

**ICANN  
Transcription  
IRTP Part D Working Group meeting  
Monday 27 May 2013 at 15:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of IRTP Part D Working Group call on the Monday 27 May 2013 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-irtp-d-20130527-en.mp3>

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#may>

Attendees:

James Bladel – RrSG  
Chris Chaplow - CBUC  
Rob Golding – RrSG  
Angie Graves – CBUC  
Mikey O'Connor – ISPCP  
Bartlett Morgan – NCUC

Apologies:

Jill Titzer – RrSG  
Simonetta Batteiger – RrSG  
Bob Mountain – RySG  
Holly Raiche – ALAC  
Alan Greenberg – ALAC  
Avri Doria – NCSG (standing weekly apology)  
Michele Neylon - RrSG (standing weekly apology)  
Kristine Dorrain – NAF  
Barbara Knight – RySG  
Volker Greimann - RrSG  
Oliver Hope- RrSG

ICANN staff:

Marika Konings  
Lars Hoffman  
Julia Charvolen

Coordinator: Today's call is being recorded. You may go ahead.

Julia Charvolen: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone.  
Welcome to the IRTTP Part D call on Monday 27 May. On the call today we have Angie Graves, Mikey O'Connor, James Bladel and Bartlett Morgan.

We have apologies from Jill Titzer, Simonetta Batteiger, Bob Mountain, Holly Raiche, Alan Greenberg, Avri Doria, Michele Neylon, Kristine Dorrain, Barbara Knight and Volker Greimann.

We have from Staff Lars Hoffman and Marika Konings and myself, Julia Charvolen. May I remind all participants to please state their names before speaking for transcription purposes? Thank you very much and over to you.

James Bladel: Okay thank you and welcome everyone to a special holiday edition of the IRTTP D Working Group. Would note that we have a small group today but we are attempting to push forward in our agenda.

Can we just briefly leave a note here if anyone has any updates to their SOI? Okay no hands and no one trying to get in the queue for that. We have an agenda but as Mikey and Staff were discussing before the start of the call, we have such a light attendance this time around that we would perhaps dispense with our normal agenda, and just take a look at some of the more administrative or housekeeping type items that need to be accomplished just to keep the Working Group progressing.

I don't know if that will take the entire hour. Mikey did you have a hit list of things that you wanted to cover in that regard or...?

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey. What I was thinking is that, you know, we've been taking notes both through the input review tool that's up on the screen, but also I've been doing stuff in the background in this gigantic mind map.

And I was thinking that maybe what we could do is start sketching sort of the summary of these comments for sort of in anticipation of the Durban meeting.

And since, you know, it's a pretty small group, you know, we could do this without wasting the whole Working Group's time. So take that opportunity on today's call and as you say sort of do more of a housekeeping sort of thing rather than a true Working Group session.

James Bladel: Okay thanks Mikey. I'm fine with that. I see we've picked up Chris Chaplow and Rob Golding as well so welcome to a small group today gentlemen.

My only question or thought is that we haven't completed the review, so we would only be going through looks like Page 5, Comment Number 8. Is that your thinking as well Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. And so what I was thinking is if we just got a bit of a head start on this, you know, it's something we have to do at some point. And since it's mostly just us maybe we get through as much of it as we can, and then give the rest of the Working Group something to review rather than grinding through it on a call where we have a lot people there who, you know, while they may want to chip in on the summary they might find it easier to just read one.

James Bladel: I - I'm okay with that idea. Would you want to take the lead on that Mikey and start us off with Item Number 1, or do you want us to progress in a different way or...?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I could do that. What, you know, Angie, Bartlett, Chris, Rob, what do you guys think about that idea? I mean, this - you're more than welcome to stay but it's not the usual deal.

It's, you know, it's more of a summarizing kind of thing. Any big objections to that? I mean, the other option is to essentially cancel the call and just wait till next week.

But I was thinking that it might be an opportunity to slip some administrative in that we're going to have to do at some point. Chris, go ahead. I'll just take the queue for a minute.

Chris Chaplow: Yes I would agree Mikey. Rather than cancel the call we've lost a few with it being - I realize now with it being Mondays it's not - perhaps not the best day for a Working Group because we do lose a few in the year.

So I came in late I'm afraid so I did miss exactly what you were proposing, but it sounded from the second half of it okay for me.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes it's a holiday in the U.S. Chris and so we, you know, we've taken a huge hit in terms of attendance. And, you know, it's sort of traditionally what we would do is long before now we would've canceled the call, but we had a little chat via email that said, "No let's just keep going."

And we'll - rather than doing substance we'll sort of do summarizing and see if we can pull some themes out of the comments that we've had so far, and summarize those in a way that doesn't lose anything but moves us forward in terms of getting ready for Durban and then on to writing the initial report. Okay, do you want me to run this call James because I can if you want?

James Bladel: Sure. Yes, I mean, my - well just one parting question here before I drop into a participant mode. Are we working solely from the comment review tool?

Are we also pulling in the mind map as well? What are our source materials here?

Mikey O'Connor: I thought what I would do is I'd grab control of the screen in a minute and put the mind map up. Julia or Lars or Marika, can one of you guys send me the - this version of the mind map in something that I can cut and paste from, because I was thinking I might do - is sort of staple in things from both

sources into a new chunk of the mind map and then we could push that back the other way.

I'm not exactly sure about the mechanics so if I had - I think a Word version of that summary or review tool would be great, because then if it seems easier to summarize it in the actual tool I could just switch over to that rather than doing it in the mind map. Actually that might be a better deal so...

Lars Hoffman: Hello Mikey. This is Lars. I'm sending it through the email right now so the files are not that small so it might take a minute or two but they're on their way to you, the Word version as well as the mind maps - the Word version of the review tool that is and the mind maps in various formats.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes the - it's the review tool that I'm really hot for. So the mind maps have come and - but - so you sent the mind maps first, right?

Lars Hoffman: Yes I did.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Well let me grab the screen. Coming - that gone - takes a few clicks to get that running. There's the Word version. Cool. That going - screen - we didn't get a lot of comments on the first one.

You can see that in the mind map and - but we - but I took a few notes. Might want to add to - I think I'll just - I'm going to pull the mind map out of the way.

Bigger - looks - is that readable for people? It's readable for me but I have a big monitor so shout out if it's - yes I'm getting a tick mark that it's okay. All right.

So here we go. Run my mouse. Okay, so what we've got in the review tool so far you can see is that the - it's just that the BC is restating the charter question in the affirmative.

And that - let me show you what I wrote for notes. That's very small. Hold on a minute. The notes that I took on that one are quite old. So the one substantive thing is that Registries are in favor of eliminating a step in the process.

Can't remember what we were talking about there. What we said in our response was that the Registry's opinion should be considered especially important since this is mostly their job.

So we've got quite a lot of content there. Guess I'll change the view. Better. So what I was thinking is this was a summary of our conversation, and maybe what we could do is sort of highlight the ones that we think are pretty important and highlight those.

For example we could go through, say they're supportive, that standardized case data is important.

James Bladel: Mikey this is James.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, go ahead James.

James Bladel: Sorry. I think that the key thing that struck me about the Registry comment here, and maybe it's something that we need to confirm that's the intent from Barbara when we get the larger group back, is that the Registry is talking about removing their level entirely.

So they're talking about, I mean, a - really a fundamental restructuring of the TDRP. I think it's the - one, two, three, four - fourth bullet point from the bottom there about, you know, there's the informal Registrar - yes that one.

There's the informal Registrar process and then there's the second level dispute provider process and that the Registry process, which right now is

either your optional first step or escalation step, is what they're saying should be removed.

And I think that is a huge rewrite I think of the TDRP if that is exactly what they're proposing.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes and so maybe, you know, this is a key - be - what we're doing today is identifying key discussion points for the group because, you know, that wouldn't be a bad way to walk into Durban is to say essentially there's support for this idea.

However there's some - there are some things that we want the group to focus on in their discussion, which is sort of what I was hearing you say James and I tend to agree that, you know, I'm not necessarily in disagreement with the idea but it's an important thing for the group to focus on. Maybe that's a way to handle this call is to...

James Bladel: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: ...find things that we really want to drill in on in subsequent discussions.

James Bladel: Yes those things, I mean, I - controversial is not the right word, but those things that are going to be significant changes or big topics.

Mikey O'Connor: How about something like that? Is that readable? I haven't been looking at the screen. Tell you what James. What would be cool is if you did the queue, because it turns out that with all the screen landscape that I'm using I'm...

James Bladel: Yes the queue's...

Mikey O'Connor: I'm not looking at the Adobe Connect so if - I'll continue to sort of natter on but if you see people wanting to jump in - and because it's such a small call,

you know, people shouldn't be shy about interrupting me the way James did either I think.

But anyway, yes I think that's right on. I think I like standardizing case data. I think that's something we might want to put in our report, because that's certainly - that nonstandard data certainly caused Lars a fair amount of hair pulling trying to get this stuff into a format that we could analyze.

I'm also kind of interested in the - I'm going to do this this way because I think we might have more than one key discussion point. I think another one is the impact of, you know, because, you know, right now it's - tell you what. I'll type those and then if you don't like them just yell at me.

James Bladel: No I think that's correct.

Mikey O'Connor: Get up there and highlight the context of that. Yes.

James Bladel: So if that - I'm sorry to interrupt but is that what they're saying, because the number of Registries are going to increase the process shouldn't live at that level anymore, but it should be the Registrar level and the secondary provider level?

Mikey O'Connor: I'm not sure I saw that causality. You know...

James Bladel: Yes I didn't really get that either. That's why I was asking.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. Yes. I - I'm leaving those as sort of separate discussion points because I think they're related but not - I don't think there's causality flowing either way on that one.

It's just something to talk about and, you know, we may see that. But I think that they would be proposing - and again we'll have to check with them. I bet

they'd propose this even if the number of gTLDs wasn't changing. I think they want to get the Registries out of this.

James Bladel: Well, so then that raises a question of why? And do they believe it's not appropriate or do they believe - because, I mean, it starts to look contradictory.

The volume is too low. Let's get the Registries out of this, but the Registries are going to increase so the volume might go up. So I just - I think you're right. I think we need to just kind of drive down at what they're driving at with this.

Mikey O'Connor: Right. Well, and the thing is that, you know, if you take a low volume process and now you spread it across a whole bunch of Registries, I could make a case where those go together because you could say, "Okay so except for Dot Com, you know, a Registry that sees one or two disputes a year - it's hard to maintain a process at that low a volume and do a good job at it."

Rob Golding: Unless the process is actual - also provided for...

James Bladel: Marika's in the queue. Sorry to interrupt.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes and so is Rob. Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. And I think one of the considerations was that basically you would have a lot of new Registries coming on board. And I think if I recall well, having seen their comment quite some time ago I think it may probably as well - I - that it may be difficult for them to get familiar with it and set up the infrastructure to deal with it, you know, going forward.

So I think that's part of their consideration of suggesting taking the Registry operator out of the equation, and I don't know. I don't recall that but I don't

know if it'd link to as well a possible consideration that of course who would open up to Registrants.

The volume may of course change over time. So - but it's - again this is what I recall from having seen the comments a long time ago, and I'm sure Barbara and some of the other Registries would be able to provide more insights. But I think that was a little bit the gist of it.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I think that's right. Rob, jump right in.

Rob Golding: Yes. I mean, if the issue is that there's a concern over newbie Registries for want of a better description, not necessarily applying the same rules as those that have an established policy or process, shouldn't the simple answer be that before you go live you get handed a big wedge of paper that's got some flow charts of these other processes you must follow?

And we give them their TDRP policy or ICANN gives them the TDR policy and goes, "That's the TDRP policy. You start at the box at the top and you work down the issues in those till you get to the bottom."

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. I mean, that's another approach. I think what, you know, I'll pretend to be the Registries and say that, you know, I would think that if we anticipate system is going to stay this low and, you know, if we take a Dot Asia as an example where they're kind of cruising along at 200,000 names, maybe a little less than that now, and Dot Com is at 120 million or whatever it is, then the odds that some of these Registries are going to see this procedure ever starts to get pretty thin.

And so here's an organization that's got this complicated procedure that they have to execute maybe once a year. The odds that there's going to be consistency in that are pretty bad.

And so maybe what we ought to do is aggregate that very low volume into one place. And in this case I think what they're saying is, you know, push it up to the second level providers and take these now very large number of Registries sort of out of the process altogether.

Anyway I, you know, I think for purposes of this call we've done our job on this one, which is found a couple of key discussion points. We certainly don't want to resolve this one today because we haven't got anywhere near the right people on the call to do it.

I think my thought with - for this call was just to find the tasty bits and highlight them for our future work and we certainly found that. Is there anything else in the comments and our summary of those comments that we want to add to this?

You know, if we sort of say that our goal for today is to get a set of key discussion points for each of these, is there anything else in our summary that we want to...?

James Bladel: Yes Mikey, James here. Just that there's one here, the second to the last bullet point which just says let's take a - and we've touched on this I think in a number of calls is taking this holistic view of TDRP, what it's doing, who's using it, what it's supposed to be solving as opposed to, you know, tinkering with it.

You know, maybe look at it in more of a - in need of a end-to-end overhaul. And I think that's something that we've discussed, but here it's echoed somewhat in the Registry comment.

Mikey O'Connor: What on earth is going on here? All I want to do is paste a little buddy at - I don't want to do anything complicated here. Oh I see what's going on. Never mind. Hold on while I type.

James Bladel: No problem. Queue's still clear.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

I'm getting closer. I've never used this view before. And I think I got it. Wow. I have no freaking idea what's going on. Hold on a minute. I'm going to back up. I'm going to change views. Sorry folks, but this is just too freaking weird. All right.

(unintelligible) another try at this. That's better. My apologies for not being able to operate my word processor.

James Bladel: It's funny actually, it's - I'm about three seconds behind.

So I hear you frustrated - say something frustrated and then like a second later I see what's frustrating you.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

No. All I wanted to do was copy and paste another bulletin there. It turned into this giant Federal case. Sorry about that. Actually, I think I know what I was doing wrong. So I'm going to go back to that view so that we can still see more.

I'm also going to totally screw up your format, (Lars). All right. That's why you get paid the big bucks. All right. So now he's sort of all of it. All right. I think that's enough on that one. Let's try another one.

You know, I hold up -- now this one's going to be harder, because we had more to say. Oh, that's not too bad. It almost fits on one page. I wonder if I can squish it out.

Yes. Look at that. Oh, it's so close. Current bandwidth may not be high enough. Shush. Be quiet. Adobe's whining at me because I'm -- all right. So let's see what we got here.

Should additional provision -- this is -- okay. So this is Charter question B. It had comments from the BC and the registries, which almost fit on the screen, but not quite. So we'll highlight the BC ones first and then do our (unintelligible) at the bottom.

Oh, this is the Multiple Transfers. Oh, this is clearly one that we might want to put on our discussion topics list, right? The whole 60-day thing -- just like we did for the last time.

James Bladel: Mikey, can I...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

James Bladel: ...jump in?

Mikey O'Connor: Jump right in, because I'm reading. I'm not looking at the...

James Bladel: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: ...room.

So go ahead.

James Bladel: Yes.

So I think, you know, we had some good discussions here. I think in general we've identified that PDRP is another process that is - or policy that is undermined by this practice of registrar hopping, in the case of the hijacked name.

I think we, you know, we've, you know, so we've already identified, I think, through other instances of IRTP Working groups that this is a - this is an optional lock, not a mandatory lock. And I think that the problem was -- it's that, you know, folks wanted this to remain at the discretion of the registrar.

And we didn't want or there was some resistance to the idea that it would - that we would have some sort of a overarching period where we would allow someone to claw back a name from an innocent purchaser.

Mikey O'Connor: Right.

James Bladel: But I think what this is starting to come down to -- and this is where we started talking about, well, aren't we - is it within scope for this group to go back and revisit some of the, you know, issues from previous Working groups?

And I think one of the questions that I have is do we see that it's an either or proposition -- that either we make the 60-day lock mandatory or we allow some sort of a period for claw backs, because right now we have neither.

And is that - is that the crux of the problem? And I'm not saying that it is or isn't. I'm just saying is it - is the - are those - is there a linear relationship between those two things?

And that's mainly a question for, I think, the after market folks who, you know, at least traditionally raised their concerns about how this impacts their - the economics of their industry.

Mikey O'Connor: I'm picking - I put that claw back stuff and also the six-month thing out so far.

And, you know, another way to do it is blocking from future...

James Bladel: Yes.

And I think that helps it from continuing to hop. That stops the hopping, but it doesn't prevent it in the first place.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

I think that the PDRP, though, is the horse is already out of the barn process. I'm not sure...

James Bladel: Exactly.

Mikey O'Connor: You know, I don't think this is much in terms of prevention and, you know...

James Bladel: No.

And it - and it's even not a - it's actually even not a very good cure either, because it's so slow and so long. It's really not all that useful in case of a hijack, where damages are measured in the hours.

Mikey O'Connor: I like this business of being able to bold stuff.

All right. So let's make up our topics for further discussion thing. (unintelligible) before. Key discussion points. Don't understand that blinking that it does, but all right.

So it sounds like this locking and one -- trying to summarize this notion that there is -- up in the - up in the comments there is conversation about, you know, all registrars in the chain should - would -- and then there's this six-months notion.

You know, can't summarize that very well. Just going to pull it in.

James Bladel: Did I lose you?

Mikey O'Connor: No.

I'm just being uncharacteristically quiet.

James Bladel: Oh, okay. All right.

I didn't know if I was still on the call.

Mikey O'Connor: No.

I was just editing there. I'm not sure if that - have I - have I missed any of the really juicy bits in that set of comments that we made? Let's take that as a first try and then move on to the next one.

Oh...

James Bladel: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: ...at least this one's nice and short.

Okay. This is the one about options for registrants. And this is the -- now what's the deal with this one? Didn't we - is this one of the ones we need to go back to the council and reopen?

I thought we had...

James Bladel: Well...

Mikey O'Connor: ...this discussion in a previous...

James Bladel: Yes.

If memory serves, you know, we reinforced it. I think it was IRTPA -- we reinforced the idea that the registrant can overrule the admin contacts. So if the admin contact requests and approves a transfer and then the registrant comes back later and says, "I don't approve of this transfer. Put it back."

But that was a legitimate. I think where it gets sticky is that the - in the Thin registry -- Again, Thin registries kind of being the curveball in this whole thing -- is that the new registrar may not know who the registrant was previously. So I think that's where this one got a little - got a little sticky.

Now I think that the response or the comment from the BC actually is stressing perhaps that the - a slightly different issue, which is should this be left to the discretion of the registrar to initiate the process? And I think they're saying fairly affirmatively that registrants should be able to initiate this process.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. So maybe this isn't the right place for that. You're right. I do wish that this thing wouldn't do that. Apologize.

So our comment -- so what we highlight -- this...

James Bladel: Through proceedings. Yes.

Oh wait, and the registrar would (unintelligible). Yes. So that's an interesting - I would say we capture that. Yes. I would - that would be an interesting discussion of how that would work.

And let's assume that the registrar is declining to initiate and perhaps they have a good reason. So let's not -- we won't - we won't speculate in this call.

Mikey O'Connor: Right. Yes.

No. I think what we do is we just pull out the juicy topics...

James Bladel: Sure.

Mikey O'Connor: ...for now and then...

James Bladel: I just - I think that it's often the case that we'll just - we'll just by default assume that it's - that the registrar, you know, is lazy or doesn't want to get involved, but there could be a good reason why the registrar believes that the...

Mikey O'Connor: Right.

James Bladel: ...that -- yes.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. No, I think that's right. I think it's - but it's clearly one that we want to pick up again. Okay.

So then there's the registry comment. And they have the phrase, "Dispute options," which is kind of an interesting.

James Bladel: Now if I -- I'm sorry to jump in.

If I could point back to their first response - the registry's first response, it seems like the only avenue -- if registries are saying that this mechanism should be available directly and that they -- registries -- should be out of the picture, it should either be registrars who have already declined and second-level providers, then it seems like reading between the lines the registries are saying that the registrant should be able to contact second-level providers to initiate this process.

Does that stand to reason with everyone?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

That's one way to put those pieces together, for sure. Clear avenue to -- and then they go on to say, "Because the gaming is," okay -- we aren't going to - we're not going to analyze.

We're just going to say, "Tasty topic."

James Bladel: Yes.

Well I think - I think reading this one in conjunction with the previous comment, it seems like it would have to go to the second-level provider. And then I think that the concern that the registries raise does come into bearing, which is how does the second-level provider know the parties are legitimate for, you know, but yes, let's capture those.

Mikey O'Connor: This might be where we can do the Thin Whois thing.

James Bladel: And just to jump in, the queue is clear and we are down to 10 minutes.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, thank you. Okay.

Let's just see what else we want to pick out of this one. Take that off. I'll give you a previous of the Thick Whois result that you can almost bet on. But never over until it's over, but we're very close to consensus on a finding to require a Thick Whois in all registries. So be helpful.

All right. Let's see how much we've got.

James Bladel: I don't think that's a surprise, but I think the question -- well I'm not a participant in that group, so I'll let the -- how to get from here to there is a good question.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, you know, and it turns out it's at least technically and mechanically not that tough, you know?

It could be as simple as go registrar-by-registrar and just load off of the latest copy of the escrowed data. It may not be that...

James Bladel: You know, I think there's some...

Mikey O'Connor: ...difficult.

James Bladel: Yes.

I think there's some rules under which we have to allow ICANN to decrypt that. I'm not sure if this wouldn't be a new one.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, it's encrypted. Oh, interesting.

James Bladel: So anyway, this is the...

Mikey O'Connor: So anyway. Yes. Something like that.

James Bladel: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

You know, for a while it's like you're...

Man: It's bad enough trying to get your escrow back out of them when you want. Very further, it's worse.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Don't you hate backup systems that you can't get the data out of? I hate that.

James Bladel: Right.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. I get that.

Okay. This is the one on making information available to people, as to how they do it -- making their choices available. BC's for it. Trying to find the key discussion in this.

James Bladel: Yes.

I think -- and if I can jump in here, I think our - where we were starting to land on this one was that obviously the registrar should be informed -- I'm sorry, the registrant should be informed by their registrar of their - of their options...

Mikey O'Connor: Right.

James Bladel: ...whatever they may be.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

I'm trying...

James Bladel: And I think...

Mikey O'Connor: ...to find the places that we need to beat on.

I, you know, I think there's pretty much, you know, I think...

James Bladel: Well the question was where and how.

Is this a Web site thing? Is this a terms and - is this a Registration agreement thing? Is this a...

Mikey O'Connor: That's a - that's a...

James Bladel: ...Foreign Article thing?

You know, when - how do we - how do we do it?

James Bladel: (Unintelligible)

Mikey O'Connor: I hate Microsoft Word products.

(Lars) I'm going to leave this pile of crap for you to figure out.

Woman: (Unintelligible)

Mikey O'Connor: You lucky dog.

What -- wait. I got the first half of that, James, and then I'm - I was just busy being frustrated by Word and missed the second half. You were saying the key question is where is this data and something.

And, you know, you mentioned the Registrar Agreement...

James Bladel: Well we threw out some ideas. I don't know they were in any particular order.

The registrar Web site, the registrar Registration Agreement, or -- I think one of the other options was Help and Support materials. And there was also a mention, I think, during the conversation of a TBD or perhaps there's already out there a site that was proposed in other groups -- I think, (Pedner) by ALAC -- that they would be this education site, should it (unintelligible) there, if that thing ever gets off the runway.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay.

I don't know. We could, you know, we could call it a holiday and give ourselves four minutes off. What do you think, James?

James Bladel: I was just going to call three-minute warning, so if it's...

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, come on.

James Bladel: ...if this is the wrap -- oh, you know.

Well I'm not barbecuing, okay, because we're getting something like three inches of rain every 24 hours. So...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. It's terrible up here, too.

James Bladel: But I do believe, though, if I'm not mistaken, this is the last one where we actually had comments.

We still have to go through number nine and number ten, so we've caught up...

Mikey O'Connor: Hopefully, you know...

James Bladel: ...to where...

Mikey O'Connor: Oh yes. So we're caught up.

Oh, good for us.

James Bladel: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: So we can't...

James Bladel: We've caught up to where we couldn't go any further anyway, Mikey, without the rest of the group.

Mikey O'Connor: That's what happens when you keep your nose right down in front of your shoes and not looking at the road. Good. Good deal.

Was this a good -- is this a good process for folks, or was this just a total waste of time? I'm really looking to the...

James Bladel: Well...

Mikey O'Connor: ...quiet folks...

James Bladel: ...you know...

Mikey O'Connor: ...on the call on this one, just to see.

James Bladel: Well just my two cents is, you know, we, you know, it'd be -- we made more progress than nothing. And nothing was probably -- well it was staring us in the face with a can full of calls, so I think...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

James Bladel: ...you can always beat nothing.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, that's true.

James Bladel: So...

Mikey O'Connor: True.

I saw (Kevin)'s hand -- (Kevin)? Who -- yes, (Kevin)'s hand go up and down. Anybody else got any ideas on this? Don't feel compelled to talk. I was just curious. Oh, I'm looking back at the chat. Wow.

Okay, let's call it a day. I'm done. I'll save a copy. (Lars), you're stuck with figuring out how to turn this formatting back into what it used to be. That's it for me.

James Bladel: Thanks Mikey.

I don't have anything extra, so everyone...

Mikey O'Connor: Okay.

James Bladel: ...have a great day and we'll chat next week.

Mikey O'Connor: Terrific.

Thanks gang.

Man: Thanks Mikey.

Bye.

Man: Thanks gang.

Man: Okay. Take care.

Man: Thanks Mikey.

Man: Thanks Mikey.

Woman: Bye.

Coordinator: Thank you.

This concludes today's call. You may go ahead and disconnect at this time.

END