Vertical Integration PDP Working Group
TRANSCRIPTION
Monday 06 September 2010 at 17:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Vertical Integration PDP Working Group meeting on Monday 6 September at 1700 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:
http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-vi-pdp-20100906.mp3
On page: http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#sep
(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:
Contracted Parties House
Registrars Stakeholder Group
Thomas Barrett
Volker Greimann
gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group
Keith Drazek
- **Commercial Stakeholders Group**
Mikey O'Connor – CBUC- Co-Chair
Scott Austin – IPC
Individuals
Roberto Gaetano – Individual - Co-Chair
Richard Tindal
Katrin Ohlmer
John Rahman Khan
Eric Brunner-Williams
Jothan Frakes
Faisal Shah

ALAC/At Large
Baudoin Schombe
Alan Greenberg
Sivasubramananian Muthusamy

Staff:
Marika Konings
Glen de Saint Géry

Apologies:
Cheryl Langdon-Orr
Kristina Rosette
Michele Neylon

Sebastien Bachollet – ALAC
Statton Hammock
Jeff Neuman
Ron Andruff
Vika Mpisane
Jean-Christophe Vignes
Ruslan Satarov
Paul Diaz
Krista Papac
Avri Doria
Ron Andruff
Kathy Kleiman

Coordinator: Please go ahead. This evening's conference call is now being
                 recorded.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks very much (Tim).

Glen de Saint Gery: Thank you very much.

Mikey O'Connor: Glen and Marika, are we - have we refined our roll call/Declaration of
                 Interest process at all, or do we just go through it and let people do the
                 whole shebang every time?

Glen de Saint Gery: Marika, would you like to...

Marika Konings: This is Marika. We have some revised instructions that we will be
                 sending out to all the working groups hopefully shortly, as I think at this
                 point unless someone has any updates to the Statement of interest
                 that they submitted at the beginning of this working group in relation to
                 this issue of vertical integration, they should state that. Otherwise, we
                 are assuming that what is in the Statement of Interest is still relevant
                 and up-to-date.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. So maybe, what we can do is Glen can call the roll and then I can ask if anybody's got a change and they can tell us about that.

Glen with that, why don't you go ahead and call the roll, and then we'll get started.

Glen de Saint Gery: I'll do that Mikey. Good morning. Good afternoon. Good evening everyone. This is the vertical integration call on September 6. And on the call, we have Mikey O'Connor. We have Sivasumbramanian. We have Faisal Shah, Baudouin Schombe, Keith Drasek, Roberto Gaetano, Jothan Frakes, Eric Brunner-Williams, Katherene Olmar, Alan Greenberg, Thomas Barrett, Scott Austin, Richard Tindal. And for staff we have Marika Konings and myself Glen de Saint Gery.

We have apologies from Paul Diaz, Avri Doria, Statton Hammock, Kristina Rosette, Jean Christophe Vignes, Michele Neylon, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, and Ruslan Sattarov. Thank you very much Mikey. Over to you.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Glen. Thanks all. Many of us declared our Statement of Interest changes last time. I don't think we need to do that again. But if anybody's got any changes to the Statement of Interest that they filed at the beginning of the working group, this would be a good time to tell us about that. Anybody got something that they want to tell us?

Jothan Frakes: Hey Mikey, this is Jothan.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Jothan, go ahead.

Jothan Frakes: Well, let Eric go first and then I'll go after him.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Eric, go ahead.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you Mikey. This is Eric Brunner-Williams, and I'm declaring a change in my Statement of Interest, which I'll be filing sometime during the week when I have time. But, the gist of it is I'm no longer consulting for (Core).

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Thanks Eric. Jothan, go ahead.

Jothan Frakes: This is Jothan Frakes. I still need to file an updated Statement of Interest, but I had outed myself at the Brussels meeting that I was no longer representing Minds and Machines or Top Level Domain Holding registrar. That I'm not from the contracted parties, but rather participating in an individual capacity.

Mikey O'Connor: Good deal. Somebody's got a modem going in the background. Whoever you are, if you could mute that would be good.

Anybody else with a change in their statement of interest before we get going?

Okay. Well I really only have one agenda item, and that is to keep working on the harms list. And just for fun, let me post the link to the Wiki page to the chat. Any other agenda items that people want to add to our list before we get going?

Okay. Well, let's keep working on harms for awhile. What I did last week was build that little Wiki page that I pasted the link in the chat for

those of you who are on Adobe Connect. And you know, mostly to give us sort of two tracks. One, if people would like to submit changes to the list in Word document style, they can submit them to the list and Margie will be the keeper of that. And if people would like to go right in and change it in the Wiki, there's a Wiki page with the same stuff. And, Margie and I will endeavor to keep those two tracks linked up.

And, I think that pretty soon - maybe - I don't think this call but maybe next call, we should set a deadline that says that at least the list of harms is complete. Not that the definitions are complete, not that the applicability of the harms are complete, but at least to get the list nailed down.

Oh Eric, I see your hand up.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Well thank you, Mikey. I still have a meta process inquiry. So far, you've restricted yourself to the (Jeff E.)'s and Anthony van Couvering text. Is there a reason for that? If so, could you share it?

Mikey O'Connor: No. No reason. It's just what came to hand. You know, that was what we were working on on the last call, is sort of how to get the rest of them into this document, and...

Eric Brunner-Williams: I'm simply perplexed as someone who's submitted a list of - doc of harms. But what the process is for the co-Chairs to consider them as actually existing? It's a (legitimate) question.

Mikey O'Connor: Well, I don't think it's a question of the co-Chairs. It's - you know, we pretty basically had to get the documents started in a place where folks would maintain them, and that's what we did last week. So, we've got

two. We've got the one that Margie is compiling in the Wiki page. And so...

Eric Brunner-Williams: Well, considering I'm (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor:...I'm guessing - I'm sorry, Eric. Go ahead.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Can you suggest where a third one can be maintained?

Mikey O'Connor:Don't know what you're driving at.

Eric Brunner-Williams: So, you're just going to stick with just these two then?

Mikey O'Connor:Well, yes. And presumably, they'll get things added to them until we're done.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Well, I've attempted to add the issue of collusion during (auction) to at least one of them unsuccessfully.

Mikey O'Connor:Give it another try.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Really?

Mikey O'Connor:You know, pick your vehicle. Either the list or the Wiki, and try to insert the language again.

Eric Brunner-Williams: I've already sent it to the list.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Well then, we'll ask Margie to dredge up the posting you made and get it added to her document.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you (unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. You used the term before the next meeting you hope to say that the list of harms is complete. I think we and you should be careful on the wording we use. That is, we have finished identifying the harms that we could have identified. The expression saying this is the complete list of harms and no other ones exist, or the implication that that is so, is not something that I think we want to promulgate. But rather, this is our best effort at this point.

People who create (harms) - people have to...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. Although I do want to put a little pressure on it to get the list complete, because otherwise we'll never get this done.

Alan Greenberg: The best we can do is identify the ones we can think of. People who do harms in the world are remarkably innovative in coming up with new ones that we haven't thought of ahead of time. And, I just think we need to acknowledge that in the list.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Fair enough.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you.

Man: We could always include a reservation to supplement.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. That'll be good to stick in there I suppose. Tom, go ahead.

Thomas Barrett: I have a suggestion on this (unintelligible) document. You know in reading it - for example, competition harms, the third bullet, talks about decreased number of registrants able to offer TLD. And then, it seems to make another point, talking about registrants having a ten year head start. And, it strikes me that maybe we need to break out the harms according to who is being harmed.

So I mean, I'd like to see - and later on in the document we have harms to consumers. I'd like to see this broken down by harms to registrants, harm to registries, harm to end-users so it's clearer what the harm is talking about.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Tom. I think that that's a great segue into sort of the next phase of the harms list, which is that once we've sort of got the universe of harms out there, we need to do some analyzing of them.

Scott Austin: Mike, this is Scott. I'm sorry to break in, but I don't have a computer so I'm not able to raise my hand here.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, okay.

Scott Austin: I just want to concur with Tom's comment. That was exactly the point that I made last fall that we need to break...

Mikey O'Connor: We have fabulous background noise. I don't know if we can figure out - somehow, somebody's got a beeping kind of busy signal (unintelligible).

Scott Austin: That's not me.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Scott Austin: But, I wanted to note my additional one was registrants, which again I think the question is, is a registrant going to be the TLD owner, or is it going to be the second level domain owner? And you know when we say end-user, we need to be careful with that because there's several different end-users involved. And that's it. Thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Thanks Scott.

                     (Tim), are you still on the call as the operator?

Glen de Saint Gery: (Let me turn the call) - I'm just finding out from (Lori) what's happening, Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. It's getting a little bit better. Thanks, Glen.

                     Anyway, after we get this universe of harms sort of thrown out there - you know, I view this as sort of the throw harms on the wall phase. You know at this point, we're not saying that they're right. We're just saying that they're ones that either we've thought of or somebody has thought of in a document, and we just wanted to write them all down. That's part of the reason I want to get done with this phase, so that we can move on into a sort of an analysis phase.

And, one of the analysis is the who is harmed?

That's really interesting beeping.

And, I think that there are several other analyses that we want to do, but we've sort of held ourselves back from that. We've held ourselves back from defining these. We've held ourselves back from describing who's harmed. We've held ourselves back from a determination as to whether or not vertical separation is the best way to solve that problem. And, I think that we really need to get started on that. That's part of the reason I'm pushing for - attempting to draw some sort of a line in the sand there.

Tom, is your hand up from before or is that new?

Oh, it's from before.

So anyway, on the Wiki, I left a little space for us to start describing how we want to analyze these. You know, what dimensions we want to look at. And, I really think that what we need to do is start fleshing that out. So Scott and Tom, you're right. I mean clearly, one of the things we need to figure out is who is harmed, and then we need to make a determination as to who of those people that are harmed really matter in our analysis. It may well be that registries, registrars might get harmed but that we don't care, and I think that's an important decision for the group to make.

So, I guess what I'd like us to do is really try and get to the exhaustive list of possible harms that we're aware of -- to fold in Alan's point -- as

quickly as we can. And, I'm just wondering if next week is too fast? Is that pushing people too hard? I mean, we've been looking at this - pretty much the same list for it seems to me three weeks or so, and not much change -- the exception of the one from Eric that we missed -- seems to be going on. So, I know that Kathy had a few that she was going to add, and I'm not sure whether she was successful in doing that or not. I guess I can't check that fast. She was maybe going to drive some stuff into the Wiki, but...

Scott Austin: Mikey, this is Scott.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. Go ahead, Scott.

Scott Austin: Did you compare what we have now with - you had come up with a very - I thought a fairly comprehensive bullet point list several months ago. And, my...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. My starter kit.

Scott Austin: Yes. And, I just wondered if all of those are now incorporated into what's on the Wiki, because I thought it was very good.

Mikey O'Connor: I'll take an action to check that out, because I haven't checked my list against the one on the Wiki.

Scott Austin: Yes. I think that'll be a great addition anyway.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. I'll do that.

So, if we were to encourage people to think about - I mean, do people have any - Eric mentioned one already on this call. Do people have any in your own minds that aren't on the list now that should be? And, should we you know, drag ourselves through the list one at a time right now to make sure? Because, I'm feeling like we need to you know, get on.

Eric, go ahead.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Thank you, Mikey. In the second of my two notes, the first one which was - well actually, I sent two notes. One was through the comment on (Jeff E.)'s work, one was the comment on Anthony Van Couvering's work. A third note -- I think I sent three - it might've been included in the first two -- touched on issues which have not been discussed. For instance, the capture of the entire round - or the fundamental issue of the round, being the relationship of the existing contracted parties to each other, to the exclusion of the interests of applicants who are not presently contracted parties, and so vertical integration itself is being a possible harm to the roll-out of the 2011 -- or whenever it happens -- new gTLD process.

I think we haven't touched all the possible harms, to answer your question. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Well, I think it would be great to get those out there. I'd much rather have a big list that we (dwindle) than a list that we come back to in several months and say drats; we missed one. We missed two. We missed five. And so, I would encourage one more try at getting things into the list so that we can review them.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Now, if I may Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: Go ahead, Eric.

Eric Brunner-Williams: There's considerable push back by the authors of the two documents which you are accepting as statements of harm to things which they are argue are either properties of all applications, not merely vertically integrated or vertically restrained applications. So, it's not as simple as saying let us brainstorm and then (dwindle) later. There's a considerable amount of (pre-dwindling) going on by the parties that you're delegating this responsibility to. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Well, we undelegated that last week. That's part of the reason that I'm pushing now, because the Wiki is available to all. There's no filtering by either Jeff or Anthony on either the Wiki or the Word version. And, that's part of the reason that I'm pushing for more - you know, more ideas. Because you know, I don't want any filters at this point. I think the group needs to do the filtering, but not authors doing the filtering. And so, that's why this has been pushed out to these two places.

Partly - it's two places because some folks wanted to use a Wiki and other folks didn't. And so, we'll just use them both and make sure that at the end they are synched up. But, they will be done with no eye to filter - you know, sort of pre-filtering proposed harms. We'll let the group do that during the analysis part of it.

So again, you know I encourage folks - especially if you contacted either Jeff or Anthony directly and couldn't get your idea into their list, do it again because we're in a different circumstance now.

Well you know, back to this list. I mean, I guess the first question is - and maybe I'll tap my co-Chair on this one. Do you think this approach Roberto of drawing a deadline for next week's call for at least preliminary inclusion in this list is a good idea? Is that too fast? You know it's so many people are not on this call and may not see the email. That's the only drawback I could see. But in terms of drawing this to a close, it's been pretty stable for awhile. What do you think?

Roberto, go ahead.

Roberto Gaetano: Yes. I think that the reason why we have - I for instance, was not thinking of pushing for a close up to now is that in fact after the - a very intense period, people were going on vacation and so on. So, I understand that today marks the official end of the vacation. So, I think that in the next week or so we should be able to - we should be able to make a final call today distributing that on the list so that all - even the people that are not on the call realize that we are on a final call. And then, finalize that - I don't know.

If we need some bit of discussion next Monday, because maybe we have some additions, some question, and so on, and with the idea that in the course of next week - so, leaving next Monday's call for discussing the list of harms, and then closing Wednesday, Thursday of next week so that we have a stable list. And then go to the next phase, which is analyze harm by harm and see where the - what is the impact in the relationship to the integration or separation.

Mikey O'Connor:I think that's great. So what we could do is focus people on the call next Monday. But, I do like the idea of giving it a couple more days after the call, and then head into the analyze phase. And maybe, we

could kick off a thread on the list about how to analyze so that we could pick up some of the stuff like what Scott and Tom were talking about, and drive that into the thinking so that we could really get going on that maybe two weeks from today. That seems pretty workable.

The two weeks from today is also - when's the Board thing?

Glen de Saint Gery: Mike, this is Glen. On September 24.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, okay. So, they won't have started yet.

Glen de Saint Gery: And, two weeks will be the 20th, if that's right. Because, then next week is 13, and then the next Monday is the 20th.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. Okay. So, we could start analyzing, and then pretty soon after that we'll hear back from whatever comes out of the Board meeting and can sort of fold that into what we're doing. I think that would be good, because then what we would have done is built an - at least tentatively arrived at a stable list and started our analysis. And then, we could fold in what the Board has to say after that. Oh, that sounds like a good plan to me.

I don't know that we are terribly productive going through the list item-by-item on today's call, but I would be happy to do that if people feel like that's useful. I think that this list is going to need a fair amount of scrubbing, because you know the sources of these bullets are all over the place, and there's going to be a lot of - I think disagreement. So, I guess one of the questions that I've got is do we walk through them on calls, or do we try and figure out some polling mechanism where the group can very quickly weigh in on questions like you know, who is

harmed? Whether vertical separation is the best approach to solving that problem. I know it's the dreaded poll work, but what do people think about the idea of trying to put some polling together around this list rather than grinding through it item-by-item on the call. Is that a good idea or a not so good idea? Any thoughts?

I'm not getting - oh, Eric. Go ahead.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Well, thank you Mikey. (Unintelligible) titled On Harms, the note of 8/16, the other entitled On Harms, the note of 8/9. For no reason other than my - from intellectual interest, I tried to think about the offered harms as generally as I could. I've actually seen no similar evaluation of any of the harms offered on the list. And the only indication I have that anyone's actually read my own is that Volker has indicated so in the last conference call.

So, my point being merely that it's - so far, there doesn't appear to be any working means to discuss what is offered as a harm by anyone. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Any ideas on how to proceed with that effectively? I mean, I think that's basically the question that I'm asking is how to go about that.

Scott Austin: Mikey, this is Scott. One comment. One of the reasons - and I've said it before on this - on the calls is - that I'd spent some time on the document I produced was I thought we needed some context. And I just wonder with some of these harms, rather than to give specific attribution -- that is who inserted or who submitted it -- maybe there needs to be some way of putting in the context such as you know, has

this harm ever been the subject of not necessarily a litigation, but you know, where does it come from?

Even if it's a new account or something that shows how it arose, and if it's just one time, or - because I guess what I have a problem with in assessing them is you know, are there big harms and little harms? Are there just anecdotes? And also, there are people on this list that have a certain amount of experience and expertise in the business, and I feel very reluctant to counter that or to question that if that's no you know, what I do for a living.

And I guess my question is, if there's some way we can put in the context some of these harms as - you know, is this a real threat to the industry? Is it a real issue for people who are operating either as registrars or registries, or registry service providers? Or like I said, just to try and put it in context. I'm not asking for legal precedent, but you know is this something that comes up often? Is something that come up often? Is it - how much of a harm is it I guess?

Mikey O'Connor: You know, we started on those - thanks Scott. We started having a conversation about that on the list, and I can't remember who was on which side of the argument, but there was a topic about assigning risk to the harms. And, some people were pretty keen on the idea and some people were pretty reluctant about that. But, it seems to me that that's the kind of thing that we need to. You rattled off a bunch of dimensions Scott, that I sort of scribbled down in a hurry. You know the source of the harm. Where did it come from? How did it arise? How often does it happen? And, this notion of threat or risk.

Is that something that somebody just needs to go off and start writing and then let people edit? Or, do we poll people to get ideas and consolidate those? Do we have a conversation about each one on the phone call? I - you know that's - yes. Go ahead Scott.

Scott Austin: Yes. Let me just give one response, and that is that the problem that I have, I think all of those are great ways to go in terms of the specific item. Plus, the notion of risk to me is - and I mean for the number of years I've been practicing, that is one of those polarizing elements that is voodoo to some people, and to other people it's their livelihood. So I mean, some people just don't believe that you can properly assess risk. That it's probability. That's it's chance. That it's you know how many times out of a particular occurrence? You know to me, that's the last one because it's so easy to shoot at if you want to shoot it down.

My question was really whether there can be some specific instances cited - even it's just in a news report. I mean there have been news reports, and people on this list have access to unique journals and trade publications, and you know forums. They have unique access to certain sources that a lot of us might not be aware of, but at least it could help to corroborate or to determine if some of these are real, if they're imagined, and maybe put it into context for those that would quickly dismiss them or pooh-pooh them if you will as being de minimis.

And, I think that's what a lot of (unintelligible) tough time putting them into a context of, "Well, is this worth making it to the list? Or is this something that shouldn't be on the list?" You know are we tilting a windmill, or is it really valuable and it's something that should be on

here. And that's - those are my thoughts. Just that the factual aspects of it, not the risk.

Mikey O'Connor: So rather than using risk, maybe zero in on sort of examples from the real world compiled for each one?

Scott Austin: Yes. Maybe context, but just where was this cited so that it's not like somebody is just being subjectively saying, "Oh (unintelligible) dangerous," and someone on the other side of that saying, "Oh, you're just raising that because you don't want Michele Neylon: to succeed in getting my risk," you know sorry, "my harm put on here."

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. No, I like that idea a lot. I'm taking notes. I'll write a post to the list at the end of all of the - any other ideas like Scott as to how we could tackle the analysis? Break - you know, this is about breaking this puzzle into bite sized chunks more than anything else. And any way to sort of make it into chunks is useful I think. So, the idea of who is harmed I think is a good way to break this into chunks.

Volker, go ahead.

You may be muted Volker, but you have the floor when you get off mute.

Still can't hear you.

Glen de Saint Gery: He is muted Mikey, and it's maybe the operator that has muted him. So, I'll ask the operator to unmute him.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Thanks Glen. Maybe there was a lot of background noise on your line Volker.

Volker Kuhlmann: Can you hear me now?

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, now I can hear you just fine.

Volker Kuhlmann: Ah. Very good.

Mikey O'Connor: There you go.

Volker Kuhlmann: Yes. One of the things I'm actually looking forward to is once we actually start discussing the individual harms, especially those that are supposed to come from vertical integration, if these harms are really exclusive to vertical integration scenarios or if these harms can also be - and just maybe to even just so slightly occur in the fully vertically separated environments. And if we as a group come to the conclusion that a majority or a certain number of items do not really relate to vertical integration at all but are more general harms, then the decision or the harm - definition of the harm becomes much clearer as not something that really should concern us in discussing vertical integration or separation.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. I've added that to my little list of chunks. Because clearly, that's a very important discussion to have. And you know, I think that you and Ron have had that conversation before on the call. And I think Ron agrees with you, but he still wants to document all the harms. But that aside, clearly...

Volker Kuhlmann: We've also had very good discussions about that in Brussels, and I think one of the main issues is not vertical integration for many people, but more of a question can harms be prevented under the pretense of talking about vertical integration, which I think is a bit unreasonable, given the larger point of competition that could be destroyed by such scenarios.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. And, I'm going to add another one to my little growing list here. The one bullet is exclusive to VI? And then, the next one is preventable by vertical separation? So, sort of the same question a different way but not quite, and I think it's fair to ask both of those.

Volker Kuhlmann: Actually, I agree with you completely. And now I go back to mute so you won't have any silly noises again.

Mikey O'Connor: Well, I don't know. It sounds fine. I wouldn't worry about it now Volker. Whatever the background that was on your line seems to have gone away. So, we won't take quite such drastic measures from now on.

Anything else that strikes people as a good way to slice this puzzle into smaller chunks? We've got a pretty good list going here, which if I'd been really on top of it, I'd been typing into the workspace, but I'm not. Maybe the thing to do, you know given the light participation on the call in general - we've actually come up with quite a bit for me to write to the list. Maybe what we should do is draw this call to a close fairly early and let me send out a few messages to the list.

Eric, if you would be kind enough to repost your items to the list one more time -- I promise this'll be the last time -- and I'll make sure that

we get them into the list this time around, because I wasn't paying attention to that kind of stuff before.

Eric Brunner-Williams: Very well.

Mikey O'Connor: Thank you, sir.

But, let me sort of compile this list of ways that we could slice and dice the list of harms. And at the same time, I'll also send out a note setting out our informal deadline, which is to try and get this list stable on the call next Monday and into a stable form by about a week from Wednesday so that we can start this analysis up. Because, I think that people are sort of chomping at the bit getting ready to start analyzing things. And, I don't know that we have to make the deadline absolutely, totally solid. If somebody comes up with something later, I think it can probably get into the list. It's just that it will get more analysis if we can get it into the list early and do it all at once.

So unless anybody else has got anything on their mind, I think we'll call it a day today. And, I wish you all a happy remainder of the day or evening, and thanks for joining us on this US holiday. That's it for me. Roberto, you got anything before we (start) jumping off?

Roberto Gaetano: No. Just one thing. When you were talking about launching on the list some discussion on the different items, I think we can do that in parallel. I mean - or maybe, this is something we need to think of. Do you think that if we don't wait until we have a finalized harm list, you know to launch the discussion on how to proceed then in the next phase and how to treat them, do you think that people will get confused, or that we can actually make progress?

Also, taking advantage of the fact that people will join again after the holidays and are full of energy and can do multi-tasking (unintelligible)?

Mikey O'Connor: I am looking forward to a newly reenergized group. I think it would be all right to at least kick off the analysis discussion in parallel with the harms list. We haven't really seen many new ones come into the list, so I'm sort of feeling as though we're close enough to get started on the other. And then if something big rolls in, we'll certainly be able to add it. But, I think people need something else to do. I think that's sort of my sense right now is that we've kind of beaten this one to death. We need to sort of move on to the next thing.

So let's try it, and then if it totally confuses people, it can be my fault as usual. So, get that started.

Roberto Gaetano: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: Cool. All right folks. Have a great day and we'll see you a week from today. That's it for me.

Glen de Saint Gery: Thanks, Mikey.

Roberto Gaetano: Bye.

Man: Well, that was a quickie. Thanks, Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: What? Go ahead.

Man: That was a quickie. Thanks, Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor:	You bet.

Man:		Yes.

END