ICANN FY14 SLIDES	RySG COMMENTS	ISPCP COMMENTS	MIKE O'CONNOR COMMENTS	BC REPLY COMMENT
Slide 3 - Overview		ISPCP questions the large increase in recurring costs and questions the accountability of taking that step.		The BC supports gaining a better understanding of the increase in recurring costs.
Slide 3 - "This proposal will be modified as a result of feedback from the community and ICANN's Board, and will be considered for adoption in June 2013."		Given the short time frame and limited availability for conversation about the budget, how does that administration align the FY14 budget with the requirement that this remains a bottom-up accountable process?	Really? How much room for change is there in this budget? It would be helpful to know the discretionary/flexible parts of the budget.	The BC supports understanding the level of stakeholder involvement intended in finalizing the FY14 budget.
Slides 7-9 - Organizational Transformation		Have the sweeping initiatives outlined on Page 9 been vetted by the community and approved by the Board?		The BC supports questions about the process for finalizing the FY14 budget.
Slides 7-9 - Organizational Transformation		Is there a way to phase the transition to the worldwide matrix organization that is proposed?		The BC supports this question.
Slides 7-9 - Organizational Transformation		What happens if ICANN can't sustain the predicted rate of change, it or it causes unforeseen consequences?		The BC supports this question.
Slides 7-9 - Organizational Transformation		Has consideration been given to conducting pilot tests of this idea in a limited way before completely converting to the new structure?		The BC supports this question.
Slide 9 - re: FY13 and FY14: Continued Transformation		There seem to be a number of overlapping initiatives in the DNS Industry Engagement area (introduced on Page 9). The ISPCP feel that there is a need to ensure that issues such as redundancy, scope-creep, the possibility of over-rapid expansion and a thoughtful determination of ICANN's role in promoting the "DNS Industry" are well understood, vetted by the community and approved by the Board in order to justify this spend.	There seem to be a number of overlapping initiatives in this area (detailed in subsequent slides). Issues: redundancy, scope-creep, over-rapid expansion, questions of ICANN's role in promoting the "DNS Industry"	The BC supports questions related to DNS Industry Engagement.

ICANN FY14 SLIDES	RySG COMMENTS	ISPCP COMMENTS	MIKE O'CONNOR COMMENTS	BC REPLY COMMENT
Slide 9 - re: FY13 and FY14: Continued Transformation		Accepting that one of the primary goals of this budget is to further strengthen the infrastructure, the ISPCP questions why SSR staff and infrastructure, and bottom-up policy-making bodies are suffering so badly in this budget. With so many resources being channeled into the infrastructure support of internal overhead activities (such as "institutionalize management disciplines" and "mature organizational support functions"), why is "world-facing" infrastructure being starved? We question whether these choices are being made with the encouragement and support of the Board and equally important, question whether such decisions also require additional dialogue with those stakeholders most impacted.	SSR staff/infrastructure, and bottom-up policy making bodies, are suffering in this budget.	The BC supports questions about budget allocations to SSR.
Slide 9 - re: FY13 and FY14: Continued Transformation			It looks like we're already committed to this dramatic change of the organization – but what happens if we can't sustain it or it causes damage? Is there room for some "pilot before we roll" behavior?	The BC supports gaining a better understanding of the organizational transformation.
Slide 9 - re: FY13 and FY14: Continued Transformation			What happens if these revenue assumptions are wrong. What if the gTLDs are delayed – does ICANN create an ambiguous role for itself by having a stake in, and a bet on, the timing and size of that new revenue stream?	The BC supports these valid questions.
Slide 12 - re: Budget Process -- Mid-year change		Have budgetary caution and safeguards (described as "Original Approach" on Page 12) been lost during the transition to the AtTask system (described as "Revised Approach")?		The BC supports this valid question.
Slide 12 - re: Budget Process -- Mid-year change		Does this new approach provide adequate basis for ICANN to carry out its fiduciary responsibilities?		The BC supports this valid question.
Slide 12 - re: Budget Process -- Mid-year change		Is there any way to re-establish the review and revision steps that were lost upon budget management changes?	Where is the "change the budget" part of this new process? Or does the process stop with public comment. Are we just providing comment on an already-frozen budget?	The BC supports this valid question.
RE: Slide 14 - FY13 Forecast vs. FY13 Published Budget	FY13 forecast = $18,008,000 for historical development costs Have deposited these funds into the ICANN Reserve Account? How much? When will 100% be deposited? Has ICANN settled on a target for the Reserve Fund? Clarity on this figure, and ICANN's progress on reaching it, would be appreciated.			
RE: Slide 14 - FY13 Forecast vs. FY13 Published Budget	FY13 FORECAST = $573,000 for "Bad Debt Expenses." What is the nature of these? FY14 budget represents a 43.3% increase – what drives this? How does ICANN intend to resolve "Bad Debt Expenses"?			The BC supports these valid questions.

ICANN FY14 SLIDES	RySG COMMENTS	ISPCP COMMENTS	MIKE O'CONNOR COMMENTS	BC REPLY COMMENT
RE: Slide 14 - FY13 Forecast vs. FY13 Published Budget			See FY13 Forecast alongside FY13 Published Budget. Mikey's note points out, in the FY13 Forecast, under "Change in Net Assets," $103, 027, with the note "There's good news in FY13 -- but...most of this is offset in FY14. This is primarily an artifact of new-gTLD delays. Since that program is front-loaded with expenses, delays generate good news in early years, bad (to very-bad) news in later years. Are we ready?"	
Slide 15 - FY13 Forecast vs. FY13 Published Budget – Revenue	FY13 forecast = $72,687,000 in fees paid to ICANN from gTLD registrants via registries and registrars, representing approximately 95.1% of ICANN's revenue. RySG requests why transparency of source and output of funds via charts (as have been provided in years past) are not provided for FY14 in budget.			The BC supports these valid questions about transparency.
Slide 15 - FY13 Forecast vs. FY13 Published Budget – Revenue			Is there a contingency plan if these numbers actually reflect a flattening/maturing of demand for domain names, both in existing and new gTLDs? How much of the expansion of ICANN described in this budget be gracefully unwound if things don't turn out the way we hope? Is there a plan to protect core functions in that scenario?	The BC supports these valid questions related to contingency plans.
Slide 17 - re: Security, under Professional Services			Just as the Compliance function was starved for years, this is troubling. Is this $1.2 million of projects: being carried forward in base, cancelled, or are they a part of the $1.6 million on page 22 (so there's really only $.4 million in new money)?	The BC supports this valid question.
Slide 19 - FY14 Draft Operating Plan & Budget vs. FY13 Forecast	1) is the plan still to transfer the recovered historical new gTLD costs into the Reserve Account? 2) If so, when will the historical costs estimated for FY14 be deposited into the Reserve Account? 3) Is there an estimate as to when the Reserve Fund will reach the Board's targeted amount? We note: The FY14 ICANN Operations budgeted revenue (excluding new gTLDs) increases 15.4% over the FY13 forecast while expenses increase 23.8%; this still leaves $3,659,000 in revenue over expenses. We have several concerns in this regard: 1) A 23.8% year over year increase is very large; 2) the fact that expenses are increasing at a year over year rate of 8.4% more than revenue and there is still over $3.6M in excess revenue makes us wonder whether ICANN registry and registrar fees are too high; 3) the fact that revenue is high should not be a license to spend more. At a bare minimum, explanation should be provided regarding these concerns.			The BC supports these valid questions and the request for a more detailed explanations.
Slide 19, in "Fav / Unfav" column, $(76,786)			Here's the "bad news" half of the favorable variance in FY13. Of the $76m gained, $62m shifted into unfavorable variance in FY14 due to delays in new gTLD, and higher than anticipated withdrawals. That's OK, but only if there are no more delays and withdrawals stay on track – which risks reducing some of ICANN's independence in overseeing the new gTLD project as ICANN becomes tied to program performance.	
Slide 20 - FY14 Draft Operating Plan & Budget vs. FY13 Forecast - Revenue	...request for disclosure of the amount of estimated expenses planned in support of the GNSO in general and specifically registries, registrars, registrants, gTLD users, RIRs, and ccTLDs. This used to be provided but is no longer and no adequate rationale was communicated. The RySG believes that providing this level of detail is a transparency requirement that those who pay the fees deserve.			The BC supports this request for greater transparency and more details of the GNSO budget.
Slide 21 - FY14 Draft Operating Plan & Budget Variance Analysis - Revenue	What is the explanation for the $37,000 increase for ccTLDs? What should the community expect going forward with regard to ccTLD contributions? Will the expected changes to subsidization be changed? ICANN lowered its FY14 target for ccTLD contributions, and it rarely received the full budgeted amount over the past several years. Why should gTLD fees be used to subsidize ccTLD support? Is it not reasonable to expect the ccNSO to be relatively self-supporting?			The BC supports questions leading to a better understanding of ccTLD support and participation.

ICANN FY14 SLIDES	RySG COMMENTS	ISPCP COMMENTS	MIKE O'CONNOR COMMENTS	BC REPLY COMMENT
Slide 21, under "New gTLD App Fees"			This reads strangely to me. It seems to imply that expenses are a cause/driver of revenue. Are revenues being treated as deferred, and being realized on the basis of progress toward contract? If that's the case, is ICANN really an independent evaluator?	
Slide 22 - FY14 Draft Operating Plan & Budget Variance Analysis	...request that notes be provided as done elsewhere to explain the main causes of variances not obvious or explained elsewhere (e.g., personnel, meetings); this could be accomplished via written notes and/or by providing detailed breakouts of variances by categories.			The BC supports this valid request for details related to reasons for variances.
Slide 22, under "ICANN Operating Expenses" - "Impact of Internalization (incl. languages)			This is by far the largest increase. What's the rationale for this scale of increase/scope-gallop/reorganization. Are there measures of success. Are there rollback options if if fails? Can we pilot some of these initiatives before committing this much money?	The BC supports these valid questions.
Slide 22, under "ICANN Operating Expenses" - "Right-Sizing of DNS services"			How much of this increase is for things that the community agrees are in scope? EG DNS Industry Mgt?	
Slide 22, under "ICANN Operating Expenses" - "Impact of DNS growth on Tech Services"			How much of this is the $1.2million in deferred Security money from FY13?	The BC supports this valid question.
Slide 22, under "ICANN Operating Expenses" - "Increased Community Engagement"			This is the smallest pile of new money – are we starving the bottom of the bottom-up process?	The BC supports this valid question.
Slide 22, under "ICANN Operating Expenses" - "Impact of Internalization (incl. languages)			This is by far the largest increase. What's the rationale for this scale of increase/scope-gallop/reorganization. Are there measures of success. Are there rollback options if if fails? Can we pilot some of these initiatives before committing this much money?	The BC supports this valid question.
Slide 23 - Draft Operating Plan & Budget Headcount by Function *	Some of the groups on this slide are self-explanatory; others are not. We request that at least the following groups be defined: 02 — Strategic Comm; 03 — GSE; 06 — DNS Industry; 08 — Operations; 09 — Technical functions; 10 — Org support.			The BC supports this valid request for definitions of groups receiving headcount.

ICANN FY14 SLIDES	RySG COMMENTS	ISPCP COMMENTS	MIKE O'CONNOR COMMENTS	BC REPLY COMMENT
Slide 26 - Management Delivery: Objectives & Goals w. FY14 Draft Budget		RE: Disconnect between Outreach and the policy-development process How are "Engage Stakeholders Globally" and "Increase/Improve Participation" initiatives coordinated, so that they complement and reinforce each other?		The BC supports this valid question.
Slide 26 - Management Delivery: Objectives & Goals w. FY14 Draft Budget		RE: Support for the multi-stakeholder model - What is the rationale for the proposal on Page 26 that "Operations Excellence" (which reads like a catchall for overhead functions) receives ten times the money that is going to "Multi-Stakeholder Model Evolution"...?		The BC supports this valid question.
Slide 26 - Management Delivery: Objectives & Goals w. FY14 Draft Budget		RE: Support for the multi-stakeholder model - How is this budget process structured to guard against bloat in recurring overhead costs and ensure focus on the "line" functions (such as the bottom-up multi-stakeholder policy development process) that the organization must deliver as part of its character in the Bylaws and the Affirmation of Commitments?		
Slide 26 - Management Delivery: Objectives & Goals w. FY14 Draft Budget		RE: Reduced emphasis on Security function - Just as the Compliance function was starved for years, the ISPCP (the recipients of the first call for help when the DNS and numbering systems break) finds the treatment of the Security function in this budget troubling. For example, $1.2 million of Security projects and headcount are listed as cancelled in the FY13 variance analysis on Page 17. More detail is required on what specific projects come under this heading. Have these projects been carried into FY14? If so, is that delay the primary source of the $1.6 million of additional funding listed on page 22 (so there's really only $.4 million in new money)?		The BC supports these valid questions.
Slide 26 - Management Delivery: Objectives & Goals w. FY14 Draft Budget		RE: Reduced emphasis on Security function - Given the imminent arrival of new gTLDs, and the certainty that there will be "interesting" security, stability and reliability issues arising from that change, shouldn't the Security function be a front-and-center item in this budget? Currently the Security function only appears to be briefly mentioned, in a couple of footnotes.		The BC supports this valid question.
Slide 26 - Management Delivery: Objectives & Goals w. FY14 Draft Budget		RE: Support for the multi-stakeholder model - What is the rationale for the proposal on Page 26 that "Operations Excellence" (which reads like a catchall for overhead functions) receives ten times the money that is going to "Multi-Stakeholder Model Evolution"...?		The BC supports this valid question.
Slide 26, alongside "Optimize Policy Development Process" and "Engage Stakeholders Globally" (more)			Are these two efforts being coordinated? If they're not, we run the risk of drawing many new participants in, but not providing them with a landing pad or a path to constructive engagement. What role, if any, is envisaged for AC/SO's in this? Do they have the capacity to deliver what's expected?	The BC supports these valid questions.
Slides 28- 32, Draft Operating Plan & Budget — AtTask *	Particularly for larger programs, detail about the various projects and their associated budgeted expense amounts are needed to allow for an adequate review of the budget. This is critical as ICANN shifts to a "matrix" operating structure and initiatives are handled by cross-functional teams. ...request that project detail be made available for all programs. In fact, it would also be very helpful information if a tool was provided to help community members navigate the AtTask information. As one small example that is near to our hearts, where would the cost of Registries Stakeholder Group support be found in the budget? In exploring the AtTask spreadsheet provided, we were unable to find that.			The BC supports this request for detail of all programs budgeted.

ICANN FY14 SLIDES	RySG COMMENTS	ISPCP COMMENTS	MIKE O'CONNOR COMMENTS	BC REPLY COMMENT
Slide 29, under "Deepen Partnerships with Internet Organizations…"			How does this differ from Internet Governance Ecosystem below?	The BC supports this valid question.
Slide 29, under "Deepen Partnerships with Internet Organizations…", $28,000			What does $28k buy? Does it move the needle?	The BC supports this valid question.
Slide 30 - Draft Operating Plan & Budget — AtTask *	In one of the programs under the Effective Business Operations portfolio: Other Programs for Effective Business Operations, $6,795,000 is budgeted for this program, which amounts to 44.0% of the total portfolio budget; apparently no further detail is given for this program. What is this program? It is way too large to be shown without further breakdown both in terms of the projects it includes and the dollar amounts associated with those projects. Without it, it is not possible to perform a competent review of the budget.			The BC supports this request for program detail.
Slide 30 - $9,000 for "Implement Operational Readiness" under "Institutionalize Management Disciplines…"			What does $9k buy? Does it move the needle?	The BC supports this valid question.
Slide 30 - "gTLD Services" and "gTLD Operations" under "Optimize gTLD Services"			What's in "services" vs. "operations"? Is "services" the bucket for supporting the new trade organization?	The BC supports these valid questions.
Slide 30 - "Risk Management" under "Plan for Scale, Security, Continuity"			Is [risk management] coordinated with the "security, stability and resiliency" bucket on the previous page?	The BC supports this valid question.
Slide 30 - $3,000 for "Continuity of Outside Mechanisms (UDRP, TMCH), "Risk Management" under "Plan for Scale, Security, Continuity"			What does $3k buy? Does it move the needle?	The BC supports this valid question.
Slide 31 - FY14 Draft Operating Plan & Budget - AtTask		RE: Disconnect between Outreach and the policy-development process - Is ICANN proposing to do outreach through the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees that support the policy-development process? Or is the Engage Stakeholders Globally effort (funded for $11.7 million - Page 31) independent of those bodies?		The BC supports gaining a better understanding of "Outreach" and "Engage Stakeholders Globally".

ICANN FY14 SLIDES	RySG COMMENTS	ISPCP COMMENTS	MIKE O'CONNOR COMMENTS	BC REPLY COMMENT
Slide 31 - FY14 Draft Operating Plan & Budget - AtTask		RE: Disconnect between Outreach and the policy-development process Presuming that Engage Stakeholders Globally initiatives results in many new participants..., where in the budget are the allocations for required resources for SO's and AC's to welcome, brief, train, develop and mentor influx of new participants?		The BC supports gaining a better understanding of "Outreach" and "Engage Stakeholders Globally".
Slide 31 - re: $5.5 million for "Engage Stakeholders Regionally" and $1.8 million for "Global Stakeholder Engagement Planning"			How much of this is office cost, vs. actually engaging with people? Does this include a lot of on-ramping for new people once they arrive or do we leave them to fend for themselves? What's their path to productive participation?	The BC supports this request for program detail.
Slide 31 - re: $99,000 for "Regional Initiatives, including Centers of Excellence"			What does $99k buy? Does it move the needle?	The BC supports this valid question.
Slide 32 - FY14 Draft Operating Plan & Budget — AtTask	- Organizational Reviews portfolio comes under the Evolve SO/AC Structures. Looking further into AtTask, two of the programs and their budgeted amounts are: the GNSO Review with $0 budgeted; Structural (Organizational) Reviews Management with $199,589 budgeted, which amounts to 100% of the amount for this portfolio. In other words, there are no funds budgeted for any of the specific reviews such as the GNSO Review, even though the GNSO Review is expected to start in FY14. ...requesting explanation			The BC supports this valid request for an understanding of why no funds are budgeted for GNSO Review.
Slide 32 - FY14 Draft Operating Plan & Budget — AtTask	RE: Support Policy Development Efforts portfolio under the Optimize Policy Development Efforts goal. In AtTask, two of the programs are: GNSO Policy Support with a budget of $80,831 (1.6% of the portfolio expenses); SO Policy Development Efforts with a budget of $2,063,662 (40.9% of the portfolio expenses). We assume that most GNSO policy support will be funded out of the SO Policy Development budget; is that a correct assumption? ...request breakdown both in terms of the projects it includes and the dollar amounts associated with those projects. Without it, it is not possible to perform a competent review of the budget.			The BC supports this request for program detail.
Slide 32 - FY14 Draft Operating Plan & Budget — AtTask		RE: Organizational transformation - At a more detailed level, the ISPCP asks whether the "Optimize PDP" item is in line with the "GNSO Project List."		The BC supports this request for program detail.
Slide 32 - FY14 Draft Operating Plan & Budget — AtTask		RE: Organizational transformation - Likewise on the same page the "Evolve SO/AC Structures" item contains $200k allocated to "Organizational Reviews" -- does this imply that ICANN anticipates a self-assessment by the GNSO?		The BC supports this valid question regarding Organizational Reviews.
Slide 32 - $6k for "Anticipate and accommodate community evolution broader geo participation" under "Evolve SO/AC Structures"			What does $6k buy? Does it move the needle?	The BC supports this valid question.

ICANN FY14 SLIDES	RySG COMMENTS	ISPCP COMMENTS	MIKE O'CONNOR COMMENTS	BC REPLY COMMENT
Slide 32 - "Evolve Multistakeholder Model" under "Evolve SO/AC Structures..."			How does this differ from "optimize policy development process" below?	The BC supports this valid question.
Slide 32 - "Increase and Improve Global Participation..."			How does this differ from "engage stakeholders globally" on the previous slide?	The BC supports this valid question.
Slide 32 - "Deploy Collaboration Platform" under "Increase and Improve Global Participation..."			Can we pilot this first, then deploy it if it works?	
Slide 32 - "Enhance Community Participation" under "Increase and Improve Global Participation..."			How does this differ from "enable cross stakeholder collaboration" below and "engage stakeholders globally" on the previous slide? Are these initiatives coordinated so that new arrivals have a clear path to effective participation?	The BC supports this valid question.
Slides 35-36 - Draft Operating Plan & Budget — Community Support Requests	As communicated in the Operating Plan & Budget webinar held on 15 May, there is an asterisked note at the bottom of slide 36 that is refers to services that are already provided in in-kind but there are no asterisks shown for any of the special budget request line items. Please update the table on these two slides to identify the items that will provided as in-kind services.			
Slides 35-36 - Draft Operating Plan & Budget — Community Support Requests		RE: Disconnect between Outreach and the policy-development process NONE of the CSG Fast Track budget requests appear to have been funded; are they elsewhere in the budget? Can these resources be made clearer? Nearly 50% of the budget allocated for community support requestss has been allocated during the fast track process, but none of the Constituencies' requests in the CSG have been dealt with. Is it expected that unpaid volunteer participation will cover this gap without any incremental resources or support? Request involvement by constituency leaders in discussions and decisions impacting these groups' ability to properly function.		The BC supports this valid question.
Slide 38 - New gTLD Program - Financial Summary		RE: Process - Initial ISPCP identified several apparent arithmetic errors, each valued at up to $5 million (in the new gTLD Refunds). The number and size of apparent errors discovered raises concerns over the level of accuracy of the budget overall.	The variance seems high at $17,004. Check my arithmetic: The sum of variances as listed in this paragraph is: $5.8 + $3.2 + ($24) + $7.3 + ($5.3) = ($13) So I would put the variance at -$13 million rather than -$17 million as listed. Can we take the $4 million I've found and put it into Working Groups?	The BC supports this valid question.
Side 38 - New gTLD Program - Financial Summary			Note: Mikey points out an apparent mathematical error which ripples through the rest of the summary, and the presence of a positive number that he says should be a negative number.	

ICANN FY14 SLIDES	RySG COMMENTS	ISPCP COMMENTS	MIKE O'CONNOR COMMENTS	BC REPLY COMMENT
Side 39 - New gTLD Program - Financial Summary - Variance Explanations			Projected withdrawals of 645 seem low. Please check my arithmetic: The sum of actual/projected withdrawals listed is: 1+35+470+150=656. Presumably pre-reveal withdrawals is a positive number, making this bigger. I don't know what the pre-reveal refund rate is. If it's 100% that means $5.3m of refunds from pre-reveal would work out to roughly 29 additional withdrawals. A 90% refund rate would drive that to 32 pre-reveal withdrawals. So I calculate projected withdrawals at 656 plus either 29 or 32 – a range of 685 to 688 total projected withdrawals. Partly, the arithmetic seems wrong. Partly, 685 strikes me as an optimistic estimate. Granted, estimating error has less impact the further through the tiers we get.	The BC supports this valid question.
Side 40 - New gTLD Program - Financial Summary - Variance Explanations			That $4 million difference also shows up here, it should be (-$13 million), and ripples through this page as well.	
Slide 40 - New gTLD Program - Operating Expenses	The current estimate for full program expenses as of April 2013 for Pre-delegation testing is $24,303,000. The RySG suspects that this could be reduced significantly if unnecessary duplications in the process were eliminated as there is a fairly limited number of backend registry service providers who will bear the bulk of the pre-delegation testing requirements.			
Slide 41 - New gTLD Program - Expense Variance Analysis - gTLD Team headcount			These strike me as high cost per head.	
Slide 41 - New gTLD Program - Expense Variance Analysis - Other Overhead			This strikes me as high, as a variance.	
Slides 38 - 43 - New gTLD Program		Are the assumptions about the timing and size of the revenue-generating potential of the program realistic, given the history of delays this far?		The BC supports this valid question.
Slides 38 - 43 - New gTLD Program		Is the lack of sufficient contingency within the budget likely to put pressure on staff to downplay serious obstacles that may occur during this budget cycle? How would any such occurrences be dealt with?		The BC supports this valid question.
Slides 38 - 43 - New gTLD Program		How much of the expansion of ICANN described in this budget be gracefully unwound if actual demand and revenue fall short of projection? What is the plan to protect core functions in that scenario?		The BC supports this valid question.

ICANN FY14 SLIDES	RySG COMMENTS	ISPCP COMMENTS	MIKE O'CONNOR COMMENTS	BC REPLY COMMENT
Slides 38 - 43 - New gTLD Program		What is the gTLDs continue to be substantially delayed -- does an optimistic revenue forecast, which supports the proposal to dramatically expand recurring costs, create a conflict of interest for ICANN by giving the organization a stake in, and a bet on, the timing and size of the new revenue stream? Could this perceived or real conflict reduce worldwide stakeholder confidence in ICANN's judgment in these matters?		The BC supports this valid question.