

**ICANN Transcription**  
**Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms in all gTLDs PDP Working Group**  
**Wednesday, 25 January 2017 at 04:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms in all gTLDs PDP Working Group Meeting on the Wednesday, 25 January 2017 at 04:00 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. Attendance may be found at:

<https://community.icann.org/x/L53DAw>

The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-rpm-review-25jan17-en.mp3>

Michelle DeSmyter: Well, good morning, good afternoon and good evening to all. Welcome to the Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms in all gTLDs PDP Working Group call on the 25th of January, 2017 at four o'clock UTC. In the interest of time today there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken via the Adobe Connect room so if you're only on the audio bridge would you please let yourself be known now? All right thank you...

Kristine Dorrain: This is Kristine Dorrain and I am trying to get onto the bridge right now.

Michelle DeSmyter: Oh okay thanks, Kristine, thank you. As a reminder to all participants as well please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. And keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise. With this I'll turn the call back over to J. Scott.

J. Scott Evans: Thank you so much, Michelle. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening everyone. It's my understanding from the two cochairs, and our able staff, Mary Wong, that we had the discussion of some of the TMCH charter

questions in Category 1. And so I think the two questions, one had to do with, let me see here if I've got the email here from Mary, or, Mary, do we have those for the screen? I don't see them listed...

Mary Wong: Hi, J. Scott, and everyone. This is Mary from staff. Yes, we have all the questions from Category 1 on screen and...

((Crosstalk))

Mary Wong: ...that's the first slide that you'll be seeing after the title slide. And the other slides are the follow-on questions that were sent to the mailing list if that helps.

J. Scott Evans: Yes, I can't – okay here it is, I can read this, scroll bar at the bottom and it's going to give the – because mine is cut off. So we were discussing this Question 1 about is the Trademark Clearinghouse clearly communicating. And I think there was some discussion around like, you know, who is it supposed to be communicating to? So I'll open it up for the floor. Let me minimize my screen here so I can see hands that go up. Does anybody have any thoughts with regards to this Question 1 about the communication of the Trademark Clearinghouse?

Okay. Well, if there are no comments then we'll look at Question 2. And we have, "Should the Trademark Clearinghouse be responsible for educating rights holders, domain registrants and potential registrants about the service it provides? If so, how? If the Trademark Clearinghouse isn't responsible who should be?"

Speaking not as chair but as a rights holder and a representative of Adobe, and the Business Constituency, I would argue it's ICANN's responsibility to educate rights holders and the Internet stakeholder community about the Trademark Clearinghouse, what goes in, how it's used and what it's used for. That's just my perspective. I don't think that's necessarily the job of the

Trademark Clearinghouse. I mean, I think that they do, for marketing purposes because they want people to use it, market it. But I don't know if education – you want the purveyor of the service, which is receiving a fee, to necessarily be the educator. I'm not sure – I look at education as being a little bit more objective than no. So I sort of see that as ICANN's role.

I see we have two hands up. I'm going to call on Kristine Dorrain first.

Kristine Dorrain: Hi, everyone. This is Kristine. Can you hear me? Okay great, I'm on mobile so let me know if there's a problem. So I know that we're sort of revisiting a little bit to capture anyone who might have missed last week. Wanted just to get back on the record, one of the things that I talked about with Question 2 was with respect to the Trademark Clearinghouse, I believe that they should be educating their users on the technical aspects of the Trademark Clearinghouse.

So, you know, how – for rights holders, how they get marks in, how to interact with the Clearinghouse, how to talk about – or how to, you know, contact the Clearinghouse if there's a problem, that sort of use-based education. To the extent that the Trademark Clearinghouse services are being used to interfere with domain name registrants or potential registrants, that sort of education should be the onus of the people whose customers are, you know, having that experience, so registries, registrars and probably ICANN as sort of a neutral third party for sort of being the master provider of that sort of information. So I thought I'd get that back on the record for this call as well.

J. Scott Evans: Thanks, Kristine. Petter Rindforth, I see your hand.

Petter Rindforth: Hi, Petter here. Hearing Kristine I think had the same idea but I'm not sure if it was – well as far as – I think the Trademark Clearinghouse should – we should split up education versus information on the Trademark Clearinghouse should be responsible for the initial information whereas ICANN and other providers should do the education. That can also add some other aspects of

the Trademark Clearinghouse. But I think it's – the providers – the provider providers must be – must have the basic information and be responsible for updates of that. Thanks.

J. Scott Evans: Thank you, Petter. I see Kathy Kleiman has her hand up.

Kathy Kleiman: Good evening, J. Scott. This is Kathy. And apologies for being a little late. I guess in some ways we are repeating a conversation of last week but I think the Trademark Clearinghouse is the organization with the incentive, the opportunity and the focus to educate everyone on the Trademark Clearinghouse and the services it provides.

Maybe there was some thinking early on that ICANN would do it or could do it, but that's fallen by the wayside because ICANN didn't do it. So the only education that exists, and I've been told this by many, is the Trademark Clearinghouse and the Trademark Clearinghouse for its direct customers, the trademark owners.

I don't think it would impose a lot on the Trademark Clearinghouse to extend its education to everyone. So what is a sunrise period and have materials that explain it from the perspective both of the trademark owner who may be registered in the Trademark Clearinghouse database as well as the domain name registrant that may be affected by it because there's a domain name that they wanted to register and it's not open at the first moment, at the first second of general of availability because it was registered during sunrise.

And this gets much more important for trademark claims. So that people have some where to go when they get a trademark claims notice that has some good educational material. So again, Trademark Clearinghouse right now is the group with incentive opportunity and focus. And we're looking at a vacuum, so it sounds like we all want to fill it but I'm not sure kicking the can down the road will do that. Thanks.

J. Scott Evans: Thanks. And I think I can barely read just I took out my contacts. Is it Vaibhav had his hand up next.

Vaibhav Aggarwal: Yes, that's correct. Vaibhav Aggarwal. Good morning, good evening, good afternoon to everyone. It's a pleasurable morning here in Delhi. And with sunny winters. Now just to take on where I think most of us are on the same page. There should be awareness but I must (unintelligible) that it should be a community effort and it shouldn't just be limited to ICANN or TMCH itself.

So if the community, let's say for example, if the registrar community is doing business using TMCH and there is a business aspect connected to it, then the business stakeholders as well as the service stakeholders both should be involved in spreading the awareness about the subject. So it shouldn't be, you know, TMCH as a service shouldn't just be cornered either ICANN shouldn't be cornered. I think it should be a community effort to educate the registrants about TMCH and its service.

And I think I'm sure this is being taken up before as well, and I'm happy to take it up again, but I'm sure I don't need to belabor on the point that I'm trying to make. Thank you.

J. Scott Evans: Thank you. And next was Kristine Dorrain. Kristine.

Kristine Dorrain: Hi, thanks, J. Scott. Kristine from Amazon Registry Services again. I just wanted to counter a little bit with the idea about the Trademark Clearinghouse being able to provide sunrise information. Every (unintelligible) how their sunrise is going to go. So the Trademark Clearinghouse (unintelligible) provided to a registry for sunrise but as far as what the specific registry is going to do with that information it could vary based on the sunrise and is it a start date sunrise, and it is an end date sunrise.

It's how long is the sunrise? And what are the different allocation mechanisms and, you know, even if you're in the Trademark Clearinghouse

that doesn't mean you're going to get allocated the trademark based on the registry operator's policies.

So the Trademark Clearinghouse really, other than sort of providing some technical overview on how the darn thing works, I just don't think that you're going to be able to rely on them to differentiate from provider – from registry to registry.

Additionally, I think the claims are a little better because at least the text is static. But with respect to the claims service, some registries can extend the claims service beyond the traditional I think 60 days so you can go, you know, a year if you want. The Trademark Clearinghouse, you know, would need to sort of customize that.

I think that the registries and registrars should be conveying information to their customers or if they're not doing a good job then it becomes an ICANN and if ICANN's not doing it then we need to get on ICANN, not shift the responsibility to someone else. We wouldn't ask, you know, any given restaurant to talk about how the FDA, the US FDA is, you know, doing their job. You know, we would put it back on the FDA to, you know, step up and explain themselves better. Thanks.

J. Scott Evans: Thank you. George.

George Kirikos: George Kirikos for the purpose of the transcript. Yes, I'm leaning more towards what Kristine just said that we – the TMCH are just contractors, they should just be, you know, have a very defined set of duties. And the rest should be left to ICANN and the registries because ultimately it's the registries that have the relationship with the customers.

Also, if you look ahead if there's going to be multiple TMCH providers and not just one provider, how do you share the education goal if there's supposed to be, you know, multiple providers, I don't think it's going to be very –

something that can be, you know, written down in a contract that they have to spend, you know, a certain amount of dollars or how it would work if there are multiple TMCH providers. So that was my perspective on this issue. Thanks.

J. Scott Evans: All right. So any other thoughts on comments on this one? George, your hand is still up. I'm going to assume that's an old hand and you're not responding to my last question. Okay, all right, well I mean, it seems like we've had a robust discussion. This combined with the discussion from last week, I see that we have – and we have some discussion going on in the chat. I hope that will be replicated because I'm not going to read these long statements that have been placed into the chat. That could be read when people read the transcript and listen to the transcript or read the transcript from the chat that's put out by staff when they do a summary of the meeting.

So it looks to me like, you know, it's hard to say but it seems to me, Mary, that one of the things we should do is perhaps it looks like to me there are – there seem to be sort of two – maybe there are three views here but I'm not sure. One was the view I expressed and it seems to be that Kristine and George have either agreed or have a version of that which is it's on ICANN to be the neutral educator of sort of the ecosystem which is ICANN and the applying for domain names.

I think that Kristine's point that could be emphasized in that educational materials, a sunrise period is X sort of from a general perspective, but then there are different flavors...

((Crosstalk))

J. Scott Evans: We're getting some feedback from someone so if everyone could put their phones on mute, that'd be great. So it seems to me that that's one perspective. And then there was Kathy's perspective, and Kathy's perspective seems to be – I wouldn't say that it's a polar opposite but it's quite different

and that is she believes that the TMCH itself should be charged with and the one that has to do the education of everyone within the ecosystem.

And I'm not so sure those were – it seems to me that those were the only two we got unless what George and Kristine were advocating, and you all can chime in if I'm – it's different than mine that it's ICANN, that it should be some sort of hybrid combination between ICANN and registries and registrars educating their consumers. And that all sort of combined. I guess we also had – I apologize – we had another point of view which was that it's the community itself, the whole community should be involved.

So it seems to me we've got three and/or four different perspectives that I think we need to sort of distill, Mary, into some sort of bullet point that we can then circulate to the group to see where we can build some consensus around it. I see that we have Heather Forrest raising her hand. Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, J. Scott. Can you hear me okay?

J. Scott Evans: I can. I don't know if everyone else can. I certainly can hear you perfectly clear.

Heather Forrest: Super. Thank you. I thought, J. Scott, I would speak out for that third option that you've just articulated at the end of your summary, which is the hybrid. And the way that I would see the hybrid is, you know, so often in ICANN we have a – a substance and a function or a, let's say, the why, the policy behind something and then the how something works. Dare I say policy and implementation?

And to a certain degree, of course, the TMCH operator has a role to explain the functionality of their system. And how it works and how best to use it and how not to use it and so on and so forth. But certainly ICANN, as keepers of the policy, have, let's say, a different role to play, which is not the technical

side of things or the functional side of things, which is the rationale and the underpinning behind why something is in place and how it works.

And I think it's very easy for folks who lived through the development of the policy for the new gTLD program prior to 2008, or let's say, you know, prior to and after 2008, prior to 2012, to – we all remember why things were put into place and how they came to be a particular way. But the newcomers to the system certainly don't know that. So I see that as being, let's say, the manifestation of the hybrid, if I can speak to that one. Thanks.

J. Scott Evans: Thank you, Heather. And Michael Flemming, I see your hand is up.

Michael Flemming: Thank you. Michael Flemming for the record. I'm assuming I can be heard. But just to touch on the community efforts, I think we also need to extend at least look at the TMCH agents as well being included in those communication efforts and regards to how that can be communicated out to rights holders, for example.

And another aspect of this question I'd kind of like to extend to is in the – have we – kind of reflect the wording perhaps or can we look at how the TMCH communicated – sorry, how the TMCH educated rights holders, domain registrants as well as potential registrants in the past? I think being able to look at how that was done, and I know it was done because I worked with TMCH sort of the staff TMCH myself to do seminars here in Japan. But looking at how examples were done in the past would help give us a better focus as well.

J. Scott Evans: Thank you, Michael. Well, I think that that certainly is something that we could consider. And but again, I think that we need to – I would suggest, Mary, that we distill these, looks like three and/or four, maybe four different positions around and as we try to develop consensus we may want to look at what Michael just brought up is to look at how this has been communicated in the past.

Now I know Kathy has clearly stated that in her opinion, she believes there is a huge vacuum and that she has been told, I believe if I'm quoting correctly by many, many people there is a vacuum that ICANN has not stepped in nor has anyone else.

But somebody has gotten some information somewhere because people have been using it and people are either – think it's working or don't think it's working and so they have some cognizant idea of it. And maybe we need to look into some of those communication efforts that happened in Round 1, see if they were in fact effective and who was doing them. Was it registries? Was it registrars? Was it the Clearinghouse? Was it ICANN? And if that can be improved upon.

But I think to move us forward I'd like to take the four positions, put them in bullet points and then we can put a footnote down at the bottom saying that Michael has suggested we take a look back and some ways and then we can feed that into.

But we've got to build consensus around something and I think if we take these four bullet points, get down to that, we can work into whittling that list down because the discussions and decisions aren't going to be made on this call nor any call, they're going to have to be presented to the list from a distilled from these conversations so that the entire list, those who cannot make a call because of timing, conveniences or whatever, will have the ability to express their opinions and share them with their communities for those that are serving in a truly representative standpoint and want to make sure that they social it within their own stakeholder group.

I see we have Kristine Dorrain's hand up again. And it's gone. Is that purposefully gone or did we lose her?

Kristine Dorrain: So sorry. I clicked the wrong thing. Can you hear me now?

J. Scott Evans: Yes.

Kristine Dorrain: Okay. I had to switch devices so let me know if there's a problem. I wanted to just – I think remind everyone that the question formation team that I was on, has requested information from the Trademark Clearinghouse on what sorts of education is provided. So we should have that at our disposal eventually for review.

Additionally, it might be helpful to add to our list of things – and these may be questions that we actually did ask as a team, Mary or Kathy or Vaibhav, you may remember I don't off hand, but we may have asked registrars and registrants if they do offer training on either the claims or the sunrise and how that, you know, how that's impacted by the Trademark Clearinghouse. So we may have some data coming in the near future that we could use to help inform our decision here.

J. Scott Evans: Okay. All right, all right, thanks so very much. So very much. All right, so I think those were the only – were we going to go onto Question 3, Mary, can you give me some help here or are we just doing 1 and 2 and then we were going to look at the feedback we'd gotten with regards to 1 and 2? Thank you, Mary. Go ahead.

Mary Wong: Thanks, J. Scott and everyone. I think it's really up to the group because last week we had quite a good discussion on Questions 1 and 2 and there were some follow up questions that were posted to the list and that you can see in the remainder of the slides. So you could go through those or you could start on Question 3 which I don't believe we actually had any or much discussion of last week at all. So we weren't sure what the attendance would be or what the interest of this group, I guess either option would work depending on how you, J. Scott, and Kathy and the rest of the group would like to approach it.

J. Scott Evans: Okay, I'm having real trouble reading the slides so if I look here we go down after Question 3 in the bullet points are those the questions that were circulated? Because I saw very little discussion on the list so I'll ask the group – so first of all, Kathy, clarify for me if the bullet points at the end of Question 3, after Question 3 are in fact the additional questions that are possible to discuss or is there something else I'm missing? Kathy. I'm sorry, Mary, I'm sorry. Go ahead.

Mary Wong: Not at all. And I'm happy to cede to Kathy if she has comments. You're right, J. Scott...

((Crosstalk))

Mary Wong: ...we did circulate the follow up – yes, we circulated the follow up questions that are in the remainder of these slides, which are on Slides 3 and 4 to the list. I believe we only got substantive comments from Greg Shatan, not able to join us on the call. So what we could do is recirculate these questions together with the notes from today, encourage folks to continue that conversation and then start on the Question 3 today, which is the information on the operation of the Trademark Clearinghouse, if you like.

J. Scott Evans: Yes, I think that's what I'd prefer to do unless I see any strong objection to that. I'd like to get, you know, a wider involvement looking at the additional questions that you have on Slides 3 and 4. So if we could do that, circulate those again and see if we can get someone beyond Greg Shatan to respond.

So we have Question 3 here, I'm going to have to blow up my screen, which means I won't be able to see your hands for just a moment, while I look at this. What information on the following aspects of the operation of the TMCH is available or where can it be found? Okay, that seems like it's an interesting question to be asking this group unless perhaps they have some sort of intuitive knowledge that I don't have.

But I would put this to the group, are you aware of any particular information with regarding these A, B and C here, TMCH services, contractual relationship between the TMCH providers and private parties? And with whom does the TMCH share data and for what purposes?

It would seem to me that the people that would know about B and C would be the Trademark Clearinghouse vendor, but perhaps I'm naïve. Does anyone else have any idea about where we might find this information? I see Kathy's raised her hand.

Kathy Kleiman: Hi, J. Scott. I just want to agree with you. I think you're right, that the TMCH providers, both IBM and Deloitte, probably in the reverse order, Deloitte and IBM, are the right place to go for the answers to these questions. I don't...

((Crosstalk))

Kathy Kleiman: ...either.

J. Scott Evans: ...then I would suggest that the chairs on behalf of the committee spin this question to those parties and ask them if they're willing to share this information with us. Michael Flemming.

Michael Flemming: Hi, J. Scott. I just would like to ask a clarification question. I guess I'm not understanding, are we supposed to be trying to answer these questions right now or (unintelligible) who we need to ask in order to answer these questions?

J. Scott Evans: I think it's a combination. I think there's some of the things we're looking for a solution like Question 2, we would distill it down into possible answers that we would build a consensus around. And then of course that would bleed into an action plan.

I think with regards to this Question 3 is pretty clear, we can't answer it, we don't have that information, we would seek to get that answered by the vendors as I've just stated. And let me look at Question 1 again. And I think with Question 1 I think that that is a subjective question that we would ask that this group answer by reaching out to members of this community which they interface with and are representing here to bring that information forward and share this question with their community so we can have that as well as the input as the experiences with particular group. Perhaps I'm off. And I will open it up to you or others that might have different thoughts.

Michael Flemming: Thank you, J. Scott. So as a follow up to at least looking at Question 3, the best data – the best information you will find is obviously speaking directly from the provider, the TMCH providers. Other than that though, of course, the TMCH services are all listed on the Website, (unintelligible) clearinghouse.com as well as especially the TMCH share data. When you say share data do you mean like the number of trademarks, for example, or do you mean – that's the only thing that could come to my mind.

Okay, with whom does the TMCH share data? I read that incorrectly. But that kind of data is provided in webinars by the TMCH. They have mailing lists that they send that out to. And then in regards to Question B, for contractual relationships between the TMCH providers and private parties, as in private parties, do you mean the TMCH agents? Or what – who is this – who does this (unintelligible)?

J. Scott Evans: I didn't write the question so I'm not sure, but if I had to postulate just based on the discussion that we've been having in and around these issues over the last six to eight months, I would assume that this falls mainly for those parties beyond ICANN, such as registries, that might be running additional services off of the Trademark Clearinghouse. But I could be incorrect. Somebody correct me if I'm wrong, I was not on the drafting committee for this, or if there's somebody who has a perspective that's different from this or remembers something different than I did.

I'm sorry, can you hear me now better? Did you all hear what I had to say? Are you hearing me better now? Okay some people heard me and some people didn't and for that I apologize. But I'll try to repeat quickly.

With regards to Michaels' follow-up question with regards to who these private parties are, it's my understanding is that just from having extrapolated from conversations we've been having over the last few months is private parties would be third party registries that are doing additional services based on the information in Trademark Clearinghouse. But if that is not what was meant, I said if somebody worked on drafting these questions are looking at them before this could answer that because that would be my perspective.

Mary.

Mary Wong: Thanks, J. Scott. And like you, I'm happy for my recollection to be corrected. I agree with you, I believe that the idea was to see the extent to which and if possible who was using the Trademark Clearinghouse database for purposes other than sunrise and claims. So for example...

((Crosstalk))

Mary Wong: ...for blocking mechanism services. What I've done is I've put in the Adobe chat the specific question that we've asked Deloitte and IBM – yes.

J. Scott Evans: Okay so, Michael, did you see Mary's comment in the chat that's right above Maxim's comment? You see that there's a specific question we asked with regards to this. Okay you see it. Thank you, Michael, for letting me know that in the that. So that's who that is.

So unless I see any objection I would suggest that Kathy and Phil and I send a – look at this question and see if we can ask these questions or if they haven't already been asked, ask these specific questions to IBM and to

Deloitte. Do I hear any objection to that? If you object please put a red X in the pod with regards to your response. Okay it looks like we may have already asked that, we just need to shake the tree a little to get it from the GDD folks who maybe are serving as our conduit with the provider.

I see that Kristine Dorrain has raised her hand again. Dorrain, I'm sorry, Kristine. Go ahead.

Kristine Dorrain: Thanks, a lot, J. Scott. So I just wanted – this is sort of the relation that we had in our subgroup where we created the original list of questions for the Trademark Clearinghouse is we were worried that coming back them in piecemeal. So we've got a whole bunch of charter questions related to the Trademark Clearinghouse here, and I'm wondering if we want to really go back to them week by week piecemeal with more questions where (unintelligible) two charter questions that we happen to be discussing those couple of weeks.

I guess maybe we need to work out a system to how often or how really to communicate to the Trademark Clearinghouse. But I do encourage us to try to see what information we get back from them. We may find that some of this information was answered in what we get. Or we may find that they're being uniformly unresponsive entirely and we shouldn't really expect to get any of the information we're looking for.

So I just want to throw that out for discussion and as far as sort of how we're going to go about this data collection.

J. Scott Evans: Well, what if we cull through these questions and make a list of the questions that we believe we need to ask the vendor directly and then we ask them to come to our meeting in Copenhagen and we set them down in a room and we just ask them the questions and tell them what we're looking for. I mean, it seems to me that would be face to face, hopefully we have a lot of people at

the meeting that would be able to participate. And then we could, you know, sort of have side discussions if those needed to be had.

I just think that there's, you know, have a consolidated list if we get them all in the room, we ask them what – and they can answer verbally what they think they can answer. They can follow up with us if they think they can't. We can set deadlines for that to occur. I just think that, you know, we've got to have some way to interact with them and bring this thing forward.

And I do agree with Kristine's point and I think it's a very valid point that you can only go to the well so many times before you're going to come back dry. You may come back dry the first time, but certainly even the cooperative party after the third or fourth question is going to get exhausted and not want to deal with it. Even if you get – only contact them once, you contact them with 13 questions you're much more likely to get a more positive response than if you come in with one or two questions every three or four weeks.

I see first Mary's hand is the first one I see and then I see Kristine's hand so we'll go Mary then Kristine.

Mary Wong: Thanks again, J. Scott. So especially for the folks who haven't been able to be on all the calls, the staff recollection is that the reason – well one reason why the questions were sent to the providers as soon as the sub team was able to confirm them was so that we would have the initial responses around about now basically, have the opportunity to review them and possibly develop follow up – not necessarily questions but just things that we want to follow up with them on.

And the idea was to do that before the Copenhagen meeting so that we can continue to have that conversation with them. So one action item that staff will take away today is to indeed find out if the TMCH providers or one or both will be in Copenhagen or if not if they can participate in a session with us.

And on that note, I just wanted to put for the record that this working group will likely have up to a three hour meeting on Day 1 of the Copenhagen meeting, the 11th of March, which is a Saturday. And we also will likely have a slot which is more like the regular open community slot for something like an hour or so on Day 5 of the meeting, which is the Wednesday the 15th. So in other words there should be opportunities to engage with both the providers and the community. Thank you.

J. Scott Evans: Thank you. Kristine.

Kristine Dorrain: Thank you. Kristine Dorrain again for the record. Yes, I guess I just wanted to – Mary said a lot of what I was going to say. I really like the idea of that face to face meeting in Copenhagen and I guess I could have put this in the chat but I'm trying to keep the audio conversation going too so you don't feel lonely.

But the – but I think the ability to, as you just pointed out, sort of digest some of the information that we're about to get, apply them to these charter questions and these additional questions and then use the time in the next few weeks to formulate sort of deeper dive questions, and we then (unintelligible) I think is a really great strategy. So that's a long way of saying yay, plus one.

J. Scott Evans: Okay well that sounds like we've got a plan. And so if we've already reached out to the vendor with these questions, Kathy, I would also say that one of the things – I keep saying, Kathy, I'm so sorry, Mary and Kathy, I'm tired. It's been a very long day. Mary, one of the things we may want to do is chase the vendor to say that this is what we're trying to do is get this information so that we can, you know, have this face to face meeting and let them know what our desire is and why we need it to get them a hard deadline to get it to us.

And I would suggest that that's – I would suggest that it's probably no later than the 15th of February just because that would give us some time to deal

with this on the phone so the people who will not be there live will have a chance to perhaps give their input to those – to the chairs and those that will be there live so that no one gets left out of that discussion. So that's sort of – I see that Mary has agreed to do that.

At this stage, I think that we've gone through these three questions and we've decided to circulate the additional questions that were posted, you know, to the list, again, to see if we can get a little additional discussion besides the one gracious response we received from Mr. Shatan. We've got sort of an action plan with what we're going to do with some of these other things.

And so I suggest at this time that we can give each other 19 minutes of our day back, unless anyone has any other business that they'd like to discuss. Don't see any hands. I'm not hearing anyone coming forward. I don't see – George is typing in the chat. Let me see what he's got to say before I – oh, he says "Bye, folks."

Okay, with that I'm giving everyone now 19 minutes of your day back. I really appreciate everyone, especially those it was inconvenient time zones, I'm glad we were able to accommodate those who it is usually inconvenient for. Thank you for being with us and thank you to staff for their help and everyone have a great day, a nice evening or a wonderful tomorrow. Bye. Goodnight.

END