

---

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. Welcome to the AFRALO ALS mobilization report document call on Monday the 23rd of November 2020 at 16:00 UTC.

On the call today on the English channel we have Seun Ojedeji, [Adam Ahmat Doungous], Adri Loubser, Bram Malawi, Daniel Nanghaka, Katambi Joan, Sarah Kiden, and Abdeldjalil Bachar Bong.

On the French channel, we have Michel Linze, Bamba Vissindou, Olévié Kouami, and Aziz Hilali.

We have received apologies from Abdulkarim Ayopo Oloyede, and Pastor Peters.

From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Alperen Eken, Yaovi Atohoun, and myself, Claudia Ruiz on call management.

Our interpreters for today are Isabelle and Jacques. And if I could please remind everyone to please state their names when taking the floor so that the interpreters can identify you on the other language channels, and to please keep your microphones muted when not speaking to prevent any background noise. Thank you very much, and with this, I turn the call over to you, Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thanks a lot, Claudia. Hello everyone. Welcome to our call and thanks to those who have been able to make it on this call. The agenda is as presented. Before we go into the agenda proper, I'd like to hear if

---

*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.*

---

there's any suggestion for modification on the agenda. Okay, seeing no hands up, hearing no voice, I take it as the agenda has been adopted, and of course, we move to the next agenda item, which is a brief introduction.

This call is to discuss our views and opinion on the ALS mobilization work party report. If you recall, the report was circulated I think a month ago if my dates are right, and we asked our members to provide comments. The essence of this is, as you know, this report is going to have impact on how ALSes would operate within At-Large and ICANN going forward, and of course, we felt it was very important that members from our region had this opportunity.

Of course, members from our region were part of the members that actually developed the proposal, the document itself, but we also want to give an opportunity for the entire membership to have a second look at the report to be able to give their opinion about it. And of course, from AFRALO, working with staff, we put up a Google doc which is also linked in the agenda. The Google doc is where we put up the report for people to make comments. We only took comments, not edits, so comments on any section of the report, and we had a lot of comments.

I should note that we got [inaudible] comments from some of our members, especially Pastor Peters, and I'd like to thank him for his comments. One of the things that we did as leadership was that we had a special call with Pastor Peters not long ago. The essence is that we want to streamline the comment as much as possible so that what we have on this general call is few and we would not be taking too much of the entire membership's time.

---

So we had a special purpose call with Pastor Peters, some members of the work party were also on the call, and of course, the AFRALO leadership. The essence of the call was to deliberate and then see some of the comments, specifically the comments Pastor Peters has made, and see if we can actually resolve some of them by providing clarifications to one another and trying to explain the intent of some of the sections of the report which Pastor Peters has commented on. And I'm glad that we're able to make good progress with that to resolve some of the comments, and the ones that we have which are still open are the ones that you have on the document at the moment.

So what we're going to be doing apart from the open comments from Pastor Peters which are few, and we'll also be looking at the other comments that have been made by the rest of the membership. So the approach to this is for us to look at the comments that we have open at the moment, see if there's anybody against us making those comments as part of our concerns to ALAC [inaudible] report.

So that is the essence of this call. There would be no new comments that we'd be getting from this call, we would be looking at the existing comments that have been made and then seeing if there's any support or otherwise to go ahead with them. And of course, we would be providing some clarification as well.

So that's the methodology I'm suggesting, and then at the end of it all, we would then discuss after we do the review, then discuss next steps on how to get the comments, our feedback to ALAC based on the number of comments that finally survived, that we finally agree on from this discussion. I'd like to pause here and see if there's any suggestion

---

for modification to what I've suggested as working methodology for this call. Any comments, any different opinion, please, this is the opportunity to raise it now, the floor is open.

Okay, seeing no hand up and hearing no voice, we would then move to the next item on the agenda, which is the review of the comments. So I would like to ask staff to display the Google docs and then we would go through the comments, the ones that are open or have not been resolved, which you'll find on the right hand of you facing the screen.

And of course, I should note that I also requested the chair of the work party, Alan Greenberg, to kind of respond to some of our open comments to provide in terms of a clarification, for clarification purposes and also to aid our discussion on this call. So of course, Alan is not on this call but thanks to him as well because I think he did so.

So we'll move on to the first comment. Can you scroll down, staff? We have this comment from Emmanuel, and it says that the report doesn't clearly explain how the [inaudible]. There's quite a lot that was said in that single comment, but there is a clarification that needs to be made. I think Emmanuel's comment was general about the entire report, and the clarification that Alan made in relation to that, can staff please scroll to that? And of course, that's the clarification in there, is that the essence of it is to improve communication with ALSes and of course to also strengthen to some extent the ALSes' participation and expectations as well.

So what I suggest was that since we are looking at the body of the content of the report itself, instead of these general comments, let's

---

just focus on the content of the report. So the subsequent comments, and then we would see that if there's any section that has been commented about which we are not comfortable with, we can then raise them.

So I think I would suggest that this comment from Emmanuel, if Emmanuel is on the call, that we mark it as resolved because some of the comment that has been made by Emmanuel on this particular topic, they were also reflected in the contents of some of the sections of the report. And I think that focusing on this section of the report on the actual contents would be more [effective.] So my suggestion on this comment that was made by Emmanuel is that we mark it as resolved because obviously, our goal here cannot be that we don't want the report to continue. Our goal would be to actually say which part of the report is it that we have significant concern about and then we can hear based on that. So I suggest that we mark it as resolved and move on to the next comment that is available. But before I ask staff to do that, I would like to hear if there's any opposition to my suggestion.

Sorry, I'm looking at the chat as well now. Okay, seeing no hand up, hearing no voice, I hope we have [a staff that have] access to resolve that. Can we mark that as resolved, please? Okay, so we move to the next comment. This is the comment about the reporting, that is ALS reports to ALAC biannually. The concern there which was raised was that this shouldn't be to ALAC per se. It is the RALO that should be responsible for it.

Alan has kind of agreed. Alan has responded that he's happy with removing the "to the ALAC" part from it. And of course, staff will always

---

coordinate with ... Normally, [inaudible] report will be normally posted somewhere in the Wiki. I don't know if we have staff here. How do they intend to operationalize this? Maybe just for the information of members on the call. Can anyone speak on this? Is there staff on the call that can talk about the operationalization of this? My understanding is that normally, the reports would be posted on the Wiki. Of course, subject to privacy laws and stuff like that. And then from there, anyone that triggers some of these requirements [with a] notification, we will then go to either to the ALAC RALO leadership, and perhaps if there's no action from the RALO leadership, ALAC can then take it up. But I just wanted to confirm if that is the operational aspect of what staff would be doing. I'm not sure if staff is in a position to say yes or no now.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Heidi, yes. You have the floor.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'm not sure if you wanted me to outline what this report is asking, but in terms of what is done now, definitely, it is staff. We don't report that to the ALAC whatsoever. It's there for them if they wish to see it, but we don't pass on information per se.

Basically, every year, particularly around the annual general meeting, we take a look at who is on membership. In particular for the voting, we need to make sure that we have the correct information on if there are

---

votes within the RALOs, but besides that, we don't have any qualifications right now for them to report to us annually. So in the report, that is changing. The report requests that every two years, there is information sent from the ALSes to staff. Currently to the ALAC as well, but Alan has commented that he's happy to remove that. So basically, it's just a checking in with At-Large structures to see if they're still working on issues related to ICANN, etc. So I think that's all in the report as well if you want to have more details on what this report is calling for. Thank you.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

All right. Thanks, Heidi. I think that's [explanative.] So I think the intent from AFRALO which we're trying to get clarification on is this report, if there's any action that needs to be acted upon, if it needs to be acted upon once it is sent to staff or is collected by staff from the various ALSes, a first line of action should be for the RALOs, and of course, the next line can then be if necessary, ALAC [inaudible]. So we agree to remove—we agree that we're going to be commenting on this. Alan has also agreed to remove the aspect of the ALAC. And I would suggest that we maintain this comment as one of the comments that we'll be making to ALAC on this particular report. Is there any opposition to that suggestion, anybody with a different opinion?

Because by the way, Alan has just put his own personal comment, he didn't put the comment as authoritative comment or so, it's just his own agreement that it makes sense that the comment that we are making on this particular one is something that is doable. Whether ALAC is going to accept is a different thing. So I would suggest that we include it

---

in our request for ALAC as one of our suggestions for modification. Seeing no opposition, no hands up, hearing no voice as well, I would suggest that we are fine with that. I will ask staff to leave that open without hitting the resolve button. So we'll move to the next comment section.

Okay, so this comment, we have initially resolved this but I see Chokri was asking what the role of RALO and ALSes would be in this CRM I think staff may be in the best position to explain this because I think it's more operational. It looks like the CRM is actually going to be some kind of database building. So maybe staff could talk about this. Heidi, you have the floor.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Thank you very much. This is client relationship management. ICANN is using Salesforce. They are in the process of rolling it out by each SO and AC. At-Large is in line. I think that the GNSO is going first and other groups as well. For At-Large, support staff are already being trained on it, and you'll also recall that this is one of the issues noted in the At-Large review implementation report. This is particularly under issue 16 which relates to metrics. So there is Cheryl who's leading that particular issue is working on that in the metrics group. Well, she's discussing it. She hasn't had a call with the metrics group yet, but there are plans to slowly roll this out within At-Large.

And what this is, yes, it's going to be a fantastic tool to automate how the relationship with the ALAC members, with the ALSes eventually on how active they are, things like that. It'll be by person, in a way, within



---

the system, so you can see if there's someone who's active in a working group or person you'll see how active that person is across At-Large, within AFRALO and across At-Large. So it'll really make it much more effective for both ALAC and staff but also for the RALO leadership to see what their members are doing. Thank you.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Okay. Thanks for the information. I'm not seeing Chokri on the call, but I hope that response provides some insight on what the system will be about. And in terms of our role, our role would also be to provide relevant information to better populate the database of the CRM once it's finally uploaded. Our role will also be to [backstop] improve our participation so that there's more information that is about our participation that is actually logged on the CRM system. So I think that's why I said it's more operational, it's not something that we need to comment, that we need to disagree with. It's something that we should actually applaud.

So I would suggest that this is definitely a point of clarification. I hope that Chokri at some point will be able to listen to the recording and then get this information since he's not on the call. But I will suggest that we mark this as resolved so that we can move on. Any opposition, different opinion on that? Seeing no hands up and hearing no voice, I would suggest, staff, you may mark it as resolved.

So we move to the next comment. Okay, so this is one of the comments that have been made which was actually referring to entitlement. The intent here is because we had a talk with Pastor Peters on this to

---

understand why he made this comment and what was his intention, the point here is that ALSes for instance, there may be a reason why they could apply for funding.

So the word does not entitle ... it's a little bit harsh. It's quite definite. The fact that in future, there may be a reason for them to apply for funding from ICANN if there's a process that actually comes up for that, and Alan's clarification was actually, I think, staff, could you expand that? So Alan also agrees that it's possible, though he's saying that he's not aware of [inaudible] possible it could happen. So I think the word, making it too definite, it was quite harsh. So we're suggesting that maybe instead of using "does not," we change it to a "may not," which is a minor word change but makes it obvious that indeed, it's possible that ALSes may get funding if they apply in future. Nobody knows what is going to happen in terms of options that are available within ICANN in future, and I wouldn't know what to term the outreach and engagement support which ALSes may actually apply to if there's a process for that in future. That in itself is a kind of funding support to do XYZ.

So I would suggest that this comment be maintained [inaudible] comment that we would make to ALAC, and then I'd see if there's any opposition to that. The floor is open for this. Does anyone oppose leaving this comment open and not resolving? I see no hand up, hear no voice. Staff, leave it open, we'll move on to the next item. Heidi, you have the floor, please.

---

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Thank you. Just on this, I know this exact note, this exact sentence is within all of the ALS accreditation—applications, and we believe it's also in the MoUs, but we're looking into that. But I think that the text here [is] entitle to, it does not say that they cannot apply for funding. As you know that they do through their RALO through the additional budget requests, but that there's a separate process for that. So I think what this is saying is if an organization were to come in, they can't expect it. I think because of all the various possible programs that now do offer funding support, there is a possibility of it, you just can't expect it. I think that's what this language is saying. Thank you.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Thank you, Heidi, and I think this clarification is fine. Perhaps maybe instead of saying—we just end it we suggest removal of the “or receive,” because I think the thing is that it's a little bit ... Yes, there is a process for receiving funding when it comes to outreach and engagement, but they are able to do that because they're an ALS. So they're able to apply for that because they are first an ALS or a member of a RALO. But the wording here actually kind of says that that particular option is also not there. That is the way I'm reading what Pastor Peters is trying to say in his message, which I think makes some kind of sense. And perhaps some kind of rewording will be required on that particular section to actually clarify that because you're an ALS does not mean that you automatically have access to funds or you automatically get some kind of funds. You have to [inaudible] to some extent, you have to [inaudible] some processes that exist to actually apply for such funding whenever they become available. But in the current wording, it does not even give room for such processes to be taken opportunity of

---

whenever it becomes available. So I think some kind of rewording may be due to kind of clarify that part and the intent of that part.

So if there are suggestions for wording on this call, [inaudible] wording you would like us to take note of, I would be happy to hear that. Otherwise, I would just make a general statement on this to ALAC, and of course, if appropriate wording comes to mind, we would also think about it in our response to ALAC. So I would suggest that we leave this open as earlier mentioned and then move to the next item. Any opposition on that suggestion?

Seeing no hands up and hearing no voice, we move on. I hope ... please stop me and ask any question. Of course, I'm the only one who's been talking for a while now, so please, if you have any questions or clarifications to make, [inaudible].

So on this, Abdulkarim was making a comment with concern about having to accredit ALS applications for global organizations that actually have global membership. And there have been a lot of discussions that we've had on this particular one, and if you look at the comment on the issue, you'll see that Abdulkarim and myself had some back-and-forth trying to explain why this is not an issue, why it's actually good. And of course, it's very [rare occasion] we have this kind of arrangement. And then the point also is that so long as this particular ALS, if approved to a region, does not also become an ALS in another region, in another RALO. I think that is what is important to mention. So I would suggest that we flag this part but we just flag it to mention that we are fine with this so long as the ALS does not exist in another region. Pastor Peters

---

was fine with that, and I would like to hear a suggestion, any opposition for my suggested way forward on this.

So leave it open. It's not kind of resolved yet. But what we're talking about is that we're not going to be opposing having such ALS to be able to be accredited in one region of their choosing based on the number of membership, but they should not be ALSes in multiple regions, multiple RALOs. That is the main gist of this. Any opposition to that suggestion as a way forward?

Okay, seeing no hands up and hearing no voice, I guess we move on. Let's leave it open and then I would word it accordingly. Okay, is that the last comment? So there's this comment I think we just passed. I think there's a comment before the one from Chokri. Okay, yeah, so the one from Chokri is the next and it's talking about 5(a), RALO recommends, to be specific, page 14.

I'm highlighting the part right now, so I think you should be able to see. That is the next comment, the one about recommends. So Chokri was saying something about here, this part, we actually did not mark it as resolved just because Chokri was not on the call at that time, and I've provided some clarification to Chokri on this. Staff, can you click on the "recommends" so the comment comes up?

Okay, so that [is there.] The first one is the "recommends." We're on the first one, (a). So clarification has been provided to Chokri on this and I would just like to suggest that we mark this as resolved unless there's any opposition to my suggestion. Seeing no hands up, hearing no voice, please, staff, mark it as resolved.

---

Then on item 5(c), we'll try to finish this call before the top of the hour, just not to take too much of our time. We'll try to finish at the top of the hour. We're almost done, actually. So this is in relation to I provided some clarification to Chokri on this as well. There could be situations that a RALO is not currently in a position to make recommendation on the particular ALS application. It's possible. Because it doesn't happen in our own region doesn't mean it doesn't happen in other regions. So we suggested that it's better to still leave that option available and Alan has also provided some clarification.

So I suggested that staff mark it as resolved because it's not an issue. So, any other comments? Okay, please, staff, can you ... This one about global ALSes, is that the one from Abdulkarim about—which comment is this long one referring to?

This long one is referring to item two about ... Yes, I've already said that we should leave it open. We're going to summarize ... write the intent in a different way that actually communicates what ... We're not going to be opposing this particular text, but we're going to be reinforcing that so long as the particular ALS does not feature in multiple regions, we'd be fine with it.

So let's move on to the next comment, please. It's on page 16, the [footer] page. All right, so on page 16, there is a first comment, initial comment in relation to rationale provisioning. The idea is that a rationale should be provided for rejection, and Alan has also kind of agreed that rationale should normally be provided, but he also indicated that there may be scenarios where providing such rationale may not be

---

possible. In fact, it could also be in the interest of the ALS itself who does not want that rationale.

So what was suggested is that instead of [inaudible] the current way, that we should—this entire line can just be worded that instead of saying that it should be [via chair] and all those things, that the response should normally contain rationale. So I ran this through Alan just to get his feeling about it. I think he was even the one who suggested this text, that if we word it this way, just to remove the possibility of an ALAC chair even taking just the [condition] that this rationale will not be provided discreetly. That was the intention.

So I think we'll leave this open. I would word the response, our comment, our report on this appropriately. My suggestion is we leave it open or we just suggest that the highlighted text in that particular comment be worded in the way that has been proposed in the conversation by myself. So, any opposition to that? Chokri, you're welcome to the call. Seeing no hands up, hearing no voice, I think we can move on to the next comment.

Okay, the next comment is about ... Staff, I think we may have skipped one comment. There is one before the table, the one immediately after the comment about ALAC chair, item nine. Yes, ATLAS staff. That's one. What we're saying here is that it is not just ... Please, can staff click on that highlighted [inaudible] so that the comment can come up?

So that's the comment, we're saying it's not just ALAC and the At-Large staff, it should be ALAC, the AFRALO ... Sorry, the RALO leadership and At-Large staff. Alan also agreed with that when I discussed with him

---

about it, so I would suggest that we leave it open and it would form part of the comments that we'd make to Alan. If there's any opposition to that, please, I would like to see hands up. Otherwise, we'll move on to the next comment.

All right, the next comment, this was a clarification comment I believe to ...

OLÉVIÉ KOUAMI: We have a question in French. Olévié would like to take the floor.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Okay, please go ahead.

OLÉVIÉ KOUAMI: Yes. This is my question. The RALO leadership and the leadership of ALAC. What is the difference? The leadership of RALO, isn't it the ALAC council? Thank you.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Thank you. So the RALO leadership, for instance, as it concerns AFRALO, they're the officers of AFRALO which is the chair, the vice chair and the secretary in our own case, the secretariat, but we also refer to the RALO entire leadership of AFRALO, it also includes the ALAC members from the region and also I think the outreach and engagement co-chair from the region. So those are the people that we also refer to as AFRALO leadership, entire leadership. But immediate leadership of the AFRALO



---

is those three officers and the entire leadership of it is actually the ones that I've mentioned which includes the officers and the ALAC members from the region and the outreach and engagement co-chair from the region.

The ALAC, however, consists of 15 members and when it comes to leadership team, I think the leadership team are five, including the chair, and of course, one person from each RALO, and I think two of them are chosen as the vice chairs. And so within the 15 members of ALAC, there are five people who are referred to as the ALAC leadership team. And those five people are chosen from—of course, includes the ALAC chair as well and the rest of them are chosen, one from the members of ALAC from each region. I hope that clarifies. So that's the difference. There are two different bodies. ALAC is different from the ALAC leadership is different from the RALO leadership.

OLÉVIÉ KOUAMI:

Thank you very much, it was very clear. It's noted.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

All right, so we move on to the—

OLÉVIÉ KOUAMI:

So I understand that very clear. Thank you.

---

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Okay. Thanks for the question, Olévié. So we are on what comment now? I think we are done. Are we? Yes, the comments on the table [inaudible], I think that was a clarification comment from Chokri. No, we are not on this yet. Yes, the one ... So Chokri was talking about delays here, that it should [inaudible] into consideration that there could be delays with ICANN meetings.

Alan did not quite understand this before but when I had a call with him, I'd explained to him what he meant and it's [inaudible] just needs to be added, that, subject to those kinds of delays, the 90-day may not always be met depending on the environment and the situation. So Alan probably said that if there's opportunity to update this document, they would take that into consideration. So this is not something we need to comment on, it's [inaudible]. I think that can always be mentioned. So I think we mark it as resolved. Or do we prefer that we actually make a comment about this? Okay, maybe we just make the comment. So let's leave it open. I would [inaudible] comment that we'd make. I'm not seeing any hands up on that yet. I hope people are actually following on with me on this. Heidi, please.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Seun, just really quickly on the elongation of the application process for an applicant during an ICANN meeting, it's due to staff bandwidth. It's just because during an ICANN meeting, all staff are really focused on the meeting and supporting At-Large in all of their sessions, so it's just very challenging to at the same time move that process forward and at the same time, in addition to staff, it's also the ALAC who are focusing on the meetings and it's challenging to have them vote on an application.

---

And a lot of times, other key activities within ICANN are also either stopped or the period is elongated. This includes public comments as well. So it's a process that we're familiar with here. Thank you.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Yes. Thanks. And I think Chokri is also saying that we should make that note, that at least this is not going to ... If we don't meet up with the 90 days, this is why that is not happening, we are not [inaudible] 90 days. I think that's what Chokri is trying to say. So there is probably no need to mention it in our response because I think it's something that is obvious. So I think let's mark it as resolved. Thanks. Chokri is on the call as well and I hope he's fine if we mark this as resolved. You have the floor if you want to speak.

CHOKRI BEN ROMDHANE:

Yes, it's okay for me. I would just like to mention that. Okay, thank you.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

All right, thank you. So let's mark it as resolved and move to the next item. Okay, so we are on ... Yes, I think this is the one where Chokri was saying something about [inaudible]. Actually, Chokri [criteria] two and three, they are different and they have actually been clearly identified as criteria two and three. I think it's just probably the bullet points. I suggest that we resolve this because the two criteria are actually different. Chokri, unless you have any opposition to that, my suggestion on this particular comment is that we mark it as resolved.

---

CHOKRI BEN ROMDHANE:        Okay, go ahead.

SEUN OJEDEJI:                All right. Thank you. So we'll move on to the next comment. I think we are almost done. Three minutes to the top of the hour. We will finish before. All right, so this next comment is from Tijani and I think it's the one about the role of ALAC and RALOs, that ALAC does not oversee RALO per se, and I think that's already [taken note of] so I would suggest we mark it as resolved. Any opposition to that? So the important information here is that this has already been noted. The oversee aspect has already been noted by even the chair of ALAC, and I think there's really no need for us to mention it as a concern again since it's already been noted as something that would be corrected. So I suggest that we mark it as resolved. Any opposition to that? Seeing no hand up and hearing no voice, staff, you may proceed to mark it as resolved.

And of course, we are now left with one more comment. So this comment was in relation to individuals and ALSes being treated equally. And this is actually in relation to communication. So whatever communication that we are sending, the intent here is that the communication should go to everyone. So I think we've agreed, clarification has been provided by Alan, and of course, it's also clear in the text that it is not that ALSes are being equated to be the same thing, have the same powers or equal power as individual members, but it is that when there is communication, it is actually fair that everybody receives similar, same communication so that individual members are also informed and there is no discrimination in terms of the volume or the amount of communication that each member category gets. So on

---

that note, I would suggest that we mark this as resolved unless there's an opposition to that suggestion. All right, staff, please proceed.

This brings us to the end of open comments, and now we move to the next agenda item, which is next steps. The next steps on this is that the ones which are open right now are the ones that we would then try to communicate to ALAC about. I understand that ALAC has a call in the next eight or nine hours' time. AFRALO leadership will try to see if we can get the comments to ALAC before their call. I have personally requested 48 hours timing after our call to send our response to the ALAC. I've sent that to the chair. I hope that we will still have that 48 hours. Nevertheless, we would still try to get our comments to ALAC before the call, or try as much as possible to do that.

So action item would be for AFRALO leadership to analyze and send the comments to ALAC. The second action item is for staff to freeze the working document. Sarah, you have the floor, please.

SARAH KIDEN:

Hi everyone. Thank you, Seun, for taking us through this process. I believe it's been very helpful. So I'd like to suggest that when you're sending the comments to ALAC, seeing that we don't have so much time, is it possible to just summarize and point them to the exact place where they'll be looking? Like on page this and this, so that people don't have to scroll through everywhere looking for the details. I'd just like to suggest that. Thank you.

---

SEUN OJEDEJI:

All right. Thanks for the suggestion. That was noted. I'll work based on that. Any other comments or suggestions or opinions on the suggested way forward? All right, seeing no hands up and hearing no voice, I'd like to thank everyone for attending this call. I think we are two minutes beyond the stoppage time. Thanks for attending, and of course, talk to you all soon on the list or on another call. Bye for now. Thanks to staff as well and to the interpreters. Bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**