Welcome. Finalize agenda (EF)
   Dedicated the meeting to Dr. Robert C. Heterick. Observed a moment of silence.
   Proceed as if there was a quorum. (DB and Eldridge arrived late.)

Minutes, Spring 2003 meeting (SA/GMc)
   Wells was not legally a proxy.
   Not all reports included.

Treasurer's Report (SC)
   • See handout, includes income and expenses plus projected expenses
   • Income from VTLS: $500, Cal Tech ETDs 2002 Conference: $5000, Interest $32.21.
   • NDLTD has a tax ID number; completing forms for 501 C3 (have 18 months to complete this; volunteer accountant at BYU has been helping). Must send to LeClair Ryan for final approval.

Reports
Awards (JH for Guédon) – Handout
   Award is for innovative use of technology, one each for a thesis and a dissertation. Will fund conference attendance.
   DL hopes that ProQuest would fund but new president is reviewing her budget

Discussion
   JL: How do we limit to two the number of submissions per institution?
   GMc: The award winning ETD should be publicly accessible without any restrictions.
   JH: Will look at CGS (Council of Graduate Schools) award as a possible model.
   Should be present at the conference to receive the award.
   TH: This isn't a conference that winners would feel compelled to attend. It is more a promotional event for NDLTD.
   JL: 2 different levels of support: travel that may be substantial for international travel
   VC: Give a travel grant, e.g. $500-750 for US travel and $1000-1500 to international winners
EF: Award individual for their work, e.g., $500 for the author or other representative of the institution; Grad Dean, for example, could receive the award. Therefore, someone from the winner’s institution must attend the conference to receive the award.

- Adobe (GMcC, ML, SA)
  Handouts: Awards, Slides, International Strategy

**AWARDS**

GMcC: re awards early discussions with EF; worked with SA to draft. Get corporate sponsors, for example Adobe could be one sponsor of awards. Draft in information packet. Spotlight an ETD; spotlight a leader who is driving the initiative around the world; faculty award also, i.e. three levels of awards was the intention of the draft when it was prepared.

ML: His preference is for the leadership award, an opportunity to recognize those who are moving the initiative forward.

Discussion

EV: Shouldn’t we recognize the institutions that have done important work?
SA: Her institution made a big deal of recognizing the student. Adds value to the institution
JL: Multiple levels of awards
GMcC: Wants to get shining examples of ETDs because many are not aware of the possibilities. Get people’s minds going. Imagine the possibilities. Think beyond the paper in an electronic file.
EF: Maybe change the name of the committee to Recognition and Awards Committee
GMc: Build web site with ETDs nominated and award winners.
GMcC: Corporate sponsors can lend PR activities. Corporate sponsorship could include not just cash awards but perhaps professional development.
EF: re EV’s suggestion to award institutions that require them.
GMcC: Frequent flyer miles as an example of building award
SA: University of Kentucky is also offering less expensive housing for award winners.
GMcC: Adobe will donate $5000 to awards and recognition program.

Adobe presentation: PDF (GMcC, see handout)
  Refocusing from illustrative tools to edocuments re intelligent document and education. Reducing the pain of paper documentation. ML is helping map this strategy.
  Increase awareness that ETDs and PDF go together. PDFA (A is for archiving.) is recognized as being important to Adobe as a company, both education and business sides of Adobe.
  Technology and e-books re content management server. Model of paperbacks on the laptops has not panned out; use something more like the music industry is trying—small bits and pieces
  Content Management Server designed to protect copyright as well as the transaction and distribution of copyrighted materials. Has a lending capability; Cleveland Public Library is using it.
  Handout provides a description of the range of activities that also support NDLTD

Discussion

AP: XML is another workflow, e.g., U Montreal
GMcC: Technical white paper will address that and other issues. Also addresses open standards.
EV: Retrospective conversion of TDS is a concern also re Paper Capture. There are, however, some licensing restrictions (e.g., per copy basis). Can this be addressed to also improve the workflow?
JL: Technical white paper if needed, but Deans and Provosts need something else. Marketing experts could help prepare an executive summary
GMcC: Yes, easier to digest will be the Promotional Flyer and the website is more directed to JL concerns—top level, quick read,
JL: Still need to address the middle ground. Test the flyer to be sure that it is complete enough
GMcC: Creative group is being used to extract the key messages from the white paper to provide a clear benefit message. Handout is draft flyer now for potential audience feedback.
AP: Need an international perspective also
GMcC: Will help tremendously in this area. There will also be the ability to localize some documents.
    There will also be phone contacts with paper follow-up
EF: Discussion of Adobe’s objectives. How do we count ETDs?
SA: Unspoken faculty concern that the quality is not good enough
SC: Embarrassed by what they did as very young academics
VC: Let’s look at Eaton’s and GMc’s studies of publishers
GMc: Related VT’s experiences, i.e., according to VT author surveys, faculty are advising students to
    restrict access because of the faculty’s concerns about compromising future publication
    opportunities if ETDs are too widely available. However, publishers’ surveys have been conducted
    in all subject areas, (i.e., sciences, social sciences, and humanities) and these reveal that the
    overwhelming majority (~90%) do not have a problem with ETDs being available without
    restrictions on the web. These survey results are available from http://scholar.lib.vt.edu
EV: Trends in access at CalTech when authors realize potential from world recognition
SR/JB: Walinski articles
GMcC: Use EV’s chart from Educause presentation to show increase in accesses with world
    availability
VC: Average accesses in paper and then increases with electronic use; publish these statistics
EF: Communication is what’s necessary to create a sea change
ML: How-to information vs. political
SA: Many students need the how-to at institutions where there is a choice without information to help
    or to encourage them to create ETDs. Her doctoral study included interviews that demonstrated
    that students don’t have the information they need.
EF: The stuff is already available but the people who need it are not getting to it.
BK: U Kentucky feels that they have fallen behind because they don’t have the cookbook that their
    students need. UK is creating a unit to provide technology support
ML: Prior years at Apple. Could fund an NDLTD member to do this educational piece.

10:20 DB DB/World Bank arrived. Quorum is now.

EV: Don’t mandate PDF
EF: Mandate electronic submissions
ML: Permission for faculty and students is a very valuable piece that Adobe can help with and has
    prioritize
EF: Multiple levels of cooperation. Institutions that don’t know about NTLDT and ETDs. Getting the
    word out to help institutions and countries. Get to the leaders of those institutions. ETDs are easy.
    There are solutions available. Take this step into digital libraries. Each institution needs a champion
    to lead the initiative; more important prior to direct mailing. They can make it work. They will need
    to know about their peer groups and what they are doing with ETDs.
    Library is the most conservative group on campus followed closely by the Graduate School. Faculty
    is at least if not more conservative. These are reality that we need to face.
GMcC: archiving and standards like XML are coming from internal documentation developed from work
    with government. Next Tuesday afternoon there will be a revised document available. 20-30
    commentators on white paper

EF: Do we want to form an Adobe committee? 2004 Expansion Initiative could be its name.
SA: Broader range of members than the Membership Committee
EV: No restrictions on who can be members so could be external to the Board of Directors. Only
    constitutionally relevant committees are official.
ML: A generic committee would serve you better
JH: Moved that we establish a Communication Committee
SR: What about a task force
DL seconded motion on a Communication Committee

Discussion:
TH: Why not be part of Membership Committee?
SA: Membership committee should be inclusive enough
AP: Yes, use the membership committee
JH: Volunteered for the Membership Committee to address this issue
EF: This is a friendly amendment to the charge of the MC. Subcommittee of MC for a two-year focused effort to support these efforts.
JB: Doesn’t see a problem but Shalini, chair, must be informed.
DL amends her second to match the friendly amendment
Voice vote: all in favor

JH: ETD implementation tutorial is being proposed for the next conference (with Tim Brace/UT Austin)
EF: Suleman is getting funding to work on the official NDLTD web site with mirrors distributed internationally.

SA (w/GMcC and ML) re International Strategy
Re building a database of contact points. Find decision makers at each university
US strategy: all the CGS schools and their contact points purchased by Adobe
International strategy: university associations

Discussion
AP: Latin American contacts compiled but didn’t send because there were some pirating concerns.
SA: Wants to include all, but she had to prioritize what her research assistant had time to do
GMcC: Ranked different areas of the world but database will continue to be enhanced and grow. Now have 2000 institutions that are predictors for success.
SR: Will send information about Canada—universities with graduate schools
SA: Database is to be inclusive even beyond the Adobe initiative and goals
EF: We are interested in increasing awareness throughout the world, not limiting them to Adobe’s concerns. Perhaps the World Bank and others will develop specific initiatives also.
SA: We are just starting this initiative with this NDLTD tool. We are growing.
DB: This is an excellent foundation. Questioned if database was open access
SA: Not yet, but should be and will be.
DB: World Bank has direct links to development foundation. She is also working with Nigerian Librarians—3 universities have ETD requirements.
EF: Conferences should be included when there is an ETD presence—both prior notice and records of past participation.
GMcC: At the Educause conference last week Cal Tech and Ohio St (Steve Echart) made presentations addressing large audiences. He promoted joining the NDLTD in his closing presentation remarks. Great advertisement for NDLTD.
EV: JL suggested a workshop
JL: A year ago when she proposed the workshop, she didn’t highlight ETDs. Now she would have and she will at the next CNI conference. Upcoming opportunities: CNI and JICS (all UK universities) do a joint conference biannually with CNI. Recapped joint preconference with JL, GMe, and John McCall. SA should add this to the database.
CA: JISC is not a membership organization
SA: This is important for the policy making roles of these organizations.
GMcC: At Educause conference digital repository was one of the buzzwords. Therefore, ETDS are part of something much larger.
EV: This year’s doctoral student is next year’s faculty member
ML: ePortfolio space is another movement that can affect ETDs

CA: JISC/FAIR Handout
Reported on JISC and its work in the UK. A government funded organization. Helps with IT at >16 educational institutions; re library and database services, development programs, best practices, building software and moving universities to make policy decisions. It is influential.

FAIR Program (14 projects): Focus on Access to Institutional Resources. See handout. EF was part of international committee that helped decide what the project priorities were and is continuing on the advisory committee. 5 themes, began summer 2002. Three projects specific to ETDs:

Daedalus. Note 5 separate repositories for different formats; using ETD DB software but also ePrints. Through summer 2005 to work on cultural aspects and advocacy

Theses Alive at U Edinburgh: OAI database specifically for ETDs. They are going to use DSpace for their digital repository because it is larger that just ETDs. Wrote an add-on to track authorship to receive comments and give comments during the preparation of the ETDs. Sharing with 5 other UK partners to investigate scalability. Piloting a national support service to demonstrate how to make an ETD (re Adobe’s goal) and to show that preparation is not difficult. Goal of 500 ETDs by Oct. 2004.

Electronic Theses project at Robert Gordon University, Aberdeen. Theoretical models for UK educational sector. Testing with DSpace and ePrints.org. Partner with British Library (not yet in digital arena, but is planning through this project to learn); University of London Library is an active partner with its virtual research environment. University of Cranfield is a new university (since 1992). These institutions are very “go ahead” about ETDs and faculty promote students activity. Older universities are more resistant to change. Multimedia within theses is another issue being addressed. Will be tested in next year. Finish testing in Oct. 2004. One of the general main barriers is the desire by examiners to examine a paper copy even when digital is available. First 15 months of testing and evaluation; then implementation in final year.

JISC is working with BioMed Central to fund 15 months of UK charges; promotes awareness of OAI indirectly.

Discussion
EF: Awards program—JISC may have an award re ETDs.
CA: JISC doesn’t have a history of making awards especially since its funding comes from institutional support. But, British Library does make awards and as it moves into ETD sphere may see it as a means of promoting their own activity. Recent legislation requiring electronic deposits will promote ETDs.
EF: Fred Friends [UK UTOG?] group has been officially completed and a follow-up group has not come into being. This time next year he’ll know more.
JB: Scotland is dominating.
CA: Just a coincidence. Very old institutions but major research institutions. Robert Gordon is so new that senior admin is using ETDs as a way of promoting and getting recognition.

CURL: Consortium of University and Research Libraries (like ARL). SHERPA is part of this. SCONUL: Standing Committee On National and University Libraries—changed (Steven Towns). Every library head is on this committee. These would be the libraries in UK interest in open access and digital repositories.

RoMEO highlighted for IPR re ePrints and publishers copyright policies. How can this information be embedded? Creative commons licenses in OAI were a goal. OAI Rights is a subgroup with Herbert Van de Sompel.
JH: Culture of academia in international setting, re peer review
CA: When the Theses is accepted and made available through the BL/library, but not published. This would imply (1) getting sold and (2) quality. In arts and humanities theses become books that are more reader friendly than their research theses.
JH: What is the largest resistance in the UK?
CA: Biggest area is the exams office or registry because they establish the workflow and it was established to handle paper. Trying to convince these offices and getting senior management to buy-in and then instruct offices to participate.
CA: Richard Bolderstone, director of E-Strategy and the British Library. There is also someone for the ETD strategy.

- Standards: TH (Moved up on the Agenda to accommodate ML/GMcC leaving early.)
Harvesting from 40 institutions, have 41,000 records. Not currently de-dup’ing. Averaging about 3-4 institutions/month. Added 8—9 from Spain. Steady growth. Metadata is variable in quality. Good use of ETD MS, most repositories with MARC have it, and simple and expanded Dublin Core.
Standards work has not seen much or any activity. Open questions include IDs for DTDs. Jeff Young (OCLC) is working on IDs within an OAI concept to get a standard way of identifying ETDs in OAI repositories. No stats re URLs that resolve to PDFs but this could be done.
PDFA is getting attention. Harvard is doing quite a bit of work. TH has the first draft that is circulating to be an accepted standard.

Discussion
EV: Metadata standards? Discuss off line
TH: PDFA issue is whether to promote standards for the theses themselves. Version of PDF that will be stable long term and interpretable long term. It is very large, not as large as postscript. Restricts what you can do with PDF and it may grow and change. Files may be larger and it mandates some metadata; has levels of conformance.
JH: What is being done about addressing older, pre-PDFA PDFs?
ML: Cookbook may provide a guide to transferring to PDFA.
SR: PDF XML?
EF: NDLTD web site should be a source of information on these issues.
ML: Adobe is one member that is addressing this issue. Web access to NISO site: Flecker at Harvard, Hunter at Elsevier, and ? at GPO.
VC: Carl Grant, VTLS President, is president elect of NISO.
GMeC: Take away is: session on PDF at the ETDs 2004 conference (Chuck Meyers will do this session).
TH: An institution applies it and this makes it a viable standard.
EF: Standards committee should be tracking PDFA.
TH: More immediate is the Identifier Issue

- CrossRef (EV/EF; email from Pentz) - Handout
EF: CrossRef for Pentz. An organization of publishers whose works get DOIs (Digital Object Identifiers) and get resolved to other works that get DOIs, i.e., cross references. When ETD is produced could get assigned a DOI and the references could be in the metadata record and the full text document also. Complications include CrossRef supports this activity by charging for the service. $1.00-$1.50 to register a DOI. NDLTD might do this rather than individual universities. Could dues include DOI? Questions: resolving links into the future when all we hold is the metadata? How do we make sure links from ETD to other things? How do we ensure quality metadata? Would this require changes CrossRef software? Do we have the rights to do this? And more questions from CrossRef so EF is bringing this to the NDLTD Board of Directors

Discussion
EV: OAI issues. There are currently about 9 million DOIs and growing
SR: Questioned affordability of DOI.
EF: CrossRef has some sense of these issues.
JH: Incorporate it into the dues structure
EV: This would complicate the Dues issues for NDLTD
EF called for a straw vote for re joining CrossRef
JL: Does this include a cost?
EF: Yes
DB: Unicode compliance question
EV: He doesn’t know
TH: Don’t assume though it should be the case
Cost discussion.
CA: UK’s Stationary Office is doing what NDLTD could do as an agency.
JL: We need more information.
AP: We need more information.
EV: CrossRef is one agency and there are others for DOIs.
JL: Let’s think about it in an international context. There may be an existing agency that would do
this more easily since NDLTD has no infrastructure to do this.
VC: Agrees. We need to factor in things like duplicate numbering.
EV: Does the membership want this?
JL: We need a proposal, a draft, how would it work, costs and benefits
EV: Could form a group to explore the issues
JB: That is one component. Let’s look more closely at DOIs and identifiers.
EV: We need to form a proposal.
EF: Three issues: Identifiers, DOIs, and CrossRef as an agent for DOI
   Who is interested VC, SR, JB, EV, TH, AP, DL is a working group who will submit an electronic
report. Explore identifiers, DOI, and CrossRef.

Committee Reports (led by chairs)

Membership Committee (EF for Urs) – Handout
• Status
• Categories, dues
• Promotion and recruiting
• Surveys
SA for Urs: In Germany discussed and discussed online. Dues and benefits of membership:
   There must be dues is recommendation. Dues structure: different tiers with different benefits plus
   institutions from developing economies.
   Benefits of membership: awards, conference attendance as part of membership (one person free with
dues), more formalized mentoring structure, tutorial access—question re openness, guidelines,
   perhaps provide web space if needed, corporate members could have display space at conferences.
Categories of membership
Marketing campaign: membership three year—buy two get three approach.

Discussion
VC: Is individual membership restricted to university?
EV: Anybody
VC: Corporate membership: begin with University-level dues for smaller corp.
JL: Very nice job on tackling these difficult issues. Conference fee as a member benefit but at the
dues level you’re not creating an effective structure. Reduced rate might be preferable. Third year
for free concept: May not fit for the way institutions prepare or pay their budgets.
SA: Goal was operating money up front.
DL: Give a discount for paying multiple year dues.
EF: Do we need money up front if we don’t know about future expenses? Continuing membership may warrant a reduced fee.
GMe: What was the basis for the fee?
EV: Every university could afford.
SA: Not enough benefits to warrant a high fee. We want our information to be openly accessible.
GMc: Yes, this is the library’s goal and would potentially be in conflict with members-only access to NDLTD resources.
Gaur: Question re consortium of mixed membership, i.e., educational and commercial
SA: Didn’t consider this
EV: Proposed non-profit organization category combining with university and with consortia.
TH: Would Board of Directors members have to be paid membership?
JB checked the Bylaws: Not currently a requirement.
EF: We’d be adding individuals and a membership category to the Bylaws.
   Summary of benefits for joining: awards eligible, harvesting in union cat, discount on conference registration, mentoring, discount on display or demonstration at conference, discount on access to membership addresses, eligible for board membership. And can serve on Nominating Committee and Membership Committee without being a member of the Board of Directors.
   There is also prestige factor etc. to include in benefits.
   What about in-kind contributions in lieu of dues?
VC: Sealed corporate membership dues needs additional consideration.
EF: Let’s address all the levels: Single university
JB: What is a single university? Not a university system?
JL: Handle these like a consortia.
SA: Single degree granting institution: $300/yr
SA: Ditto for less developed countries as defined by the World Bank’s list.
JB: University consortia could still join, e.g., California
VC: All members of the consortia must join together.
SA: Consortia deals with its membership issues.
   Consortia of single degree granting institutions (must have at least 5 members)
   Consortia of university systems, e.g., Pennsylvania, California
   Not-for profit organizations, e.g., ARL, CNI; includes government organizations, NGOs,
   Includes supporting institutions, e.g., national libraries, JISC $300.00
Corporate: will add to supporting institutions

Discussion
VC: In-kind contributions would garner more money that requiring fees DL concurred.
EV: Getting people involved is more important at this time
   Individual: one person $25.00
EF: We have concurred with our Bylaws.
EV: Plan A
SA: Plan A. Elegant table, clearly understood, is forthcoming.
BK: Conference budget is looking good. Announce ASAP membership requirements; $20 for each membership will go to the conference budget. Institutional memberships. Individuals get a conference registration discount if their organization is a member.
EF: Calendar year is membership year. Current members will be affiliate members until dues are paid.
SC: We need accounting procedures. Membership committee will prepare the call but SC will send and receive payment. Coordination of conference fees and membership
EF: Call for motion
JB: Membership Committee report was amended
EF: Called for approval from the Board: all in favor. Gave them one week. Membership committee will address recruitment and surveys in the future.

Bylaws (EV) – Handout: revised draft
Read through and the Board discussed the changes. See revised changes to the Bylaws. Term ends at end of the conference. Voting takes place at the annual/conference board meeting. All meetings are open to guests. Elected board members should commit to attending the board meetings.
JL: Sought guidance for the Nominating Committee re who should be nominated for Board.

Discussion
DB: World Bank may be able to offer audio conferencing capabilities.
EV: Missing two Board of Directors meetings may be cause for dismissal from the BoD.
TH: Moved that the Bylaws be accepted as amended.
By voice vote it was approved.
EF: Diepold does not wish to be nominated for continuing service on the Board of Directors.
JL: Suggested communicating with Directors to ensure their active participation and not bounce anyone off the Board.
EV: Ask for resignations.
EF: Will contact Directors and discuss their terms and attendance at meetings.
Two consecutive meetings missed and unresponsive to contact or unwilling to participate in the next meeting (e.g., participate in conference call), they are automatically dropped from the Board of Directors.

2004 Conference (SA) – Handout
• ETD2003 recap; exit survey was helpful to 2004 conference planners
• ETD2004 plans: see conference report handout
• ETD2005 plans: update available
• ETD2006 prospects: Brazil, Morocco, India, Montreal. SA discussed how to be inclusive in advertising a call, pros and cons. Each will be asked to make a presentation to the Board.

Executive (EF): No report

Finance (SC)
• Status
• Financial model
• Funding opportunities
• Dues structure
• Budget for next year

Nominating (?, For Guédon):
EV: Are we voting on a slate or individuals?
EF: Chair of the Board question?
JL: Moved not to appoint a chair of the Board
VC: Seconded
Unanimous voice vote

VT ETD-db Software (GMc)
• See revised handout with programmers amplifications

Union Catalog (VC) – Handout
See revised handout
Avg. 30,000 hits/month
14 language interface; expand to 22 languages
TH: Hundreds of thousands of hits daily from Hong Kong and Virginia Tech.
VC: OAI front: VTLS will release a shareware as open source

UNESCO – Plathe, did not attend. No report.
EF: A lot has been done, e.g., ETD Guide. He was in Mexico. There was a grant made to Hussein Suleman from UNESCO to support web site.

Brief Items
• NDLTD logo/icon (JH/GMc) – Handout
  EV: Ask Adobe what their plans are for marketing the NDLTD.
  SR: Worked with a design firm
  John: Will followup
  AP: Volunteered her service
  SC: Offered to have students at BYU have a design competition
  EF: Created committee for the logo design: of JH, AP, SC, BK.

Reports
ADT (Australian Digital Theses) Program (see conference reports/SA) – Handout.
  EF asked TH to contact ADT about participating in Harvesting.
  SA: Note that they are looking outside their national boundaries.

Africa (? for Ubogu) – Handout from May 2003 Board meeting
  EF: meetings have been taking place in South Africa.
  DB: 3 Nigerian Universities and some in South Africa with GWU and Georgetown University.
    Nigerians have ETD initiatives in place and eager to participate in NDLTD.
  TH: Questioned metadata harvesting. DB will look into this.
  SA: U Tennessee is working with a Ghanaian university.
  DB: Nigerian universities are preparing a national metadata initiative also.
  TH: Start small!

Appalachian Regional ETD Consortium (JH/SA) – Handout
  Hagan: Trying to get broader participation throughout Appalachia. Could be a model for regional participation.

South America: AP’s Handout: Report, Venezuela statement.

Canada: SR’s Handout

CGS (nothing)

China: Ming Lo’s Handout (EF’s VT student)

India: Urs’s Handout
  Mini gave the report and mentioned a government repository and move to mandate ETD submissions.
  EF: There is high level of support

New Business
• Registry of NDLTD-related organizations (Jose Borbinha’s email) – Handout
Expertise database; picking up where Peter Diepold left off when he retired. SA moved and JH seconded that they encourage the progress to continue. VC wants to know what is included for VTLS? Reorientation towards harvesting from searching? TH tried to harvest Greek once but character encoding problems halted it. OCLC is discouraged with Z39.50 harvesting. Initial harvesting problems with OAI are easily overcome. VC: offers translation and mapping so that OCLC can harvest from VTLS. TH: Russians also have large Z39.50 database with similar problems.

**ORI (EV) - Handout**

This proposal critiques the lipstick on the pig, but they have not a pig.
EF: What do we do about this? The potential is there for them to put a commercial face on a free product.
GMc: Is our web site unclear if they get this
JL: Ignore it.
DB: Encourage them to contact NDLTD members about the copyright issues.
JL: Let’s not promote them contacting our members
SA: Make it obvious on the web site that the content belongs to the authors
EF: Recommending to OAI data providers state that they are making information available only for non-commercial use (re metatdata).
EV: Open URL standards is prepared to go to ballot. Should get the registry authority or agency.

EF: Nomination re vacancies: Vacancy replacement votes: can these take place electronically. Yes.

EF: Thanks to everyone for coming and actively participating.