

DTM Podcast #7: Design Expertise

Show Notes

In this penultimate DTM podcast Peter talks to one of his colleagues at Delft, Professor Matthijs van Dyke. Matthijs is a Professor of Practice and co-author of the well-known [Vision in Product Development](#) (ViP) method. Matthijs is not only an educator though. His main job is working at the design business he co-founded: Reframing Studio in Amsterdam, where he has built up considerable expertise in design working with major clients and organisations. In the podcast Matthijs reflects on his changing role in the business, what his core expertise is, and why he doesn't think that trying to categorise people into different levels of expertise is useful. Following the interview Peter and Mieke discuss what they think about design expertise, pulling out some key themes from the interview with Matthijs. Total running time is 35 minutes.

Peter introduces a book by Bryan Lawson and Kees Dorst called [Design Expertise](#) (also mentioned in the Assignment 2 description) which gives an overview of how designers develop across many different disciplines. There are some excellent case studies of how top designers work – a recommended read. The different 'levels of design expertise' that the book quotes is from a paper by Hubert and Stuart Dreyfus called [Expertise in Realworld Contexts](#) which is an insightful look at why it is difficult (or impossible) to encode human expertise into computer code. Bryan Lawson has written much about the design process and the expertise of designers, and Mieke mentions one of his papers about how designers make sense of new situations through their experience: [Schemata, Gambits and Precedent: Some Factors in Design Expertise](#).

Peter mentions a bestselling book by Malcolm Gladwell called [Outliers: The Story of Success](#), which amongst other things discusses the idea that becoming an expert 'simply' takes 10,000 hours. Finally if you want to follow up on the cooking documentary that Peter mentions, '[Salt, Fat, Acid, Heat](#)', it is currently playing on Netflix.

Podcast Transcript

Introduction

Peter Lloyd: Hello, it's Peter Lloyd here. This is the penultimate podcast in this year's DTM series and it's about the idea of expertise and particularly design expertise - what is it? how do you acquire it? and what distinguishes a novice designer from an expert designer?

First of all I talk to Matthijs van Dyke, a fellow Professor at Delft, but more significantly someone who has considerable expertise in design practice. And as in the other podcasts, after the interview Mieke and I pull out some of the key themes and mention some useful references for you to follow up on to find out more about design expertise and expertise in general if you're interested.

Finally, a word of warning about the sound quality in the interview. Although Matthijs' microphone was working fine, my microphone decided it didn't want to work so I may sound a bit further away than normal. Once you get used to it, you probably won't notice but I thought I'd confess up front. You got the important guy!

Anyway, enough of me talking and on with the podcast...

Part 1: Interview

Peter Lloyd: I'm here in the studio with Matthijs van Dyke, who is the founding director of Amsterdam based Reframing Studio, a professor of practice and mobility design at Delft, and a co-author of the book Vision in Product Design. Matthijs has many years of experience working as a designer across a huge range of briefs. We're going to talk about what that experience means in terms of the expertise he's acquired. So welcome to the DTM podcast Matthijs.

Matthijs van Dijk: Thank you. I feel honored.

Peter Lloyd: Very nice to have you here, and we've worked together before, so we know each other quite well. I wanted to start off by asking what kind of projects does Reframing Studio work on? Can you tell us a bit about the studio set up and clients that you work with?

Matthijs van Dijk: What we do nowadays is that we're just very interested in society. It's not that we start from a societal problem, but that we start from a societal theme. And it's really nice not to start from a problem, but more from a from a boundary like 'information in society' or 'psychiatric health care and society', so it's of value free frame you start to work with.

Peter Lloyd: Are you working with a client?

Matthijs van Dijk: When you work with a client. Yeah, I think what we do is mainly to describe a boundary of research. Because we really don't know yet what we will come up with. The only thing that we know are the steps we take from A to Z. And that's what we sell to the client. The client is often a little bit confused about their role in future society. They want to understand future society, and by understanding future society, they also can kind of decide on what kind of role they want to play in future society.

Peter Lloyd: So they come to you with a question?

Matthijs van Dijk: Yeah, but it's more about understanding their role, than understanding a problem. That's a completely other thing.

Peter Lloyd: And what kind of clients do you work with?

Matthijs van Dijk: It's all type of organizations, but they have to have a specific size because the work we do takes a lot of time. So small organizations often do not have the capital to start working with us. Think of national governments, city governments,

big corporates, non-governmental organizations or foundations. I think it's also related to organizations who've never seen a designer before. I really like to go there.

Peter Lloyd: How do they find you?

Matthijs van Dijk: They don't find us! ha ha, I think we're more proactive over there, we're interested in a societal issue and then we start doing research on who's in charge and then we start conversations. Often an assignment is more an end result of a conversation than of a sales project.

Peter Lloyd: So I want to quote something from the ViP book which is relevant to that question. You say quite early on in the book that (I quote) "I started working with ViP in 1995, and it's like any innovation process. It took 15 years to implement and it took me 10 years to sell the expertise to clients." And I wondered how has the expertise you sell changed over the years?

Matthijs van Dijk: I think there's not a lot of things that changed but maybe there are some steps that are easier to execute because of tools we have developed. When I listen to those words in the book that was published in 2011 and written between, so five years before, it still makes sense. It took a lot of time and effort to put that new way of working...

Peter Lloyd: Into a business and a practice.

Matthijs van Dijk: Exactly. I think it's true that organizations understand better what that type of process can mean for them. But on the other hand, the process didn't change at all. It's still the same thing. And maybe by making things a little bit more explicit and by understanding yourself where the emphasis is when working for a client, because when you think of ViP, it's different steps. I think in the beginning we always presented it as just following those steps. But maybe you have to say it's not those steps, but there are three very important stages. It's understanding a likely future world. It's taking a stance and understanding what world you desire for. And of course it has to be realistic. And then the third thing is to come up with interventions that make that

transition happen. And I think that's a much more simple story than kind of explaining all eight or ten steps that are on the line, ViP.

Peter Lloyd: Do you always work with the ViP method with a client - is that what reframing studio does?

Matthijs van Dijk: Yes, what I experienced when you start to create content before you have any organization it doesn't work. So I have a dialogue with a client or an organization. We just talk about things and then we understand together we have to start doing something. We always work with ViP, also because there are so many other organizations who work in another way that we are just not good at, so we're good at ViP and there's a lot of work to be done in relation to ViP and I fully understand that the whole world doesn't want to work with ViP.

Peter Lloyd: But it's kind of a philosophy as well as a... philosophy is the wrong word, there's a kind of worldview behind it?

Matthijs van Dijk: I fully agree, so in principle you start to explore how future society looks like without taking into account the existence of the organization you work for. It is disconnected from the organization you work for. If the organization doesn't allow that type of exploration, it's not going to work. And the big consultancies, of course, they start from an organizational point of view often. They start from inside and look outside and we start from outside and then want to understand how it affects everything on the inside.

Peter Lloyd: You describe it as a very easy process. You know, you meet clients, you have these nice conversations. But I wonder what you feel that the expertise that you've built up over the years is. I mean, when you start off, if you think back to the first years of your practice, how is that different from now What do you really feel that you've kind of got expert in?

Matthijs van Dijk: I think we're not afraid anymore of any complexity. When you think of 20 years ago, we thought maybe we should avoid that specific theme because it's just too complex to start working on. And I think we're unafraid at the moment, so we

created so much self-confidence that this process will help us out, that we don't care anymore how complex that first kind of, so the complexity of where we start from, we don't care anymore.

Peter Lloyd: And when did you realize that you had that confidence?

Matthijs van Dijk: I think that evolves very naturally. You automatically kind of constantly increase the complexity step by step and before you know it, you're doing things that you thought of 10 years beforehand that you could never do. It's a very natural thing. And you do not reflect on it. I think it's also kind of triggered by that you feel excitement yourself by constantly increasing the complexity of issues you work on, because otherwise things become boring, too. It's not that a small, less complex theme is boring, don't get me wrong. But I think from a more human point of view, there's a tendency to constantly increase complexity.

Peter Lloyd: Do you think now, if you compare it to where you are now with where you started from, do you think in a different way? Do you see things in a different way when you design?

Matthijs van Dijk: People often think that when you make things theoretical, people do not understand things anymore. But it's exactly the opposite. Those theories, they help you to truly make good decisions and to understand what you do and why you took that stance.

Peter Lloyd: It sounds like the way you are describing what you do is that you're constantly learning new things, things are coming along and you're able to bring them into your work somehow.

Matthijs van Dijk: Yeah. What you can say is that each step in ViP, you can see it as a concept or deliverable. But behind every deliverable is a theory. And those theories, they can really help you understand how to develop those deliverables. And I think what happens is that those theories become more and more nuanced and profound.

Peter Lloyd: So the more you think about them, the more complicated they get maybe or the more they resonate with you or...

Matthijs van Dijk: Yeah, the more delicate your understanding is. If you wake me up in the middle of the night and you ask me: 'give me some kind of theories on how people perceive an object', then I will give you an answer.

Peter Lloyd: Ha ha

Matthijs van Dijk: Yes, that's really stupid. And maybe it's not even true. But I think it's true and it helps me designing stuff. And it helps me to explain to an organization that design is not something that is a choice from a designer's point of view, but it's a choice you make for someone else.

Peter Lloyd: How do you organize the projects that you have? How many people do you have working at the moment?

Matthijs van Dijk: 14

Peter Lloyd: And are you part of every project?

Matthijs van Dijk: No, so my role changed in the last year. I'm more the dialogue starter and it takes so much time to start a project. So the first kind of encounter you have with an organization, the time between this first encounter and starting a project often is three years or something. And I'm kind of this guy starting to work to start this dialogue and to maybe lure people in. Maybe luring is the wrong word, but maybe sometimes it is.

Matthijs van Dijk: Yes, bringing in people and connecting with people?

Matthijs van Dijk: Connecting with people but based on stories. What I do is storytelling, but more on the theoretical point of view and how it can be of help for an organization.

Peter Lloyd: Do you have specific mechanisms or techniques for reflecting, either personally or as a studio?

Matthijs van Dijk: Yeah, I think we're in the middle of redefining what that could be because reflecting, we did mainly from a content point of view and I think from a process point of view, it's much more interesting. And the thing is, so when you're under a lot of pressure, we have just so many things to do and then it's often only content, content and then you reflect on content because that's what you deliver in the end. And now we fully understand if we don't reflect on the process and how we work together and how we make this working together more of an appropriate concept, then maybe in the end content will suffer from it. So we're in the middle of it, to do proper reflection.

Peter Lloyd: So I had a question. There's a book by Brian Lawson and Kees Dorst called *Design Expertise* and in that book they quote a philosopher called Hubert Dreyfuss who has this model of the different scales of expertise. They have a scale that goes from 'novice' to 'beginner' to 'advanced beginner' to 'competent', to 'expert' to 'master', and then to 'visionary' at the end. And I wondered, where...

Matthijs van Dijk: That's stupid! I don't like that scale at all!

Peter Lloyd: Oh, why not?!

Matthijs van Dijk: You can be visionary as a novice!

Peter Lloyd: I was going to ask you where you'd put yourself on that scale.

Matthijs van Dijk: Yeah, that's a difficult one.

Peter Lloyd: It's difficult to say that you're a visionary! I notice in the book that you say that some of the VIP approach was based on talking to visionary designers, too.

Matthijs van Dijk: Yeah, in the beginning, but the thing, of course. What for me is very important, when you look at visionary designers, what they do...

Peter Lloyd: I wondered about that. I was going to say, as you get more experienced, are you able to play more? And take more risks maybe, or you describe sort of embracing more complexity, but in a sense, is that is that just playing with things in a way where complexity tells you something?

Matthijs van Dijk: Yeah, but it's also playing in increasing complexity, because what you do, you put even more elements on the table because you say we're going to play. You allow yourself to maybe not know what you do. And that's very interesting. But in the end, playing is about increasing complexity. And I really like that. And that's where people sometimes make a complete kind of, they have a misunderstanding about what play is all about. They think it's about lightness or rules, less rules. And still I really like to think about how you should develop as a designer is a very interesting question, I think. So that's why I don't like it when you say visionaries at the end.

Peter Lloyd: It's not a mechanical process of going from one state to the other, it's not that, you have elements of all things at every stage?

Matthijs van Dijk: I truly believe that we have to sell design as being visionary, because that's what design is all about in principle. If you only say in the last stage of your career you can do what design in principle is for, I think that's a bad story!

Peter Lloyd: Well talking about learning. I wondered as you are a professor here at Delft too what the crossover is between your practice in reframing studio and the teaching that you do at Delft. How does that crossover? Is that the ViP method that crosses over?

Matthijs van Dijk: Yeah, it is. And it's also about the storytelling of ViP. I think, so what I feel now is that concepts that are not so easy to grasp, it's really necessary that you have to tell them in all kinds of different ways, so there's not one explanation of ViP. But maybe there should be 10 or 200! And the more there are, the better it is. That's maybe the opposite of how we started with it because we were always saying this is ViP and this is what it is. But the funny thing is if you see reframing as how Kees Dorst sees it, you kind of look at it from a different perspective. I think this is what I do nowadays that

I can kind of like explain ViP from ten or fifteen different perspectives. I can turn it around, flip it over, I can start from everywhere, I can start from everywhere. I really enjoy that.

Peter Lloyd: So when you work with students, you're able to take different positions in order to understand their worldview and bring that out.

Matthijs van Dijk: Yes, I can empathize with them because then I see OK, this is not going to work, so I have to use another type of entrance or another story or another analogy or another. And then I just do it differently. I'm constantly looking for this, you want to create this relationship with the students? And every time it's a unique relationship, so you have to be careful that ViP is not so strong that it doesn't allow for that unique relationship anymore. And that's what I'm capable of doing now.

Peter Lloyd: It's interesting because you're describing the expertise that you've developed as a teacher too, as well as the expertise that you've developed as a designer.

Matthijs van Dijk: Yeah and again, so my role as a designer. I'm not responsible anymore for the content of all the projects we're doing, I've got a completely other role. And I had to adapt to that role, too. I hated that role in the beginning. I just hated it. And then I had to rethink myself in relation to the studio.

Peter Lloyd: I think there are some architectural practices, maybe, where they develop a certain way of thinking about the world through the projects that they take on. And then the people that start those practices become slightly more distanced from the actual realities of producing the projects. They're thinking all the time about where projects fit and how they fit into their kind of longer-term vision for the studio or the business.

Matthijs van Dijk: It's true. Yes, it's something like that. And then the most difficult thing is that the quality of the work you deliver is studio effort. You don't want to become this architect, that one person, because then you're dead as an organisation. So it's very interesting how the people working within Reframing Studio, they are so

much better in executing projects now. And this is, of course, what I also tell the organizations I start this dialogue with. And again, I'm only a conversation starter.

I think that's a good point to end on. Matthijs, thanks very much, it has been a really interesting discussion. Thanks for joining us.

Matthijs van Dijk: So when we start this I can't stop anymore, as you notice. I'm going to stop now!

Part 2 Discussion of Interview

Peter Lloyd: Ok. That was Matthijs van Dyke from Reframing Studio. I must admit, I really enjoyed that discussion. It didn't quite go where I thought it was going to go, but I thought we touched on some interesting areas. What did you think?

Mieke van der Bijl: Yeah, it was great to listen to. In general I really love people who are talking about their work. If you ask them, you know, why do you do this work and why do you love this work? You always get really great stories. I also really enjoy that when I was listening to this podcast.

Peter Lloyd: And what have you learned in your work, too? Because I think that's really nice to hear from people that are really experts, and we'll come on to talk about the model of expertise later. But to really get them to think about what they actually do differently from when they started off. It's something that they probably don't do that often. You need the question, don't you, to actually start thinking about that?

Mieke van der Bijl: Yeah. And he had some really great examples of that as well.

Peter Lloyd: What were the things that stood out for you then in the interview?

Mieke van der Bijl: Well, you know, this podcast obviously being about expertise, I thought it was interesting you asked the question about if he thought of himself as a visionary and then he didn't want to answer that question, which I totally understand because I don't think anyone would think of themselves of a visionary or if they would think of themselves as a visionary, they wouldn't say it right!

Peter Lloyd: That's what I said it is difficult to describe yourself as a visionary.

Mieke van der Bijl: It's a very strange thing to say about yourself! but I really liked how he was saying how his work had become much more about, I would say, relationships. He was saying one of the things that he does on a daily basis is building relationships with clients. And that's a real skill how you go through this dialogue with clients. And he was talking about how he works with students as well, so there's kind of a relational aspect there as well, how you help students through this process. And he was even talking about the studio work, it's not about individual design projects. We do it as a studio. "I don't want to be the architect" which I think is a really interesting way of looking at it, maybe that's how we think of architects as being kind of the single architect and not bringing their team along. But I really like this relational aspect.

Peter Lloyd: That was something that Kees mentioned in the first podcast or the second podcast, the idea that you can have a business and have projects, but when you know how those projects run and you're a director of a business it has to be about something else. I think Matthijs described that quite well you know, this idea of starting conversations often three years in advance of getting the projects, I think, and actually thinking about where you want to be positioned within a societal context, all those sorts of slightly bigger questions that he now gets the time to think about and explore with potential clients.

Mieke van der Bijl: And I think that's real skill, real expertise. We tend not to talk about these softer social skills in terms of building relationships, but that really requires asking the right questions and good listening. I think it's something we can do more about in our educational program as well.

Peter Lloyd: I thought it was interesting how he described his relationship with theory. He mentioned theory a few times, which I thought was interesting - behind every stage of the process there's a theory and that was one of the expertises that he said he'd acquired over the years. He can have a more nuanced idea of the theory behind certain steps and he can articulate that to clients. I think at one stage he said he was a theoretical storyteller, he uses theories to tell stories. It's interesting in a course like design theory and methodology. You tend to think of theory as an abstract, not a very useful, thing. But actually, in his context, it is really useful. It helps persuade people, it helps convince people to invest in your organization.

Mieke van der Bijl: The other thing I really liked was the way he was talking about ViP, particularly in relation to the expertise levels, but we'll get to that in a moment. We often tend to think about novice versus expert designers. How I often explain it is I often use the metaphor of dancing. I mean, there's many different metaphors we can use, but if you want to become a dancer, you know, first time you step on the dance floor, especially in ballroom dancing or latin, you kind of have to count, like one, two, three, one, two, three. And you are really conscious of what's happening. But when you become more expert that kind of counting you no longer do, and it becomes much more intuitive into.

Peter Lloyd: Fluent, Fluency.

Mieke van der Bijl: Fluency, yes. So that's something we see in design as well. You know, when you when you first start designing, you follow all the steps. But the more you do it, the more fluent you become. And I really liked what Matthijs was saying, because I think that might even be an expert level further, I don't know, but he was talking about ViP and how they used to say that there's only one way to do ViP and it's this way. And it's a bit about, you know, these are kind of the steps, this is how you have to count and this is how you have to do it. Whilst now he's saying no there's like many different ways you can do it. So it's more like a framework. And it's up to the designer how to work with that. And I think that's real expertise when you can let go of that dogmatic way of doing design.

Peter Lloyd: So let's talk about the model of expertise I introduced in the interview with Matt. One thing that I've always been quite interested in is this classification of expertise as 10,000 hours. Malcolm Gladwell in his book *Outliers* refers to it. Basically, if you spend 10000 hours on anything, then by definition you're an expert, because within that time you've had to practice so much, and you've become fluent so much, and you've thought about the subject so much. It's just an amount of time invested in something. When you think of your lifetime as a designer, how many hours that you're going to naturally spend thinking about design and solving design problems, if you stick with the profession, you'll end up becoming an expert at some at some point. The model is from a philosopher called Hubert Dreyfuss and has six levels of expertise. It starts off with novice. It goes to advanced beginner, competent, expert, master and visionary. I think the first thing to say is that it's really helpful to not think of expertise just in terms of novice and experts, because that's a dichotomy that doesn't really help you. Either you're a novice or an expert. Of course there are other stages in between. And I think particularly in an education, it's interesting to think about how do you get from a novice level to being an advanced beginner? What are the things that you have to acquire? And from advanced beginner to becoming competent? And those things are much more about learning techniques and becoming fluent in certain activities...

Mieke van der Bijl: And recognizing situations, those kind of things. I recommend that people listening have a look at those different levels of expertise, because I think it's quite useful. One of the things that I like about, I think it's in this book by Bryan Lawson and Kees Dorst, is that design consists of many different expertises. It's not just being a designer, for example how Matthijs was talking about building all these relationships. There's a specific expertise or idea of how we talk about framing, for example, or it might be about visualizing. So most people, they would sit on different levels of expertise, on different competencies or skills.

Peter Lloyd: Actually, I think that's a real sign of someone gaining expertise is that they're able to isolate different bits of the whole system. If you ask someone about designing, they're able to talk about one very particular component of designing and how that operates, rather than talking about the whole thing. I think if you are someone who has less experience, you know what's the design process, there's a natural inclination to say, well, it's this Double Diamond process, which covers everything but

doesn't really tell you the small details that quite often matter in a design process. And so that ability to really focus in on details and ignore the rest of it and practice that little one component and then link it to other kinds of things that displays someone developing expertise. The metaphor I like is cooking, you know, because it starts off with how to boil an egg and you know, you can't even boil an egg. But then you go right up to the top chefs to see what they do, There's a sort of mid-level of following recipes. And I think recipes are quite a good analogy with design methods because you have different stages and you have to add ingredients but there's a lot of 'feel' involved. And as you get more experience, you kind of know the ingredients that work together: if you have to put in a bit more olive oil or a bit more flour or something like that. And you develop your taste, too.

Mieke van der Bijl: You're flavour balance.

Peter Lloyd: Yeah. There's a really good cooking program on Netflix called 'Salt, Fat, Acid, Heat'. They are the four components of cooking that form the basis of every food. And what the top chefs do is manipulate those four components. It is really nice because it's simple. But as you see in the programme, the documentary is much more complex than that. The other thing that Hubert Dreyfuss writes, that I thought was really interesting, was about intuition. The paper is called Expertise in Real World Contexts and it's really a paper that asks the question 'what is expertise and can we capture and put it in a computer? That's what the underlying question is. They say, no, we can't really do this. And this is a paper about why, why we can't really do this. But at the beginning, they say (quote) "expertise is based on the making of immediate, unreflective situational responses. Intuitive judgment is the hallmark of expertise." And I think that's really interesting because design methods are all about getting away from intuition somehow. But if expertise is all about intuition, then what role do design methods play? And I think it's interesting to sort of think how design methods get you to a point where you can let your intuition takes over. That's what I'd look at, you don't start off being intuitive. Basically, your training gets you to the place where you can start trusting yourself and being more intuitive and I think Matthijs described in the interview about play, you know, being able to play with things and not being afraid to embrace complexity and all those sorts of things. I think what he was describing there was, you know, I use my intuition a lot more these days than I did in the past.

Mieke van der Bijl: Yeah. I mean it's that term 'intuitive judgment'. What does that mean in design? Because we use it quite a bit. I think also in design theory, we talk about judgment. But does that mean that we're judging the design situation?

Peter Lloyd: I think you're judging a number of factors. So I sort of think of myself as an educational designer, I guess, and the educational courses that I work on, that we've worked on together. When I'm making a judgment, I'm sort of thinking of what the consequences will be, but I want them to be interesting consequences that have a number of layers. You know, they might go one way or they might go another way. And you create this sort of container for that somehow. It's not certainty that I'm looking for, it's just: is this going to go an interesting way? Does this setup lead to interesting things? And that's just an intuitive sense of: "yeah, I kind of know what people are like, and if they use this thing to do this, then something interesting will happen."

Mieke van der Bijl: I think that's also related to how we build expertise because we build expertise in design by doing lots of design projects. I don't know if it's Brian Lawson who says that when a designer faces a design situation, new problems situation, they recognize patterns from the past. I think also Donald Schon talks about that. I guess that's that kind of intuitive judgment. You can recognise there are things there that you have seen before. And it doesn't mean that you have evidence that it's going to work, but it gives you that sense of confidence that you know...

Peter Lloyd: Yeah, yeah. I've been here before and I know what the variables are here.

Mieke van der Bijl: Even though each design situation is unique and different, there's always a pattern there that you can recognize.

Peter Lloyd: I think expertise, for me it's an interesting podcast because it brings a lot of other things together in design methods. The whole point of being at university is to get better at something and actually you want to feel that you're developing through your life. For me it's like a key topic to embrace and to think about and that we'll come back to in Assignment 2. Some of the things that Matthijs talked about are things that will be relevant in assignment two for the Practice Manual.

Mieke van der Bijl: Yeah.

Peter Lloyd: Ok, so thanks Meike. I think that was a good discussion, we touched on some really interesting stuff and as with the other podcasts, we'll put all the references in the show notes.

Mieke van der Bijl: And next time you interview an expert ask what they're expert in and on which level they would position themselves.

Peter Lloyd: Exactly, yes. Good one. Ok, bye.

Mieke van der Bijl: Bye.