

YESIM NAZLAR:

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. Welcome to the AFRALO single purpose call on ARIWG report taking place on Thursday 16th of July 2020 at 16:00 UTC.

On our call today on the English channel we have Seun Ojedeji, Maureen Hilyard, Vernatius Ezeama, Joan Katambi, Gabriel Bombambo, Remmy Nweke, Abdulkarim Oloyede, Dave Kissoondoyal, Aziz Hilali, Sarah Kiden, Tijani Ben Jemaa, and Isaac Maposa has also just joined us as well.

On the Spanish channel, we have Olevie Kouami.

Currently, we don't have any apologies received for today's call.

From staff's side, we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Yaovi Atohoun, Herb Waye, and myself, Yeşim Nazlar and I'll also be doing call management for today's call.

As you know, we have French interpretation and our interpreters are Jacques and Camila. And we do have real-time transcription service provided on today's call, and I've just shared the link with you, so please do take a link. And our final reminder is to please keep your lines muted when not speaking and also please state your name before speaking, not only for the transcription but also for the interpretation purposes as well, please. And now I'd like to leave the floor back over to you, Seun. Thank you so much.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Thanks a lot, Yesim. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. Before I continue, let me recognize the presence of the chair of ALAC, Maureen. From what I understand, it's good morning for her. And all the colleges that have virtually made it on this call, members of AFRALO, thanks for making it to this call. I think it was just last week also that we planned around this, we discussed this during our monthly call, and of course, thanks to all the members who have been able to attend on short notice. Thanks to all the ALAC members from this region as well who have actually, the three of them are on the call, as I understand from the list. And of course, to staff who have made this possible.

So this meeting is to discuss the final report of the ARIWG working group, and of course, [inaudible] discussion during our monthly call, some observations were made mostly from our ALAC reps from the region, and of course, we thought it was important to further understand the issues and also give some of us more time to actually go through the report, and also so that we can then read and of course so that we can discuss in a more informed manner during this single-purpose call.

I've also requested that the chair of ALAC be available on this call to kind of give us a general overview of the report, and of course, it is going to be a general discussion and I hope that we'd all focus on the substance of this discussion and of course, the end of it all, I hope it will be worthwhile of our time.

The agenda has been presented in front of us. I've already gone ahead and first done the first and second, but nevertheless, that is the agenda.

Any suggestion for modifications? Seeing o hand up, hearing no voice, I would consider the agenda adopted, and of course, this then takes me to the next item, which is item three to hear brief remarks from our ALAC members who are from our region, especially regarding the final report. I would give each ALAC member two minutes to just give their brief remark because they're actually kind of our major source of resource when it comes to this report. So I would like to give them that floor and of course, anyone that wants to start first can raise his hand. The floor is open to Tijani, Abdulkarim, and Dave. Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you so much, Seun. Thank you for this call. It was asked for during our last monthly call by members of the AFRALO, because I presented, I exposed my opinion about this issue. I said that I said on the ALAC mailing list that this report should be discussed before being sent to the board. It should be discussed by the ALAC members after consultation with their RALOs, and then it should be voted on by the 15 members of ALAC.

This made Maureen exceptionally a little bit angry, because she thinks that I don't do anything, and at the end I say we have to discuss. So, for the record, I made the same remark about the progress report that was sent to the board one time before, and I was said the same thing. We received the report a few days before it is sent to the board. I think that it cannot be discussed in a few days, and I think that because Maureen said that I had to go to the Wiki to follow and on the dashboard and

then to make my remarks there. And there is where the progress is made.

By the way, I am listed as member of this working group, but I have never received an e-mail from this working group. I have never received an invitation to any meeting of this working group. I don't know how I am a member. I discovered that I am a member but I am not.

So it is not a personal thing. I think this is a very important report. It will shape the future of At-Large. And for much less important things, such as statement about something which is not very important for the end users, we draft a statement or an opinion, we put it for the comments of the community for a sufficient time, and then we vote on.

This report was sent without being voted on and without being discussed or commented on. I find this not normal. I will not say more since I have only two minutes, so I will give the floor to those who want to continue [inaudible]. Thank you.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Thank you, Tijani. There will definitely still be enough time to discuss this on the agenda, and of course, we will take a lot of discussion at that time. Thanks for your remark, and of course, now any other ALAC member who wants to speak? We have Dave and ...

DAVE KISSOONDOYAL:

Yes. Can I continue, Seun?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes, you have the floor.

DAVE KISSOONDOYAL: I think the report has been sent, but it is good that we are going to have a thorough discussion, and I think that the discussion should not stop only for this meeting but it has to follow until the report is sent to the board. From what I understood, the report has not been sent to the board, it has been sent to the community. If Maureen can clarify this, thank you.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay. Thank you. Maureen, can you clarify a quick one on the [inaudible] please?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Do you want me to start the presentation now, or respond to Dave's question?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Just to respond to Dave's question.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Okay. Yes, you're correct, Dave. What we've done is we've actually sent the report to MSSI and we had actually said that we were going to get it to them by June 30, and that was ICANN 68 happening around that time. There was so much work going on with that, plus finishing up the report and getting it to MSSI.

There's MSSI, which is the multi-stakeholder strategy and strategic initiatives group. They are the first process before it goes to the board proper, of course, but they're the first step. And then as the OEC—

HEIDI ULLRICH: Maureen, it's the Organizational Effectiveness Committee of the board. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes, exactly.

SEUN OJEDEJI: It's a lot of acronyms.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yeah, I know. [So also I think that's us, that's At-Large.] Yes, the Organizational Effectiveness Committee, and they include, they do have board members on that particular committee before it goes to the thing. So there's a process, and this is why we've been saying I wanted to—we did promise that we would get it to that first stage by June 30, and it was last minute before we finished the report. We only had a couple of days and we put it out as soon as it was ready to go to that first stage, which really didn't give us time, and we do apologize for that, which is why I'm really pleased that you've taken the initiative to want to hear more so that when we get—and I hear from Heidi that they're actually looking at it and they can give us some feedback before it goes to the board proper in September, that we will actually all have an

opportunity to not only discuss what we've done but also have the advantage of getting some feedback from MSSI and the OEC group. If we need to make some amendments, we can discuss those and get it done properly before the full board gets to see it.

SEUN OJEDEJI: All right. Thank you.

MAUREEN HILYARD: So there's method to my madness, I'm afraid. But I'm glad that I can come and explain it to this group. That's fine. Thank you.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thanks, Maureen. Thanks for that update. And a quick one from Abdulkarim.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: I probably don't have much to say. I think we need to look for a way forward, and to me, I think Tijani has explained what the situation is. Maureen's given an explanation to say it was because we were in a rush. But the problem is what is the way forward. Are we saying we'll still be able to comment? Because my initial opinion is there's nothing wrong with having a minority opinion of [inaudible] and drafting something to say this is our take on this thing, on this issue.

That was my original thought and that is what I think we're going to do today, so look for a way of how we can—because [inaudible] I don't

think [inaudible] problem. I don't think—we don't have to agree all the time. [inaudible] intention is for everybody's voice to be heard, and for each to be taken into consideration, especially in the entire process.

So I want—I think because my major thinking is [most of the report is from] [inaudible] then that is the end of it. If we're saying we're going to be able to comment on this thing once it comes back from the committee, I don't know how we're going to do that. What is the point in doing—one of the things [I have] is about Tijani has problems regarding the part about [inaudible] public comment. Some of this problem I have [inaudible] it's an opportunity—for example, I'll give you an example. It's the issue of [the staffing.] The report is saying [we'll have somebody going to be temporary staff.] To me, that's not good enough. We can actually [inaudible] we have somebody who's going to be permanent, [inaudible]

SEUN OJEDEJI: Abdulkarim, let's leave the discussion on the report on item five. Just needed your brief introduction, just a brief remark.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: That's all [inaudible]. Thank you.

SEUN OJEDEJI: All right. Thanks. So we will move on to item four, which is presentation of the report. I'm going to ask Maureen to do a quick talk about the report. It's good to hear that to some extent, opportunities for review or for comments, to hear the view of members of the community is

not—the window is not closed yet. So that is comforting to know. Of course, there may be some lessons that need to be learned. We would always continue to improve and of course, we have to also continue to accommodate ourselves to some extent. So I think we would get to summarize that on item six. For now, for the sake of those who have not really heard about this At-Large review implementation working group report, [inaudible]. I hope that this would be a good opportunity for us to hear that and of course, just as Tijani was saying, this particular [inaudible] also listed on it, but I don't think this last one was shared with the working group yet because I even searched my mail, I don't think it was formally sent to the working group. So maybe Maureen could also talk about that when she does the presentation: at what point does it get to the working group and in terms of the development of the final report, I'll leave that for those that actually were involved in this development and of course, what is the way forward as the chair of ALAC that Maureen is thinking is the way forward from our own perspective, and considering the observations that have been made? That could actually help this discussion on item five when we get there, so it would be good to hear [so that] we don't start discussion issues that have already been addressed.

So on that note, I would give Maureen the floor to speak about presentation of ARI working group report. You have the floor, Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you very much, Seun, and thank you to Tijani and Dave and Abdulkarim for raising important issues. And you can be sure that although it seemed pretty rushed at the time, it was planned that there

was going to be some further discussions on this. And I'll talk about that as we're going through the report.

But what I thought I would do is, especially as there's some people here who weren't with us when we actually first started this journey that really started in 2015. And I know that Tijani and Aziz—good to see you, Aziz—were there. I think it was the end of January 2015 where MSSI gathered us together and we already knew that we were going to be reviewed, but it was the first meeting to start preparing us for the review and for what it is that we would need to do.

So when we had that very first meeting, moving through that particular year, it was a year when we were looking at self-assessment, we were really looking at what are some of the things that the reviewers, when they were finally appointed, because at that time they hadn't been appointed, what would they be looking at?

So we were already starting to look at what's happening within At-Large at the moment and what are some of the things that they might possibly pick up. So it was a year and a half later when the ITEMS team was selected by ICANN to actually do the review, and of course then, I think it was in Helsinki, we actually met as groups, because I can remember APRALO having their discussions with one of the reviewers. So that was a RALO discussion, and they did that with all the RALOs. They had meetings with the ALAC, they had meetings with working groups. It was quite a comprehensive and busy time at that meeting.

And then it wasn't until half a year later, in January as you can see, there was the draft that came out which when we got it, we said, woah,

that's interesting stuff in this report. And there was a public comment and then they presented their final report a year after they had been appointed.

And then from there, we worked on their report and made some suggestions and working with OEC and MSSSI, and then we went through the implementation plan, the sorts of things that are more recent. By 2018, we started working on the plan and the board had looked at it, they liked our plan, then they said, okay, that's your plan, start working on how you're going to actually implement that plan. And that's the work we've been doing over the last 18 months.

So it's been a long and arduous process. and for those of us who've lived and breathed it for the last five years, I guess it was like, I think I'm over it. I'm over the implementation part. And we completed—we've just got a few tweaks to go to actually have completed the things that we promised the board that we would do to look at the things that they raised within the review. And what we've got now is in the report, all we were just saying was this is what we said we were going to do, we've done those, we've completed all those activities, we're actually on to the next stage now. We're into continuous improvement.

So that's the journey. And just to let you know that it isn't something we did overnight and then we said, "Okay, this is the report, this is what we're going to do." It's something that we've thought about from the time in 2015 when we were looking, we were actually already starting to think then about what are some things, and changes were starting to be made even in 2015 based on that self-evaluation. Next slide, please.

You have access to this so that you can go through it at your leisure. But in January 2017 when ITEMS finally made their findings, they came up with 16 recommendations and some of them, you'll notice, and some of them you'll think, "I haven't seen that one before." There were some, for example, first one had to do with ALAC advice and comments and statements. They didn't feel it was very clear as to what it is that ALAC was—what comments were being made. There were lots of working groups. There's a bit of a mishmash about what was being recommended by the ALAC and how it was done. So you can already understand from that that we've made changes to make things a lot clearer.

The second one was the one that everybody really was up in arms about, is because they wanted us to get basically rid of the ALSes. ALSes are part and parcel of our whole organization. There was no way we were going to get rid of ALSes. Although we appreciated their view of having—because the purpose of At-Large is to bring the individual voices into the At-Large community's discussions. So we appreciated that, but we didn't see the point in actually getting rid of ALSes because they were such an important part of our work in the communities, and we didn't think that the review team totally got that.

So we were quite against the empowered membership model that they were presenting there. But as you know, item two is something that we've really focused on and we've focused on it from the viewpoint, first of all, of the ALSes, and because we've actually got more time to work on it, we're actually now moving into looking at individual members and how we can make their roles more effective within At-Large as well.

Item three of course was to do with staff and things that they suggested that staff would do, and that's been worked on. The fourth one was to do with leadership, and the review said that the ALAC leadership team was making too many decisions on their own and that—in fact, I know that statements came from RALOs and others that RALOs felt that they weren't having enough input into the decision making that was made by the ALAC leadership team. They wanted to have more input.

Of course, for me, myself, when I came onboard, I took that very much to heart and created the ALT Plus so that the RALO leaders—and that's all RALO leadership team—were part and parcel of that decision making. And in fact, I know that it's my fault that in the last 18 months, the ALT Plus team has focused more on the process, because I needed to get this information done for the review report, so for the 18 months, I've actually—every ALT Plus meeting and ALAC meeting, I said I do need some support in this, please check on your—as Tijani said, check on your dashboards if there's anything that you want to have input, please put it in there so that we can actually work on it.

And yeah, so that became a big issue too. It was a major change, and it was accepted by some and not by others. But that was something that had been pointed out by the review and we needed to work on that one, and I think we've actually made some good resolutions. And moving forward, now that the review is over and we're going into continuous improvement, for example in the next ALT Plus meeting, we're proposing less process and more looking at policy issues. They may not be just policy policy, they may be operational policy like what's happening in ICANN that we can have some input into. So the ALT Plus is actually going to be very different from what it used to be.

Then I think that five and six, we sort of negated because they were things that were already in place and we didn't think that they needed to be changed, we already had GSE involvement, the electoral process was something that had been developed by At-Large and we did not feel that we were going to change it because somebody said it was too complex. So we just left that.

The working groups, there was a mess of working groups. So for policy, we've consolidated them all into the CPWG and now of course because there's been a n overload of work and probably more so since the pandemic, we had to break that up into one that's looking at operational stuff so that we're looking at two different sorts of aspects of the work that we look at within At-Large to contribute to ICANN.

And of course, we've got our outreach and engagement. That's always going to be important. So that's something else. Social media, we joined that with another—8 and 9, we sort of merged those together, and then 10 and 11, there was no way we were going to replace the ATLAS. We felt that that was really important to keep, so we rejected that one. And fortunately, the board also says, okay, you won't have to concentrate on that one, we'll work on that one later. And they did, of course, with ATLAS III.

Communication, that's something that we're working on. So there are three items that we actually completely have not done anything with, and that's 12, 14 and 15, because they involve funding that is totally out of our control, so we have not. Those were the three things that we said to the board—and I agreed—that At-Large itself would not be able to work on.

So those were the 16, and of those, only eight of them were the ones that we've been focusing on. It's taken us a year of implementing the actual process, the steps that we needed to take in order to make those improvements. It took us a year to plan that, and it was a working group that actually worked on planning it and there were representatives from each of the RALOs, and some were more participative than others, but at the same time, we had to work on who came along, who made the suggestions, and what the suggestions were for change and that's what we implemented.

So that was a year of planning. We gave it to the board, the board said go for it, we agree with what you're doing, and that's what we've been doing for the last 18 months. So that's the review.

The rest of the presentation that I've got—and I think you all have access to it—if you go to the next slide, please, as we were going through, of course, every step along the way, I've shown on the journey we've actually had to write a full report on what it was that we were doing. For example, with the feasibility study, this is just actually one page of a full report, but after we got the recommendations from ITEMS, we went through each of the 16 recommendations and we said what we liked about it, what we didn't like about it. And what we didn't like about it, of course we said we rejected.

But for example, in ALAC advice, some of the things that they were recommending, we already had it in place. But we recognized that they were actually things that we could fix. For example, people couldn't find the information that they needed very easily, the website wasn't very clear, and the Wiki spaces have always been a mess, but ITI, the new

initiative that's looking at ICANN's new website, that is going to hopefully help us, except that we'll be way down the track before our wikis get looked at. But at the same time, ICANN's already putting in place things that are going to help us with our communication mechanisms as well.

But I think that for example like with number two about the empowered membership model, that was a big reject. I don't think we—although, as I said, we appreciated the model, and we have given more focus. I think that was one of the reasons why we said to all the RALOs it's really important that the RALOs give their individual members who cannot get to an ALS, don't belong to an ALS, not interested in a local ALS, but they're interested in participating in ICANN, an that's what we're focusing on, getting those individual voices in.

So this was basically the page that was our starting point for writing up our feasibility study and giving reasons why we were going to accept some of the things and what we were going to do about it, and things that we already supported that they recommended. Next. Very quickly, I'll go through these others.

Then of course, the board, their resolution in 2018, every time we wrote a report, they said, "Yes, we like it," they never said "No, we don't like it," but they said "Yes, we like it, go ahead and do whatever the next stage was." And for this one, we'd actually explained what we liked, what we didn't like, and how we wanted to move ahead. And when we put that report to the board, the board said, "Yes, that looks really reasonable. Okay, so now we want you to do the next steps." Next slide, please.

So that's when we went in and we used that year of looking at those eight items and developing the steps that we would take to make the improvements that the board had actually said we needed to make. So that was a really busy time, because we had to be really creative, we had to look at what are some ways in which we can make change that is actually going to make At-Large a better place. And I think that for those of you who were not here in 2015 so that you could actually see the difference between what we were doing in 2015, the way that we were doing things, and the way in which we've tried to improve how things can be done a little bit more efficiently, a little bit more effectively.

So for those of us who lived it, we can actually see those changes. At the same time, some change may be acceptable to some people and not to others, but I think we're looking big picture and seeing what benefits it brings to us as a community. Okay, so just moving very quickly. Next slide, please.

The dashboards were really important. From the outset, we created a timeline. We said that issue one and two would need a little bit more time. Everything else, we could do by June. And this is what we've actually done, this is why we're saying we're going to need a little bit more time to finish off—well, issue one is always going to be we're always going to be continually improving the way in which we give advice and statements, but the others, the issue two, as I said before, we're finishing off the work that Alan's been doing with ALSes. That document will become a policy for us, and we'll be working on something for individual members as well so that we get more people in there. Next slide, please.

But when we're looking at dashboards, for every month, we actually diarized whatever it was that we did, and each of those eight issues for every month. Sometimes there were some months when we didn't actually focus on [inaudible] so there may be a month missing. I think for this one, there's nothing in April on issue one because we might have been focusing on something else. But have a look in there, you will see that there was actually something happening every month in every one of those issues. Next slide, please.

I think when it comes to what was actually done, I think that I've actually put one on [its side,] the At-Large work effort, the three lines represent the timelines, what we actually had finished for the first and second and final report, and the amount of work that was actually done in getting those eight issues done. So the pink line demonstrates that there were only two issues that we didn't work on. We put all our efforts into six of those issues.

But the issue two, because Alan was very keen and he'd actually already set up a plan for the ALS Mobilization, but with his EPDP responsibilities he didn't have time to get started until the last six months. There were meetings happening before then, but the biggest efforts have come in the last six months as you can see. And similarly, with the metrics, we couldn't really work on the metrics until we'd completed all the other activities.

But I think for us, and especially in light of getting individual member participation for item two, we found that the biggest impact for us was the fact that we had so many people coming, attending the CPWG meetings after ATLAS III, and that was a really positive progress for us.

So when we're looking at why we're doing things, it's actually the data that we collect, and this is really important, that we actually get that. That data really showed for us that what happened at ATLAS III really made an impact on what we're doing and what we're wanting to achieve in At-Large.

So I'm really sorry that it went a little bit over time, Seun, but I think it's important that people understand that it hasn't been a slow process, it's been a long-term, and at every At-Large, ALT Plus meeting, and every ALAC meeting, I really did try to focus people on contributing as much as they could, except that we became really rushed at the end. And we will continue to have these discussions as an ALAC and as At-Large, as an ALT Plus from now on. Thank you.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Thanks, Maureen, for the speech, for the presentation, and thanks also for your concluding statement in terms of the commencement and engagement going forward, [inaudible] improve the engagement on things going forward.

This is the point where we'll open the floor for comments. The comment can either be on the report or anything that has been made in terms of concerns that may have been raised. But from what I hear so far, is that the report is still open for review, for comments. It will still indeed be shared with the community. I think I like the final statement of Maureen in terms of indicating that there'll be an improvement in engagement of the community, ALT Plus and ALAC.

I think when I was on ALAC, it's very important to actually ensure that ALAC is engaged on this. I think it will be good that before the statement is delivered, I think if need be, there should be an understanding with the MSSI that there would still be engagement with the community on the report.

I think it's a procedural thing that should normally just happen. It doesn't mean that the content of the report would change, especially considering that the report itself is about updates on what is the progress made so far. There may be some section of it that may not reflect the status of things properly, there may be some additions that need to be made in terms of status of things that may be suggested within the community or within ALT Plus or the ALAC. And it's only when there's an open opportunity to actually comment that those feedbacks can come in.

I'd like to open the floor once again. I've not seen any hands up yet. I'd like to open the floor, anyone who wants to speak. Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much, Seun, and thank you, Maureen, for the report. My comments were about the process, and why I spoke about the process was because I had issues in the substance, in the content of the report. The reviewers said that the ALT, the At-Large leadership team was taking too many decisions on their own. Their proposal is to suppress it. What we did? We created ALT Plus. Okay, very good. But is it the response to the concern raised by the reviewers? No. We created

another, if you want, structure, which is doing good work, [if it is an addition, good,] no problem. But the problem is that this ALT Plus [erased] totally the ALT, which is the At-Large leadership team.

For the record, At-Large leadership team is a structure which is in the rules of procedure of ALAC, and that have specific role. If we replace ALT by ALT Plus, it would be a big problem because ALT Plus so far is just a sort of another ALAC meeting, if you want, because we gather people, of course, it is open to the ALT, to the RALOs, leaders, etc. But those people are all welcome to the ALAC meeting and they are attending ALAC meetings. So we don't have to duplicate the ALAC meetings so that we have those people informed and to have the input of those people to the ALAC.

If we lose the ALT, the ALT is there to help the chair, to help him for the management of the At-Large, of the ALAC. And of course, it is said in the rules that the ALT doesn't have any decision-making powers. And the reviewers were wrong. I have been on the ALT since long, and the ALT have never decided for ALAC. Never. It was to prepare the ALAC meetings and then to implement or to follow up on the decisions of the ALAC meeting.

So the ALT has a very important role, in my point of view. I don't say that the ALT Plus is not good. It can be good. But it has to have a defined and clear role. It shouldn't be only a gathering of everyone so that we can discuss, etc. It should have roles, clear roles, and in this case, yes, we can add it. It is an addition. But it shouldn't be a substitute to the ALT. This is one remark that I wanted to make. Thank you.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thanks a lot, Tijani. Maureen has put something in the chat. Does she want to just quickly say that out?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes. Sorry. I agree with Tijani about that the reviewers' view about the ALAC leadership team as opposed to the At-Large leadership team that we now have, that the comment had been made that—I don't know where the comments were from, but they were obviously taken as considered important by the reviewers. And so one of the things, as I mentioned before, is that we're going to go back to the ALT Plus as it was meant to be, and this was to allow the At-Large leadership, community and anyone else who wants to come to discuss issues. And this is an important issue, and I'd already highlighted to Heidi and the staff that after the review, that we would go back to what the real purpose of the ALT Plus is, and that's to actually look at issues so that we're not repeating, as we have been doing because we've been focusing on policy, focusing too much on the general stuff that At-Large is doing and not on the specifics which the ALT Plus is supposed to be trying to do.

This is going to be another form of a change, and change is always going to be difficult to do when people are having to adapt to a new way of doing things, but I think that just, as I said, looking at the big picture, how can we make things easier for people to understand? How can we bring community members into the ALT Plus to listen to the ALT Plus, to listen to their leaders talking about issues that are important to At-

Large? So that's one of the things that we need to grow within our community. Thank you.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Thanks, Maureen. Any other intervention? From what I'm hearing, the major view on the report—and Tijani has made an observation in terms of its contents. Of course, the provisions of the rules of ALT Plus should no longer— if it is desirable, considering its work, should no longer be informal. [One we already heard then is to find its way] into our rules, with clear rules for them.

I would just want to note, especially to the chair of ALAC, that it is from what I'm hearing from her, she's confirming or indicating that this report would indeed—please, Maureen, raise your hand and correct me if this is not the case, that this report would be—there would be engagement within ALAC, within ALT. ALT, which means that chairs of the RALOs are there, and they may engage our community before it finally goes to the board. Is that what I hear in summary, Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Seun. The report reports on what we've actually done, and what we completed according to what the board asked to do when in their feedback they said, "Yes, you can do these eight items and these are the things that you have to do to show that you've actually done what we've asked." And we've done that.

So please read the report, but I don't think that there's anything that we can change. The only thing that we can change is how we're going to

move forward, what are the continuous improvements that we can make. Now, that is something that we can have input into. We can't actually change the report because it reports on what we've completed.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Okay. Maureen, thanks for that. I think maybe I didn't phrase that properly. I think it's clear that the report—I have gone through the report—is about what has been done. The point, I think, which has been made is that the way we did attend to some of the issues in the report may need to be done differently, could have been done differently. That is the point.

So if there is a continuous commitment from ALAC that there would be a review of how we improve on what has been done, because I think that is the main goal. At this point in time, I don't think what has been done can be—what has been written in the report in terms of updates needs to change, what needs to change is how we need to improve on what [is written in these] reports in terms of the activities, in terms of the processes, in terms of—like the observation that Tijani made.

So I think one of the fears that has been said that I think may be a concern is that once we close this chapter by sending this report finally to the board, there may be no interest again to actually think about how do we improve. I think that is the main thing, because that will then close the chapter of things. So I think that's intentional effort to actually see that—Dave, I see your hand is up. You have the floor.

DAVE KISSOONDOYAL: I think, okay, the stage we have reached right now, we're in the implementation stage, but I personally think that the issue lies in the review itself. For example, item four where it states that the ALT makes too many decisions on its own. But I think this has its validity since the ALT was the ExCom. I do remember when I first joined the ALAC, I was member of the ExCom. The ExCom was like the executive committee of the ALAC together with the chair, take decisions and then those decisions were approved in the ALAC committees.

But when the reviewers came and said that, okay, the ALT take too much decisions, this is not a valid point from my point of view, because the reason of the ALT was to take decisions. So right now, we are questioning in the implementation space the items of the review itself, but we should have taken this matter during the review itself, not at this implementation phase. I think I made my point, if it's clear. Thank you.

SEUN OJEDEJI: All right. Thanks. We're at the top of the hour now. I would like to request staff to allow a few more minutes before we round up on this.

YESIM NAZLAR: Hi Seun, sure, we have actually confirmed an extra 15 minutes total, and we have already used four minutes of it. So we still have time. Back over to you.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thanks, Yesim. Abdulkarim, go ahead.

ABDULKARIM OLOYEDE: Thank you very much. My comment is, yes, I want to first of all thank the leadership for coming to this meeting, and I think it's important. But going forward, I think the report is going through evaluation at this moment. When the report comes back, what happens? Because I'm thinking, do we need to wait to get to that stage? Because I think based on my own opinion, I think it's going to be difficult to actually—and where I stand is, I'm not saying our own opinion or my own opinion must be [inaudible]. But at the same time, there should be a mechanism to say, "You know what? Somebody disagree with this and this is what he says about this."

And to me, it adds value to the report itself if we said there is a room for minority opinion to be on the report. That is what I'm thinking. I'm not saying I totally disagree with the entire report. There are lots of good things and I want to commend the leadership on those good things they've done. But there are some issues which I just think it's better for us to resolve them at this time. If we say we should wait until when we're taking it to the board, I think it might be too late at that point in time. It's better for us to say, can we itemize things we probably disagree with? And we look for [inaudible] this is what we think needs to happen. Let us [inaudible] and submit it to ALAC. That is what I think is going to be—because now it seems as if we're going to agree with everything and it's going to be the end of it. But I'm sure this is going to come up again later on. Why not we document it, put it in writing and submit it formally? I'm not against the process—it's a good report.

SEUN OJEDEJI: All right. Thanks, Abdulkarim. So I have a couple of hands up. I'm going to now be very strict with the two-minute timer, please, so please [inaudible] making an intervention. Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Seun. I think there is a little bit of confusion. I want to make it clear that the reviewers proposed a plan for review for At-Large that we rejected. At-Large rejected it, and At-Large proposed to the board an alternative proposal that the board accepted. So the review we are doing, we are implementing today, is our review. We proposed it. And this alternative proposal was done by not one or two or small group, it was done by the whole At-Large. The RALOs contributed, everyone contributed. So it was a very good work and I am really happy to have this done by the community, and this is what I wanted the implementation plan to be done like that. No problem.

So the implementation now is to make our proposal of a review, to implement it. This is the implementation plan that we are working on, and the report is the report of the implementation of our proposal. But our proposal didn't say how we will implement them. That's why the implementation also needs to be discussed by the whole community, because it is a practical way to reach the review, and we need to have it adapted, adopted by the whole community. Since it is the point of view of the community, since it will impact the whole of community, the whole community should adopt it. It is not, "It's done, the report is like this so it is done." No, it is not done, in my point of view. It must be discussed and it must be adopted. Thank you.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you, Tijani. Olévié.

OLÉVIÉ KOUAMI: I would like to first and foremost thank everyone for the efforts that have been made to present this report and to organize the call [inaudible] to take part in this discussion. I have followed the presentation very closely, I was very interested in the matter. Have I understood well, the report is based on what has already been accomplished? So there's no further discussion to be had on what is actually included in the report. So with that, I'd like to know what we can do on a regular basis with the tools so as to make sure we can participate at every policy consultation and every comment period, because I didn't follow closely and I feel like I've missed part of the possibilities to contribute to the report and to the work that made it up.

Other than that, I would like to know who are the members of the ALT. Is it only the chair? So, what is decided within the group, the ALT is the representative of the chairs of the different RALOs? Other than that, I would like to congratulate you all for the magnificent work that has been accomplished. it wouldn't have been possible without you. Thank you.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thanks a lot. The ALT is composed of ALAC, leaders of each RALO, the chairs of each RALO, I think the liaisons as well are part of the ALT. There may be others, but those are the ones that I—I think past ALAC

chairs, if I'm write, are also on the ALT. Maureen may put it in the chat to correct that if it's not the case.

In terms of—I hear Tijani, I hear Abdulkarim, I hear some of the other comments from those who have spoken. What I would suggest as a way forward from the report itself, there are some of the issues which the approach of implementation of eight is they are basically technical in terms of the dashboard, in terms of outreach and engagement dashboard and things like that which does not necessarily impact significantly on the community as such, but I think some of the issues in terms of the one that Tijani raised are those that are actually very critical to the future and the participation and the interest of the community.

So I think that there is a point in saying that, how do we implement our report? Just since we discuss, we actually engage the community [to get] the report, to get our response to the board. How we implement it should also [be representative to the] community. But that did not happen. It would be good to hear from ALAC how they intend to actually engage the community in the implementation going forward since the final, the combined report was not actually presented to the community.

Even though we recognize—I personally recognize actually that sections of the report were developed by the community because there are some of the issues that actually have representation from the community. So I think we should note that as well.

So in terms of way forward, I see your hand up, I'm going to give you the floor soon. So in terms of the way forward, I would like to perhaps suggest that if we can have this commitment from the ALAC leadership, that the items which are of critical concern, when communicated to ALAC, would be considered for improvement. That would actually—if there can be a process for that. Okay, this is from so so date to so so date, you are welcome to submit any concerns, anything that you think that we should improve, not in the report that is being submitted but actually in the issues, and the approach by which the implementation was done. If there's anything that you think we should improve upon going forward outside of the reports, then people should hear them and then ALAC should have a process by which it wants to implement that.

That is what I'm suggesting as a way forward. If we are in agreement with that, we can then agree as AFRALO to formally communicate that to ALAC chair. Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

It was an old hand.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Okay, so I would like to hear reactions to my suggestion. Basically, what I'm suggesting as a way forward is that we actually recognize that, yes, this report, the full report in itself which provide updates on status of implementation of the At-Large review proposal, did not experience a wide consultation of the community, but irrespective of that, there is a need to improve on the way we are implementing some of the issues.

So from us, as AFRALO, we would be communicating to ALAC on the importance of ALAC to have a process in place by which feedback can be gotten from the community on areas of implementation that need to be improved upon and what exactly needs to be done in terms of the improvement.

That is what I'm suggesting as a way forward. The report itself has already gone to MSSI. Yes, the report has gone to MSSI. It still does not mean that we can't improve our approach of doing things in terms of the content. That update of the content does not need to go through MSSI. We can improve ourselves within the community. So if ALAC can actually communicate a process post report submission, that will also be, in terms of a way forward, I think that would be a good thing from my own thinking. I would like to hear reactions to that. We're already two minutes past the 15 minutes that we were given. Any one-minute interventions on what I just said? Tijani, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much. I would like to support what Maureen said. Please read the report. It is very important. Second point, we need to have the issues inside the report, the content of the report, please read it and tell us what you get from it. Is it really an improvement? Are we improving? Is there any other way to improve by implementing our proposals? This is what we need to do now, and this is our contribution. We need AFRALO to contribute to this discussion. I know the discussion is not open, but we need to open it. thank you.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Okay. Any other—if I'm not hearing support for what I've suggested as a way forward, I won't take it up—I won't give it as an action item for the AFRALO leadership. I would like to hear support on that, otherwise I think we won't have any consensus opinion on this matter. So I'd like to hear from ... A tick mark or an X would help. I see a tick mark from Tijani. I see a tick mark from Sarah, from Dave. I've not seen any reject yet, so on that note, I will take it as an action item for AFRALO leadership [to get] the ALAC rep from our region to draft a note to the ALAC on our proposed way forward on this matter.

Having said that, let's also indeed put another action item to staff, or maybe to At-Large, the AFRALO leadership to think around how to further engage the AFRALO community on the importance of actually going through the report and also participating in it.

This is going to be a second process to what we're talking about, especially if our first communication to ALAC is affected, because [inaudible] mechanisms, having our people go through the reports, giving their feedback, and when we give the feedback to ALAC, it doesn't get considered. So we need to first get a response from ALAC on our first statement on whether there's going to be a clear process that'll be defined for that. And if there is, then we can engage the community.

Having said that, I'd like to thank everyone who has joined this call and I'd like to thank Maureen especially for actually waking up very early to attend this call. Thanks to staff and to the interpreters for staying extra on this particular one. It's been a very engaging session and I hope that you have a good morning, good afternoon and good night to those who are already going to bed. Thanks a lot. Bye for now.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Bye.

YESIM NAZLAR: Thank you all. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a great rest of the day. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]