

**Uniform Domain-Name Dispute-Resolution Drafting Team (UDRP-DT) Drafting
Team
TRANSCRIPT
Friday 29 April 2011 at 1500 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the UDRP DT call on Friday 29 April 2011 at 15:00 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-udrp-20110429-en.mp3>

On page ;

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar#apr>

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Attendees:

Carlos Aguirre

Philip Sheppard

John Berard

David Taylor

Staff:

Margie Milam

Khalil Rasheed

Gisella Gruber-White

Apologies:

Mary Wong

Kristina Rosette

Coordinator: At this time I'd like to advise all participants today's conference is now being recorded. If you do have any objections you may disconnect at this time. You may begin.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you, (Kathy). Good morning, good afternoon to everyone. On today's UDRP call on Friday the 29th of April we have

Carlos Aguirre, Philip Sheppard, John Berard, David Taylor. From staff we have Margie Milam, Khalil Rasheed and myself, Gisella Gruber-White. Apology noted from Mary Wong.

And if I could just remind you to state your names for transcript purposes. Thank you, over to you Margie.

Margie Milam: Thank you. We also have apologies from Kristina; she wasn't able to make it as well.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you.

Margie Milam: Okay well so we'll make this call brief. And since we have four people other than staff on the call I guess the question really is do we have sufficient amount of time to go through the list given that I just circulated all these names in the last, you know, half hour or so? My apologies but I did just receive names this morning. So there was not much I could do about it.

So what I have for the agenda is just finalization of the speaker list and then - and that's really it for today. And really my question for you all is do you feel that we have enough information and enough people on the line to decide this today or if we should try to pick this up on Monday.

John Berard: Margie, this is John. I have a suggestion that might answer all that without, you know, being too problematic. We're planning on doing this Webinar on the 10th of May, yes?

Margie Milam: Yes that is correct.

John Berard: And at a specific time, right? What's the specific time we've picked?

Margie Milam: I think it's...

David Taylor: Fifteen hundred hours UTC I think isn't it?

John Berard: Right.

David Taylor: David here, sorry.

John Berard: It's my experience that the hardest thing to do in the current day is to get people to appear at the same place at the same time. So I would suggest - I would suggest that we, as David might say, stipulate that everybody on this list comes with a recommendation and a credential that we send a note to every one of them and ask them if they could participate - if they could participate at that time on that matter.

And just let them know that we're trying to - we're putting together this Webinar; we're trying to identify appropriate resources to participate and we're just trying to find out availability because that alone may cut this list in half.

David Taylor: Which is - David here - which is probably what we'd need to do anyway.

John Berard: Right.

David Taylor: Is cut the list in half.

John Berard: And some may choose to use a fake scheduling conflict not to participate. And we should allow them the grace to do that.

Margie Milam: From a - this is Margie. From a logistics standpoint it's really hard to do it that way. I do a lot of planning for like I say our (unintelligible) forums. To manage the list that large and to figure out who's responded and who hasn't and then in a sense we're giving them an expectation that they will be invited and they might be (unintelligible) for all that that they weren't, you know, chosen.

So I don't know, I mean, just my personal opinion; I'll do it either way but I do feel like it's a difficult...

((Crosstalk))

John Berard: But then what you're talking about is we now need to go through this and rank order these potential candidates, right? And then what you're going to do is you'll invite the person at the top and if that person says no then you'll go the second one and if that person says no you'll go to the third. And that's easier than just trying to do a first cut with who can do it?

David Taylor: David here. I'd probably chip in on that. I think the main worry was just - I can completely see where you're going, John, on this. I think because we are going to lose a lot of people who potentially won't be able to do this.

The problem is one of expectations and I'm just thinking now, you know, if for instance picking the academics if we've got one, two, three, four, five - five academics there if we asked all five and all five say yes

and then we decide to take two of them because we decide we need two academics, you know, two complainants, two respondents or something all talking together and that's six.

We can't have more than that then we end up with the scenario that's saying, you know, people are saying well that was funny because I wasn't selected by whoever was doing the selection and we'll have some sort of discussion of bias or whatever that potentially...

John Berard: You realize that what we're doing right now is on tape though right?

David Taylor: For a second? What we're doing right now is...

John Berard: What we're doing - yes so anybody who wants to, you know, look at that has access to our conversation...

David Taylor: Oh sure, yes.

((Crosstalk))

John Berard: ...either pruning the list before we invite people or we're pruning it after we find out their availability. I'm just trying to figure out a way...

David Taylor: Yes, but I think - but again I think maybe one of the things as well is, the - I mean, I'm looking at - just talking about the academics list as an example and we can sit and talk about the complainants list as well. But we've got - of the people there, you know, I said some of them would be one-sided and fewer of them would be the other side.

So you already know people's positions on what they're going to do.

John Berard: Right.

David Taylor: And we've suggested names to try and get a balance. So we're kind of looking for one pro and one against so we have a good discussion. So there because we've maybe got less people who you'd consider pro we've already put in a bias because we put more people in there.

And then the same thing on the respondent, you know, because we've got many more complainants outside counsel and less respondents outside counsel. I would be worried in the same way in reverse that we're inviting too many complainants outside counsels and (unintelligible) respondents outside counsels.

((Crosstalk))

John Berard: I didn't mean to make the process more difficult I was - I thought I might be able to offer...

David Taylor: Yes, no, I agree, I agree; I see...

((Crosstalk))

John Berard: ...easier but - so I'll turn it back to you Margie, you can lead us through this if we now want to talk about the pluses and minuses of each of these people. How many academics do we want? Two? Do we want one respondent, one complainant and then what two people from the - well one from each of the - or two panelists? How do we - how many people are we looking for?

Margie Milam: That's a good question.

David Taylor: And I've got the same question for you as well, Margie, because I was wondering how many you were thinking of.

Margie Milam: I forgot - let me tell you what I remember. We did invite three panelists - I'm sorry, every provider - to have one speaker so that's four right there. And they haven't given me the names but they've all confirmed that they will be sending, you know, will have someone participate.

And I don't know that we've been very clear about how many from each category. We have two hours all together.

And we already have too many categories so we've got staff, we've got registrars, we've got academics, (unintelligible) and, you know, complainants both inside and outside counsel and panelists. So that's like (unintelligible) there.

I was thinking one maybe two in each category. What do you guys think?

John Berard: I don't think we need two outside counsel complainants and inside counsel complainants; we can probably just pick two from that entire group or say one from each, a company person and an outside counsel.

Margie Milam: Yes.

John Berard: And maybe we can get by with just a single respondent counsel. I mean, Berryhill seems to be the frontrunner but, you know, John is a -

is quite a personality. I don't know, Ari Goldberger might be a better choice if we're trying to - well, I don't know, Berryhill probably knows the thing best of all.

You know, there's nobody on this list who is a - is the respondent as opposed to the lawyer to the respondent, right? I mean, it'd be great to have somebody who...

((Crosstalk))

David Taylor: Sort of a well known cyber squatter.

John Berard: Well, you know, yes. You say cyber squatter somebody else might say domainer, somebody else might say, I mean, you know, yes; we all have many labels.

David Taylor: Yes, yes, yes.

John Berard: But - and that's I think the point here, I mean, trying to get behind the labels, right?

David Taylor: I mean, I'd certainly be open if we look at the number of complainants we've got there in the outside counsel, we've got one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine and complainants inside counsel we've got another four so we've got 13 and we've only got four respondents so that's my - the same point I was making before with the, you know, with the academics.

This one is heavily biased if we can call it biased towards the complainants.

John Berard: I'm sure some would.

David Taylor: I'm sure some would. So there we need to try and, you know, even it out as best as we can. So do we have something where we've got two respondents and two complainants or, you know, or two - I suppose two outside counsel for complainants and two outside counsel for respondents and then just maybe have one complainant inside counsel there so you have, you know, you have one (unintelligible) a lot of these out of those four so that way it's less - because I don't think we need two.

So I'm presuming they're saying something similar but again we are doing a lot of presumption.

Carlos Aguirre: Sorry, Carlos Aguirre here. Can you hear me?

John Berard: Yes.

Carlos Aguirre: Thank you. I think to each category is a well number - is a good number. What do you think about?

David Taylor: I think, I mean, we could probably go down that route. The only thing I'd probably say on the panelists would it'd be worth - my personal view is it'd be worth to get more panelists there because they're really the ones who see the cases; they will see the complaints and the responses.

You know, and in my email (unintelligible) earlier somebody like David Bernstein, you know, his actual transfer rate is quite low and he will find very often for respondents.

So - and he finds for them for the right reasons as far as I'm concerned; it's when a complainant has, you know, overreached and he's got the experience there of seeing hundreds of cases where either complainants overreach or don't.

So, you know, his viewpoint to me would be, you know, really good to have there. So I'd say, you know, things like that we should possibly have four panelists or maybe, you know, I don't know how many we could get there but I think that would be very interesting.

So I'd probably come from more on the panelist side and less one the rest then maybe two on the rest would work if you say - if you think that Carlos.

Philip Sheppard: Philip here. I think I agree with that. I mean, we're going to get better balance and expertise I think from the panelists so I think, I mean, the general principal selecting I know one from each of the providers seems to be a good start. And aiming at two from each of the other categories seems about right.

David Taylor: Because panelists by definition...

((Crosstalk))

John Berard: ...are we assuming that inside counsel and outside counsel for complainants are separate or a single category?

Carlos Aguirre: Sorry, Carlos again. We expect to have a - so I mean, for two hours is correct?

Margie Milam: Yes.

Carlos Aguirre: Okay. If you - if we have four participant per category is not so much in two hours? I don't know.

Margie Milam: Yes, I believe what Philip was saying was four for the - just panelists category; one for each provider. And then I think still talking about two for the other, is that right?

Philip Sheppard: Correct.

John Berard: Right and my...

Philip Sheppard: So we're talking about - we're talking about 10-12 participants all together which is, you know, five (hours) of talking - which is the first hour of talking time so with introductions, delays, etcetera, that gives you about 45 minutes of Q&A; that sounds about right.

Carlos Aguirre: Could be.

Margie Milam: Okay so how do you guys suggest we narrow the list down? Do we try to narrow it on the call?

Philip Sheppard: I would suggest that if people have knowledge of the - anybody who's been suggested then that would be a useful criteria to - you know, put a tick to say they may be the preferred one to invite.

And then you should, you know, you go down the list after that saying - in terms of the state of panelists for instance if we've got, what, three from HKIAC if anybody knows then that may be a reason to say let's have this guy first otherwise we may just have a - send an invitation to those three, I mean, that invitation to say, you know, one will be chosen and then you can choose them on the basis of their availability as John had earlier indicated if we've got no other means of judging.

And maybe do that with some of the other names taking the preferences where we've got more than one nomination.

John Berard: This is John. I don't know any of the panelists but I was - I was encouraged by David's comment about David Bernstein. I mean, I, you know, if he's a pragmatic panelist and certainly somebody I think we probably ought to have on there.

The only other names that I know and feel strongly about would be Jonathan Cohen and John Berryhill for the respondents. And I was intrigued by the note that Jeff Neuman sent around regarding Konstantinos's book and taking a closer look at that. I think I could easily see Konstantinos being a preferred panelist.

And my assumption is that the registrars probably put a lot of thought into Statton as their recommendation so I'd probably endorse that as well. So that's, you know, right there one, two, three, four - that's five people right there that, you know, that would be the extent of my ability to comment even somewhat credibly.

Margie Milam: David or Philip, do you have any observations on some of these speakers?

Philip Sheppard: Yes, as I indicated in the email that some of you may have seen I liked the thought that WIPO had put into all their nominations. They seem to understand exactly what we were aiming at and therefore had made some selections based on that.

We didn't have that thinking process expressed in the - what we had from the other organizations. So I would give preference to their proposals. We had some discussion on the list in terms of academics of Cedric Menara. And I was also encouraged by that discussion so I would give a preference there.

Jonathan is somebody I can - Jonathan Cohen going back to complainants is somebody I know well. I don't know how active Jonathan has been of late; that would be my only question.

John Berard: Philip, what was your question? I didn't hear that.

Philip Sheppard: How active has Jonathan Cohen been lately?

John Berard: I don't know the answer to the question. You know, I see him at the ICANN meetings from time to time.

David Taylor: And David here. (Unintelligible) sort of running through the list there and the people I know certainly and I've sent an email on that, David Bernstein and Tony Willoughby they would both be excellent because David's US and Tony's UK and when I was saying that they don't - they often don't agree.

It's one of those things that WIPO has a panelist session every October and for the last six, seven years I've been going along to that and there's a session where David Bernstein is propped up against Tony Willoughby and they have detailed arguments on free speech and what sort of cases should happen; whether this would be under this in the US panelist or UK panelist, etcetera.

It's something which is one of the most intriguing and interesting sessions that you get on the panelist discussion. And they do fall quite soundly on different sides of the coin. So that - in that sense I think they're both very good.

And again - and the same comment as I made for David Bernstein, I mean, Tony Willoughby, when you see some of his decisions and if you do read through a complainant who goes up and gets Tony Willoughby and has not made a good case isn't going to win it unless the, you know, the respondent is such an obvious, obviously clear cyber squatter.

So you really - you have to make the case out whereas you may have other panelists who wouldn't be so strict and he is very strict. So in that sense he's strict because they've been doing cases for a decade. So on those - so I think both of those are very good.

Matthew Harris I know well. He's put forward by the CAC. I think that's the only one they've put forward. In the same way he's incredibly rigorous and you sometimes see comments about NAS panelists writing short decisions; Matthew Harris is probably one of the lengthiest decision writers in the world; he can write 20-25 pages.

So he is very, very thorough as well which among other things I think he's good because they really do know the issues. So those are three I know very well. (Christopher To) I do know - not so well but I do know him.

Of the complainants if we're going through...

((Crosstalk))

David Taylor: ...candidate because he's at the same firm as I am so anything I say would be biased. Paul McGrady files a lot of complaints. And I think he's good because he's recommended there by NAF and WIPO so I think that's quite good if you've got two providers and we work on that basis that two providers have suggested the same person; it seems to me that's a good reason perhaps to go with that person.

And then of the other people I'd, you know, I know some of them vaguely but not particularly well. I haven't sort of read many cases by them. On the complainants themselves if I was going through (Amy Gessna) from BMW - I suppose the BMY which is down there, that's quite interesting to listen to and I've heard her speak and they do file quite a few complaints. I don't know about the other three particularly on that.

Respondents John Berryhill, know him well. I think he should get the vote in there because NAF, WIPO and CAC, three of the providers all recommending him; that means he'd definitely be pretty much top of the list because he is well known and he's, you know, argues his cases

very, very well and has acted for many, many respondents. So I think he's a - certainly a good person to put up there.

Perhaps we should try and get somebody else in from HKIAC if we can to get sort of more of the distribution shall we say of people and not have so many Americans.

And on the academic side I'd probably stick with that. I think Cedric Menara would be very good (unintelligible) posts. And I think Konstantinos as well would be very good because he's, you know, certainly the fact he's writing a book and the fact his presence in the ICANN meetings today means he's very active and he's active in the stakeholder groups so I think he would make, you know, a very good person to be there as well.

And then obviously registrars we have no one else to choose from so I think we could back that. And I have no idea who Khalil is - hey Khalil, sorry. I'd completely go - no, I do know (unintelligible) so I think Khalil would be good if we can get - an ICANN staff would work.

And I think that gives a good balance if we've got, you know, a registrar and ICANN staff and academics. I think that in itself would be a good session, great session to have on this.

My thoughts rushing through.

Margie Milam: Sure. Carlos, did you want to add something?

Carlos Aguirre: No, Margie, I can talk only about academics. I think (Michael Gate) and Konstantinos Komaitis are good names. Maybe (unintelligible) is the

third one. But I don't know the other - the names nominated in other categories so I can't talk about this.

Margie Milam: Thank you. I'm just at a loss to figure out what the next step is in terms of narrowing this list. Should I send an email out to the list (unintelligible) that we talked about just now and give people through the end of the day to provide any final comments and then Monday I guess have another call?

I'm just trying to think, you know, try to get this list back in the...

((Crosstalk))

Philip Sheppard: Philip here. I realize it's difficult. I mean, I think (unintelligible) analysis was quite helpful actually, I mean, he was basing it on some - on some personal knowledge and also on the recommendations we've had. I agree with his analysis that where we've got, you know, more than one nomination from the provider that looks like a good reason.

And then I'd be very happy to go with his referrals as the short list and maybe send that out as a straw man that - to get comment on and see if we can get consensus around that.

John Berard: I agree, let's assume that we've just set the list and send it out for final okay.

Margie Milam: Okay so let me - okay let's take a few minutes, let me go through each category tell me who to put on the short list. For the panelists we said we wanted one...

((Crosstalk))

John Berard: We're committed to taking one from each provider, yes?

David Taylor: Yes I think we should definitely I think...

((Crosstalk))

John Berard: So clearly Matthew Harris has to be on the list. And, you know, we need to - David's analysis regarding Bernstein and Willoughby was interesting but, you know, interesting to take them as a pair; I don't know how you would take one over the other. Is Matthew Harris an American?

David Taylor: He's UK.

John Berard: He's UK so then I would say let's go with David Bernstein who's from the United States. And then in terms of the HKIAC does anybody have a recommendation between or among (Yun), (Wu) and (To)?

David Taylor: Just as (unintelligible). I couldn't recommend one over the other so I'd just be guessing. I think maybe that's one Margie could suggest sending that out saying, you know, going back to the provider and asking the provider, you know, to contact them and say, you know, could they check with one of them would be available to do it.

And, you know, we'd certainly like to have one of them but we're not in a position to decide who. And then that way they can have a discussion themselves and they'll probably come to, you know, to the

view and recommend one of them. Just saying, you know, we're very keen to have one from HKIAC.

John Berard: Right.

Margie Milam: Okay.

John Berard: Now - and then there seemed to five...

((Crosstalk))

John Berard: ...organizations here.

Margie Milam: One, two...

John Berard: What is NAZ?

Margie Milam: A typo on Number 2.

John Berard: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

John Berard: So then the question is does anybody have a recommendation between (Able), (Sasson) and (Carmedy) or should we do the same thing; send them a note and say offer up one.

Margie Milam: If I can...

((Crosstalk))

David Taylor: Oh sorry I was just going to - David here - sorry, (Sally Able) is the only one I know that, I mean, I wouldn't want to dismiss the other two just because I don't know them that's certainly not a good enough reason. So, yes, maybe doing that...

John Berard: We can do that for you, David.

David Taylor: Yes, you could. But, I mean, that's a good way of saying yes we'd like, you know, could they recommend or check with the three of them and ask them to - the provider to send out - and so if you want Margie asking which of those three we'd simply like to have one of them on board; could they recommend or could they liaise with the three and come back with one name.

John Berard: No I agree that's the sensible thing to do.

David Taylor: Because then we're not selecting as well, you know...

((Crosstalk))

Margie Milam: Sure.

David Taylor: ...not doing too much of a selection process here.

Margie Milam: If I may comment? The name (unintelligible) (James) (unintelligible) came from (Christine Dorian) from (unintelligible) about the - if you recall I had (unintelligible) to that just asking basically who do you recommend. And then you guys asked me to go back and say we want

someone with more, you know, with the most experience so that's (unintelligible).

Philip Sheppard: Well yes, I'd agree with that. And, I mean, also looking at the selection, I mean, my understanding - and tell me if this is still correct - is that WIPO is rather dominant in terms of the volume of complaints.

John Berard: Yes...

((Crosstalk))

John Berard: ...I'd say that's fine.

Philip Sheppard: And given that's the case I'd have thought there would be a strong case for taking up both of their suggestions particularly as David was saying they come from different perspectives; I think that would be very valuable if we know they're good presenters and have those different attitudes; that strikes me as a good reason to have them.

And, I mean, each on the rest in the way we just described; that seems to good to me.

Margie Milam: So do you all agree with - that we should have the two from WIPO?

David Taylor: I think it'd be good; I don't think we'd lose anything. And if at the end of the day we decide against - I mean, they may not both be able to do it so again that could be a self selection.

John Berard: So we're agreeing that we'll do five panelists then?

Philip Sheppard: I think - as I say - coming back to that I think on the panelist session I think that's - for me anyway I think that we get the most value from this and that was our objective to get the views of the providers and, you know, factual looking at the UDRP and the - and that side. So I think we're going to have an automatic bias on complainants and respondents.

So the panelists to me seems to be a good - where I'd certainly put more panelists there if we can get good panelists; the more input we can get from panelists the better. And the more input from the providers the better. At this stage that's what we're certainly looking at.

And so, I mean, if it's five that doesn't particularly bother me and in the end we may end up with four only on the day. And if it was six it wouldn't bother me on the panelists if we, you know, had to open out and do more.

Margie Milam: Okay well I'll put that on the short list. So I think we're good. We're - just to summarize kind of - and (unintelligible) right?

David Taylor: And if we had to drop somebody I think - I can't remember who said it but on the point of who is - oh, you know, John, you'd said if Matthew Harris refuses - him being English then I'd, you know, if we had to go for David Bernstein or Tony Willoughby then let's go for David so we've got the broadness. We'll probably end up with more Americans anyway but hopefully we'll have a good spread anyway.

Margie Milam: Okay. So now complainants where are we on complainants ad McGrady because he's been requested in two different forums. You

have any other recommendation - or and (Amy Gessner) from BMW, right? That's the other...

David Taylor: Yes, yes...

((Crosstalk))

David Taylor: ...to get an actual complainant themselves as opposed to an outside counsel. I think that'd be good.

Philip Sheppard: Yes, good balance, I agree.

Margie Milam: Okay. We've got McGrady, (Amy Gessner) from BMW. Now let's move down to the respondents; John Berryhill obviously because he's been recommended several times. Who else on the respondent list?

John Berard: I think David's suggestion was a good one that we go with one of the two HKIAC recommendations.

Margie Milam: Okay. And if I recall from the email from them (unintelligible) - I'm sorry, I cannot read Chinese an actual respondent as opposed to an attorney. And then the second name is a representative. So I'll respond back to (Dennis) (unintelligible) contact there to check to see if one of them could be available. Does that sound all right?

John Berard: Yes.

Philip Sheppard: Yes.

David Taylor: Sounds good, Margie.

Carlos Aguirre: Yes.

Margie Milam: Now let's go down to academics. Looks like we've got Konstantinos as the one that has the most (unintelligible) both on the list and among you all. Do you want one or two academics?

((Crosstalk))

Philip Sheppard: ...trying to go for two and why not the last two on the list which seem to have - we know that both currently engaged one in terms of studying and one also up to (unintelligible) I think they're sounding good to me.

Margie Milam: I'm sorry you're referring to Cedric the last name listed?

((Crosstalk))

Philip Sheppard: Yes the last two on the list, yes, Konstantinos and Cedric Menara.

Margie Milam: Okay. Are there any...

David Taylor: If neither of them can make it then we can go back we've got the other three there so that would - three other options behind us then as backup.

Margie Milam: Any objections to that approach the last on the academic list?

David Taylor: No.

Margie Milam: Okay I think I've got it. Then we've got Statton and Khalil from staff. So what I'll do is I'll summarize this, send it out to the list today and ask if there's any objections. If not - if I don't hear anything come Monday around noon or so I'll start inviting people.

David Taylor: And interestingly enough that gives us 13 named people and then plus the providers if I'm right so we've got 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 people in total, yes, is that right?

Margie Milam: Yes I think it'll be a very dynamic and interesting discussion.

David Taylor: It's a great group.

((Crosstalk))

John Berard: What I'm interested in is the chat that will go on alongside the (unintelligible). And that will be the most interesting data.

David Taylor: And the thing is as well here is we obviously we do need - are we going to try, Margie, get these out - sort of invitations out today or...

Margie Milam: No I think I'll do the short list today and invitations out on Monday.

David Taylor: Okay.

Margie Milam: Just in case there's some serious objection. I doubt it but, you know, given I gave such a short amount of time to look at the list...

David Taylor: Sure, sure.

((Crosstalk))

Margie Milam: ...that we should give at least (unintelligible).

Philip Sheppard: That's fair enough.

David Taylor: Yes.

Philip Sheppard: Excellent.

Margie Milam: Okay.

David Taylor: That's good.

John Berard: Well thank you all. Thank you, Margie.

Carlos Aguirre: Thank you.

David Taylor: Thanks a lot.

((Crosstalk))

Margie Milam: I'll try to set up another call some time next week to just kind of go over the format. I'll ask for a Doodle to be sent out just to figure out a time that works for everybody. Okay?

David Taylor: Okay...

((Crosstalk))

David Taylor: Are we going to do that - we'll have to do it early on in the week I guess Monday or Tuesday because if the - if it's on the 10th of May that'll be less than week away...

Margie Milam: Yes, right, okay.

David Taylor: ...we'll be really, really tight, won't we?

((Crosstalk))

Margie Milam: Gisella, if you hear that if you could do a Doodle for Tuesday of next week?

Gisella Gruber-White: I'll get the Doodle out for Monday or Tuesday if everyone can respond asap we can get the call set up.

Margie Milam: Okay. Terrific. All right thank you...

Gisella Gruber-White: Have a nice weekend everyone.

David Taylor: Yes same to everyone else.

Philip Sheppard: Okay, all right.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you, bye.

David Taylor: Bye-bye.

((Crosstalk))

Margie Milam: Bye.

Coordinator: This concludes today's conference.

Gisella Gruber-White: Thank you (Kathy).

Coordinator: Thank you. At this time everyone may disconnect. Have a nice day
Gisella.

Gisella Gruber-White: Lovely, have a nice weekend. Take care. Bye-bye.

Coordinator: Okay bye.

END