Terri Agnew:Welcome to the Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) in all gTLDs PDP Working Group call on Wednesday, 31 May 2017 at 16:00 UTC for 90 minute duration.

Terri Agnew:agenda wiki page: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__community.icann.org_x_EQbwAw&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpCIgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0AIgn-H4xR2EBk&m=ZxHh4t27L-wxIDd9K5AOSlzVE6QICKdUb4Clu2j5llg&s=1XB-5B3LOy7KgNQjyns2i3qkeLpHm9D8DM_Xme8YfpA&e=

Michael Flemming:I must be early.

Terri Agnew:Hi Michael, meeting will start in 14 minutes

Kathy Kleiman:Welcome all!

George Kirikos:Hi folks.

Paul Tattersfield:Hi everyone

Philip Corwin:Hello all

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):Hello All

Steve Levy:Hi all!

Lori Schulman:No worries. ICANN will be in Barcelona next year.

Susan Payne:or even Seattle Lori :)

Susan Payne:oops - meant INTA will be Seattle

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):why not Montreal?

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):*for ICANN

Mary Wong:Kristine Dorrain is on

Lori Schulman:ICANN seems to be following INTA. We've recently had meetings in Panama and Barcelona. Precisely where ICANN 62 and 63 will be...as of now.

Lori Schulman:My understanding is that subteams are short term.

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:Agree Loir

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:Lori

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Lori, any chance INTA chooses Montreal instead of Seattle ?

Lori Schulman:I support short term projects not a second work group.

Lori Schulman:@ Maxim LOL

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):I hope subteams finish their mission and report to the whole WG and then they are dismissed

Lori Schulman:+1 Maxim

Michael R Graham:Sorry to be late. I am under the weather and have no microphone connection..

Mary Wong:Note that the proposed Q4 from the TM Claims Sub Team addresses the question being discussed on the list by Phil, Greg and others regarding wording of the Claims Notice.

Michael R Graham:@Kristine: Thanks for taking the lead in explanation!

Lori Schulman:Very well done I think

Lori Schulman:at least on first glance

Claudio:need to move over to audio-only

Michael R Graham:No, I think Kristine has covered it well.

Paul Tattersfield:very good presentation (especially off the cuff) thank you

Michael R Graham:@Mary: I believe that is correct -- the Questions should not change.

George Kirikos:Very bad font.

Terri Agnew:also listed wiki agenda page: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__community.icann.org_x_EQbwAw&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpCIgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0AIgn-H4xR2EBk&m=ZxHh4t27L-wxIDd9K5AOSlzVE6QICKdUb4Clu2j5llg&s=1XB-5B3LOy7KgNQjyns2i3qkeLpHm9D8DM_Xme8YfpA&e=

Terri Agnew:under documents

Mary Wong:Is this better? Everyone can scroll, and if you don't want to use Full Screen you can magnify to 125%

khouloud Dawahi:yes ,thank you mary

Philip Corwin:Much more readable

Paul Tattersfield:better font but the scroll but doesn't use all the window here so has scroll bars and dark grey panels down each side

Mary Wong:@Paul T., we aren't able to change the margins in the display pod, unfortunately.

Paul Tattersfield:thanks mary, that's a shame

Jon Nevett:Too soon to see if there are any objections

Jon Nevett:First time at least I am seeing it -- please send to list

Mary Wong:Current list of Sub Team members for Private Protections can be found here: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__community.icann.org_x_tcrRAw&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpCIgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0AIgn-H4xR2EBk&m=ZxHh4t27L-wxIDd9K5AOSlzVE6QICKdUb4Clu2j5llg&s=puX9bb3VOZvepV6uYhCY7es907bKOZSZkASYNK0LW5g&e=

Mary Wong:We note also that Paul McGrady had previously volunteered to chair this Sub Team, and that presumably is something the Sub TEam will decide on its first call (which staff will schedule shortly once the WG signs off on sending these questions to the Sub Team).

Claudio:Mary, can you please add me to this subteam

Jon Nevett:I disagree with that -- it should be at this level

Lori Schulman:Agree with Susan - maybe Voluntary Practices?

Lori Schulman:or Voluntary RPMs

Brian Cimbolic:I like voluntary practices

Mary Wong:A previous suggestion was "Additional Voluntary RPMs".

Philip Corwin:Private refers to private sector provision of additional protection options not mandated by ICANN -- not secret.

Greg Shatan:Support the change in terminology.

Greg Shatan:don't see

Lori Schulman:Voluntary to contract parties

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):bor both , if registrants do not agree -most probably they can not registre

Lori Schulman:Voluntary is absolulely correct

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):*register

Susan Payne:thank you that sounds good

Greg Shatan:Don't see "Private Protections" as a buzz term. But maybe I'm traveling in the wrong circle..

Greg Shatan:"Discussion" is not the same thing as arguing a position.... :-)

Lori Schulman:Kathy: I don't think that you were engaging in discussion; I think that you were challenging Susan rather than noting a suggestion. Whether you support or reject the suggestion is for another discussion.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Greg, I am not sure we will not see this named "behind scenes private protections" today :)

Lillian Fosteris:I agree with Greg. I haven't heard of "Private Protections" before

Greg Shatan:None of this is behind the scenes....

Lori Schulman:I have seen Private Protections used as well as Voluntary

Greg Shatan:I volunteer for this also.

Mary Wong:Now 18, with Greg

Lori Schulman:Voluntary for Registries

Phil Marano:I am happy to volunteer as well.

Philip Corwin:There is clearly high intetest in this subject of additional, non-required protections

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Lori, and obligatory for Registrars and Registrants registering in those TLDs

Lori Schulman:Thanks Maxim, I appreciate your noting the distinction

George Kirikos:Let's change the name of "Smarter Non-Exact Matches" to something neutral, too.

Lori Schulman:SMEMs

Philip Corwin:Prerhaps Comprehensive Non-Exact Matches, as I beleive that Greg has identified every possible variation of non-ecat matches that may be associated with cybersquatting.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):I failed to find in the document - what to do with single letter TMs (if any)

Lori Schulman:Many have flip phones because they don't trust the data collection on smart phones

George Kirikos:Shhh, don't tell Greg about Alexa, or we'll have to add #13, sound-a-like matches.....

Lori Schulman:perhaps they are smarter?

Claudio:how about we call it the "covfefe" subteam? :)

George Kirikos:My thoughts on Greg's proposal: http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/gnso-rpm-wg/2017-May/002017.html

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Claudio, do you suggets adding "mumble-type" matches?

Susan Payne:@Maxim, that's a really good point. Would need some thought to get the balance right, but I think there are ways to address it by needing to have some minimum level of actual matching with the typo/fat finger etc type categories so that you could nmot have another letter being considered a "match" to a one letter TM

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):infamous THE entry ... I think it will have lots of notifications

Philip Corwin:In addition to the questions and comments I amended to Greg's draft, I believe we need to consider whether there is any data indicating the extent of the problem this proposal is intended to address. That is, to what extent have these types of non-exact matches been associated with cybersquatting at new gTLDs that resulted in UDRP or URS filings? There is always some element of cost/benefit analysis in policy decisions.

George Kirikos:@Phil: right, these seem to be common types of historical cybersquatting, when type-in traffic was easier to monetize. New gTLDs get much less type-in traffic than .com, and so PPC parking is much lower.

Steve Levy:LOL! Did you mention covfefe on a dare?

George Kirikos:So, this document is trying to address issues from 10+ years ago, not cybersquatting of today.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):I think 10. should be extended to include latin symbos mimicing IDNs - it happend too

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):*symbols

Rebecca L Tushnet:Wouldn't enom/venom be caught by at least some of these rules?

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):almost similar matches?

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):also it needs to be added to work of sunrise subteam (if we decide to add "sunrise too")

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:The first sentence references sunrise or claims.   If it's going to be part of Sunrise, it's going to need to be implemented in the TMCH db.

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:And, come to think of it, either way...

Michael R Graham:I do have comments on Greg's proposal -- but typing would be difficult. I do have a proposed amendment to my proposal.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):If Sunrise is left there - it needs to be discussed in Sunrise subteam

Susan Payne:I think it's important to bear in mind however that you could apply some of these sensibly to sunrise ie mark plus keyword or mark plus commonly used terms. whereas others, like the fat finger and character replacment are unlikley to be at all relevant or attractive for a sunrise registration even were we to try to go down that rabbit hole

Lori Schulman:Agree with Susan.

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:Agree with Susan.

Michael R Graham:I would view some of the categories as additions.

Lori Schulman:We could have sunrise team look at proposal for relevancy to our questions

Terri Agnew:finding the echo

Greg Shatan:I muted my tablet, which was causing the echo.

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:I think we need to look at the practicalities, including: for each brand, there would be, what? 50? 100? variations in the TMCH db?

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):question: what to do in situation where BOTH parties are in TMCH ?

Greg Shatan:Happy to work with Michael on a next draft.

Michael R Graham:My general revision/clarification of my proposal -- and I would want to craft it as part of that better -- would be: "but only where the Trademark string is separate from and does not constitute only an alphanumeric component of (e.g. -red, etc.) the other elements of the domain name."

Greg Shatan:Maxim, same as we do now.

George Kirikos:@Kristine: I showed some math in my email. It could be far higher than that.

Michael R Graham:Would be glad to work with Jeff.

George Kirikos:Especially if combinations are permitted, i.e. multiple rules being triggered.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):This paper is too Latin script oriented (10 and 11 sould look almost like mirror versions of each other)

Michael R Graham:NOTE: categories 8, 11 and 12 would be covered by my String-contained proposal as revised.

Jeremy Malcolm:Since this proposal is limited to claims, why doesn't it go to the claims subgroup and questions?

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:ah, thanks, I'm a day behind on reading the list.

Greg Shatan:George, your math is based on a false assumption, that the potential matches would result in any similar number of actual matches.

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:@ Jeremy, the first sentence says Sunrise OR Claims.

Rebecca L Tushnet:Not to mention other keyboards since we're now talking about multiple languages

Rebecca L Tushnet:(alphabets)

Jeremy Malcolm:But Greg said we should only consider it in context of claims

Jeremy Malcolm:Unless I misunderstood

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):if we leave Sunrise - we are at risk of creation of new rights which do not exist in the Real World

George Kirikos:@Greg: no it's not. Go and generate all the combos just fot the top 10 terms in the Analysis Group's report.

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:Also, in order to generate a claims notice, the registrar has to ping the TMCH to get the data, so the preliminary question is how all these variations are added to the TMCH and validated.

Greg Shatan:Jeremy, you are correct.

George Kirikos:Then you'll see how much the expansion is correct.

Jon Nevett:Question -- Greg, when you say that your proposal only would apply to Claims, are you suggesting that it would apply to both sides of Claims (notice to registrant and acknowledgement AND notice to mark holder) or just notice to mark holder?

Georges Nahitchevansky:Yes there is a significant problem. It is not just a UDRP and URS issue, but involves countless demand letters, takedowns, monitoring and follow up. I would suggest that better than 90 % of brand owners have experienced these types of issues

George Kirikos:*how much the expansion is going to be, rather.

Greg Shatan:@George, you're talking theory, I'm talking what is likely to happen, based on potential registrations.

Michael R Graham:Several of the categories seem to require moderation that would violate the intent to avoid subjective review: 2, 4, 5, 9, and 10. Categories 1, 6, and 7 would be excellent additions to String-contained trigger for TM Claims Notice

George Kirikos:@Greg: Every single 3 and 4 letter .com is registered.

Greg Shatan:Georges, that's an incredibly important point, and one I've been waiting to make....

George Kirikos:Every 3, 4 and 5 letter mark would generate enormous number of false positives, by your rules.

Michael R Graham:I do think review of categories in terms of whether their capture can be implemented automatically would be essential.

Lori Schulman:My apologies. I need to leave the call for another meeting. See you online next week.

Mary Wong:@Phil, policy staff is not aware of any data on the extent of the problem that this proposal seeks to address. However, we'd draw the WG's attention to the Analysis Group's work on this point in their report.

Philip Corwin:@Jon--good question above. Notice to mark holder alone would not raise the issue of discouraging intenfded domain registrations that would not be infringing.

Scott Austin:variant matches, fuzzy matches

Rebecca L Tushnet:But the question is: can these problems be mapped to the categories proposed to be covered? If not, then the target and the weapon are mismatched.

Justine Chew:I seem to have drawn a particularly poor connection tonight. Will drop off now and catch up via the notes / recordings.

Mary Wong:@Greg, are you referring to the Hogan Lovells study that WTR just reported on? https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__www.worldtrademarkreview.com_Blog_Detail.aspx-3Fg-3Dcfc250b5-2D6521-2D4448-2D8e84-2Da91d2c5f8236&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpCIgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0AIgn-H4xR2EBk&m=ZxHh4t27L-wxIDd9K5AOSlzVE6QICKdUb4Clu2j5llg&s=26yWfIfCQgZXrT79swO4VPcu0u8RUcNz0lXtfFpwR7Q&e=

Mary Wong:We will try to get a copy of the study (unless anyone already has it and can share) for circulation.

Claudio:link to a study on typosquatting: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__lirias.kuleuven.be_bitstream_123456789_471369_3_typos-2Dfinal.pdf&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpCIgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0AIgn-H4xR2EBk&m=ZxHh4t27L-wxIDd9K5AOSlzVE6QICKdUb4Clu2j5llg&s=SVeIDhimo0UcsXhf8F47FjZnVL21N1EhyGgziF-2f5A&e=

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):inclusion of single and 2 letter TMs will generate almost 100% rate of claim notices to registrants and it might lead to decline in use of domains in total

Greg Shatan:Mary, yes it is that study.

Georges Nahitchevansky:Greg is correct that UDRP and URS are just the tip of the iceberg. There have been several studies on typo domains, other categories of domain registrations and the type of problems that have been encountered on a regular basis

Kathy Kleiman:@Greg: would these variations be added to the TMCH Database?

Michael R Graham:@George K -- Do you have any idea how many of the 2, 3, 4 letter strings have been registered in New gTLD to date?

Susan Payne:are you willing to have loser pays then George?

Greg Shatan:I'm open to ideas to make the matches "smarter" still.

George Kirikos:@Susan: Sure, Susan. I would take matters to court, in any event, where it's loser pays (in Canada).

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):which number covers famous 1 and l and I issue?

Ivett Paulovics:Sorry, I have leave the call.

George Kirikos:@Michael: most are premium priced by the registry operators. One can check, obviously.

George Kirikos:Disproporationate, exactly.

George Kirikos:That's the entire TMCH, in a nutshell.

George Kirikos:It's trying to fight the problems of 10 years ago.

George Kirikos:*Disproportionate, even

Georges Nahitchevansky:Smart matches make sense. This is not just a trademark issue but a consumer issue. There is so much fraud with these types of domains that Greg is addressing that this is becoming a major consumer issue and a questioning of the integrity of the system.

Mary Wong:To Jeremy's last suggestion - note that Q4 of the TM Claims Sub Team questions is: "If the Review of all RPMs in all gTLDs PDP determines that non-exact matches of trademarks should be allowed inclusion in the TMCH, should the TM Claims Notice be changed, and if so, how?"

George Kirikos:Resolutions shouldn't be through polls.

George Kirikos:Otherwise, there's a high risk of capture by the IP constituency.

George Kirikos:We should see where the data takes us.

Mary Wong:@George, correct - WG Guidelines don't favor polls for consensus. However, as an informal tool for gauging support and to guide planning, they have been used by several WGs with success.

Michael R Graham:@Georges: Agree. @George: We should seek balance for all constituents -- TM Owners, Consumers, Registries and Registrars, etc.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):who will decide which TMCH current entries need to be removed if a conflict arise?

Georges Nahitchevansky:Again George K, this is not simply an IP constituency issue, but a much larger issue and problem that many constituencies have been dealing with

George Kirikos:i.e. support for any proposal needs to be *justified* by the data and logical reasoning, and not just popularity.

Claudio:Agree with John's last point. there is a big difference between "innocent infringers" and bad-faith activity

Colin O'Brien:+1 Claudio and John

Michael R Graham:@Greg: Would you agree to limit the "smart" categories to TM Claims Notices and not Sunrise?

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Michael +1

Greg Shatan:Michael, yes, my proposal is limited to Claims.

Susan Payne:agree that there is scope for "smart" claims notices depending on what the trigger is. we don't need to assume that all of these should have identical treatment and so reject out of hand

Greg Shatan:No, these would not need to be registered.

Greg Shatan:These would be generated.

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:@Phil, how do you propose the claims notice gets generated, without the TMCH?

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):then it needs to be added to the text (that it should be not used as a basis for inclusion of such records into TMCH)

Paul Tattersfield:@Claudio, the problem is the bad actors need a much higher level of deterrent to change behaviour, where as the genuinely innocent can be very easily deterred by far minor warnings

Mary Wong:Aren't Claims Notices sent by registrars?

Greg Shatan:Kristine, it would be TMCH record then fed through a food processor....

George Kirikos:Very true, Paul.

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:And bad actor is distinguished from good faith registrant only by intent...something it's impossible to know

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):+1 @Paul

Susan Payne:I think there a few RySG members here - although many not terribly vocal. would be good to hear from them

Brian Cimbolic:I like that approach much better than notice going both to the registrant and the TM holder

George Kirikos:True WHOIS is a much greater deterrent to cybersquatting, than the TMCH.

Greg Shatan:Paul, some really bad actors will be deterred by nothing. But it's amateur hour in the new gTLDs.

George Kirikos:As long as one can commit fraud anonymously with impunity, a million notices won't make a difference to professional criminals.

Greg Shatan:I would not support a TM holder only notice system.

Kathy Kleiman:I'm closing the line so that we can move on...

George Kirikos:1200 over how many years?

David McAuley (RySG):I must have missed Jon's comment in chat as summarized by Phil but it sounds sensible to me, as does Brian's comment just now

George Kirikos:Whereas the TMCH is a $5 million per year business, i.e. $20+ million over 4 years.

Greg Shatan:This is a multi billion dollar problem overall.

George Kirikos:So, spending $20 million, and saving a couple of million in UDRPs? Horrible math.

Michael R Graham:@Brian -- Agree on avoiding over-broad Notices, etc.

George Kirikos:Eliminating TMCH is an entirely fair suggestion. Do the math, calmly and rationally.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@George, it is not 16.6 k USD per one

Greg Shatan:Again, George, your "math" is based on false assumptions.

Greg Shatan:My pleasure.... :-)

Susan Payne:thanks Brian, that is really useful information. $1.8m is of course just WIPO and not the other providers I think, but even that is a huge sum being shelled out by brand owners to try to ensure that consumers are not deceived

Georges Nahitchevansky:George K - Do the math. Count the UDRPs and URS through WIPO, NAF and other provider and multiply by filing feels, then add counsel fees to bring these proceedings and investigate the parties etc.. The numbers are staggering.

Philip Corwin:That WIPO 3.0 Overview will be very relevant to our UDRP review work next year.

Greg Shatan:Each filing fee is only the tip of an iceberg...

George Kirikos:@Georges: no they're not. Add them up.

George Kirikos:Low millions.

Claudio:perhaps some of the $100 million surplus can be used to cover TMCH costs

Jeremy Malcolm:haha

John McElwaine:@Claudio great idea!

Michael R Graham:I believe Greg and I should confer to see if we can derive a "smart match" revision of the Question 10 proposal to present to the Group for debate and consideration.

Susan Kawaguchi:Agree with Georges the filing fee is only 10-20 % of the cost of filing a UDRP

Kristine Dorrain - Amazon Registry Services:Have to run for another call

Michael R Graham:@Claudio -- Agree with good use of surplus.

Mary Wong:@George K, I don't think data is being expected for design marks and GIs, is it?

Michael R Graham:@George -- Raising the "capture" argument is not productive.

Claudio:@George helps registries and registrants too (as most costs get passed down to them)

Georges Nahitchevansky:Wrong George K. UDRP and URS is just a piece of teh problemn. Count the number of demand letters, investigations, lawsuits etc. There have been any number of studies that

have concluded that we are talking billions of dollars. This is not some minor issue as you are trying to paint it. There have also been FBI and other law enforcement studies on the level of fraud using bogus domains etc.

Colin O'Brien:Members of the IP constituency represent the interest of the millions if not billions of their clients customers.

Maxim Alzoba (FAITID):@Claudio, costs are transferred to the party caused the issue usually

George Kirikos:@Michael: It's a serious concern, nonetheless.

Michael R Graham:There are levels of consensus -- I believe defined by the Policy & Implementation working group.

George Kirikos:+1 Jeremy.

Louise Marie Hurel:+1 Jeremy

George Kirikos:An unpopular position, but supported by data and reasoning, is more important than "popular" positions based on self-serving interests of the dominant group.

Scott Austin:+1 Georges

Paul Tattersfield:registration regisitry services group is probably going to make the situation worse for IP rights enforcement :(

Michael R Graham:@George: Agree -- but data and reasoning must be accurate and fairly applied -- regardless of popularity or self-interest.

Susan Kawaguchi:polls have worked well for getting a "sense of the room" in the RDS WG

Claudio:can the co-chairs reach out to the contracted parties house to encourage their participation (on the basis they are underpresented in this group)?

George Kirikos:How would we know there's no bloc voting, when the IPC constituency mailing list is private?

George Kirikos:There is limited transparency in the various constituencies for mailing lists, etc.

Petter Rindforth:Hear, hear!

David McAuley (RySG):well said Greg

Paul Tattersfield:Good to hear Greg

Claudio:thanks, Kathy

Terri Agnew:Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) in all gTLDs PDP Working Group is scheduled for Wednesday, 07 June 2017 at 03:00 UTC for 90 minute duration.

Georges Nahitchevansky:Well said Greg

Mary Wong:Thursday

khouloud Dawahi:Thanks Terri

George Kirikos:So, that'd be Tuesday night, for those in North America?

Mary Wong:THursday for APAC/EMEA, Wednesday evening for Americas

Michael R Graham:Thanks, Kathy!

Paul Tattersfield:thanks all, bye

Steve Levy:Bye all!

Terri Agnew:I will adjust to Thursday

Greg Shatan:Bye all!

khouloud Dawahi:bye

Georges Nahitchevansky:Bye everyone

George Kirikos:Bye folks.

Louise Marie Hurel:Bye all