13:06:57 From Participant 1 to Panelists : Hi, glad that I could join :)
13:07:03 From Participant 2 to Panelists : Hello. There was an issue with the connection. Some colleagues from the SCBD cannot get in just yet.
13:08:20 From Participant 3 to Panelists : No problema. Thanks!
13:09:37 From Support Team : Hi all - this should have been solved now
13:10:22 From Participant 4 to Panelists : Will we be able to record the session?
13:11:22 From Participant 5 to Panelists : Now all well. Thanks!
13:11:44 From Support Team : Yes the session will be recorded.
13:17:03 From Participant 6 to Panelists : Is this the chat for questions?
13:17:16 From Participant 7 to Panelists : will you share the recording and desk used, please?
13:17:44 From Support Team : Please use the Q&A box for questions to the presenters
13:17:52 From Participant 6 to Panelists : ok thanks
13:17:58 From Support Team : Recording will be made available after the event
13:24:54 From Participant 7 to Panelists : thanks in advance for the recording. Would you share the attendees list, too? Thanks
13:25:50 From Participant 8 : hi. did indigenous people participate?
13:27:34 From Support Team : @Participant 8 : please put questions in the Q&A box rather than the chat
13:46:03 From Participant 9 : Would be good if the presentation can be shared
13:47:32 From Participant 6 to Panelists : Loved the Darwin picture and LUCA!
13:48:07 From Ibon Cancio to Panelists : Thanks
13:51:01 From Participant 10 to Panelists : Poll didn't turn up on my computer anywhere I could see it!
13:51:49 From Participant 11 to Panelists : maybe you can add an extra poll on the audience composition - would be interesting to see (especially when relating to the poll)
13:52:00 From Participant 12: Besides the participation of indigenous people: How will UNDROP be integrated into the projectís considerations (UNDROP = Rights of peasants Ö.)
13:53:18 From Participant 13 to Panelists : Open Acces is of extreme importance for public health research and control of pandemics
13:53:59 From Participant 14 to Panelists : use doesn't necessarily end in commercial applications. it can just be foundational research
13:54:23 From Participant 15 to Panelists : I need to leave you an hour. I will try to come back as soon as possible if possible. Very interesting if I cannot express this later on!!!
13:56:06 From Support Team : all a general reminder: questions for panellist in the Q&A box, general discussions and comments int he chat box if possible
13:58:54 From Participant 16 to Panelists : It is of course possible to link any species sample (one individual) to the DSI's produced from it - If you wish. Its just not done often

14:02:43 From Participant 17 : How is the ìoriginî of DSI determined in that slide?
14:03:24 From Participant 18 : Its in CBD DSI Studies 2/3
14:05:25 From Support Team : We are not taking questions or comments ëby voiceí. Only in the Q&A box. If you have technical issues, just message me and I will try to help.
14:06:23 From Participant 19 : It is important to bear in mind that data/information is not the only non-monetary benefit generated by scientists through the use of DSI. There is also reputation, increased capacities to use data, know how, funding for continuing the research, etc. These benefits are not public goods. Can the discussions around benefit-sharing take into consideration the possibility to share these benefits too?
14:07:08 From Participant 20 to Panelists : Option 1: challenging that it require national implementation
14:08:43 From Participant 21 to Panelists : How would these micro-levies be assessed? Would Sigma or Fisher be responsible for including a fee on their products? Also, how would this affect laboratories at small colleges and universities with limited research budgets?
14:09:40 From Support Team : Hi - can you put your question in the Q&A box?
14:10:57 From Participant 22 to Panelists : Re map on direction of flow of DSI, how did you determine 'origin'? the place where the sequencing took place or the place where the sequenced genetic resources came from?
14:11:19 From Participant 23 to Panelists : Option !: To homogenize or synchronise national legislation is almost impossible, as seen with the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol, because politics and ideology play a huge role in shaping national policy. The most ìsocialistsî or ìleft wingî the politicsîideology a country has, ironically, he more it seems to reject open access and adopt the cumbersome and incoherente legislation proposed by the Nagoya Protocol
14:11:47 From Guy Cochrane, EMBL-EBI to Panelists : Participant 22 : Origin here was the place where sampling happened, not where sequencing was carried out.
14:11:56 From Participant 17 : Paging ITPGRFA...
14:12:21 From Participant 24 : Agree. This is an important capacity-building question. Bioinformatic workforce capacity, expertise and access to computational resources become intertwined with equitable access to DSI as a public good.
14:12:28 From Guy Cochrane, EMBL-EBI to Panelists : E.G. if an organism is sample in COUNTRY X and sequenced at a facility in country Y, it was country X that was recorded.
14:12:30 From Participant 25 to Panelists : If option 1 is taken up, is the micro-levy only applied to generation of sequences through equipment etc. levies?; what about the use made by accessing open access is this without charge?
14:13:35 From Participant 26 to Panelists : wrt option 2 - ìDoes not affect open accessî is a big claim - i.e. open access for members zero access for everyone else
14:13:58 From Participant 22 to Panelists : re membership fee, do the membership fees increase with the annual commercial sales of the

user, or is it a flat fee?
14:14:06 From Participant 14 to Panelists : I can't hear anything
14:14:13 From Participant 27 to Panelists : the micro is off
14:14:13 From Guy Cochrane, EMBL-EBI to Panelists : I donít hear Paul
14:14:18 From Participant 28 to Panelists : There is no sound!!
14:14:20 From Participant 29 to Panelists : sound?
14:14:25 From Participant 30 to Panelists : we can't see nor hear you
14:14:28 From Participant 1 to Panelists : I can't hear anything
14:14:29 From Participant 31 to Panelists : we cannot hear anything currently
14:14:31 From Participant 32 to Panelists : Can you please unmute?
14:14:35 From Participant 33 to Panelists : Is it normal there is no sound ?
14:14:35 From Participant 25 to Panelists : No sound
14:14:36 From Participant 34 to Panelists : You are muted!
14:14:48 From Guy Cochrane, EMBL-EBI : Participant 22 : Origin here was the place where sampling happened, not where sequencing was carried out.
14:14:56 From Participant 14 to Panelists : is it just me?
14:14:56 From Guy Cochrane, EMBL-EBI : E.G. if an organism is sample in COUNTRY X and sequenced at a facility in country Y, it was country X that was recorded.
14:15:28 From Participant 14 to Panelists : yes, I can see and hear. thanks!
14:16:04 From Participant 8 : I cannot hear
14:16:09 From Participant 17 : for that proportion of DSI for which you actually have such data @guycochrane , correct?
14:16:42 From Guy Cochrane, EMBL-EBI to Panelists : Participant 17 - yes, for the proportion that exists within the INSDC databases.
14:17:01 From Guy Cochrane, EMBL-EBI : Participant 17 - yes, for the proportion that exists within the INSDC databases.
14:17:22 From Guy Cochrane, EMBL-EBI : .. and has been annotated with source country information.
14:22:37 From Participant 35 to Panelists : t is important that the DSI can be openly used so that this contributes to scientific advances at a global level, however, the sovereignty of the countries of origin of the genetic resources that gave rise to it has not been taken into account in today's discussion. In addition, an analysis of the technological differences between countries has not been made to the DSI and how this may favor the use of DSI and the generation of products, processes and services by developed countries rather than by developing countries. We must seek a balance between free access to information, but also support the technical development of developing countries so that we are in equal conditions in the use of DSI
14:24:24 From Guy Cochrane, EMBL-EBI to Panelists : would it be possible to remind participants to pose questions/raise points in the Q&A - otherwise itís very difficult to track, respond and maintain threads.
14:26:10 From Participant 17 : @EsthervanZimmeren a problem I see is that every user of those products who is not engaged in the

exploitation of genetic diversity per se will be a disgruntled ìtaxpayerî looking for an exemption. At the national level.
14:29:26 From Participant 36 to Panelists : will we receive the list of participants of this webinar ?
14:29:29 From Participant 37 : thank you for presenting all options in detail, especially pointing out proí s and conís. Also good examples from other sectors, but I miss the work already done on ëDSIí in for instance ITPGRFA of FAO and financial experience of Crop Diversity Trust.
14:31:58 From Participant 26 to Panelists : Blockchain is not a solution to any real world problem. There are more efficient computational solutions to every problem except for the absence of trust in someone to keep a ledger, and almost no real world problems are caused by the inability to trust a ledger keeper. Even if a solution with some of the features mentioned in option 5 is preferred, this can almost certainly be done better in another (less-hyped) technology.
14:32:30 From Participant 26 to Panelists : And donít get me started about smart contracts!
14:33:52 From Participant 26 to Panelists : Almost no deployment of blockchain has actually worked to deliver anything. The nearest thing to ìblockchainî successes in fact donít use most of the features of blockchain but just borrow the word because it is fashionable and you can raise/make money against it
14:33:54 From Guy Cochrane, EMBL-EBI : For blockchain, another technology could be substituted. Option 5 is really introducing the splitting of data element and the ìexternal technical solutionî, where the latter could be blockchain or something else.
14:34:22 From Participant 26 to Panelists : Yes, but we really shouldnít mention blockchain. Its nonsense mainly used for scamming
14:34:24 From Guy Cochrane, EMBL-EBI : do send your comments to Q&A as this discussion is just with the panelists.
14:34:32 From Participant 26 to Panelists : Oh, OK
14:35:42 From Participant 38 to Panelists : Thanks very much for great presentations and discussions. Also thanks Amber for answering the questions and sharing the email address (sorry for my oversight, it was there in the email messages). Thanks once again.
14:38:17 From Participant 39 to Panelists : Following from Zimbabwe. A riverting discussion.
14:38:28 From Participant 40 to Panelists : issues that are transversal to all the options must be addressed. Standards for cyberinfrastructure and cybersecurity will have to be developed simoultaneously. Another key aspect should be the interoperability of the selected option with the ongoing ABS processes in each country ñor at least the Nagoya onesñ, so the use of DSI is in line with the MAT.
14:40:35 From Participant 23 to Panelists : Option % to manage DSI with Blockchain seems a very sensible option ! The technology is not fully mature yet for adoption, but any developing country not understanding Blockchain and the BIoRevolution (that includes DSI) will be left behind and society will suffer
14:42:02 From Participant 41 to Panelists : @IbonCancio: thanks for your answers; sure, scientists need to provide proactive suggestions of what could work; GR and DSI are different when the latter has no

clear unique GR link with a provider country; I'm not questioning the provider country souvereignty in regulating that use.
14:44:32 From Participant 42 : Physical material has very different properties than DSI ñ if you want to handle both efficiently, it may in fact be helpful to have different rulesets for DSI and physical material. A two tier system in fact could be efficient – think of cars and aeroplanes: They transport people using different traffic rules that are tailored to their different properties.
14:45:57 From Participant 43 to Panelists : Concerning the cloud-option: payment by use does not seem completely fair. This allows rich countries/institutes/industries better access to data then poor counterparts. I'm in favour of levelling the playground.
14:46:35 From Participant 16 to Panelists : Any part of physical materiel (GR) includes DSI
14:51:07 From Participant 73 to Panelists : Will the recording of the meeting be available to the participants?
14:51:50 From Support Team : Hi – yes we will seek to make it available through the website where the webinar was announced, along with the presentations
14:52:29 From Participant 74 to Panelists : It might be worth tapping into the discussions surrounding indigenous data sovereignty as well, especially the CARE principles, which complement the FAIR principles https://www.gida-global.org/care
14:52:46 From Participant 17 : What about a microlevy disarticulated from use? For example, on alcohol sales. This would require an approach that set a figure for the expected income of a multilateral beenfit sharing system to which the rate of the microlevy would be matched, based on the market for the item subject to the levy. Itís politically difficult, but I see no reason why a levy must be directly linked to DSI use, provided that the levy generated the expected revenue.
14:54:58 From Participant 43 : the microlevy system: those producing DSI are providing added value to the GR, but will also run the risk to be taxed the most.
14:55:48 From Participant 44 to Panelists : The European Union is putting much effort on FAIR data.
European scientists must not only implement these principles in their own work but they should also question How this official European policy on FAIR data is considered by the European ABS policymakers / negotiators? In how far the European position on ABS is compatible with the developing FAIR data policy? How can we help incorporate the FAIR prinicples into the ABS policy. Note that Open data open access is not the same as FAIR.
14:56:13 From Participant 45 : I would insist that any DSI system would need to have a carbon and energy footprint as low as possible and not further contribute to climate change and its awful consequences!
14:57:09 From Participant 23 to Panelists : Option %: Blockchain is a technology that is not fully mature yet, but it will get there. To reject Blockchain now because of cost and difficulty of implementation needs careful consideration. But please do not dismiss it on the face of cost and complexity. Technologies mature and become simpler and cheaper (like mobile phones or CRISPR)
14:57:15 From Participant 23 to Panelists : option 5

14:57:24 From Participant 46 to Panelists : Is it possible to save the chat and QnA messages? There is some useful feedback. I am trying to save as much as possible but I can't read them fast enough.
14:58:28 From Participant 18: CBD DSI Study 1 covers scope and concept of DSI. The AHTEG report based on that proposes to limit DSI to 'molecular data' and exclude certain types of associated data
14:59:44 From Support Team : Hi – the chat and the Q&A will be saved! no need to rush to take notes.
15:00:50 From Participant 16 to Panelists : Interesting it took two AHTEG's on DSI to get to that point..
15:01:54 From Hugo Schally : Apologies for not putting my camera on, but I have a driver problem with my camera !
15:04:09 From Participant 47 : Congratulations on the study. In my humble opinion, we should focus more on mechanisms that ensure that products (arising from the utilization of DSI) that are ready to be marketed are the point of incidence of the monetary benefit sharing obligations. Furthermore, the amounts payable should be based on sales revenue. Equity in the sharing of benefits should take into account that the monetary benefits should be shared by those who actually had monetary benefits, if no monetary benefits arise, no monetary BS should apply. Product notification should be the focus of regulation, combined with the obligation to register research results when there are results (articles, patents, etc.). Patent offices and agencies responsible for approving products (for human, animal consumption, etc.) and others that require transparency about the production process and its ingredients must be the checkpoints and be empowered to demand proof of origin of the RG or the DSI (accesion number, for instance).
15:05:00 From Participant 47 : Moreover, benefit sharing calculation shouls be conducted after a year of exploring the product arising from the utilization of a DSI, we would know the product's revenue and be able to calculate the benefit sharing on that revenue. Government agencies responsible for collecting taxes on income and sales revenues should play a more important role in any model to be discussed.
Any research (commercial or not, for agriculture or health emergencies etc) must be open, but when the results are obtained, it should register the origin of the GR/DSI (at a Multilateral Clearing house mechanism maybe?), in the same way as the obligation to deposit a sequence before publishing the paper. Researchers should be obliged to electronic register the use or development of a DSI, after utilization, but prior to publication/patenting results.
15:05:04 From Participant 48 : I think you should take the example of the ITPGRFA and establish a multilateral fund that only funds conservation projects
15:06:17 From Participant 49 to Panelists : Not sure whether this point has already been made in the chat or Q&A but open access to all relevant DSI or better GRSD (ICC nomenclature) of a specific pathogen is specifically critical for the development of vaccines and diagnostic kits for this pathogen – so it is not only an issue of comparing a multitude of sequences but to make sure you have all the relevant ones.
15:08:15 From Participant 17 : Insisting on how countries spend

revenues risks a paternalistic sort of imposition on sovereignty. But of course Parties can voluntarily enter into multilateral approach that emphasized support for IPLCs, for example.
15:08:44 From Participant 40 to Panelists : The commercial use of DSI must be linked to the origin, but also to the probable revenue comming from the developments derived from the use of DSI. The IP component here will be of special relevance for the BS with the provider of the resource.
15:09:48 From Participant 50 to Panelists : Thanks for presenting all options in detail, along with their respective proí s and conís. We should now explore the feasibility of working out a hybrid option from these menu of options.
15:10:37 From Participant 49 : Not sure whether this point has already been made in the chat or Q&A but open access to all relevant DSI or better GRSD (ICC nomenclature) of a specific pathogen is specifically critical for the development of vaccines and diagnostic kits for this pathogen - so it is not only an issue of comparing a multitude of sequences but to make sure you have all the relevant ones.
15:12:16 From Participant 17 : most pandemic-relevant pathogen DSI (Cov-2 and influenza) is presently NOT shared in an open access system, and the scientific community is fine with that.
15:15:34 From Participant 51 : As I understand it the relevant pathogen sequences are largely shared by GISAID which states that it is open access, although it required registration by users - maybe it depends on how one defines open access
15:15:49 From Guy Cochrane, EMBL-EBI : Participant 17 - the scientific community is not happy with all systems in use to share Influenza and SARS-CoV-2 data as these are not open; access is restricted and redistribution is not allowed, limiting application of the data.
15:16:26 From Participant 1 to Panelists : I think it is important to distinguish between (i) the access to the GR (followed by the first use of DSI) which is covered by Nagoya, i.e. a bilateral agreement (with presumably direct benefits to the provider country), and (ii) secondary use of DSI once it has been sumbitted to the database, which may be covered by a multilateral agreement.
15:17:27 From Guy Cochrane, EMBL-EBI : @Participant 51 - indeed, itís a question of definition. As far as I know, GISAID does not allow redistribution of data, e.g. to create a secondary databases that provides onward additional value. Allowing redistribution is important to enable the maximisation of knowledge and benefit from DSI.
15:17:38 From Participant 17 : GISAID, like it or not @guycochrane is the dominant system. I have problems with it too, but to factually accurate here, CoV-2 and influenza data is generally shared in a system with significant access restrictions and the user community is generally enthusiastic about this non-open access, non-INSCDC approach.
15:18:32 From Participant 52 to Panelists : In establishing a functional benefit-sharing mechanism in a multilateral system, I think it is highly relevant to study the MLS benefit-sharing fund under the ITPGRFA. It links the use of benefit-sharing with conservation and sustainable use, with a particular focus on

developing countries.
15:19:01 From Participant 52 : In establishing a functional benefit-sharing mechanism in a multilateral system, I think it is highly relevant to study the MLS benefit-sharing fund under the ITPGRFA. It links the use of benefit-sharing with conservation and sustainable use, with a particular focus on developing countries.
15:19:16 From Guy Cochrane, EMBL-EBI : INSDC is providing the tractable sequence data sharing system for genetic variation in SARS-CoV-2 (raw sequence data from the virus) - a function that is not supported by GISAID. What INSDC and GISAID are doing in COVID-19 are complementary to each other.
15:19:37 From Participant 40 to Panelists : the ongoing worldwide situation will accelerate scientific and technological developments based on DSI, and this will be a big part of the Bioeconomy strategies of many countries. This developments can be achieved through multilateral and international collaborations that must include both revenues, BS and biodiversity sustainable uses.
15:20:29 From Participant 18: Also this database annotates and shared COVID data https://nextstrain.org/ncov/global
15:20:34 From Participant 40 to Panelists : this must be stated from the beginning, through MoU, LoI, and included in MATs
15:20:42 From Participant 44 to Panelists : Taking aboard the relevant remark of Hugo I must rephrase my questions into the following remark:
One needs to check whether proposed technical solutions for "DSI" management in the context of ABS is compatible with the technical developments developed to implement the FAIR data principles.
15:21:59 From Participant 17 : @guy last time I checked there were far, far more complete Cov-2 sequences in GISAID than Genbank. Again, Iím not endorsing GISAID. but @Jorg too Ö look , not true. GISAID is not open access and it dominates flu and covered-2.
15:22:05 From Participant 17 : cov-2
15:22:28 From Participant 17 : Nexstrain is drawn from GISAID
15:23:15 From Participant 44 to Panelists : Scientists may engage into such technical compatibility exercice: making the DSI issue technicalities an opportunity/incentive to improve FAIR implementation.
15:23:43 From Participant 53 : French Nagoya Focal Point - Participant 53 would like to thank all colleagues and contributors to this amazing project aiming to help us to better understand the complexity of situations and thank you also for the options proposed. On our side, besides the complexity from a scientific and an operational point of view the key question is the one expressed before : what would be the legal basis of such options because Nagoya treaty has been ratified and countries put in place ABS legislations to implement PIC and MAT system. Therefore, some of the proposed options (mainly all) will involve to take new legislative measures to deal with DSI which was not foreseen in the scope of application of Nagoya treaty. This is why we also support the reflection towards a multilateral pragmatic system and we need to continue to build on best practices and find a convenient solution for all. Many thanks to the organisors, to our moderator for your excellent organisation.
15:24:32 From Guy Cochrane, EMBL-EBI : Participant 17 There are 87k

raw sequence data sets in INSDC from the virus - critical in accurately calling viral variation and not fully available from genomes. Not as well, though, that there is an overlap in assembled genomes between ISNDC and GISAID (submission to both is possible and recommended during COVID-19 (see http://www.insdc.org/sites/insdc.org/files/documents/INSDC_Statement_on_SARS-CoV-2_sequence_data_sharing_during_COVID-19.pdf)
15:24:38 From Participant 20 to Panelists : The Wildsi report should be widely distributed among science in order to help them speak up
15:24:43 From Participant 54 to Panelists : Thanks a lot for such important job and presentations. I think we need to analyze the study and discuss the options provided in it with national stakeholders.
15:25:26 From Participant 23 : Scientists (biotech) do speak up to governments and international fora about open access of DSI or the use go GM pr edited crops. Depending on the political colour of the Government, scientists are bullied and demonised as ìbiopiratesî or ìlovers of Big Agî. I personally received a ìprizeî as a ìbioPirotî during the COP-MOP 2016 in Cancun for defending open access of DSI. The policy process is highly politizsed and ideologically biassed
15:27:17 From Participant 17 : @Guy And over 100k in GISAID, including many Genbank does not have. Look, this is really not a debatable point that a non-open access database is dominant in influenza and Cov-2, and I guess thereís really no point in continuing to go back and forth on it.
15:28:47 From Participant 20 to Panelists : The White paper - to be widely distributed in science world /univiersities could enhance broader involvement
15:29:40 From Participant 45 : I would be worried to have two level sciencists, the ones who are rich enough to have access to all databases data and the others who have less budget and are limited in what they can do as analyses.
15:30:46 From Participant 55 to Panelists : Thank you to all the panelists and organisers, this has been very interesting and great to hear all the different views.
15:31:30 From Participant 18: Crispr-CAS9 wins Chemistry Nobel - relevant to DSI!
15:31:56 From Participant 24 : We encourage US submitters to submit SARS-CoV-2 sequences to both GISAID as well as GenBank and SRA; many other large sequencing efforts are doing the same. GISAID is wonderful for data sharing, but it can be restrictive to downstream applications, and it is becoming increasingly clear that sharing of raw sequence data is critical for sequence comparisons and analysis. Many large sequencing projects are submitting to both GISAID and INSDC... but Participant 17 is right: GenBank submissions continue to lag.
15:34:48 From Participant 6 to Panelists : Excellent concluding thoughts! Congratulations Amber & Team !
15:38:46 From Participant 56 to Panelists : Can we have access of this presentation? thanks
15:39:24 From Support Team : Presentations and recording will be shared
15:39:39 From Participant 57 to Panelists : The big elephant in the

room is COVID-19. It may fundamentally change genomics research and innovation patterns (including in ag) and redefine open access paradigms.
15:40:39 From Participant 58 : Thanks, good job!
15:40:40 From Participant 55 to Panelists : Thanks and bye!
15:40:40 From Participant 59 : Thanks for a great wevinar!
15:40:47 From Participant 60 to Panelists : Thank You! Good bye...
15:40:48 From Participant 3 to Panelists : Thank you !!
15:40:49 From Participant 1 to Panelists : I would also gladly consent to have my information displayed if this helps for sharing the Q&A anf chat.
15:40:55 From Participant 61 to Panelists : Thanks a los
15:40:56 From Participant 62 to Panelists : A very constructive and interesting webinar. Thank you!
15:40:57 From Participant 63 to Panelists : Thanks!! Great seminar!!
15:41:02 From Participant 6 : CONGRATULATIONS AMBER!!!
15:41:02 From Participant 64 : Thank you very much for the wonderful webinar!
15:41:02 From Participant 1 to Panelists : Great event!
15:41:03 From Participant 22 to Panelists : thanks very much. very constructive
15:41:05 From Participant 65 to Panelists : Thanks a lot for this very interesting webinar !!!
15:41:07 From Participant 75 to Panelists : thank you!
15:41:08 From Participant 11 to Panelists : thanks Amber ad all others - great webinar - and curious to see results and disseminations!
15:41:18 From Participant 66 to Panelists : Thank you. Great webinar
15:41:26 From Participant 67 to Panelists : Thanks you everybody !
15:41:42 From Participant 68 : Thank you for nice webinar.
15:41:46 From Participant 69 to Panelists : I enjoyed very much. THank you from Japan.
15:41:49 From Participant 70 to Panelists : Thank you very much!
15:42:07 From Participant 45 : Thanks, it was very informative!
15:42:12 From Participant 71 to Panelists : thank you for the comprehensive overwiew and qualified discussions
15:42:39 From Participant 72 to Panelists : Thank you very much!! Very interesting.
15:43:05 From Support Team : Hi all - we will close the webinar in a couple of minutes so feel free to fill in the poll and log off
15:45:56 From Participant 45 : I guess that I do not understnad where to fill the poll?
15:46:37 From Support Team to Participant 75 , All Panelists : Hi, you should be able to simply click on one category in the pop up window?
15:47:22 From Participant 45 : I do not see any pop-up window. Maybe that it depends on my security settings?
15:49:33 From Support Team to Participant 75 , All Panelists : i am not sure - it should be in front of your zoom. I can follow up with you by email to get your vote.
15:49:56 From Support Team : Thanks everyone! closing the webinar now