

Pioneers and Pathfinders: Greg Mostyn

(This transcript has been generated through AI technology.)

Zeynep Ersin: Welcome to Pioneers and Pathfinders, Seyfarth's podcast about the people and ideas reshaping the legal industry.

Kevin Young: I'm Kevin Young, an employment litigator and counselor, and I've spent my career putting new tools and ideas to work in client service and helping colleagues and clients to do the same.

Zeynep Ersin: And I'm Zeynep Ersin. I lead innovation and design thinking at Seyfarth, focusing on reimagining how legal services are built, delivered, and experienced.

Kevin Young: Each episode, we sit down with someone on the front lines of legal innovation to unpack what they're doing and what it means for where our industry is headed.

Zeynep Ersin: We'll keep it fresh, we'll keep it fun, and we'll keep it to 30 minutes. Let's jump in.

Kevin Young: Today, we're joined by Greg Mostyn, CEO and co-founder of Wexler. Wexler is a fact intelligence platform built for litigation teams. Wexler extracts events, timelines, and contradictions from large evidence sets and links everything back to its source, helping litigators build a clear factual picture from what could be hundreds of thousands of documents.

Zeynep Ersin: In this episode, we get into what it really takes to bring new tools into major law firms, how litigators are actually using AI to change the way they build cases, and the elephant in the room—what would actually happen to the billable hour? We also dig into where legal AI is headed, what Greg wishes he'd known when he first started, and what might soon look outdated about the practice of law. Let's get into it.

Kevin Young: Greg, thank you so much for taking time to join us today. We're thrilled to have you on the podcast. You're someone who we look at and we know is on the front lines of legal tech and innovation in this really fast-changing moment that lawyers and the broader legal industry really find ourselves in. But before we get to that forefront that you've been on since co-founding Wexler, we'd love to hear a little bit about you, about your background and about how you got to where you are today.

Greg Mostyn: Definitely. Thanks for having me, first of all. A bit of a circuitous route to founding a legal tech company, but actually it's a personal one. I'm not an attorney, but I come from a family of lawyers. You may have seen, but my dad was a judge and before that he was a barrister—like a trial attorney in England. He did family law. He actually did a couple of big matrimonial disputes—so did Paul McCartney, Princess Diana, a few others—and was very involved in some quite important case law. So he was very, very involved in the early days of Wexler, not so much involved anymore. But he sort of taught me about how important it is to have a grip of the facts in any dispute. And actually the legal question is usually applied after the factual question. And we saw this was a really good, more deterministic use case for generative AI. So rather than trying to do every legal task, we wanted to be focused. The first thing we built was basically a chronology builder. It was about building a chronology, understanding the facts of the case in quite deterministic terms.

My brother's also a partner at a big US firm. My stepmom's a barrister, so surrounded by lawyers my whole life. To me, law is litigation. It's not contract review. It's really standing up in court, preparing your arguments, building the facts, that kind of thing.

In terms of my personal journey, I was at Oxford. I founded a few businesses there. They were events businesses. I worked in the music industry. Then I worked for a couple of tech startups as a marketing director. And then I went to Entrepreneur First, which is an incubator where you go pre-idea—people call it Love Island for tech. So pre-idea, pre-co-founder, you go and you get paired up and you work your ideas. And that's why we had the light bulb moment with my personal connection into the space. And I know so many of my friends are lawyers from my year at Oxford and so on. So I had a good testing pool of people to sort of take the idea through.

Kevin Young: Were you considering any other industries before you ultimately landed on legal?

Greg Mostyn: Yeah, so at the very beginning, we were doing something which was more like marketing tech—content creation, using generative AI to sort of create marketing assets and things like that. And to be honest, ChatGPT came out and we were like, you couldn't create a business out of [that]. A lot of people did at the very early days. There were quite a lot of these AI content startups, but actually [we] realized it was something that was low value and probably the first to be commoditized by the generalist models. And we've been proved right in that regard. And so we've gone for really complex high-value disputes work, which is a lot harder. And we see the generalist models are not really capable of doing to a great degree. So yes, we did start [there] and [are] very, very glad that we decided to move on from that idea.

Kevin Young: Greg, I think you see the legal tech space very up close and personally. It seems like a space that's gotten really crowded for the better from my perspective over the years. A lot of companies out there doing really cool and innovative things we probably couldn't even have thought about four or five years ago, even imagined. I'm curious how you see that space from a macro level today and how Wexler fits into it.

Greg Mostyn: Yeah, so I think you're right that legal tech used to be something that didn't really have the attention of venture capitalists because honestly, as a business model conflict, it seemed like with a billable hour—and we can open a whole can of worms there—but essentially, it didn't feel like this was a place where you could create multi-billion dollar companies. And now clearly that's not the case with the amount of venture capital that's been flowing into the industry, of which we also are beneficiaries.

I think at a macro level, obviously, you've got the generalist players, Harvey and Legora, plus there's Clio plus CoCounsel and a few others who are trying to do sort of every legal task and be very broad. And then you've got eDiscovery, which was the sort of historic legal tech, really. It was the first type of legal tech which basically got created because of email and because of the massive flood of data that was being created and how impossible it was to keep up. And then you've got where we fit in, which is more sort of specialized systems which can go really deep into these tasks, create a massive amount of ROI. But we always say we're a scalpel, not a Swiss Army knife. And we win deals because we go really deep into the workflows. We find things that those generalist platforms don't. And in litigation, you know better than anyone, it's about winning. It's about getting the upper hand in the theater of litigation, and that's what we do really well.

So I think we tend to get a lot of interest and buy-in from firms who maybe already have one of those generalist platforms, or maybe they don't and they want something more specialized. But

even if they do, they realize that litigation is something that is a bit different because it's very messy. The dataset isn't rote or pro forma, and it's not easy for the LLMs to work over that unstructured data. And so yeah, that's where we're winning a lot of deals.

You've obviously also got on the transactional side, you've got the CLM providers and all that kind of thing. But yeah, I mean, there's a lot. I saw the Legaltech Hub GenAI market map—there's like another 100 solutions there every month. So yeah, I think it will be a meritocracy in a certain way. I think the best providers will win out. At the same time, I think it's no longer like a winner-takes-all market. There's so much innovation going into this space, so many VC dollars, but there's also so much value to be created. Actually, I read a lot about the Jevons paradox for law, and I massively agree with that. I was speaking to an in-house counsel the [other] day [who] said their HR disputes have gone from 1,000 to 10,000 in a year. We need even more lawyers to work out what's real, what's not, and that work. Also, we need the tech that can usher in that era responsibly.

Zeynep Ersin: So Greg, how has the perspective changed or not changed since you launched Wexler—I think back in 2023—in terms of the conversations you're having with clients, prospective clients? Has it been consistently the same, curious, or has there been a pendulum swing in any direction?

Greg Mostyn: I mean, obviously we've become a lot more well known. So in that sense, it's a lot easier for us to get through the sales process. At the same time, obviously people realize this is here. This is happening. This is real. This isn't a flash in the pan. And this isn't like blockchain or Web3, which obviously everyone was heralding as the big innovation in the sector. So yeah, definitely people are coming with a real appetite to engage.

I guess the counterpoint is obviously there's a lot going on. So there's a potential for overwhelm. And being—I'm sure, Zeynep, you're getting bombarded by vendors all the time. So it's about having a clearly differentiated perspective and a product which you can clearly see is differentiated and solves a unique problem that really helps us in those kinds of conversations. So we always say it's by far net good. We always love when firms are being propositioned by other platforms because it means they're already alive to the possibilities of AI and likely there's partners who are already saying, "What have we got for the disputes practice?" But yeah, it's definitely—trying to navigate your way through that can be a challenge. So you just got to stay focused, keep building a good product, listening to your users and customers, and building something that really solves their problems.

Kevin Young: From a track record perspective, as much as you're able to share, are there any particular compelling success stories that you've heard from Wexler users that you could talk about?

Greg Mostyn: Yeah. So I can't say the firm, but we had a really interesting one, which was a collective action where Wexler basically saved 40% of the total hours on the case, and it was a fixed-fee matter. And it was hundreds of hours, basically. But I think it was even more than that. And you can do the math as to how much that is with billing rates in the US. Yeah, that's a significant amount of ROI. And even on non-fixed-fee matters, it's about reducing the write-offs and opening up to new work that maybe they wouldn't be able to bill for otherwise. So that was a really good one for us to understand that the value of this isn't just hypothetical or it's like having a play around. This is creating real compelling ROI that can be measured in dollars and cents in a lot of them.

That was a good one. We've also done a few big cases. So we've done hundreds of thousands of documents with a few different clients on one case with 50 or 60 attorneys working on the data, I think up to 500,000 as well. So yeah, that's a kind of different ballpark. They don't come along every day, but when we do, there's not that many other platforms that can cope with that many documents with such detail. So yeah, there's a few little tidbits.

Kevin Young: Greg, you mentioned it a couple of times, the billable hour. It's in some ways a bit of the elephant in the room around a lot of these conversations, though I think the departure of the billable hour—it's not something that many people would miss, I think, attorneys, firms or clients—but it's been part of the profession and the way that big firms have defined at least the economical value of what they're providing the clients for quite some time. It seems like the tools we're talking about have introduced at least conversations around change for that or sped them up. There's plenty of firms, certainly ours included, [that] have been talking about and offering alternative fees in the right circumstances for quite some time. But I think the trends we're seeing kind of advance those conversations and advance the thinking around the possibilities on it. And I'm curious what you're seeing from your perspective. You've got, in a way, like you said, a kind of self-selecting group of clients or potential clients who kind of see the value of this type of technology. What are you seeing or hearing about what that means for the billable hour model and about alternatives to it?

Greg Mostyn: I think you're right. People have been predicting the death of the billable hour for years. I think I was actually talking to quite a lot of GCs who kind of prefer the billable hour because it's easy to calculate what you're getting and the value of that. At the same time, I think we will naturally—the market is going to reward efficiency. It's just a question of, you know, supply and demand. It's a meritocratic system, you'd expect. So I do think there's going to have to be some creative thinking and blue sky thinking about how that works, especially when you see the kind of AI-native law firms that are popping up. Again, for litigation, I think [we're] a bit shielded from that, but certainly the legal services that I, as a consumer of legal services, am the beneficiary of—for certain times, I would welcome fixed fees and we actually do operate on a fixed-fee basis for some of the things that we do, like our fundraisers, etc.

Look, I'm not here to opine over the business model. All I know is today, Wexler creates a ton of value from reducing write-offs and, when there are fixed fees available, plus the ineffable finding the killer fact that otherwise would have gone missing and winning the case, etc. But I do think we are seeing more and more creative alternative fee arrangements. And actually we're seeing—maybe another interesting insight—is we're seeing a firm like yours could maybe do work that would usually not be something that it would offer, but you can give an associate AI and then they can go and do it and the client has a much more affordable either fixed fee or hourly rate because of that, and those hours you wouldn't have billed otherwise. So they're creating value in other ways and finding revenue streams from this technology. So yeah, I think, again, I'm not here to opine on the future of the profession in general, but I do think that we are seeing some creative thinking about how to maintain value.

What I would say is I think there's going to be a ton of legal work related to AI coming down, like the legal framework for all of these models and who owns what and AI agents that can do entire tasks end-to-end, the whole cyber practice, employment work, which I know you've [done] a lot of. There's a guy called Aaron Levie who is the CEO of Box, and he says it's the best time in history to be a lawyer because of the amount of AI-generated content that's going to require legal human eyes to review.

Kevin Young: Scott Turow wrote the book that everyone had to read before he went to law school, which was called *1L*. He also wrote this article, I think it was in the ABA Journal at the time, called "The Billable Hour Must Die." I think he wrote it before I got to law school. And the article gets republished all the time. It's never changed. It's kind of stayed the same and it's stayed relevant as long as the billable hour has. So it seems like the tools and technology that we've got in place allow even more advanced conversations around really building around value and then redefining it.

Zeynep Ersin: So I'm curious, do you have a sense for the success story you mentioned, the 40%? How is that calculated? Do you know?

Greg Mostyn: Can't divulge too much, but essentially I think they kind of interviewed the users and the lawyers involved and they estimated based basically against the total hours on the matter. And we've had other clients who said it's up to 90% of the kind of more—it kind of depends on what task you're doing. If you're using it as a sort of sparring partner, when you're getting more and more into the detail, maybe you'll end up spending a lot of time on it, but you're producing a much better quality work product, which is of course what you want to do. But sometimes for the really number crunching, churning through documents and reviewing things, then maybe it's going to be a lot higher time saved because the human side is less valuable. It's qualitative. We do have some tracking available within the application as well, where you can understand exactly how long things have taken. Yeah, usually it's about getting time with the user and speaking to them directly about how much time they would have saved. Obviously, they can look at the hours they've actually spent on it on the billing software they have.

Kevin Young: Greg, to get to those types of impacts, obviously, it requires a few ingredients. One is a really excellent tool, which Wexler obviously is, to be able to provide that sort of value. Obviously, you need a firm or an attorney who's open to it, who's eager to try it. But the other piece of it I think about quite a bit, it's got to integrate. It's got to integrate into the attorney's workflow and into the workflows of the teams around them. And I know that that can be pretty difficult in certain circumstances, really getting something to stick, especially when you've got busy lawyers who are used to filling out their days in a certain way and have done this same sort of task so many times over and over, fitting in a new tool to be part of the workflow. It's certainly far from impossible, but it's not easy either. I'm curious if that's something that y'all have focused on and gotten to see kind of where integration has worked well and what the ingredients are to make integration really take off.

Greg Mostyn: Yeah, so I think adoption into a busy lawyer's daily work stream or workflows is always the key challenge. And it's about—internally we use Claude for our internal operations. I think the thing that was a real game changer is when it got the context of the company brain, if you like, plugs into our systems and then it knows about you and it knows what to suggest at the right time. That's always what we're thinking about.

How can we give it more context about the case? You upload the complaint, you upload the pleadings. We're currently building a procedural timeline. It will say, "You've got this deadline coming up. Here's some work you need to produce based on the documents you've already uploaded." We integrate into various eDiscovery platforms as well. So it kind of has the context from there and it suggests when to do certain tasks. So yeah, absolutely, thinking about those triggers, when to use the platform, understanding the context of the case, of the business, of the person, and using all of those things can massively improve the adoption journey.

I would also say that I think it is a bit different now. People use ChatGPT in their personal lives a lot. And it's a kind of new wave of AI-native lawyers that are the kind of core associate group these days. Even some partners—like my dad, this is funny actually, he got obsessive vibe coding and he made an app for his tennis club, which he runs, which sends everyone reminder emails and has a scoreboard and all this stuff. And he made it on Gemini and he was vibe coding away when we were on holiday. So I do think it is different now. This technology is kind of magical and definitely the adoption challenges aren't as hard as they were, but obviously integrating into the workflow is something that we're thinking about day in, day out. And I think it's also like the interface. You can use voice, you can just type to it, and you can extract so much more out of sort of non-technical users than previously.

Zeynep Ersin: Greg, how has your perspective changed or have you had any moments along the way since starting Wexler or things that surprised you or that you wish you knew when you started out?

Greg Mostyn: Probably a ton. Someone told me being a startup founder is like being punched in the face every day. So there's always setbacks and it's how you respond to the rolls of the punches and keep moving forward. I don't know if there's one specific thing. I think there's a ton. The fundraising journey—I did get quite a lot of good advice, but it's always a real struggle. We were fortunate enough to get a bunch of good partners, but that's always tricky, like that whole game theory piece about getting people on board with your idea and leveraging the competition you have from other investors and all the rest.

Obviously, law firm procurement cycles at the beginning—we did our first big law contract when there was only four of us and we sold into big law with all the security and the InfoSec surveys that I'm sure Zeynep is used to dealing with. And that was obviously very, very hard. But if anything, it steered me to not have imposter syndrome ever again. So there's lots of things I'm sure would be smoother, but maybe if I had known them I wouldn't have learned from them in quite such a real way. Everything we've done so far has made the company what it is today.

Kevin Young: Greg, I'm curious, and this one may be tough to answer, but I'll try it anyway. You've had the opportunity now to sit across the table from a lot of lawyers, legal departments, heads of AI and strategy like Zeynep. In doing that, have you found anything particularly surprising about how lawyers or legal organizations think or [are] thinking about this particular moment?

Greg Mostyn: I don't know if this surprised me, but it definitely surprised some of my team. It's just that the users—it's a counterpoint to what we just said—but our engineers are not lawyers. Actually, one of them is a lawyer, as it happens, but most of them aren't lawyers. Making sure that the product is designed for a non-technical user is super important. Making sure it's not overly complex, making sure it's something really intuitive. Even if people are more technical, it still needs to be super simple.

That's definitely been—I was already aware of that and I've spent enough time with lawyers to understand that, but definitely some of my team, they're like, "Oh, we can just make this an icon." And I'm like, "No, it can't be an icon. It needs to be words. No one's going to know what it is if it's an icon." They're like, "Yes, they will." And I'm like, "No, they actually won't. You need to write that out in English so they understand." So definitely some of that journey has been something for our product team to work through, which is why we've now got more ex-litigators in the team. So yeah, I'd say that's probably a learning for us all.

Kevin Young: Well, it's interesting, right? It's really about learning to speak each other's respective languages, whether it's on the technical side—oftentimes attorneys will be told to try to dilute some of the legalese in communicating things and explaining them. And it's interesting to hear it from both perspectives too, when you're thinking about how you're creating your UI and the features and the natural progression of how the thinking process would be to navigate the UI that's coming certainly from an attorney lens and a user lens, but in a way that is accessible and easy to navigate and to incorporate is so important.

Zeynep Ersin: Do you find—and I know that Wexler has continued to grow and evolve as far as how it's changed or it's grown—what's that been like in terms of new features or just like the size of the company, what's that look like?

Greg Mostyn: So yeah, we're growing all the time. We grew 8x in the last year and we're on track to continue that growth, which is really exciting. In terms of features, we don't want to be a Frankenstein product with hundreds of features. So it's always a question of what's going to have real value. But we build a bunch of new stuff, some of it less interesting, some of it less sexy on the surface, if you like—more prosaic things, which actually are really important, like a bundling feature we just released today. Then we started developing the ability to save down your own templates, which would be like, let's say Kevin has a specific way of drafting his statement of facts and Zeynep has a different way of doing it or a motion or whatever it is. We can save that down and incorporate that into the brain of the product. So yeah, things are developing all the time. We're always thinking of what's the highest impact thing that we can develop. But as I say, we don't want to be a bloated product with a massive feature set. I think now there's so much you can do from within a chat interface or within an agentic interface, if you like, where it can access different tools and access different contexts.

What we have done is a ton of infrastructure on scale. So as I said, we can do up to 500,000 documents and it should be a million by the end of the year. And that's not like eDiscovery style, just responsive to certain keyword searching. It's like deeply analyzing every single word and every single page, looking for it[s] conflicts with every other fact, understanding even if it's a handwritten medical record, and the pattern and the chronology and all those kinds of things. So that's not been trivial at all. And that's something that we're continuing to innovate on so that whether it's a week-long investigation or a decade-long class action, we can store all the documents.

Kevin Young: I have a question, and this might require getting a little bit technical, but we'll see how it goes. You mentioned some features are sexier than others, but nevertheless even the ones that aren't quite as glitzy can be worth working on and delivering to your users. I'm curious, could you tell us one—a feature you worked on that just took so much more than people might appreciate or understand, more resources or people or brain power?

Greg Mostyn: Yeah, definitely. We released a feature called Subsets, which is essentially the ability to... I don't think any other platforms [have] built this, which probably suggests why it's so hard, but it doesn't seem like it's a massive thing. Let's say I have 1,000 documents, I could create a subset of 100 documents, another subset of 200 documents, and you can then ask questions over the whole thousand, or you can zoom into each smaller subset. That might be based on metadata, it might be based on time period, it might be based on a certain person or entity or various other characteristics.

That involved basically a complete re-architecture of our whole system because the whole way it used to work is you just upload documents into an isolated database and then upload them

into a different one. Users [said], "This is cool, I can now create these different subsets." But actually, we called it Wexler 2.0 because it was a massive revamp of the whole way the infrastructure works. So that's a very easy answer to that one. Actually, super useful for litigation. For a class action, you can have 100 different ones based on each plaintiff, but actually not trivial at all for the tech team to develop.

Kevin Young: You read my mind. I was thinking, I handle a lot of collective action cases. You could have 100 people in one case and there's maybe a big set that applies to everybody and then subsets—one person's personal file doesn't apply to the next person. Is that the thinking behind it?

Greg Mostyn: Yeah, but you can also then ask questions over the whole data set, like who is worst affected or where are there conflicting accounts or whatever it is.

Kevin Young: That's fascinating. Very cool.

Zeynep Ersin: I think we want to move to some of our kind of lightning round type questions. So Greg, what has your interest right now that our listeners should know about?

Greg Mostyn: I'm seeing a lot of various judicial opinions and thought leaders, let's say, commenting—and it's something we're seeing a lot—which is basically the explosion of AI-generated content and the litigation wave coming with it. So I think we're about to see a tidal wave of cheap litigation powered by AI agents or even just ChatGPT. We're already seeing it. I was speaking to a big law firm the other day with the personal injury firms that are using AI to hammer corporations. I think that's only going to get even more complicated and that's a real tsunami that's coming down. It's a fact-intensive problem. It's going to generate enormous amounts of litigation. The duty on the defendant is to review all the documents, but how does that even work with the business model and all the rest? I think that's going to be something we're going to have to work through. The good news is, again, it's going to be a lot of work for everyone to try and muddle their way through that.

Kevin Young: Greg, a question we ask some guests is, what was your AI eureka moment? I think for a lot of us, we remember when we were first just hit with some realization about what generative AI can do. I think yours is probably further back than a lot of people. So I'll ask it this way: what's your most recent AI eureka moment where you saw something and it just stopped you?

Greg Mostyn: So I actually think ever since you can connect your context to these models—so that has by far made this the most useful system for general productivity tasks we're doing when we're mapping out our sales pipeline and hiring plans and all the rest. The fact that I can connect my HubSpot data and data from other systems into Claude and it's able to pull those tools and then return that to me. Like I have, every morning I have something called Daily Prospect Intelligence, which is a summary of all the things that have happened with the people I'm speaking to and things in the news and all that stuff. That lands in my inbox every morning as a scheduled task. It's gone from just being something you can ask a question to, [to] something which already knows about everything that you're working on and suggests to you proactively what's important and has the context from sales pipeline and all the rest.

That's definitely been an absolute game changer in terms of how useful this software has been, because it just means it's thought of what you're thinking before you've thought of it and it already gives you something really useful rather than you having to spend hours trying to coax it

into giving you the right output. So that's definitely been the biggest eureka moment. And obviously we're trying to be a sort of AI-native company and that's been the thing that's helped that more than anything.

Zeynep Ersin: From your perspective, is there something that lawyers, law firms, legal departments do today that you think will be truly outdated in about 10 years?

Greg Mostyn: I don't think this is the most adventurous answer, but just things like charging clients for NDAs or rote templated work where we all know that AI could generate that in no time at all, filling out a template with a few things. I do think that will seem badly outdated in one year, let alone 10 years, if it doesn't feel outdated already. So I think it needs to be restructured around genuine expertise, strategic judgment, and less about the rote form-filling tasks, which I wouldn't want to be charged as a client. I do think that will seem outdated in 10 years.

Kevin Young: Greg, final question for me. Any books or articles you'd recommend our listeners check into? I know you mentioned one by Aaron Levie before, so it can be that one or a different one.

Greg Mostyn: I was going to say maybe just go on his LinkedIn and just look at everything he's posting because it's super interesting. It's an antidote to the people who are saying it's going to be job losses and AI apocalypse. Actually, he posted an article where the CEO of Goldman Sachs just the other day—I think it might have been today—basically has said, "We're seeing this at Goldman Sachs as a massive job creator, because the history of automation has meant more deep work, more deep thinking, and humans are naturally curious and inquisitive, and we're going to find more ways to use this technology to solve harder problems and go deeper into those tasks and workflows."

Maybe I'm not as bullish as that, but I do think that there's a massive amount of opportunity and productivity that's coming from this technology. Yeah, definitely check out Aaron Levie. He's really interesting on AI in the enterprise and thinking more about the positives of this technology, and how he always says it's the best time in history to be a lawyer or a software engineer. So yeah, I definitely recommend checking him out.

Zeynep Ersin: One final question, I guess, for me to kind of bring us home. Given your background and exposure to the media and entertainment industry and some pretty big names your and your father's orbit, what's your favorite album of all time?

Greg Mostyn: I was thinking about this. I think I have to give three, maybe. One of them is a really—I just remember an iconic time in my life—which was *Channel Orange*. It was about when I was... it would have been 2012, so I was in my late teens. I just have a deep nostalgic connection to that. So that's a key one. I think Fleetwood Mac, *Rumours*—obviously way before my time, but just a timeless record. And then maybe a more current one. I didn't used to be a fan, but I have totally changed my mind. I don't know if you know Sam Fender. He's a British indie artist. He's getting quite big over here. His new album's pretty good. There you go.

Zeynep Ersin: Nice. Thank you. Well, that leaves us with some things to do, people to seek out, LinkedIn feeds to follow, and music to listen to.

Greg Mostyn: Perfect.

Kevin Young: Greg, thank you so much for taking the time. We wish you and Wexler all the best, and we hope we can have you back soon.

Zeynep Ersin: Thanks so much, Greg.

Greg Mostyn: Thanks so much for having me.

Zeynep Ersin: Thanks for spending time with us today on Pioneers and Pathfinders. I'm Zeynep Ersin.

Kevin Young: And I'm Kevin Young. We'll see you next time.