

---

YESIM NAZLAR: Started. So, good morning, good afternoon and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the AFRALO Rules of Procedure Working Group call taking place on Thursday, 1<sup>st</sup> of May, 2017 at 14:00 UTC.

On the call today on our French channel, we have Baudouin Schombe. On our English channel we have Tijani Ben Jemaa, Pastor Peters Omoragbon, Barack Otieno, Beran Dondoh and Seun Ojedeji.

We have received apologies from Aziz Hilali and Abdeljalil Bachar Bong.

From staff, we have Silvia Vivanco, Mario Aleman and myself, Yesim Nazlar.

Our interpreters today are Claire and Jacques.

And finally, as always, I'd like to remind everyone to state their names before speaking, not only for the transcription purposes but also for the interpretation purposes as well.

And now, I would like to give the floor to Tijani Ben Jemaa. Over to you, Tijani. Thank you very much.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Yesim. Finally, we didn't have Fatimata, so we are only six persons on this call. This is a little bit sad because we wanted to decide at least on the decertification. But with this number, I don't know.

---

*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.*

---

I ask you, I ask the participants if we want this to carry on and decide, or if you want us only to discuss little bit, or perhaps I don't want to cancel the call but we can discuss without deciding because we have really a few people on the call. What do you think about that? Please tell me.

Yes, Peters.

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBORN: I think in view of the interest generated by the issue, I think I would suggest that we carry this discussion forward [inaudible] very few participants, because if we discuss now, [inaudible] waste time and then it becomes [inaudible] issue.

So, could [we] postpone the discussion? Maybe some people may join us later on. If not, would not. If not, we [inaudible] other time, and we can discuss other issues. But I don't I don't feel [comfortable].

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Thank you, Peters. Any other point of view?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Hello. Can you hear me?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Seun, yes, go ahead.

---

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes. Sorry, I'm driving, so I have to park now, just make a comment. If it's possible to – I'm not looking at the agenda right now. I want to suggest the point about the [inaudible] which I've raised on the list. I would like to [share] we forward on that particular issue.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Thank you. Seun, what we wanted to decide on this time, because we will make the last reading, would be the decertification. There is no diversions. But even with this number, to be fair, I don't think that we –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

SEUN OJEDEJI: I'm getting a lot of background noise.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, there is a lot of background noise, and I ask the staff to mute people who are not speaking, please. So, any other point of view? Beran, what do you think? If she's not here –

SEUN OJEDEJI: Hello, Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, Seun.

---

SEUN OJEDEJI: [inaudible] you were saying something about the [inaudible] number of participants which is seven, which is too low. Am I correct?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Exactly, you are correct. It is not seven, it is six now.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Oh, really? I think that is very low, and it would be difficult to make any significant decision.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Exactly.

SEUN OJEDEJI: I would suggest that we'll probably create various topics with the various documents on the list, and then discuss them on the list. If [inaudible]. That'd be my suggestion. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Exactly. Thank you very much. This is exactly what I am thinking about. But since we are here, I will ask you to discuss the point that Seun raised regarding the quorum. I find his suggestions worth discussing or worth elaborating on, because he thinks that if we don't reach the 50% quorum for voting, we may – and we have quorum. We may accept the

---

decision and make it conditionate by any objection that may come in 72 hours from the meeting.

This is a suggestion of Seun. If you have any point of view, please speak up. I have my point, but I will give it after you comment on this. Any reflection on this? If not, then –

PASTOR PETERS OMORGABON: Hello?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, go ahead.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Hello, can you hear me?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, Beran, go ahead.

BERAN DONDEH: Yes, Tijani. I didn't understand what you said.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, I repeat, Beran.

BERAN DONDEH: 72 hours – I wasn't really understanding. Yes, please, thank you.

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:                   Moment. I will repeat. We have a meeting. We are in a meeting. We have the quorum for the meeting, and when we want to decide, we didn't get 50% of the whole ALSes voting for one option. So, we didn't have more than 50% for an option, means that people are divided.

Seun said we may take the highest vote and accept it assuming that in 72 hours from the call, we will not to receive any objection to this option. This is what Seun proposed.

SEUN OJEDEJI:                   Can you hear me?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:               Yes, I hear you. Go ahead.

SEUN OJEDEJI:                   I think I need to clarify. What I said was that we have a few number now, and hence we cannot really make a decision. We can continue discussion, however, I'm suggesting that the decision making can start on the mailing list and then final at the next meeting. Not this one.

So, this can just be a first call for a decision, at the next meeting and on the mailing list, and finally on the next meeting it can then be finalized. I'd also like to get clarification on what decision are we intending to make in this call. Thank you.

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No, Seun, we decide –

PASTOR PETERS OMORGABON: Pastor Peters.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, moment, Peters. With I think there is a consensus in this call that we will make discussions now. We will make discussion, we will discuss the issues of decertification and quorum, but we will not take any decision on this call. It is only discussion. Since we are on the call, we will discuss, and I asked the people who are attending this call what they think about the proposal that Seun made regarding the quorum. And I tried to explain the quorum. So, we are discussing. We will not decide anything now. We are now discussing a point regarding the quorum that Seun raised. That's all. Pastor Peters, go ahead.

PASTOR PETERS OMORGABON: Mr. Tijani, how many members are in this work group? When I mean members, I mean the original members of the work group? I understand that people can join the discussion, so what are the actual numbers of the original number of this work group?

That's number one, and then, what numbers constitute the quorum for this work group? So if we constitute a quorum for the work group, we can go ahead and discuss. And then we can [raise a] decision which you can present to the General Assembly for adoption or rejection.

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Peters. I'd like to tell you that I perhaps don't agree 100% with you, because this working group is not a decision making working group. We are deciding on our recommendations, and it –

PASTOR PETERS OMORGABON: Tijani, we are making a recommendation. I'm not saying –

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yeah, moment, please. So, it would be a pity that we make our recommendation by 50% of our group. It would be a pity. It is a group who is making recommendation, and yet, we cannot have more than 50% to decide on those recommendations? In my point of view, it's a pity.

And even with what you said, we don't have the quorum. We don't have 50%. Thank you. So, Seun, did you hear me well? Did you understand what I wanted?

PASTOR PETERS OMORGABON: Tijani, you did not answer my question. How many members are in this work group? And if [inaudible] quorum for a meeting. So that's number one. In every organization you're having a meeting, once you have the quorum, then you can discuss issues and make recommendations. That is my question. How many are we, and how many are considered quorum?



---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:                   Okay. We are six, and we are 13.

PASTOR PETERS OMORGABON:   15? What is the quorum? Is it one-third or two-third? What is the agreed quorum?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:                   No. Please, Peters. I would like to make you understand that we want this group to decide with the maximum of members. There is not a charter for this group, unfortunately. We didn't make a charter for it, but the normal rule is –

SEUN OJEDEJI:                       Hello.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:                   Moment, Seun.

SEUN OJEDEJI:                       Hello.

PASTOR PETERS OMORGABON:   Hold on, Seun.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:                   Okay. Seun, go ahead, please.

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Okay. Thank you, Tijani, for that clarification. Okay, so I see that the suggestion you were referring to that I made is the one that is in relation to the quorum of the actual recommendation we're trying to make to the General Assembly.

So yes, that position I'd still like this group to consider is I think it's better that we actually send whatever decision that is made within the ALS on the meeting allow for [someone to ask] on the mailing list for anybody to indicate objections since all the ALSes will not have the opportunity to actually attend the meeting. I think it's a fair thing to do and we assure that the decision was not done in a hurry. So, I would encourage this group to actually support that suggestion of mine. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Okay. Thank you very much. Yes, I understood that very well from your comment. So, I would like to clarify also that Seun made this comment according to the number of attendees of our call. He made a little search and found that we didn't have more than 15 attendees in the best case on our calls, so he said in this case we will not be able to make any decision.

So, if there is not another comment on this, I will give you my point of view. Is there another comment?

I see that Abdeljalil is here. That's good.

---

So, is there any other comment on what Seun proposed? If there is not, my point of view is, yes, Seun, you are right 100%.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: According to the proposal of Seun, I think that we should first discuss. There was a lot of discussion about quorum and decertification, but I propose that we will just see what was discussed, to see what was said and what we can improve first.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you.

PASTOR PETERS OMORGABON: Pastor Peters, please.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Peters, is it on this subject, or it is about the quorum of this meeting?

PASTOR PETERS OMORGABON: It's both of, all together, Mr. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I'd like not to speak about the quorum of this call, please. If you want to speak –

---

PASTOR PETERS OMORGABON: No, Mr. Tijani, can I just [hear] my view? Then when I'm done, then you can choose to do whatever you want to do with my contribution. Can I just speak, please?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Please.

PASTOR PETERS OMORGABON: Thank you. Now, this is a work group. This is an ad hoc group within the larger group. This group is not to take decisions. This group, whether we are [inaudible] or all the members of the group are meeting, whatever recommendations or decisions we'd make is a recommendation to the General Assembly that will approve the recommendation or not. So, this group is not a decision making group. That is number one I want to establish.

Number two, I ask a question, is that is this group an open-ended group, or is it group that [inaudible] a number of members have chosen to work in the work group? If it is, for the purpose of discussion if we are 10 in the group, we should have a quorum as, okay, now whenever we'll call for a work group meeting, five, six, seven members form quorum and can go ahead with the meeting. When there is not a quorum, we can postpone. That is number two.

Number three, whatever decisions we make in any discussions we're having, whether on decertification or on [inaudible] or whatever, this group is going to propose to the general [house] the recommendations, which is subject to the approval of general [house].

---

So the question I ask that you're trying to overlook [inaudible], if we must be organized, then we should have [inaudible] in the work group, and if we would meet the required number, we can go ahead and discuss, make a decision on the recommendation for the general [house] and then propose it to the general [house] for vote or no vote [inaudible]. That is what I'm saying.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Peters. I will ask you please to write on the mailing list what you said, and please don't come back to the process. We are now discussing the substance. And the substance today, two points. The first one, now we are discussing the quorum of the AFRALO meetings, not of this group. The quorum of the AFRALO meetings.

Baudouin wanted to speak. Baudouin said that we need to discuss those two points. He didn't say more than what we said before. It is always the process. We will not decide on anything since we don't have enough attendees. I hope I understood well what he said.

So, if I don't have any hand raised or anyone who is speaking up about this proposal of Seun, let me tell you my point of view. It is right that if we have maximum 15 attendees in the best case of our calls, we'll never reach the 50%.

For your information, we never decide, we never vote. We didn't vote right now during the meeting. We always make electronic vote. This is because we want to give the opportunity to all people, even those who are not attending the meeting, to participate in the decision.

---

And by the online vote, we will have the quorum. We tried it a lot of times. Even now, now that we have dead ALSes, we have already four dead ALSes, and we have more, a lot of ALSes who are coming to Johannesburg never spoke, never come, never participated.

So, if we apply what we decided on as a criteria of performance, we will be in one of the status that we mentioned together: active, less active or standby, and if they are in standby mode during one year and we interact with them during this one year, we will send them at the end of the year of their status on standby, we will then send them a last warning and asking them to explain or to come or to tell us what is the problem.

If they don't improve or they don't give understandable or logical reasons for their silence, AFRALO will proceed to the decertification. So, with this process, we will see several ALSes that will be decertified. I hope that this will make our ALSes more active and more participating, and in this case we will have more attendance, so we'll not be in the case that we'll have only 15.

So, there are two cases. One case, people continue to be like this and then so we will have several ALSes decertified. Second case, the adoption of those new rules will make our ALSes more active and this will give us more participants during our meetings. This is first point.

Second point, all our decisions are made by vote. They are made by electronic vote. So, electronic vote means that we will not have only people who will come to the call or to the meeting. We will have even

---

people who are not able to come or who don't want to come, or anything.

So, in this case, we will have – and our experience showed that we have the quorum by electronic vote. Sometimes, we don't have. One time we didn't have, but the majority we always had it. So, those are the two aspects.

One aspect is that the situation will change after the adoption of the new rules as for the attendance, and second, the decision making by vote will be always done by electronic vote because it is the most inclusive way to make everyone able to vote. And in this case, we normally have our quorum.

The proposal of Seun has some small problems. He said if we have quorum, means if we have a third of the ALSes present, this is the quorum. Our calls or our meeting can deliberate legally if we have third of the ALSes present to the call. But the meeting cannot decide if the decision is not taken by 50% of the whole ALSes, means the meeting can deliberate, can debate, etc., and when we want to decide, we can initiate an electronic vote, and in this case we will have the 50% we want.

So, if I follow the proposal of Seun, with the third of ALSes, means 18 ALS now today, I think it will be less in the future, but now it is 18. If we have 18 ALS present and if we have to vote and we don't have 26 ALSes voting for one option, in this case – and we will not have it because we have only 18 present, so we will not have 26 in any case. So, if we have those 18 people present, we can deliberate and we can decide to vote.

---

And when we decide to vote, we'll go to the electronic vote and then we may have the quorum.

And there is another problem. If we accept a decision with less than 50% of people, even if the others will not object because they don't care or they are absent or they didn't see that e-mail, etc., I think it is a pity that AFRALO take... because we don't vote very frequently in AFRALO. You have [inaudible]. We vote only for very important issues, and I think that very important issues deserve at least 50% of the ALSes quorum.

The floor is yours. Is there any comment on what I said? Especially Seun.

PASTOR PETERS OMORGABON: Pastor Peters.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Peters, yes, go ahead.

PASTOR PETERS OMORGABON: Tijani, the two issues I would... looking for [approval] for quorum for AFRALO meetings, am I right?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes.

PASTOR PETERS OMORGABON: I did propose at the last meeting that every [conventional] meeting, one third of membership of any meeting should form a quorum. We cannot



---

[now] have, so I am proposing that one fourth of the active members of AFRALO – that is whatever number is on the list – one third in any [inaudible] teleconference or if it is by e-mail list, we'll at least be able to constitute one third. That should be a quorum, and then we cannot take the highest number of that quorum to make a decision on any issues that are [being put up for] voting. That is my proposal.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. I'm afraid I don't understand your conclusion. What is your proposal exactly? Shortly, please. Yes, go ahead.

PASTOR PETERS OMORGABON: Okay. I propose one third of the members of AFRALO to form the quorum for any meetings. One third.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay.

PASTOR PETERS OMORGABON: And then if we have one third for any decision to be taken on any issue, the majority of the one third, when they vote, that decision should be binding.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I see. Okay, any other comments? You heard Peters proposing that the quorum for a meeting to deliberate is one third [inaudible] of the total ALSes.

BAUDOUIIN SCHOMBE: Yes, I have a question.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Moment please. So the proposal of Peters is the quorum for the meeting is one third and for decision-making is a majority or 50% of the third will be the quorum. This is what Peters propose.

Yes, Baudouin wants to speak. Baudouin, go ahead.

BAUDOUIIN SCHOMBE: Yes. Thank you very much for giving me the floor. I would like to know, one third is it for vote online or for vote during a meeting or for an electronic vote? The difference is very important. One third in what situation?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Can I answer the question?

[TIJANI BEN JEMAA]: Thank you, Baudouin. Let me repeat. The quorum for a meeting we can discuss and with one third of the ALSes being present in order to decide in a meeting we need 50% voting for one option. The decision will be done by the majority of the ALSes, the absolute majority. We can meet on one third. We can discuss with only one third. And we can decide to have a vote. Then it would be 50% of the ALSes. Since all our votes are

---

done by electronic means, it's going to be 50% of all the ALSes and then we reach the 50%. Is that clear, Baudouin?

BADOUIN SCHOMBE: Yes. I understood. Thank you for the explanation. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Any other remark?

Seun, you are on the call or we lost you?

SEUN OJEDEJI: Hello. Can you hear me?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. I hear you. Yes, please.

SEUN OJEDEJI: Yes. I lost the call because, like I said, I'm driving so I just got joined back in. I don't know what has been said but I would just like to mention to Tijani that, because I had some other comments to make, that I would prefer I would actually follow the summary of the discussion and then make my response on the list. I didn't follow what has been said. Thank you very much.

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Okay. Why I asked you to speak it is because it was your proposal and I made my comments. My comments were – if you can hear me, Seun – my comments were that today we are 52. When we adopt those rules we will become less than 52 because several ALSes will be decertified, first.

Second, when those rules are adopted that I think that several other ALSes will be more active because they are afraid to be decertified. So in any case, we will have a better quorum by the reduction of the number and also by having more active ALSes. This is the first [inaudible].

SEUN OJEDEJI:

Okay.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

The second point, all our votes are online. We don't make a physical vote. We didn't make so far and I don't think we will do because the online vote is more inclusive. It permits people who are not present on the meeting or on the call to vote. So I think this is the best way to continue. We have to continue making it like this.

And when we do an online vote, we will have more than if we make a vote during the meeting. So my point is that in any case, all the votes and since it is an online vote, we will have a quorum. The quorum is 50% of the ALSes.

Do you have any comment on what I said, Seun?

---

BERAN DONDEH: Tijani, can I say something?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Beran, go ahead.

BERAN DONDEH: You have an echo. I don't know where it's coming from. Maybe staff can help. Your line is echoing.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: It is not my line. Do you think it is my line? I don't think so.

BERAN DONDEH: It's everyone. I think I'm echoing, too.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. You're right. There is an echo. Staff, Yesim. Try to find the problem. There is an echo when Beran speak.

YESIM NAZLAR: Tijani, we're looking into this and do you hear me with an echo?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes.

---

YESIM NAZLAR: I think you're echo has gone now, Tijani.

BERAN DONDEH: Okay. I think it's gone.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. It's gone now.

YESIM NAZLAR: It's gone.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Good. Go ahead, Beran.

BERAN DONDEH: Tijani, from what I understand you're basically saying we're going to leave the voting to online voting so then we're basically not going to be making any decisions during any of the meetings. All the decisions will be made using online voting. That's what I understand from what you were saying. Please correct me if I'm wrong.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Thank you. The important decision, yes. If we are speaking about the normal things and if there is a consensus during the call, if we are not obliged to go to vote in this case we can decide if it is not a major issue. When it is a major issue we have to go to an online vote to be

---

sure that we have the majority of the ALSes voting. For example, I will explain you.

BERAN DONDEH: Tijani, what determines a major issue?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I will explain [to] you. Suppose we are in a monthly call and we are, for example, talking about – I don't know – certification or accreditation of one ALSes, if there is an application of an ALS, and there is the due diligence from the staff so we have the guarantee of the control of the staff on this application. And this application was very good read and understood by at least two or three or four people and no one said this ALS doesn't respect the criteria set in the Bylaws. In this case, we can decide during the call if there is consensus we can decide to accept that accreditation. If there is even if there is one objection, in this case we have to vote. And this case we need to conduct an electronic vote so that we have the opinion of the whole AFRALO members. Am I clear on this?

BERAN DONDEH: It's clear, Tijani. My only concern is then what constitutes a minor and a major decision, which means this has to be written out very clearly for people to understand which may complicate matters even more.

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

I will tell you. The major issues are, for example, if we will – I don't know – if we decide on a statement. We will make a statement to the Board or we will make a statement to the ALAC or we will approve a statement of ALAC. We need to go to the vote. If we want to appoint someone and there is two candidates, we have to go to the vote. We cannot say, "It is the consensus. We have only one against this one." No. It doesn't work. We have to go through the vote.

If we have anything which may be critical for the organization and for ALAC in general, we have to go to electronic vote. If we have consensus on things that doesn't have a real impact on the organization and its work, it is only to choose – no to choose – sometimes it's about accepting an ALS, something important, but if the staff have done its work and if the staff made the due diligence and said it is okay and if at least two or three people have already said, "Yes, we read the application and it is okay with the criteria and the Bylaws." Because we are not deciding if we accept or not. We are verifying if the application fit the criteria. We don't have any subjective right to decide, "I don't like this one so we will not accept it." We have only to say, "This application is in good standing with the criterias we have in the Bylaws."

And the decision of AFRALO is only to say to ALAC, "Yes the regional organization agree to [inaudible] ALS," and the decision of the accreditation will be done by the ALAC. So in this case we may not go to the vote if there is no objection. If there is only one objection we go to the vote. So it is a matter, if you want, of ease. We don't have to make it too complicated because in this case everything will take time. But when there is something which may cause any kind of problem, we have to go to the electronic vote.



---

Is it okay for you, Beran?

BERAN DONDEH: I understand what you're trying to say but my concern I think that you didn't quite understand where I'm coming from, is how do we now define these activities? We can't give unending examples like you're giving examples which I understand perfectly. Now how do we [carve] that out in our ROP? How do we say that this is a minor event or this is a minor decision, this is a major decision? That's my question. How do you [inaudible] it?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I tell you.

BERAN DONDEH: For people to understand without necessarily giving endless examples.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Any decision on a statement or ratification of statement or any appointment when there is more than one candidate should go to the vote. Any other issue that is discussed in the call or in the meeting and on which there is a full consensus, no one object on it, we can take the decision by consensus during the meeting. Is it clear now?

BERAN DONDEH: It's crystal clear now. That's what I was asking. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Very good.

Any other comments?

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: Can I just quickly chip in, Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Who is speaking?

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: Pastor Peters, sorry.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Peter. Okay, go ahead.

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: Yes. I think not to make the discussion complicated, we are in a democracy so any issue whether minor or major should go for voting. So that's for the record. So I want to propose if we have any issue to discuss or decide, put it before the members for voting. The vote is taken, record it, so [to] move on. So the idea of [inaudible] deciding which is minor or which is major to me will constitute or create problems later in the future. That is my concern.

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Okay. Thank you very much. Any other comment on this?

Abdeldjalil made a comment. I will read it on the French channel since it is written in French. Moment.

Why don't you read it yourself? Can I read it, Abdeldjalil?

Abdeldjalil said in our different online AFRALO meeting our major decision are mostly about the decision of ALS certification, a decision to submit comment, or statement for elections. I agree for decisions that have a limited impact on the good working of AFRALO the AFRALO bureau can decide for us. I do not see any problem. And in the case of important decision we have to have the opinion and the vote of half of the ALSes.

Okay, that's good. So you agree with me, it seems to me. You also say we work for all the ALSes for that all the ALSes become deeply involved in AFRALO. Let's make sure that ALSes do understand the topic well before they vote. If ALSes do not participate in our meeting, it will be difficult for them to make an election and to vote after a decision.

Yes, absolutely. Abdeldjalil said that for people not participating in a [reunion] even if you do an online vote, their decision is not going to be good because they didn't debate, they didn't discuss, they did not know the pros and cons.

I kind of agree with Abdeldjalil and [he] also says that for things that [do] not have an important impact, just like I said, we can work by consensus and for the others we need to vote and I can repeat in French if you want all the declarations are all the decisions to select a person if

---

we have more than one candidate, all those must go through a vote. For the other issues if there is a consensus during the meeting with deliberation discussion with at least one third of the ALSes if we reach a consensus a decision can be taken. If we have a minor decision if there is one objection, only one objection, we have to vote.

That's a summary. Do we have any other points [of] comments? We are at the end of our hour. I think it was good that we talked about it. I think it's clearer now and in the list we'll be able to work on the next decision.

I'm sorry that there are so few of us participants today because really we are running late. We need to work more. We do not want to take hasty decisions. We wanted to take our time. That is why we present a topic. The second time we do a second reading and we compile the opinions and we look at our recommendations and for the third time a second reading and adoption. So if we work that way, but if we have not enough participants that's going to be an issue.

Now I would like to look at point three which is the [position point five] which is the position of the Vice President, the job of Vice President. What I think about the Vice Chair position, the Vice Chair position for the Vice Chair, we are one of two RALOs that do have a Chair, A vice Chair and a Secretary. All the others only have a Chair and a Secretary. The fact that we have a Vice Chair is positive so that one more person is much involved and it kind of protects the position of the Chair if the Chair is not present at one point the Vice Chair can lead the meeting. But with many years of experience I noted that it works well but the only issue is to participate to the ICANN meetings it is a problem. It's [order] this Vice Chair or the Secretary. We only have two people from

---

the RALO going to the ICANN meetings. So we have to choose between the Vice Chair and the Secretary. This is something that bothers everyone. Nobody wants to decide on who's going to go, but we have to decide at one point and someone is unhappy because he cannot go to the meeting.

That is why I would like to propose we're not going to discuss that today or very briefly but we'll talk about that next time. Think about it and do you think we should get rid of the Vice Chair position? [Its] only job is to replace the Chair if need be. I think the Secretary could do that. The Secretary could replace the Chair since they work very closely together. Sometimes the Secretary is more informed than the Vice Chair and the Vice Chair, in fact, works less than the Secretary who is more aware of what's going on and can replace a Chair if need be. That would resolve the issue of choosing between the Vice Chair and the Secretary and of who's going to go to the ICANN meetings.

If you have some remarks you can – I'm listening if you have some comments.

Baudouin and Pastor Peters want to speak.

Badouin?

BADOUIN SCHOMBE:

Tijani, because this is one extra person, yes. Okay, so I think that's a good solution that you propose and that we could get rid of the position of the Vice Chair.

---

[TIJANI BEN JEMAA]: Thank you. Somebody else would like to make a comment? We have to discuss that on the list and will have a written proposal next time to talk about it. Of course, let me tell you that it's too late for this election. We were too late. Our Rules of Procedures will effective and even if we decide today, the Vice Chair is already chosen so he will go through his term. So this rule will apply at a particular date at the end of the term of our new Vice Chair that is being elected as we speak.

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: Pastor Peters want to speak please. Can I have the floor?

[TIJANI BEN JEMAA]: Yes, Pastor Peters. Go ahead.

PASTOR PETERS OMORAGBON: Yes. Mr. Tijani, now the role of the Chair and the Vice Chair together with the role of the Secretary in any organization are quite different. Now, I can understand where there is an issue in the [inaudible] of AFRALO. This Office of the Secretary is autonomous in the way that that office should not be compared to the Office of the Vice Chair. So if there is going to be a meeting and the standard procedure is for the Chair and the Secretary to represent the RALO, I [do not see] why [there should be] a debate as to who should go between the Secretary and the Vice Chair. The Vice Chair is only active in the absence of the Chair.

So if the Chair is [unable to] attend any meeting, then automatically the Vice Chair attends. But [where the] Chair is [good] for attending meetings, the Vice Chair know that by procedure then she has to stay

---

behind. [Inaudible] because the Chair is there. So now try to use the office of the Secretary for there to be a debate on that I don't think that is [non practicable].

The purpose for the Vice is to act when the Chair is not around. So I propose the Office of the Chair to be [inaudible] created because [whenever I can tell anything will happen I would not] be left without a Chair. So the Vice Chair automatically moves in. But in the [end] where the Chair is around, all the role of the Chair is [inaudible] and the Secretary performs the role. So I do not see why we should get rid of the Vice Chair because of a meeting. No. There should be no debate. [I support the three offices] to be created within AFRALO where when it comes to the position the Chair and the Secretary offices automatically represent the RALO so]when the Chair is absent. Thank you [inaudible].

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Pastor Peters. Okay. Your point is noted so now we have –

BERAN DONDEH: Tijani, I would like to say something as well, please.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Beran, go ahead please.

BERAN DONDEH: I'll just make it very short. I completely agree 100% with what Pastor Peters has said. The Vice Chair, the Chair, and Secretary have different

---

roles and responsibilities which have been mapped out, and I think the Secretary cannot take the place of the Vice Chair and neither can the Vice Chair take the place of the Secretary. In the case of a meeting, I don't think it should be an issue for the Chair and the Secretary to represent AFRALO in any of the ICANN meetings.

If, for example, maybe the Secretary cannot make it, then perhaps the Vice Chair can be substituted in extraordinary circumstances. But I don't think that should be an issue for getting rid of the Vice Chair. I think it's still a very valid position and it should be kept on board. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Okay. Thank you very much, Beran. Thank you. Your point is also noted. For your information, we are five RALOs. Three of them have only Chair and Secretary. They don't have Vice Chair. And we are only two RALOs that have Vice Chairs – APRALO and AFRALO – and we both have the same problem, the problem of who should go to the meetings of ICANN? So it is not a single problem or it's not an imagination of X or Y. It is something that exists. I am only pointing the problem. Now it is up to the group to decide and I agree with any position that the group will decide on.

Okay. Thank you very much. We are six minutes after our end of call. Thank you very much for your participation. This was a call without decision unfortunately. So this call is now adjourned. Thank you.



---

YESIM NAZLAR: Thank you all. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a lovely day. Bye-bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**