Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part B PDP
Transcription
Tuesday 30 March 2010 at 14:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part B PDP call on Tuesday 30 March 2010 at 1400 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.

Coordinator: This call is now being recorded.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, to everyone on today's IRTP call on Tuesday the 30th of March.

We have Michele Neylon, Mikey O'Connor, James Bladel, Berry Cobb, Barbara Steele, Michael Collins, Kevin Erdman. From staff we have Marika Konings, Glen de Saint Géry, David Giza, Olof Nordling, and myself Gisella Gruber-White. We have apologies from Paul Diaz and from Anil George.

If I could also please remind everyone to state their names when speaking. Thank you. Over to you, Michele.

Michele Neylon: All right. Thank you. How are we all today? Good I hope. Now, today's agenda, nothing terribly exciting, I'm going to do it slightly out of order because I think the third item on the agenda should be a fairly quick one.

James, could you just deal with that item very quickly, please?

James Bladel: There we go. Very quickly, the document that outlines the Transfer Reversal

                  Procedure -- of course the name is still a work in progress as well as everything else

                  in the document. So bear that in mind, but we're referring to it as Transfer Reversal

                  for the time being -- has been circulated to various registrars and I believe Barbara

                  has taken a look at it to kind of give it an idea of what registries might see in it as

                  well.

                  It's also been reviewed by ICANN's policy staff and legal counsel. And so, essentially

                  we're collecting all of this feedback now and it's quite a healthy amount and some if

                  it -- I think -- boils down do a few common scenes.

                  So, I think the proposal for the path going forward now is to reconvene the

                  subgroup hopefully later this week, assemble the feedback into - you know, into

                  their common element, address those major or blaring errors or omissions in the

                  original draft, and then having something to present back to the working group on

                  our next call on April 6.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Thank you, James. Does anybody have any queries or comments on this?

James Bladel: I just wanted to say thank you to Marika and all the policy folks and ICANN staff that

                  worked on this, as well as thank you to Barbara who took some time to (let) this

                  document as well.

Michele Neylon: Okay, right then. Item Number 2 on the agenda was regarding the EPP lock status, if

                  we had any other further thoughts on that. I think Marika sent around an email with

                  an extract from the conversation we had last week. Have you all had a chance to

                  have a look over that? Does anybody have any queries or any questions, or anything

                  related to it?

                  So, we all are experts on EPP now, are we?

James Bladel: Well, we can pretend to be.

Michele Neylon: Okay, that's good enough for me.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Okay, right then. Moving on to the next item on the agenda, the Constituency Stakeholder Group statements, which we were reviewing previously, where were we? I think we were fairly well along at this stage. Marika, where were we on this?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. We actually got to the end of the document on Page 6 and I think the only two items standing are the two general comments listed there.

Michele Neylon: Oh, yes. Right. Right. Okay, so two general comments considerations, both of these are from the Registrar Stakeholder Group, is that correct?

Marika Konings: That's correct.

Michele Neylon: Yeah, sorry. It's just these acronyms they keep - the change (unintelligible). Importance of developing definitions for the different terms used in the charter questions to ensure the correct understanding of the different concepts, so I think the main key thing here is that because some of the terms we're using can cause confusion. And it's the same with a lot of the working groups we seem to be involved with, but making sure that's clear.

                   Does anybody have any other comments on this? No?

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey, we could work the word bafflegab into this somehow, I bet.

Michele Neylon: Baffle what?

Mikey O'Connor: Bafflegab. I'll send it to the list.

Michele Neylon: Oh, please do. That sounds like great fun. Another comment was, domain name transfer issues must always be considered along with relevant security issues.

Marika, what does - what was the context of this exactly?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Probably James would be in a better position to comment on that, but I think it was more a general comment they made in relation to any changes that are proposed or suggested should always take into account relevant security issues with them. I think that was the context on that one...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Oh, okay. Okay. James...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Yeah...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: ...this is James speaking. Marika has it fairly accurate is that I think that in any discussion of transfers we have to recognize that there's a balance to be struck between convenience and lack of confusion, versus security and integrity of the process that prevents against loss or hijacking of domains in the process.

So, and just anything that we do to improve one may have a material impact on the other.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Thank you. Anybody else have any other comments on this? Mikey, I'd appreciate it if you sent that to us on the list. It would be - it's - I think that's absolutely wonderful. I love this whole Procrustean. Is that some kind of weird American form of procrastination or something, or...

Mikey O'Connor: I'll have to get the dictionary out on that one. I think given that it's capitalized, I think it's a reference to a group in either Greek or Roman Parliamentary procedures, but I'm not absolutely sure. But, I'll send it to the list for your further elucidation.

Michele Neylon: Procrustes, okay I'm just Googling. I have no idea. It's something do with Greek mythology.

Olof Nordling: Yeah, it does. It's actually something called a Procrustes Bed, which is very uncomfortable to sleep on, I tend to recall; Olof here.

Michele Neylon: Oh, thank you Olof. Okay, nothing like going off on sidelines. Thank you, Mikey. And if you could get us more information on it that's great fun. Okay then now, Item Number 5 I think is something that we do need to spend a little bit time looking at this.

Initial report timetable, in order to be considered discussed at the ICANN meeting in Brussels, which is in June, the initial report would need to be published on Friday the fourth of June at the latest. Does anybody have any thoughts on this? Comments? Feedback?

Oh, great hands going up. We'll take Marika.

Marika Konings: This is Marika, it's just a note probably to remind everyone that there is a draft already produced of the initial report, which already -- I think -- contains a lot of the content on, you know, proper comments, discussions we had, and some of the

issues. I definitely need to update it following, you know, the discussion we had lately on the constituency statements and some of the other issues.

And - but I think that the main gaps there are related to the recommendations on the different charter questions. I know one of course is already in the works on the transfer reverse process. I hope I got that one right. And - but I think the group might need to discuss what recommendations -- if any -- they would like to put forward for the other sections, and that's where I see it from the staff perspective that more work is required.

Michele Neylon: Just in relation to the dealing with the various charter questions. I mean, what is the best way to do that? To just take a kind of simple vote on the questions like do we need to act, yes or no? And then, if we say yes, then we look at what we're meant to do, or how is - how would you normally deal with this Marika?

Marika Konings: Well, I think it might be helpful for the group to look back at the notes that are contained in the report on each of the questions where I think - and some of them we actually spoke about, you know, possible avenues to be explored or possible recommendations.

So - and I think from there then the group needs to think about possible recommendations. And if there are any different views you might use a survey tool to see, you know, where support lies or, you know, where there's disagreement.

So - but I think the first thing would be just to go back to each of the charter questions and, you know, refresh our mind on what we discuss and see if we can come up with a recommendation for each of those.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Thank you. James?

James Bladel: Hi, this is James speaking. Thanks, Michele and Marika. With a comment to the timetable, I believe that we should treat June 4 as an absolute formal deadline, but we should probably make it a goal to have something published and open for comment sometime in the mid to late May timeframe.

The reason I'm saying that is that I haven't been doing this very long, but I've noticed that the number of groups trying to get reports published in advance of an ICANN general meeting can mean that any one document or working group output can be lost in the crush.

So, I think that it's reasonable to expect that we could get this done in four to six weeks and would hope that we would shoot for, you know, some - as early as possible as opposed to holding out the June 4 deadline.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Thank you, James. Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Michele. This is Mikey. The only - I think James is on to something, but I'd also like to add that as Marika described it, I'd like to see us fold the conversation we just got through into that discussion, in addition to just going back to the initial report, because I think we've come up with some more ideas that should be consolidated with those. Presumably, that shouldn't be hard, but let's not forget those.

Michele Neylon: Okay then, just go ahead - Marika, I'm going to put you in this firing line. How long realistically do you think it would take you to - or - you or one of your colleagues to fold in those extra bits and bobs into the draft report that you have at present?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. As I'll be on vacation next week, it might take at least two weeks, and not probably the meeting on -- let me see what's the next meeting, is on the sixth -- maybe before the meeting on the thirteenth. But of course in the meantime there's

nothing stopping anyone from looking at the document and providing suggestions where they feel that information is missing or providing suggestions.

And just if I can take a (moment) and comment as well on what James was saying and what the group could consider as well is indeed having the report (out) by our meeting in Brussels, use the meeting in Brussels actually to present the report to the community and highlight, you know, the recommendations or areas where the group feels that they would like input from the community.

And then, actually start the public comment period after the Brussels meeting, but basically, you know, people can use the Brussels meeting to think about it and ask questions that they might have. And then, formulary - formulate their thoughts, you know, following the meeting and then start the process then. Because the only concern there is that the public comment period for an initial report is prescribed by the bylaws, and I think it's 20 days, which we normally try to stick to.

So - but you know, it doesn't say that it has to start on the day that we publish the reports. I mean, we can be more flexible with that and just start it a bit later and use the Brussels meeting as an information session basically.

Michele Neylon: So, what you're saying is publish the report before Brussels, but open the comment period after. Is that correct?

Marika Konings: Yes. Yes. That would be my suggestion because in that way the community can review the report and we can discuss it there and we can present it there. But, we just wait for opening the comment period until after the Brussels meeting, because otherwise, if - basically otherwise the comment period would close I think just somewhere in the beginning of the ICANN meeting in Brussels, as we need to have the report out 15 days beforehand.

So, if we would coincide the opening of the public comment period with the publication it just means that the overall period is very short.

Michele Neylon: Okay. That makes sense. Does anybody have any issues with that idea that we publish the report within the timeframe so that it's available - that it's published for Brussels, but that the comment period does not open until after Brussels?

Does anybody think this is a good idea or a bad idea? You can just...

(Chris): (Chris) speaking. I think it's a good idea actually. It sounds logical.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Thank you, (Chris). Barbara is nodding to say that she approves. Does anybody think it is a very, very bad idea? And Matt Serlin, we'll pick on him shortly, because he's late arriving to the meeting.

Matt Serlin: Thanks, Michele.

Michele Neylon: You're welcome. Okay then, so working on that basis then we will have the document published before the June 4 deadline, and we will open the comment period sometime after Brussels, so the first week of July or something. Would that be about right Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Yes, that - I think the Brussels meeting finishes on the twenty-fifth...

Michele Neylon: Twenty-fifth.

Marika Konings: ...if I'm not mistaken. So, we can maybe open it on that Monday or maybe a week later if we (unintelligible) people will be taking time off after the meeting, so maybe on the fifth of July.

Michele Neylon: Yeah, that makes more - that makes sense to me. I mean, I - the one thing, just my own personal view is that shoving things in too close to a public meeting they tend to get lost in the noise.

Okay then, so what I would suggest then is Marika, if - just because we're all forgetful and we all suffer from problems with our email, or least I do, could you resend to the list the link to the draft document, please?

Marika Konings: Yes, I'll - it's also posted on the Wiki and I'll also send an email and attach it to that, and it's also up now in the Adobe Connect.

Michele Neylon: Perfect. Now, just recirculate it to the list basically because my - I think - I've got so many emails from you and from other members of ICANN staff that I couldn't find this if I went looking, and I'm sure other people are similar.

So, what I would suggest is that for our homework between now and the next meeting next week that everybody try to have a look over the document and just see if there's any glaring issues that's - with the document so we can discuss it a bit next week.

And then, the - so then the following meeting - hopefully by the following meeting, Marika might have had a chance to put some things in it, but there's no definite guarantee that she will.

Okay then...

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I - just to make another comment because it won't be by the next meeting because I'll be on vacation next week, so it would be in two meetings. And just to add as well, if anyone feels encouraged to, you know, provide some draft line which - for recommendations, I would really like to encourage everyone to, you know, put their thoughts on the mailing list, so maybe we can already try to get

some work done in between and, you know, throw some ideas around, which I think would be helpful.

Michele Neylon: Perfect. (Unintelligible) meant, Marika was just saying that we would discuss the draft document that we currently have next week when you're not here, without (unintelligible), you follow me.

Okay. Right. Does anybody else have any other comments or thoughts at this juncture? No. Okay.

Okay, Marika's put up the draft initial report there, which - okay we might as well start looking at it now rather than all sitting here twiddling our thumbs. Do we really need to go through the objectives and next steps of the background part of this? I mean, does - do we need to go through that or is everybody happy that it's kind of standard boilerplate?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. It probably makes sense to start a Chapter 5 and I think, you know, people might have some edits on the other chapters, but it's, I guess more, you know, worse (unintelligible) or sentences, but I think the meat of the report starts on the - on Section - Chapter 5.

Michele Neylon: Okay. I just want to make sure that people didn't have any problems, but anyway - okay so, if you're looking at Chapter 5, which means if you're on the - if you're moving the report around on the Adobe Connect it's Page 21. Everybody has individual control of this, correct Marika?

Marika Konings: That's correct.

Michele Neylon: Okay. So, to (unintelligible) the workgroups, the chapter provides an overview, yada, yada, yada, so the working group deliberations Issue A, were there process

(unintelligible) resolution/resolution of a domain name should be developed, as discussed within the SSAC hijacking report and there's links to the two of them.

The working group reviewed the SSAC hijack report, as well as the other recent report on measures to protect domain registration services against the exploitation or misuse. And discuss these with Dave Piscitello, yada, yada, yada, unauthorized transfers this all to do with the unauthorized takeover domains.

The question was raised whether the - our ways to identify a hijacked domain name registration transfer from a normal transfer. Piscitello notes he's not aware of any study and (anomaly) detection, and so on and so forth, and it goes into all the various different things.

Does anybody have anything there that they'd like to add on - in relation to Issue A? Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. I - this isn't so much something specific to that issue, but I'm feeling like it might be useful to take a little time and read this report again and contemplate - Marika, is the - I presume that the response to public comment document is also out on the Wiki?

I'm feeling the need to just sit in my study and read these two documents again before I am really going to be producing much useful feedback and...

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: Mikey, can you just clarify what you mean by the public comment document? Do you mean the summary or the grids table...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: The grid. The one that we were - that we just had up in Adobe Connect, because it seems like our thinking has moved some since the initial draft report was done. And I think what I want to do is print Chapter 5 of this report and also print the grid, and then sit and sort of read them and think about them before offering much commentary.

It's just…

Marika Konings: Yeah. So…

Mikey O'Connor: …a personal thing and if you want to keep going Michele it's fine, but I'm just not…

Michele Neylon: No. No. That's fair enough.

Mikey O'Connor: …feeling like I'm going to be contributing a whole lot of really thoughtful stuff today.

Michele Neylon: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: …are on the Wiki, but (unintelligible) in the section and I'll just put all those different ones together. So, it's the initial report, it's the grid on the constituency statement, and as well, the grid on the public comments, so they'll all be together and I'll send an email to the list when the documents are there.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. That would be fantastic because then - you know, as I say, it'd be a lot easier to sort of put them side by side. Thanks.

Michele Neylon: Just one question, Marika, in relation to this document here. Does this include any

of the data we got from Dave Giza with regards to the transfer complaints and all

that?

Marika Konings: I'm actually looking quickly through it now because I don't know if I did this report --

let me just check -- yeah, on the Sections 5.2, (AFC) input provided by ICANN

Compliance.

Michele Neylon: Okay, but I mean, the actual data in here is what I'm asking I suppose.

Marika Konings: The data as in the annex, you mean the Excel spreadsheets?

Michele Neylon: Well, anything data-wise I suppose.

Marika Konings: I think everything that Compliance provided is there, but I would encourage us all

and David Giza to have a look and see if there's anything he thinks is missing or that

would be relevant to include.

David Giza: Yeah, thanks Marika. This is Dave. And you're right, you've got the percentages

here, you know, by category across the 11 categories, and then in the annex, I do

believe you attached the - or at least the intent was attach the Excel spreadsheet, so

it's a starting point.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Thank you. Just so - I just think it's - from my perspective, personally I think it

would be make - it makes more sense if - oh, I see it is there. Yeah, there is some

kind of included link to the ticket analysis thing.

David Giza: Okay, fine.

Marika Konings: Yeah, it's actually a small document in there because it's not - it wasn't very easy to

put that in as a - in the Word document, so I thought it would be easier to integrate

the Excel document for people to see. But, you know, another way would be to post it on the Wiki somewhere and provide a link, or take out, you know, the graphics that people think are, you know, most relevant for part of the discussion and include those. So you know, there are, you know, whatever people want to suggest.

Michele Neylon: Would anybody have any suggestions? Mikey, is your hand up for - a new hand up, or is that an old hand up?

Mikey O'Connor: That's an old one. Sorry.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Well, but as you got your hand up, you can make a suggestion now. No, actually - yeah go on. Would you - would any of you like to see this on the Wiki or where would you suggest putting it, the spreadsheet?

Does anybody have any suggestions of where to put the spreadsheet from ICANN Compliance?

Okay, Marika, I would put it in the Wiki possibly, and then we can just provide a link to it maybe?

Marika Konings: Okay. So, instead of having the annex, just provide a link to the Wiki in - on their Section 5.2.

Michele Neylon: Yeah. I mean...

Marika Konings: Okay.

Michele Neylon: ...something like - just - I don't see how - I mean, I'm looking at this here and I'm not too sure how well linking to an Excel spreadsheet within a Adobe document is going to work. Anyway, never mind.

David are you still collecting just the - some of this data with regard to transfer complaints?

David Giza: We are. We could update that Excel spreadsheet with data through the end of February.

Michele Neylon: Oh, that would be fantastic. That would be fantastic. I mean, in terms of the volumes of complaints regarding transfers, I hate putting you on the spot, but -- don't really hate it...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: ...are you seeing any changes in the patterns or is it kind of much of a (unintelligible) month by month? I mean, you know, does it get worse at particular times a year, or it just always the same level?

David Giza: No, the trending is really staying the same, and so there's - for January and February there really has been no appreciable difference in the statistics that you see here on - in Section 5.2.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Perfect. The other thing I'm -- what was I thinking of? I don't know. Does anybody else have any other comments on anything else related to this draft report that we're kind of poking at at the moment, and sideways?

God, you're all very quiet today. It's very depressing.

(Chris): (Chris) speaking. I've got a comment.

Michele Neylon: Go ahead.

(Chris):   Yeah. Leading into the educational side of things on this whole domain transfer

process that so many of us that aren't so deep in the business struggle with. I think

it would be a good in appendix if we can find somewhere, if we don't have to author

it ourselves, an - you know, a dummies guide to the present registration transfer

process.

Michele Neylon: Okay. So, do you - are - (Chris), are you talking about just for transfers or for

transfers and registrations, or what exactly?

(Chris):   I was thinking of transfers, not necessarily hijacking, just the very - the basic transfer

process that it is this - that is at the moment written for the laymen, really, or

written for the registrant.

Michele Neylon: Okay.

(Chris):   They must be around somewhere, these - this document anyway, or if not we can

try and find one and just adapt it perhaps, because I think that's a good starting

point for anybody to understand the rest of the report, and perhaps also the

appendix document will get published on the ICANN Web site.

Michele Neylon: Does anybody know if such an animal exists? So, not - I think there's one on the

ICANN Web site. Would people have an issue with us drafting such a document?

Does anybody have any thoughts either for or against such an idea? Matt? Matt's

first. Go ahead, Matt...

((Crosstalk))

Matt Serlin: Yeah. I mean, I think it's a good idea. We would obviously just have to put some

caveats around it about, you know, every registrar has different processes and

things like that and also, you know, clarify what PLDs it covered, because every PLD

has somewhat of a different process. And - but otherwise, I think it's a good idea.

I think I have seen something like that out there, I just for the life of me can't remember where. Maybe at a specific registrar's site actually, I want to say, but off the top of my head, I don't know.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. Yeah, I think the - I found those documents I'm sure at places like Go Daddy and NetSolution sites, and there might be one on the ICANN site as well, although the ICANN site's a little...

Michele Neylon: You don't need to be diplomatic you can say it's an absolute nightmare to navigate. Go on. I'll just say it for you.

Mikey O'Connor: Puzzling was the word I was using, but nightmare works. But, I agree with the theme that it would be great to get one and I think Matt's also got a really good point, which is the processes do differ and it would be very helpful for people to knew - sort of know which parts differ and which parts don't to help with that dummies guide.

Michele Neylon: Okay. James?

James Bladel: Hi. Real quickly, I think that there would be significant value in having a document like that and posting that out there for community benefit. I would just point out that I would hope it wouldn't be too much of a distraction for the work of this group. We have some specific questions and problems we're working to solve and, you know, maybe it could be a - something that this group would recommend be constituted in a separate effort.

So, I just wouldn't want it to cause us to miss any dates or anything like that. So...

Michele Neylon: Okay. Marika?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I think it probably comes back somewhere in the document or

at least we discussed it as well on maybe having some more education, and you

know, how the transfer process works. I think as well in relation to the data

provided by ICANN Compliance because, you know, a number of those are linked to

the site that (unintelligible) doesn't understand the process.

So, I think maybe, you know, I agree that with James. Maybe instead of trying to,

you know, do that ourselves and maybe spend a lot of energy on that, maybe it

could be a recommendation that, you know, to the council, to look into that either

through staff initiated process or a working group, or some kind of other initiative

and trying to put something like that together.

And I think it would be - might be helpful as well if we were to work together. For

example, the Compliance team as they will probably see as well, which are the areas

that registrants cannot understand and are reasons for filing complaints, for

example.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Could we - can we word it very strongly? I mean, in terms of a - that you

know, that as a group we feel that, you know, XYZ has to be addressed, rather than

it being put in wording that it kind of gets shoved on this great pile of things we'd

like to do when we get time within the great big world of ICANN.

I mean, can we word it very strongly or how does that work? Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. (Unintelligible) just do (come in there). I think the more specific you

can be in your recommendations, the more specific the council can be when they

adopt them. I mean, if you should suggest, you know, we recommend that the

(unintelligible) council instructs staff to write, you know, XYZ to address these

issues, it's right clear, or to you know, constitute a drafting team to develop a, you know, consumer guide to the transfer policy.

I think the more specific you are in your recommendation, the more specific council can be. And if there's a very specific recommendation, it's - you know, it doesn't get that easily, you know, caught in the big pile of things, in my experience.

Michele Neylon: Okay. I think we - personally I'd be for - I'd be very much in favor of something worded plus, you know, (actionizing) ICANN staff and the community to urgently draft, you know, kind of neutral idiots guide to domain transfers, or words to that affect.

Any other comments or thoughts? I see James has posted a link on the Adobe Chat to the Go Daddy documents on domain transfers, and I've posted the one to our one, which is way shorter than his. So, now I have to go and make ours longer so that it's comparative, because I'd hate to him to have a bigger one.

Any other comments or thoughts? No. You're all terribly quiet today. Okay, then. Right then, so your homework for next week is to go off and have a look over the draft draft document, so that next week we can try to actually address it a bit more proactively, and then when Marika comes back from her break, she might have been able to put some of that together. And if not, it'll get done at some point in the not too distant future.

I would suggest that we call this meeting to a close early today because we really can't do anything on the draft report until everybody's had a chance to read over it. Does anybody have an issue with me calling this meeting to a close very early?

Marika, am I allowed to call meetings for a close early?

Marika Konings: I think you are.

Michele Neylon: Okay. Thank you, just checking in case I broke some bylaw that I wasn't aware of. Okay, with that in mind, I will call this meeting to a close unless somebody has any other business that they wish to discuss or raise. Those on the subteam dealing with the transfer thingy, maybe we can send around a doodle between us to see when would be a suitable time to have a chat about it.

James Bladel: Yeah, Michele, this is James. I'll get that going this afternoon.

Michele Neylon: Perfect. Is - do we know if Paul Diaz is off gallivanting for an hour or two, or is he gone for several days? We don't know off hand?

James Bladel: I got an auto respond from him on something earlier, so I think he may be out this week.

Michele Neylon: Okay, well we'll deal with that issue when we hit it.

James Bladel: Right.

Michele Neylon: Okay, perfect. Right, perfect. Matt, are you in your office by the way, before you - before we finish this call? Are you in your office this afternoon?

Mike Serlin: Yes, sir. I am indeed.

Michele Neylon: Okay, I might give you a ping for - about something completely unrelated. Okay, thanks everybody and sorry for cutting it short. I know you love these calls so much and want to stay here until 4 o'clock, but I think I'm just going to cut it short now. Have a nice afternoon or morning, or whatever.

                    Thank you. Bye-bye.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Okay, thanks. Bye-bye.

((Crosstalk))

END