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Host: Dan Cohen, Dean of Libraries and Vice Provost for Information Collaboration at Northeastern University.

David Herlihy, Teaching Professor, Northeastern University, Department of Music, and copyright lawyer

Dan Cohen: 00:00 In the past 30 years, the music industry has moved from vinyl records to cassettes to CDs, downloads, and streaming, all radical changes to the production and consumption of popular music. It has meant and even more radical shift for musicians themselves and their livelihoods. Today on What's New, the shifting landscape of music.

Dan Cohen: 00:28 I'm joined today by David Herlihy, a lawyer who teaches copyright law and the music industry and who also runs Northeastern University's record label, Green Line. As a music fan who came of age in Boston in the 1980s, I also know him as the lead singer and songwriter of the great band, O Positive. Still performing today, David is now working on new models for musicians to get paid for their work.

Dan Cohen: 00:51 Welcome to What's New, David.

David Herlihy: 00:52 Thanks. Happy to be here Dan.

Dan Cohen: 00:54 It's really great to have you here. I say that as a fan and as a colleague. I do wonder, you have really lived the history that I just mentioned in the introduction of going from a time when your band was on Epic, this major label that had Michael Jackson and Boston and some of these bands that were selling huge amounts of vinyl records and making tens of millions of dollars, to an age today where we've got SoundCloud and BandCamp and Pandora and all these streaming services. It's been a really radical change. From your personal perspective, what has that change been like to live through?

David Herlihy: 01:30 Well, as a musician I wasn't really thinking about the business so much. I just wanted to be in a great band and reach a big audience. But the path that that took when my band was around was very different. Back in the 80s and even before that, everybody went the same path. Everybody rehearsed in their basement, got a few songs together, did a show, get their friends
to come to the show, did more shows, got a following and then you'd hopefully get a record label. You go to a studio, they'd make vinyl or then later CDs, they'd go on to a distributor to get them into stores, they'd be on the radio, there was so many intermediaries between you and the audience. But every band from Elvis to the Beatles, to Led Zeppelin, to The Eagles, they all did it the same way.

David Herlihy: 02:22 That was just what we knew and we just played. I had this naive belief that if we were great, then everything would just work out, but it doesn't really work that way. But the impulse that drove me to play music wasn't really primarily about getting paid. It was really just more about wanting to be in the currency of music and to create something that would affect people the way I was affected by music. But it's changed, right now you have ... Record stores are gone, radio doesn't really matter. It's there, but back when I was first teaching at Northeastern in 1997, I would ask my students, "How do you guys find out about music?" And the number one answer was radio. I ask that question now and radio isn't even on the list.

Dan Cohen: 03:15 It's amazing.

David Herlihy: 03:15 It's incredible, right? And so, people still love music, but it's just so ... The channels of distribution, the way it's consumed, it's just totally different. People think of those days as the good old days, but really most bands didn't get paid. Most bands didn't get royalties and it was very hard to get a label deal. It was very hard to get noticed. At least you knew where you were going, but it was very hard. It was still very hard to do that.

Dan Cohen: 03:43 Did the format of the music impact your band? In other words, I assume as a serious rock performer, you wanted to probably create a great album and the LP was a terrific length for that kind of a thing. Was that always the goal? We're now in a very single oriented stream-oriented world, was it your goal in the 80s to really create a great album?

David Herlihy: 04:07 Absolutely, because all the great albums that I had ever heard, were to me consumed in their entirety. An album is almost like a set list where you want to have a good first song and then the last song on side one, has to be a summation, but it also has to be an invitation to flip the album over. Right? And so in many ways, making an album was like doing a set list at a club, and you're thinking about how the songs relate to each other and what the narrative arc is.
David Herlihy: 04:37 Albums created about 45 minutes worth of music. And so you would tend to create 45-minute collections of songs. Everybody from Pink Floyd, Dark Side Of The Moon, 45 minutes, you'd get a cassette, half they put it on one side, half they put on the other and then that would be ... It worked. And so, absolutely there was a natural bundle to your creativity and your narrative. To some extent, that's totally obliterated now and people don't even necessarily even listen to a song all the way through before they skip to something else. And so people are very ... There's not much fidelity, a lot of infidelity in people listening to a song from beginning to end, let alone an album.

David Herlihy: 05:23 So yes, it's changed. In many ways, there's a lot that's lost with that being gone, but it's gone. And so you can pine about it as somebody say, "Those were the good old days." I'm with my daughter and she names a song to me that I've never heard of, in 20 seconds I call it up on Spotify and it's playing on my Bluetooth speaker in half a minute. That's pretty cool. And so, I feel like technology is, change is. I feel like if you want to make it in music, it's got to be really ... You got to be great and spend a lot of time at it.

Dan Cohen: 06:00 So when you first saw the Internet and music on the Internet in the 90s, did you have any inkling that it was going to have this longterm impact?

David Herlihy: 06:13 No. My band stopped playing in 1995. Right at the dawn of the commercial launch of internet. But I began teaching copyright law in 1997, as I said. And Napster, which came out of Northeastern-

Dan Cohen: 06:29 I think our audience may not know that, but Northeastern was the home of ... Shawn Fanning was a student here.

David Herlihy: 06:34 Right. And He created Napster, which was the original peer to peer file trading network for music. Peer to peer file trading had existed, but Fanning had the idea of applying this to music. And at the time I was teaching my father's copyright law class. This is copyright law and this is how it works and you have tangible objects. And my students said to me, there's this new thing called Napster and you should check it out.

David Herlihy: 07:01 So I went over to their dorm and they showed me Napster and I said, "Oh yeah, okay sure. Play me the Simpsons theme." It took about a minute, but then all of a sudden, [singing 00:07:13] and I was like, "Oh my God." I didn't really realize what would be wrought by that, but the fact that you could hear any song you
wanted pretty immediately, to me was ... It was like Star Trek when they beam down to the planet. It's like, "Okay, that's going to wreak havoc on the airplane business."

Dan Cohen: 07:38

And I remember at that moment in the late 90s, everyone started talking about this celestial jukebox sort of thing of where every record that ever existed would be there. You just type it in. What Shawn Fanning did was index stuff and make it searchable. But it was also a time when the industry itself was starting to freak out really about this. Right?

David Herlihy: 07:59

Right, because it disrupted their control. One thing about copyright, it gives the owner of these works, these recordings and these songs control. And what Shawn Fanning did was remove control from the equation and the law really supported the record labels' attempts to punish purveyors of this new technology, but it was like they no longer could control the means of distribution and that was an absolutely disruptive influence on the way that they made money.

David Herlihy: 08:36

I think InSync sold more recordings in one week in 1999 than the entire top 200 has sold this far in 2018.

Dan Cohen: 08:45

That's an incredible step.

David Herlihy: 08:46

You're talking an unbelievable disruption and loss of control. And nobody likes to lose control. Even if you have lost control, If the law says you have the right to control this, then you're ... What the labels did was use the law in a way to try to force control over what was no longer really controllable.

Dan Cohen: 09:09

Our audience probably doesn't know the specifics of copyright around music itself. So there's a performance part and then there's the actual sheet music document that you create the performance off of. Can you just explain a little bit for novices like me, how copyright works in the music industry.

David Herlihy: 09:29

Sure, Well copyright was actually created by the government. It's actually a government ... It's actually monopoly, where the government gives the owners of creative works exclusive rights for a limited period of time so you can incentivize creativity for the benefit of society. And it used to be very short, it was 14 years. And then it was 28 years and then it was 56 years and now it's life plus 70 years. It's getting longer and longer.

David Herlihy: 10:00

But the idea of copyright is you're trying to promote creativity for the benefit of society. And so when you come to the music
industry, there were actually two kinds of works. There's the song which is the melody and the lyrics, and there's the recording of the song, which is the fixed performance. And so you have ... I'll often talk about, say Dolly Parton. She wrote, "I will always love you." Her words, her melody. When Whitney Houston, her record label wanted to do a recording of the Dolly Parton Song, they had to get a license from Dolly Parton that would allow them to make a recording and then to distribute their recording. So if I wanted to use Whitney Houston's recording in my movie, I would need to get permission from Whitney Houston's record label, but I'll also need to get permission from Dolly Parton as the publisher because the recording has both of those works together. So, a copyright is a bundle of rights. It's like straws that you can bundle together. There is the right to reproduce the work, which is the mother of all rights or copyright. So you have the right to reproduce the work. You have the right to adapt the work, make derivative works. So J.K. Rowling wrote Harry Potter. When Warner Brothers wanted to make a movie that was a derivative work, they had to get permission from J.K. Rowling to do that. So you have reproduction, adaptation, distribution. Okay, I have a copy. So now I can distribute this to the public. You have public performance, so when you perform a work publicly like a song, you play it in a club or on the radio, you also have public display.

David Herlihy: 11:42  
So for instance, certain works can be displayed like you would display a statue, or you will display a photograph, you wouldn't perform a photograph. And so, movies get performed, other kinds of works get displayed. And then finally for sound recordings it's also a digital transmission right. So, basically you have these six rights. Reproduction, adaptation, distribution, public performance, public display and digital audio transmission.

David Herlihy: 12:11  
And then the owner of the sound recording and the song, subject to certain exclusions, has the right to allow one or more of these things to happen.

Dan Cohen: 12:22  
So let's say, when you started teaching this law in 97 or a couple of years earlier, 95, that's a great example. So the Whitney Houston, Dolly Parton song, can you give us some sense of how much of that went to Whitney? How much went to Dolly? How much went to their labels?

David Herlihy: 12:38  
That's a good question. So Dolly Parton and publishers get paid on whatever happens because they were at the table first. Whitney Houston's getting paid much less beneficially than Dolly
Parton. Sound recordings came later, beginning of the 20th century, time of incredible technological change.

David Herlihy: 12:56 You had radio. And so all of a sudden the radio is playing all over the country. You have RCA making these radios and these radio stations are playing Irving Berlin songs and Irving Berlin is not getting paid. And so Irving Berlin, they realized it was impossible for them to police every individual use and get permission to every radio station. So they formed ASCAP, the American Society of authors, composers and publishers. And all the publishers pooled their rights into this one company. And then, so a radio station could just go to ASCAP and get a blanket license for all of the songs in the repertory.

David Herlihy: 13:32 And ASCAP survives today and there are other performance rights organizations today, but basically, it streamlined the process of getting publishers paid. When the Whitney Houston song is played on WZLX. Dolly Parton, gets paid through ASCAP, Whitney Houston does not get paid because that’s a sound recording.

David Herlihy: 13:54 The landscape of music industry is unbelievably complicated because it’s been inherited over centuries and you have stakeholders who are entrenched and when some new Johnny come lately technology comes along, they will allow it in there, but they won’t disrupt what’s going on. So as a result, you have this corpus of the law with all of these arms coming off the body. And so, the law is very very complicated.

Dan Cohen: 14:26 So it sounds like, just to jump forward, 75 or 100 years, we’re dealing with this all over again because of the Internet and what Shawn Fanning and others wrought. And it seems like you’ve been tracking new bills that are making their way through Congress that are trying to, like you said, balance the public’s interest in having that great celestial jukebox with the need to pay artists. Where are we now and what’s happened over the past couple of decades to deal with the impact of digital media?

David Herlihy: 15:01 Well, that’s a great question. So in 1976, Congress passed the last major copyright act and that’s, I’m fond of saying, pre VCR. That law was passed before VCRs were even deployed in the market. VCRs have come and gone and that is still the law of the land. So, in 1998 we passed the Digital Millennium Copyright Act, which was an effort to recognize the value of streaming, and of digital technologies and to prevent against piracy. And so, we passed the law, but now even that’s 20 years old, it was 1998. Here we are in 2018, that’s 20 years ago.
And that was the law in fact that end users of Napster were sued under, right? Was under the DMCA law.

Napster was actually shut down even before the DMCA came along. Napster was shut down in the early two thousands and they essentially were ... They were preliminarily enjoined and then ultimately they were enjoined because they were making ... Because Napster had a centralized server and they knew all the songs that were on the recording and so they had a right and the ability to monitor it, they could see what was happening. They didn't get permission.

But what's interesting is the history of technology has been people taking and then the law changing. And so even player pianos, same thing. They were taking before there was a license, Congress passed a law for mechanical licenses. Radio began taking before the law was there, and then you have ASCAP and then ... So then the law legitimizes that. Cable was taking content from broadcast and then Congress came in and passed a law for that. And so you have new technologies that come along and just say, "Wow, this should be great." And they do it without permission and then Congress is in this position of having to figure out, "Okay, how do we not allow the owners of content to stifle progress." Because the copyright act or the copyright law comes from the constitution and the rationale is to support the progress of science and useful arts.

And so based on this idea of promoting progress, Congress establishes for limited times exclusive rights and authors and inventors and their works. And so we're supposed to achieve progress. And so like I said before, my daughter telling me a song she wants to hear and me calling it up on Spotify and playing it on my Bluetooth speaker in 30 seconds. That's pretty cool and I think that should be able to happen. But the conundrum is, how do you pay people, composers, and how do you pay all of the parties involved in the creation of that fairly?

And so should any industry have a perpetually guaranteed business model when Star Trek comes along? And so when something new happens, how do you do that? But also, how do you make sure there's a value to copyright? There's a value to compensating, to incentivizing creators.

Because I think a lot of our audience will know that in an age of streaming, musicians are often paid less than they were when a CD was $17 and they were getting some percentage of that.
There may be thousands and thousands of streams and they would get mere pennies from that.

David Herlihy: 18:26  But the same token, if I bought a CD and played it in my house, every time I played it, you weren't getting any money.


David Herlihy: 18:32  So, yes. There was more money to be made in 1999 when shiny bits of plastic where the only way to hear music. It was a very large profitable income stream. And all the old vinyl that was now being just put on CD, it was "Raining Benjamins" in the music business. And that was pretty great and they get used to that. Right? And so yes, it has changed and I think there does need to be a way of resolving this, but it's very hard because you have a whole bunch of different stakeholders.

David Herlihy: 19:07  But you have the public and the public interest. You have services like Spotify or Itunes that consumers like. You also have intermediaries like ASCAP or the Harry Fox agency that takes care of administering certain kinds of royalties. You have the owners and the authors and each of the ... And sound recording owners and music publishers within that category. And so, you have all of these different constituencies whose interests don't always align.

David Herlihy: 19:39  If you're talking about making something simple moving forward, someone who is profiting on the way things are working right now is probably going to suffer from that. Right?

Dan Cohen: 19:48  Sure.

David Herlihy: 19:51  So a lot of companies will try to maintain their survival and uninterested in a elegant, new solution that's going to put them out of business.

Dan Cohen: 20:03  So I have seen that there's this Music Modernization Act that's past the House, but hasn't made its way through the Senate yet. What is the goal of that? It seems like it's got music in the name. It's specifically focused on music copyright and the payment schemes around that. Is it trying to rebalance the system?

David Herlihy: 20:24  It's funny because this landscape is so complicated that lawmakers, the actual legislators won't be able to really talk about it effectively on their own. They rely on their staff and their staff rely on information from the different stakeholders and they have lobbyists. And so, it's very complicated. But what
happened was that for instance, Spotify was required ... You know how we talked about Whitney Houston and Dolly Parton when Whitney Houston's label wanted to do the Dolly Parton cover, they had to get permission to make recordings and then distribute those recordings.

David Herlihy: 21:02 Spotify needs to get permission too. But the way the law was and still is, you've got to do it on a song by song by song basis. So Spotify would have to get 20 million permissions and there's no real good database, they don't know how to pay anybody and so Spotify would file these so-called notice of intentions with the Copyright Act and it was an antiquated system that worked fine before technology changed how people consume music. So Spotify and companies like Spotify are tired of getting sued by publishers. And so they had an agreement which was really bought into by the publishers and by the digital manufacturing companies and by the performance rights organizations. They were actually able to get everybody to agree on this new system. Now it's a narrow solution. It's almost like a piece of the cake as opposed to like the whole cake. I think the 1976 Copyright Act, they bake the whole cake and say we're rewriting the law in a writ large across the whole spectrum of industries.

David Herlihy: 22:08 I don't know that they can ever do that again, I think. So now they handling it from one part of the music industry, mechanical royalties, the right to reproduce and distribute recordings of songs. And so, they had a solution set up that had incredible support. It was unanimously voted upon by the House of Representatives. That's like ... Never happens. Nothing [inaudible 00:22:32] and it seemed to me to be like rocketing it's way right through.

David Herlihy: 22:36 And now there seems to be some hiccup and I have a friend, Dina LaPolt, who's a lawyer in California who was actually a major part of making this MMA possibly happen. She likens the music industry to a dysfunctional family where everybody hates everybody else. The songwriters hate the record labels. They don't like the publishers because they're not getting paid, record labels and publishers are at odds. And so the idea that we're all just gonna get along and have this sort of Kumbaya agreement. It doesn't happen and even in this instance where it seemed like it did happen, it seems there's been some hiccup behind the scenes. And I think at some legacy intermediary who stands to suffer from what's going to happen, and so, if this can't get passed with that kind of unanimity from the House of Representatives, I would have bet $1000 in April. This was going
to pass and it passed the House unanimously and now it seems to be stalled.

Dan Cohen: 23:42 It seems like it’s at the last legacy of this splintering of rights that from 100 years ago, having performance and publishing and distribution rights, there’s now stakeholders in all these places that really want to hang on to their piece of the pie.

David Herlihy: 24:00 Right? And I feel like any solution that’s going to really change it, if I was the enlightened copyright despot, I could come up with a solution, but that’s not how things work here in the US. And so you’d be taking property away from people who spent money to create these things. Although it is ... End of the day, copyrights are monopoly with certain carve-outs.

David Herlihy: 24:23 Monopolies are not good. As a monopoly for a public purpose, but when you’re talking about the private companies that can lobby Congress versus the public being able to lobby Congress in the same way, there have been a lot of really really good ideas, many of which involve collective licensing, like what ASCAP did, which I think was a really beautiful, elegant solution in the early 20th century. It seems now it’s even more splintered and so it’s very hard to even get all of the parties in the same room, let alone getting them to agree to the same thing. And there’s so much frustration about not getting paid that meanwhile the consumers are just becoming inured to just like, I pay more for a cup of coffee than I pay for my monthly Spotify collection.

David Herlihy: 25:13 And that’s really the inaction of the record industry in the decade after Napster created a feeling as if music has no value, I’m not going to pay for it. And it really has done a lot of damage. If the record labels had been more prescient, they would have all agreed to buy Napster and then just figure it out because it was at its peak of 85 million people using it, unique users. And the labels tried to approach it with their own proprietary control, which the law allowed, but which the consumers weren’t interested in.

Dan Cohen: 25:51 Can you tell us a little bit about some of the student run music licensing experiments that you’ve had here? I mentioned in the opener Green Line, which is Northeastern University’s student run label. You’ve been running that and now you’ve been looking at new licensing methods, there TV shows and movies and lots of other places that music can go now because of the proliferation of media. Can you tell us a little bit about that?
Sure. So to me, the music business is licensing. I'm a music lawyer and I do a lot of ... So, when you talk about reproduction, adaptation, distribution, performance, display, transmission, those were all permissions granted by the owner, the licensor to a licensee to do something within certain boundaries. And so, I have a vision of establishing a student-run music licensing program where rather than me talking to students about copyright and then memorizing material and regurgitating the correct answer to me on a quiz, I would like to go through all that. But then I want to actually have the students find good music, bring it into a collection on the Northeastern campus and then work to place that music in real-world situations.

So have students contact music supervisors, have them contact ad agencies, have them contact video game producers and actually place music that they like into these real-world applications. It will teach the students about the aspects of scope, the subject matter of the song, the sound recording, the field of use, the duration, the territories, permitted activities, all the stuff that licensing is. Students can learn about that by this licensing program.

And then they'll actually graduate with relationships perhaps with the people in the business with whom they have been communicating. But also there'll be able to look at a new, at maybe entrepreneurial scenarios and understand licensing and understand how to apply the idea of scope or the idea of compensation structures and royalty structures and all of the lessons of licensing and the art and the business of licensing.

So I want to create a place where students can find good music because they have awesome tastes. And frankly, a lot of the business world wants to know what students think is great. And so, if I'm an ad agency and I want to have music that resonates with a student population, what better place to go than a student-run music licensing operation. And then if the students find the next Bruce Springsteen in Brighton Mass., and then they license Bruce Springsteen for a Volkswagen commercial, and then he makes money, the student makes a connection, the supervisor gets great music at a lot less money than it would have cost to get the real Bruce Springsteen, it's a win on an educational level. It's a win on a discovery level and on relationships.

And so I have this goal to establish what I think is the country's first music licensing, fully functioning, student-run music licensing program and to establish a library of tens of thousands of recordings that have different attributes and then the
Dan Cohen:  29:32  What do you say to the young student or songwriter who comes into your class and wants to have a career in this, either on the production side or as a songwriter who’s feels they have a great hit somewhere in their brain and they want to actually go and have a career in this? What is your advice to them given how complicated this world is? We’ve got free stuff on SoundCloud. There’s BandCamp and there’s donations and there’s live performances that people can make some money on. But what is your just general advice to that student?

David Herlihy:  30:09  I’m not kidding. Have fun and write a song every day. And so when I was in college, my roommate and I had the song a day club and we would try to make up a song every day. Sometimes I wouldn’t have one. He’d come back I’d say okay and I just make it up on the spot. But if you make up songs all the time, you are woodsheeding, you’re getting really good at it, just make up more stuff. And I think the more you do it, the better you get.

David Herlihy:  30:37  Even in the old days, people worked for a long time. There’s no overnight sensations. Everybody worked really really really hard and so, it’s got to be the most important thing. You’re like Steve Jobs, you’re your own songwriting CEO. So you got to treat this like the most important thing in the world. You got to work hard at it, yes you’ve got to have fun and you got to love it.

Dan Cohen:  31:03  And you’re not providing them any advice. You should put this in this location on the web but that will get you-

David Herlihy:  31:09  I do, but I also feel you have to … There's only so many heartbeats you have in a day. And so I feel to me, I have this model about the music industry. It’s like a Yin Yang thing. It’s be great, get paid, but I think you have to be great first. We don't have time anymore for be pretty okay. You've got to really be great now, and you can't be great in your spare time. A lot of people are doing things online and they're YouTube stars and that’s fine. You have to be a student of the way you find out about things.

David Herlihy:  31:44  What I would say, beyond the dig deep and cultivate your voice and find out what moves you and write a song every day. Really write a song everyday. A guy talked to me the other day, a potential client. He had a bunch of songs, no track record. He
wanted a manager. I said, "There's nothing to manage yet. Come back to me in a month. Give me a call, 30 songs from now and then we can talk about how's your voice, what's going on?" I didn't mean your voice like your throat, but your vision of yourself. You have to find your Van Gogh. Find your genius and work work work at it.

David Herlihy: 32:26 But then, the get paid part, I would look at, Okay, how are people ... And this may be someone else who does this for you. How are people who share these attributes getting paid? Where is their music? How do they get it across? Do they have videos? What are they doing? You need to ... As much as the artist shouldn't be writing a song every day, the business person should be looking at everybody who is doing it and seeing how they do it, what do they do? And figure out the best practices.

David Herlihy: 32:58 But to me, it starts with the Big Bang of art. And even if you're inspired and great, so what, you really got to keep at it and write more songs. And so, you're young, you're 20, 19, 21, put the pedal to the metal right now and write a song every day, and come back to me in 30 days with 30 songs and maybe song 17 is actually just a middle break for song number six. By doing it every day ... And don't get too precious about it, just put a stamp on it, mail it , postcards. Put a stamp on it and mail it and just get them out and do it.

David Herlihy: 33:39 The Beatles, they played in Hamburg eight hours a night, six nights a week, seven nights a week for two months. Ed Sheeran, he plays Wembley 80,000 people. Before he made it big, he was in London playing 300 shows a year. You get pretty damn muscular, right? You're like an Olympic athlete when you play that much. So, you got to have fun. I tell them that too. I think Ben Bradlee talked about being a journalist. He goes, you got to have fun because this business doesn't pay well enough so now have a really good time while you're doing it. So you have to have fun.

Dan Cohen: 34:20 Well, thanks so much for letting us know about that and for taking us on a deep dive into music history, your own history, and really the future of where music is going. David Herlihy, thanks so much for being on the program.

David Herlihy: 34:33 Thank you so much, Dan. I appreciate it.

Dan Cohen: 34:42 What's New is a production of the Northeastern University library with engineering by Jon Reed, production assistance by Evan Simpson, Debra Mandel, Jonathan Iannone, Debra Smith,
Sarah Sweeney, and Brooke Williams. You can catch all of our episodes, show notes, and transcripts at whatsnewpodcast.org and we're available on Itunes, Google Play, and anywhere else you get your podcasts. You can follow us on twitter@podcastwhatsnew. We'd love to hear your thoughts and feedback. I'm Dan Cohen. See you next time on What's New.