating meetings and using the CCWG Accountability times of 06:00 UTC, 12:00 UTC, and 19:00 UTC? If you can recalculate them to your time zone for. For the Australian, that's 16:00, 22:00 – oh, no, sorry. That's Queensland time. Add on one hour. And 05:00. So, Cheryl, that's not good for you. It's good for Vanda.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Let me be clear. There is [inaudible] because you put up three options, and I think we can run with two, not three.

JULIE HAMMER: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I also would suggest that what we might be able to do is, as long as we make sure we have a day that is not clashing with continuing work group activity at that 19:00 to 22:00 hour line, we do find, from a historical point of view, that we can get reasonable numbers of people to attend from a global perspective in that 18:00/19:00 through to 21:00/22:00.

So as long as we pick at least one of those times, then, Jordi, I don't really care about winter and summer time. I care about running in UTC and running in UTC regardless of what seasonal changes happen.

I will argue as I have the last ten years that ICANN should do things because your winter time happens to be my summer time, but not Julie's. And we're in the same country, so there you go.

So if we run in UTC, we should be able to find a time in 18:00/19:00 through to 21:00/22:00 that works for most of us and then switch to one 12-hour-ish – it doesn't have to be an exact science – to compensate for those that find that a difficult time of day. Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER: Can I ask everyone to indicate if that would be an acceptable proposal for most of you, just by showing your ticks? Vanda, you're happy. Cheryl

is happy. Yrjo. Fatimata's already said she was happy to rotate. Jordi, is that okay with you? Yes, thank you.

Oh, and Louis has joined us. Louis, we're just indicating whether we're happy to use a rotating time to try to accommodate different time zones, and perhaps somewhere in the 18:00 to 22:00 UTC and 12 hours apart. Would that be something that you would be comfortable with? If you are able to indicate by a tick or a cross. Okay. So Louis might not be able to indicate at the moment.

Thank you. If you could clear your ticks now. Can I ask if Thursday remains a suitable day for everyone? Again, if Thursday is a day we can settle on, would you please indicate with a tick? Thank you, Jordi. [inaudible].

Gunela, please, go ahead.

GUNELA ASTBRINK: I'm just a little bit confused now. That's why I put in the chat a couple of questions. We're talking about the time range, and I'm not exactly sure within that time range what time we are talking about. That can have an impact on people as well.

Also, are we then totally rejecting this particular time we are meeting on now? I thought at one stage we would stick to this meeting time and then have an alternate time at some other time. But I might be mistaken.

I see that Cheryl put in the chat that maybe we need to have a Doodle about the exact time in the range. That sounds like a good idea. Thanks, Julie.

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks, Gunela. Yes, I believe that we were talking about 19:00 to 21:00 and about 12-hour [stops], for example, 7 to 9 UTC. But that is not this time zone. So we might subject people to yet another Doodle to settle on this. I apologize for bombarding you with Doodles, but it seems to be one of the most difficult things about scheduling meetings around the world, as we know in ICANN.

All right. I won't spend any more time on that now because we've got a lot of important things to do. I'll work with staff to send out a Doodle to get everyone's feedback on that.

What I'd like to do now is move on to Agenda Item 3, which is the proposed timeline from Tijani. We have to agree to this timeline or ask for it to be amended in some way. One of the things that we need to be quite comfortable about is whether we can deliver in the dates that Tijani has requested.

Candidate requirements we need to deliver by the 17th of October, and I believe that we're very, very close to that now, to having them finalized. So I don't see that as a problem. The expression of interest pro forma or some might call it a candidate application pro forma would need to be finalized at the same time. Later in this call, I'll give you an update on some discussions that I have been having with staff and with Ken Bour. I believe quite strongly that we can meet that.

Also, the operational procedures and guidelines subject to your feedback today, as long as you don't believe we've got major changes to be made in what I circulated, I believe [inaudible] – that timeline, because what's being targeted is an ALAC meeting. It's not on the calendar yet, but I believe that an ALAC meeting is going to be scheduled on Wednesday, the 18th of October. Heidi might be able to clarify that, but I believe the calls of the dates of the Hyderabad meeting, the normal monthly meeting, might be being brought forward a week.

I see Heidi not on microphone, and I'm not sure whether you're actually there, Heidi. But if you're able to confirm that either in the chat or not, could you please indicate that?

Until then, until we see feedback from Heidi, what I'd like to focus on in that schedule a little bit more closely is the fact that we are then being asked to be in a position to call for the expressions of interest the next day, the 19th of October. If all of our documents are finalized and approved by the ALAC, I don't believe that there ought to be a problem in that. 30 days are being allowed for the submission of candidates' applications or expressions of interest.

The next date that is on the calendar is request for candidate references, and that's being scheduled as three days after the close of submission. The issue that I'd like to discuss with you is, because we've discussed the fact and a number of you have agreed that we should we do a quick assessment, which we'd do blindly, without knowing the names of the candidates and some of their details, and produce a short list which we will then look at in much greater detail – I'm just

wondering whether, for those candidates who don't end up on the short list, we actually need to get references or not.

I'd like for some of the more experienced members of this committee to give me some feedback on what their view are on that, if you would.

Fatimata, please go ahead, and then Cheryl.

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: I would suggest to [inaudible] references at the same time, at the time of submission of the application. I don't know why we would separate the two submissions because at first glance we don't have to look at the references anyway. A good approach is doing a quick assessment and then leave that for later.

But if we do the quick assessment and then reach out to the candidates to ask them for references, that would be a kind of like letting the other, non-selected ones know that they're already rejected. I wouldn't go that way. I would ask for the [inaudible] at the time of submission of the application. Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you, Fatimata. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Yes, I think we can ask for our references for the EOI, and then certainly not look at them other than for the short listing.

[inaudible] compulsory, then you may choose to. But we wouldn't, as a group, look at them.

Part of this question stems from the day when we put our pro forma – and this is for the NomCom associates, more than our SO/AC experience – reference questions. So as a committee, we would approach the listed referees, rather than have references [inaudible] provided with the EOI.

I personally don't put much credibility in references, as they are [inaudible] and provided by a candidate with an EOI, unless I am then going to ring and speak to the referee. I'm also getting the references detailed – their contact details and who they are – and make sure that, in our expression of interest information, we say to the candidate that they need to contact them and ensure that their main referees are aware that we will be reaching out to them. I don't care whether it's e-mail or a phone call. But if you get something from your great Aunt Mary, you're only going to give it to us if it's shining and wonderful about what a good little boy you are.

So I'd get the names. If they want to give us paperwork, well, then fine. But that paperwork wouldn't hold very much credibility until we've reached out and actually interacted out with references or referees. And that should be only an effort made later on after the initial culling. Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks, Cheryl. Yrjo? Yrjo, I can't hear you. Can anyone hear Yrjo?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: No.

JULIE HAMMER: Yrjo, I'm afraid we can't hear you.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Can you hear me now?

JULIE HAMMER: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah.

JULIE HAMMER: We can. Thank you. Please go ahead.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Okay. I'm sorry. Yeah, I would advise that we would follow the NomCom procedure here and actually ask for the references at the same time. That would [save] time and make the whole thing less complicated. And I agree with Cheryl on contacting the referees, that that would be possible.

The other thing – and perhaps this is a separate discussion – is that the blind assessment in the beginning I think may be difficult because, when we read the EOI of this, it's likely that, even when they just tell you their

profession or history, you will probably know who they are anyway. So I think that this blind thing is a bit unnecessary. Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER:

Thank you, Yrjo. I suspect that you are right. I guess one of the reasons why that was discussed was because it is the way, I understand, some initial assessments have been done in the past. I guess it's an attempt to keep as many, perhaps, inclinations – I won't say "biases," I think that's too strong a word – as many out of the picture as possible.

But I do accept the truth of what you say, that there will be certain people who are easily identifiable. But we can do this in the software that Cheryl and I have been looking at with Ken Bour that is being used by NomCom, which I'll talk about shortly. I'm sure you're very familiar with it. It is possible quite easily to do that.

Yrjo, I'm just assuming that that's an old hand and not a new hand. So your hand is… Thank you. Right.

I'm getting the sense that everyone is quite comfortable with asking for the references at the same time as the expression of interest, and I think that's eminently sensible. So we will do that. What that means is that we can take out the whole line of requesting candidate references, and that gives us quite a deal more time – that is, from the 18th of November to the 22nd of December – to do our analysis, which I'm very comfortable with. So on the basis of that…

I welcome Mohamed, I noticed that you joined us a few moments ago.

Can I ask members if you are comfortable with me to go ahead and agree with Tijani's timeline? He's keen on me to provide that approval back to him. Vanda, you had already indicated you were comfortable with it in your response – ah, brilliant.

Okay. So I will go ahead and agree to that timeline with Tijani, but I'll ask him to amend it to take out the candidate references line. Okay. Thank you very much.

Moving on now to Agenda Item 4, we had some discussion on the list regarding candidate requirements. We discussed this last meeting as well, and my understanding was that most people were very comfortable with where we were this as a document to finalize. Carlos had provided some comments that I think, in my view, are very useful comments to assist us in perhaps interpreting how these candidate requirements might be utilized in putting together an EOI pro forma.

But I thought that a number of you had suggested that we didn't need to change this version of the candidate requirement to actually accommodate Carlos's comment. They were very useful comments, in my view, in any case.

So just for formality, I would like this meeting to agree that we can now formalize this, take the draft off the webpage, and state that these are our candidate requirements for the 2017 selection. I wonder if you could indicate to me by ticks or crosses whether you're comfortable with that.

Cheryl, you had your hand up, so I don't want to deny you the opportunity to make a comment by forcing you to make a tick. Did you want to make a comment there?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No. Look, I wasn't going to. I was using an entirely different piece of equipment and the wrong bit was going up instead of my green tick.

JULIE HAMMER: Oh, okay. Thank you. Thank you very much. Okay. Well, I see lots of green ticks there. Thank you very much for that. So we'll finalize those. We'll take the draft off, and we will advise the ALAC that that is the final version of the candidate requirements.

Moving on now to Agenda Item 5, an update on the proposed web tool. Cheryl, Ariel, Terri, and I had a very, very useful session earlier in the week with Ken Bour on the sorts of tools that might be made available to us to assist our whole process.

What he has put forward for us to look at initially when we do a training session or a [inaudible] session next week is very closely based on what the NomCom views. It allows online submission of applications. It allows certain information to be withheld from us, should we choose it to do a blind assessment. We can also have tools where we can vote online or record a level of assessment online. Like if we decide we want to, in our quick assessment, say, "Score each candidate between 0 and 5," to get a feel for who should remain on the shortlist, then there are tools there that will enable that to happen.

Many of you have been on NomCom in the last few years, and so you will be quite familiar with these tools, more so than I am. But I was very impressed with what Ken was proposing, and I have actually been through what the NomCom are currently using, which is what he presented to Cheryl and I, and I have compared that with the 2014 expression of interest pro forma that was used for the last At-Large Board member selection, and I've come back to Ken with some suggestions about how that can actually be even more closely aligned with what our candidate requirements are and our process, and what I'm hoping is that he may have time to update on his test website for us before we even do our sessions.

So I would like to suggest and seek your agreement that we use those tools. I think they will give us much greater security of information, and I think they will make our life much easier for getting through our assessment process. So I'd like to invite Cheryl to add any comments, seeing as she participated in that session for me, and she's seen some of my follow-up analysis, and then I'll throw the floor open to input from the rest of you.

Cheryl, would you like to add anything, please?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Julie. Just very briefly, you've done a great covering of it. One of the things that I think those of you who have recent experience of this online wiki-based, conference-based tool that NomCom has used in the last few years, and you're familiar with the processes, what Ken is able to assure us is that we can easily switch out for the [weighing]

exercise the issues that are ALAC- and At-Large-specific, if that's what we want to do. So if you have in your mind a particular focus that you've used within NomCom, rest assured that anything we want to weight as more important for assessment out of our criteria set, we can put into the process extremely easily.

So it's certainly a tool that I'm going to strongly suggest we use. Also, those of you who haven't explored it before or may have done so several years back, the brief update and refresh session for us, I think that's next meeting, but Julie has to confirm that yet, will be a very good idea. I certainly think that what we'll be using is best described as a light version, so we don't need a number of the bells and whistles that NomCom have established and that is because, for example, we have entirely different requirements for the later publication of name and of region.

We, in fact, have to publish. Once we put our final [slates] together, we have to publish a name and region of every EOI that we've received, even those that we've [culled] because they were deemed as inappropriate. The reason being is the ability for the regions to petition for any person who has put in an EOI, provided they can get the support of more than one region to have that person added to the [slate.]

So we have some very different ways of approaching things compared to NomCom, but that said, it will work seamlessly with the tools, and can Ken, as those who've worked with him would know, is an absolute guru on this, and seems to be able to put it together between cups of coffee, let alone day one and day two. That's it from me.

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks, Cheryl, and I see Louis has asked in the chat, "Is the web tool for NomCom more stable now?" I believe it certainly is, I think. Yrjö, who's on the current – you're still on NomCom, I think, Yrjö. Are you comfortable with how stable the tool is now? Yrjö, if you're able to just give a tick if it's difficult to come off mute, that would be fine. Oh, no, you're off mute. Great.

I see Cheryl has answered in the chat, "Yes," that it is more stable, but we'll need it running on a separate server.

Can I ask if anyone else would like to have any discussion or comment about using this tool that's going to be based on the NomCom tool, but a little bit simpler?

Okay, in that case, I will ask if you would formally agree to the use of that tool just for formality of the meeting and indicate by your green ticks. Brilliant.

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: Yes.

JULIE HAMMER: Great, thank you, Fatimata. Okay, so everyone is happy with that. So we'll take that as a decision of this meeting. Agenda Item 6, to some extent I've already touched upon and advised you that I've done a detailed comparison between the 2014 expression of interest pro forma, and the tools that Ken showed Cheryl and I the other day and

I've analyzed the differences and come up with a number of recommendations for how to adapt the NomCom web tool to more closely align with our candidate requirements.

I don't believe, to some extent, that we need to go through this pro forma in any great detail, but our candidate requirements are very closely aligned with the 2014 process, therefore, the candidate application or the expression of interest pro forma should be very closely aligned with what we want to use now and if I map from that into the tool, then we should be pretty fit for proceeding forward.

So I don't know that we need to discuss that too much more now. I'll give you the microphone in a moment, Gunela, but what I'm hoping is that when we do do the training session next week with Ken, I can explain to you some of the changes that either have been made by Ken or need to be made by Ken to align it with our process. Gunela, please go ahead.

GUNELA STBRINK: Thank you, Julie. I'm just going to ask a semantic question. I did go through the pro forma, and I know that it's the pro forma that's been used before, but in the section – I don't have the section number. Oh, it might be section six, about references, and it talks about getting references, but then it talks about [contesting] references, and I'm wondering if it should be referees, rather than [inaudible] in the actual –

JULIE HAMMER: Yes, I'll make sure that all of those sorts of corrections are made in the online form. I had noted that myself, Gunela. Yes.

GUNELA STBRINK: Okay, and that also [inaudible] Thank you very much, Julie.

JULIE HAMMER: Yes, thanks. One thing that I'd like to mention in this context and it comes up again in the operational procedures. Vanda raised the point in her comments on our agenda webpage, "Do we really need three referees or three references?" At the moment, what the form says and what has happened in the past is that we seek – I think it says – a minimum of three, and a maximum of four references, and Vanda has asked, "Do we really need that many?" And I would like to throw that open to those of you who have had experience in this, and ask for your view. I believe we can change that to a lesser number, should you wish. Vanda, please go ahead.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: My question was just [inaudible] because –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: There is an echo here.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: There is an echo here.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Is it better now?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: One moment, I [inaudible].

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Hello?

JULIE HAMMER: Vanda, I can hear you, and it's good now.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Hello? It's better now?

JULIE HAMMER: That's good. Please go ahead, Vanda.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Yes. [inaudible] Are you listening to me?

JULIE HAMMER: We still have an echo, but please, go ahead.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: Okay. What I ask is for to get answers sometimes from the [referee.] That's the only issue that I can see, because three persons maybe is too much for this time slot we have dedicated to the answer of those guys.

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you, Vanda. I would like to ask other people for their views, please. Fatimata, please, go ahead, and then Cheryl.

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: Yes, thank you. I'm asking the question, do we have to contact all the referees? Maybe, maybe not. But I think it's still good to have the two references, because sometimes I've experienced cases where I tried to reach referees and couldn't reach as much as two or one. Sometimes, the referee is not reachable, so it's good to have the three. That is my point.

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you, Fatimata. Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Julie. Fatimata has picked up exactly what I wanted to say, and that is if we ask the standard minimum of three and no more than four, it doesn't mean we have to contact all four, but if we can only get a hold of two, that's not bad. The other thing is we have had at least one situation I'm aware of where the referees have declined to give the

reference. Now, if you've only given one or two names, and those one or two names both happened to decline to give you a reference and they never told you that they have no intention of supporting you through your effort, but they will certainly tell us when we ask them. At least getting three or four gives people a bit of a chance of finding at least one person who can say something nice about them or perhaps not at all. So I don't see the downside of asking for the three and no more than four because it gives us the options to work with. Thank you.

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks, Cheryl, and just I guess my understanding – and correct me if I was wrong – was that in our earlier discussion on the topic of referees and references that we'd actually said that the candidate is to submit the references with their applications and my thinking when we had that discussion was that the written references, not just the names of the referees, would be part of the candidate's application form. Is that what we're intending? To me, that's a really sensible way to go, because it means that we have all of that information right from the beginning. So if I've misunderstood, I wonder if someone could please tell me. Seeing no hands, I'm assuming that I haven't misunderstood.

Thank you, I was just reading the comment. Fatimata, please go ahead. You want to respond to that? Thank you.

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: Sometimes, you might need some clarifications about things the candidate expressed, and it would just need to have some confirmation from the referees. And even if you had something written by the

referee, you might need to dig further in terms of clarification, and that's where we need to contact them.

JULIE HAMMER:

Thank you, Fatimata. Definitely, and I wasn't meaning to imply that we wouldn't necessarily wish to contact referees, but that would be a further down, a later part of our process. So I most definitely agree with you on that, but I think we can allay a lot of the problems if we actually ask candidates to submit their references from their referees with their application.

And then, yes, as Cheryl's saying, if we can only get in contact with two of them, then it's less of a problem. So if there's no further discussion on that, noting the time, I would like to leave that discussion now. We will ask the references as part of the submission process for the applications themselves, noting that we may, further downstream, want to contact the referees with specific questions or clarification.

So what I'll do then is make sure that that part of our process is reflected in the web tool that we finalize. We're a long way from finalizing that now, and we've actually got time while the expressions of interest are being submitted to work on that web tool with Ken and to familiarize ourselves with it, so that we know exactly what we're doing.

I'd now like to move on to Agenda Item 7, and I noticed a couple of our members have had to drop off. We've previously discussed [inaudible] 1 to 8, and I have now tried to finish off the rest of our operational procedures and guidelines, [inaudible] 9 to 15.

On the basis of some of our discussions today regarding candidate references and other parts of our process, I will go through the draft operational procedures with a fine tooth comb and update them to align with what we've agreed in this meeting. But in the meantime, I'd just like to invite any of you to make comments, suggestions, disagreements about anything that I've included in them or any omissions. So if you would please raise your hand if you have some comments to make.

Okay, seeing no hands, can I ask you to use your green tricks if you are happy for me to finalize these operational instructions, and circulate them once updated for your final approval by e-mail and then submit them to the ALAC? Because they have to be formally approved by the ALAC.

Thank you. I see Cheryl and Yrjö. Jordi, thank you, Gunela, thank you. We seem to have lost a few people. Fatimata, are you comfortable? You haven't seen them, Fatimata, I'll send them to you by e-mail and you can provide me any feedback, but I'll update them so that you don't waste your time looking at something that needs to be updated. Thank you.

Final Agenda Item before Any Other Business is to ask how many of our group are actually going to be in Hyderabad. I know that Yrjö and Cheryl will be there, but I was just wondering how many of us will be there, and whether any of you have suggestions for the joint meeting that we're currently planning to have there with the BMSPC.

Gunela, I see you might be there. Nor will Jordi. Fatimata, you won't be there?

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: No.

JULIE HAMMER: I'm sorry, Fatimata. No, okay, thank you. Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry, Julie, you might be saying what I'm about to say anyway. Obviously, you wouldn't be saying that, that would be silly. I would assume that, of course, we would be running this meeting – and it really is a matter of just updating and reassuring the BMSPC that we're on track. A little off [purpose] from our perspective, I would have thought, but anyway, that's my particular biases on that.

But I would have thought we would have probably running it out of the ALAC At-Large room, and as such, providing we have remote participation materials replacing what was lost in the fire, we should be able to provide for remote participation. I don't see that the joint meeting will be of benefit to us. I think the joint meeting may be of benefit to the BMSPC.

JULIE HAMMER: Fatimata, yes, did you want to add something?

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: Yes, I guess I wanted to second Cheryl on that.

JULIE HAMMER: Yes, there will definitely be remote participation. It was purely for me to know as the matter of interest how many people would be there in person, but the intent is that it definitely would have remote participation and the suggestion I've given to staff already is that really, it's just an update to identify where we are at, to identify any issues that had arisen as a result of the process, and to some extent, really, if there is an audience other than the committee members either in the room or on the Adobe Connect, just to have an opportunity for them to better understand the process. So I think I'm completely in line with what you said, Cheryl, that it's really more for others than for this particular committee.

Okay, well, that's all I wanted to do, so I'll just reaffirm with staff that what I have already said ought to be put on the agenda page. It will be adequate.

We're running pretty well on time, which is great. Our last Agenda Item is Any Other Business. We've hardly got anyone left, but thank you for those of you who've hung in there for the whole hour, and our wonderful staff support people. Can I ask if anyone has any other business? Someone with a dog has some other business.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: That's my [inaudible] I do apologize.

EN

JULIE HAMMER: I thought it might be. Okay, well, that being the case, I will end the meeting, and thank you very much for your participation and your excellent feedback. We'll keep working and moving this process along as quickly as we can. Thank you. Thank you Fatimata very much for joining, I do appreciate that.

FATIMATA SEYE SYLLA: Thank you. Bye. My pleasure.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thanks, everyone. Bye.

YESIM NAZLAR: This meeting is now adjourned. The audio will now be disconnected. Thank you very much for your participation, and have a lovely rest of the day. Bye-bye.

JULIE HAMMER: Thank you, Yesim. Thank you, Ariel.

YESIM NAZLAR: My pleasure, Julie. Have a lovely day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]