

MICROLINKS WEBINAR: LEVERAGING RECONSTRUCTION: OPPORTUNITIES FOR CREATING GOOD JOBS

QUESTION AND ANSWER TRANSCRIPT

AUGUST 2, 2017

PRESENTERS

Sonia Mistry, Solidarity Center

Neha Misra, Solidarity Center

Gregory Randolph, JustJobs Network

Prachi Argawal, JustJobs Network

Bama Athreya, USAID Center of Excellence on Democracy Human Rights and Governance

MODERATOR

Kristin O'Planick, USAID Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance

Chrissy Burbank, USAID Knowledge-Driven Agricultural Development Program

Bama Athreya:

Great. Thank you very much. This is Bama Athreya. I am with USAID as the agency's labor specialist and want to thank all our presenters. And offer some initial comments on the presentation before we get to what I can already see will be a range of excellent and very deep questions for the presenters about this presentation.

We'll mention one thing for the audience before I make comments, specific comments. And that is that USAID is supporting a large stream of work on migrant labor rights under our global labor program. And that's work that's been ongoing for many years. We are really very grateful to Ned for having supported this particular piece of research, but did want to also let our audience know that under the Global Labor Program AID has also supported a number of research products on migrant work. And that culminated actually in a conference with a number of really, really interesting presentations and discussion about migration and labor policy that took place two years ago. And then we did another event last year. And I hope everyone will keep track of the work we're supporting because we are hoping to have future events as well and some new research products. And JustJobs Network as well was a really terrific contributor to both of the events that we did previously on the research on migration and labor.

So I'm going to, as I said, I'm going to offer a couple of comments that take the findings into some different contexts. And then have one question to kick us off for all of the presenters. On background for folks on the call on the webinar, I think it's important for everyone to know that if we want to contextualize the policy recommendations of this particular paper on Nepal, they do fit within a global discussion that has been framed by the ILO, the International Labor Organization, on employment and decent work for peace and resilience. And I'm actually looking at a report that came out this year in the ILO. Their session this past year where they were focused on updating a very old recommendation. The transition from war to peace recommendation of 1944.

And I mention that because everyone knows that 1944, what the ILO was focused on was of course post-World War II reconstruction. And I think it's very interesting that the ILO now recognizes the need to update this recommendation and look at resilience and investment in decent work not only as a post conflict issue but also as a broader resilience post disaster, you know sort of post economic transition issue as well.

And so what I want to do is make a couple of comments on one thing that I have observed maybe some applicability of these recommendations beyond the Nepal. And I hope that will stimulate some discussion as well.

I just completed a TDY to Columbia. And as I'm sure everyone on the webinar knows, I mean Columbia is a country that's now looking at a post conflict transition and the implementation of a historic set of peace accords. And so one of the things that is very interesting to think about is that in the context of the peace accords, there is a particular recommendation with respect – the accords have several points. And point one is actually on rural development and the reconstruction of rural economies, particularly in target regions that were affected by this ongoing civil war.

And so one of the recommendations there is for decent work. And that's, again, this is within the context of peace accords, there's a recommendation for decent work in these communities and that rural investment and rural development also assist the formalization of employment in these regions. Now, we understand in Columbia that what that means, of course, is a long term process. And that when we talk about formalization, we are talking about a continuum. And we are talking about slowly putting into place social protection and labor law frameworks as appropriate as we, the international development community, invest in job creation in those communities.

So I think that's interesting here, and what I want to really sort of stress about the Nepal report recommendations, is from the point of view of the international donor community, it's not necessarily about saying, oh, wait, how do we invest in formalization or social protection or the appropriate level and policy frameworks? And it's more about saying, how do we invest in economic development and job creation and how do we partner with the Colombian government to make sure that the right policy frameworks are in place around jobs that are created? And that the right capacity, you know is in place. The Colombian government has the capacity to make sure it's enforcing or overseeing those policy frameworks.

So I want to stress that there's a role for the development community as investor, but there's also a role for governments. Whether it's the government of Nepal, the government of Columbia or in any other sort of post conflict situation or transition situation. But we need to I think as an international donor be mindful of that relationship with the government and stressing the need for the government to sort of come in under any investments in economic development with the right policy framework for decent work. So that was one point.

The second point, now pivoting to another region, Central America, picks up on comments that both Neha and Sonia offered at the conclusion to the presentation. About the role of unions and civil society. And I want to broaden out a little bit to diaspora networks as well. Because I think you've implied something that the audience may better understand if we really drill into what does that look like in practice?

With respect to Central America, we, of course, have a really strong interest in understanding the root causes of migration and particularly the root causes that caused the crisis in unaccompanied minors leaving Central America in recent years and what we can do about it. And I think one of the things that I've found interesting as a perhaps untapped opportunity was that at the, sort of as a response to the crisis we had a number of diaspora networks of Central Americans in North America that stepped up with ideas of how to address the crisis that offered more than just remittances. Now, you know keeping in mind the context that's again been set by Neha here about the importance of remittances to economies, whether we're talking about El Salvador or Nepal. The remittances themselves are a component of what's sent back. But I think, again, what this report really takes us to is there's an in kind contribution possible. These tremendous networks of migrant and diaspora workers offer in-kind technical capacity as well that I think is really untapped. And so in the Central America context what actually happened were there were a number of Central American workers who, because, you know in North America, of course, they have the right to organize into unions. And to be well represented in civil society. You had building trades, construction workers who were in unions who offered as part and parcel of what their unions could offer to take their skills back to Central America and to work with building trade unions in Central America to reinforce their skills and their capacity to contribute to development in their home countries.

So what was – I think what we failed to really do, and, again I speak we as the international development community. As we looked at what kinds of investments we could make in creating better jobs in Central America is we set the table for business investors to come in and help create decent jobs in Central America. But we didn't really fully set the table for these diaspora networks of workers who were willing to bring back their skills and their capacity to help us with that investment in decent work in Central America.

So I think that's something that, you know again, I wanted to make this real. Like what are we talking about here? We're talking about the in-kind reinvestment by workers. And importantly, by their networks and their organizations.

So those are my comments. Now I'm gonna turn to my question again to kick us off. I wanted to ask one question that I think is really significant and has not been addressed in this presentation. And that is how we can make these particular recommendations relevant to women? And on context, noting that we have, you know millions and millions of workers that are women workers migrating from Nepal and other countries in the region, and indeed around the world, for domestic work. And so we're really seeing that women migrant workers are ending up in the lowest field, lowest paid of occupations when they leave and when they go to other countries. And so a lot of these recommendations are really, frankly, looking at male workers that have been in higher skilled sectors and are probably developing skills. So for example, if you talk about your construction worker in Qatar, that worker is probably male and probably developing some skills even without systemic investment, is developing some skills that can be then taken home and reapplied to a home country context. But when you talk about these women, they're getting no skills in advance of leaving. Absolutely none. They're going into really low skilled work overseas. And you know my personal observation working with some of the return and having had a chance to meet returned women migrant domestic workers when they return to their countries of origin, is that they come back and there's very little they can do in their home countries because they haven't come back with anything they can really sort of bring back to their communities in terms of you know – they may have been gone for years, but they come back with no new skills, no way to really sort of reintegrate into a better situation in their communities of origin.

So I'd really like to challenge the presenters to say, let's just take Nepal, let's take the millions of women that are leaving Nepal to go and work in, you know these jobs particularly in domestic work in other countries. What can we do to really focus on appropriate skills development that they can then bring back and reinvest in their communities when they come home? Thank you very much for the opportunity to comment.

Neha Misra:

Okay. Thank you. This is Neha again from the Solidarity Center. We've seen a lot of really great questions on the list of questions for speakers and then also Bama's question. So I think we'll, I'll start with responding to Bama's question. And then have Sonia and Greg jump in.

Bama, your question on women, I think it's a really important question. And because so much of research was focused on the reconstruction and a lot of that dealt with construction we focused a lot about that in the presentation right now. But just more broadly, the question you were asking, in countries like Nepal, a lot of countries in south and Southeast Asia, the majority of migration that we see of women, as you said, is into domestic work. We do see some migration of women in Southeast Asia into some manufacturing sectors. In particular in the garment sector. For example, in Jordan and other places. But not as many Nepali workers. Although we are seeing some Nepali workers in Jordan in the garment sector. But even those tend to be men. As you were saying, the majority of Nepali migrant workers that go abroad tend to be domestic workers.

One thing I will say about that, for many women, you know migrating for work is very empowering. And so I think in the way that I was talking I do tend to come across as being a little bit negative about labor migration. I do get that there can be benefits. And for women, and a lot of the women that I've worked with in south and Southeast Asia, they have said that it's empowering for them to be able to go abroad to work. It helps them to provide income to the family. Oftentimes they're the sole or main income earner for a family when they migrate abroad. And there is something to be said for that.

At the same time though, many of the women that I've spoken to, especially the ones that migrate abroad, in domestic work are in the economy. Are migrating into

– when you migrate into domestic work in many countries it's not recognized as a work sector covered under labor laws. And so it can be very precarious and exploitative as Bama was saying.

So with that said, I think that goes to the point that we were talking about earlier. If governments are going to put a lot of emphasis on having women migrate for domestic work as a form of sending back of remittances, as a way to deal with unemployment, etcetera, there has to be a plan then how to support those communities where women are migrating out of to ensure that their children don't have to do the same thing. Because what we're seeing is women are migrating out as domestic workers, so are their girl children when they grow up. And it's not necessarily getting better from generation to generation.

And so I think this goes back to our top takeaways of governments really having to think about and focus on how do we make things better? How do we really have inclusive growth? What does that mean? And I think in a lot of ways it goes back to what Sonia and Greg were talking about. Creating jobs in other sectors. Focusing on decent work at home. And so that even when women are migrating as domestic workers, maybe helping their households and the children's school, etcetera, we can figure out ways that when those women come back and to help their children as they come out of school to find decent work in Nepal.

I'm gonna turn it over to Greg and Sonia to add a little bit to what I was saying. And then we'll get to the other questions.

Sonia Mistry:

Greg, go ahead.

Gregory Randolph:

Okay. Great. Yeah. Thanks so much, Neha, for sort of kicking things off in the Q&A section. I'll just add a few thoughts on the question specifically of female migrants. Based on some of our research and thinking on the gender dimensions of these questions.

I'll just start by quickly mentioning just so that we're all aware of kind of the context of this question in Nepal, that less than 5 percent of our migrants currently from Nepal are women. So this is not necessarily the global trend. Of course there are countries now where a majority of our migrants are women. But just to sort of put this in context for Nepal, that we are talking about only about 5 percent of the migrant worker population being women in Nepal.

But of course, you know as Bama mentioned, this is a really important question globally because we do see millions and millions of female migrant workers around the globe. And, of course, we know that many of them are engaged in occupations that are more likely to be informal and precarious than the occupations that men tend to take up when they migrate for work.

So I'll just mention a couple things that, you know just to add on to what Neha was saying. One thing is that, you know I think that despite the fact that we are talking about in-kind contributions to the economy, we do, of course, need to continue talking about the policy instruments that are guiding or failing to guide reinvestment of financial remittances in the economy. So women, like men, come, return or send back significant capital in the form of remittances. And I think that there is still a lack of innovation and creativity in policymaking when it comes to really thinking about how these remittances can be used for the benefit of local economies.

So one of the ideas that JustJobs has now brought up in multiple research reports that we've put out is the idea of the government facilitating the creation of cooperatives or producer owned companies. So a lot of times the emphasis is on sort of micro enterprises that really only employ the family of the migrant worker. But we might be able to start thinking about the creation of small and medium enterprise that have the potential to create a larger number of jobs if we think about how the government can provide some sort of facilitation or even matching investment for the creation of producer owned companies. And these could be companies that are owned and operated by women, by female return migrants. Particularly in communities where the predominant trend is women migrating.

So we actually looked at a particular district in Nepal in the report which is called Sindhupalchowk. And this is sort of unlike the broader trend in Nepal where men are predominantly migrating, in this particular district women are the migrants. And I think that this opportunity to really work with return migrants through more directed interventions, more targeted interventions from the state and from civil society to help them actually set up their own , you know producer owned companies or cooperatives, could be one way of facilitating better employment for those women when they return, as well as creating sort of larger spillover effect in the local labor market.

The other thing that I think is important to bring up is that in the course of interviewing women in Sindhupalchowk, in this particular district in Nepal for this research, one thing that sort of emerged is that women who have gone abroad and performed care work or, you know who have worked as domestic workers in households abroad, they do not perceive that they're coming back with no skills. So from our perspective we might sort of look at domestic work as not really expanding their skill set, but these women talked about the fact that they had been trained professionally in taking care of multiple children at one time. Many of them sort of gained new kinds of culinary skills. Some of them even talked about opening restaurants to facilitate the tourism industry in their hometown.

So of course these are not necessarily skills that would lead to extremely high productivity or high paying jobs. But I still think that we should be open minded about the way we look at skill acquisition and the ability of women, even those who are in domestic work, to bring back certain kinds of skills to local economies.

So just that's a couple of points that I wanted to make on this question. And thank you, Bama, for bringing it up.

Neha Misra:

Great. Thank you. Now back to Sonia to Bama's first set of question.

Sonia Mistry:

Yeah. So you know I'm not as familiar with the Columbia context, but I'm thinking about – I work more in south Asia. I'm thinking about countries like Sri Lanka. And

how we can maybe use some of these findings in a post-conflict setting. And there are a couple of points that I think maybe are worth raising.

One is that standards shouldn't be lowered to spur development. Cause one of the concerns that's really come up in the Sri Lanka context is that just to spur job growth in war affected north and east, that actually this might be creating a two tier system because labor rights are much weaker in the north and east where most workers are not aware of what their rights are. Employers are clearly not adhering to national labor law. There just simply aren't enough labor inspectors. We need more labor inspectors and trained labor inspectors. And so that's I think one issue that really does need to be addressed. Making sure that we're not creating these two tier systems.

I think the point about worker and community engagement of key stakeholders is just as relevant in a post conflict setting as in a place like Nepal post disaster. And the other point is that in post-conflict areas we'll also see oftentimes military or government presence that may need to be addressed from the start as we're developing what kinds of frameworks or policies might be necessary. Because this will also really inhibit the ability of affected communities and workers to full participate in the process.

Kristin O'Planick:

Great. Thank you. All right. So we've got a couple questions or maybe a question and a comment more specific to the unions. So Sonia, maybe you can respond to, Andrew asked what are the unions in Nepal that are most relevant for reconstruction? And then he had a related point that the Nepal workers unions rarely talk about migrant workers. And that they advocate more for the domestic workers. So maybe if you can address both of those questions.

Sonia Mistry:

Sure. So anyone who is not too familiar with union structures, sector specific unions, like let's say a union in the construction sector or in hotel and tourism – *[Audio Cut Out]* – these unions are affiliated with trade union federations. So there are several trade union federations in Nepal. There are three particularly large ones. But there are multiple federations. And they're all part of an umbrella body called the Joint Trade Union Coordination Council. The JTUCC. And I wouldn't specify one union or another because I think as we really tried to pull out in our

presentation, we're not only talking about construction workers. We really want to see reconstruction efforts look much more broadly and look at a variety of sectors. So I wouldn't specify one union or another. I think workers more broadly and their unions across sectors should be engaged.

And then the point about Nepal unions focusing mostly on domestic workers. I actually disagree a little bit with this point because there are actually several trade union federations in Nepal that have associated groups or allied organizations of migrant workers in countries of destination such as in Malaysia, where the unions are actually working very closely with unions in countries of destination where they exist. To really try to protect the rights of Nepali workers and keep them organized and mobilized in countries of destination so that they can assert their rights. So we actually do see this happening. Maybe it's not publicized as much, but they're definitely doing work on migrant workers.

Kristin O'Planick:

Great. All right. Back to Greg. We've got two questions from Ritobrato. The first, do you think that reconstruction goals are aligned with the objectives of systemic economic development visa vie time horizons? And for those who missed it, we also have Greg's co-researcher, Prati, I think she's still on the line. And there was related question that hopefully she can address. Did the study cover which sectors or jobs will have the higher economic impact in the long term? Was that something considered? Greg, to you.

Gregory Randolph:

Great. Thanks, Kristin. Maybe I can try to answer Ritobrato question and also Andrew's question sort of at the same time. Andrew was asking specifically what types of infrastructure we're talking about when we talk about sort of opportunities to use physical infrastructure to also address social and economic needs.

So I think maybe I'll start by just saying Ritobrato that I don't think that current reconstruction goals are well aligned with a broader strategy for social and economic development in Nepal. I think that that's one of the sort of the key motivations for us and that was one of the key motivations for us in actually conducting this study. Si we felt like reconstruction was not necessarily being viewed as an opportunity to stimulate broader social and economic development in the country.

So I think that the – you know there are some sort of critical needs. You know to speak to your point about time horizon, I think there are some sort of – you know there are critical needs that still need to be addressed in Nepal. But I think that the way we go about addressing those critical needs, even the short term ones, needs to take in to account some of the longer term social and economic goals that Nepal ought to have in terms of creating good jobs within the country.

And I think to sort of address Andrew's question here about what do we really mean when we talk about infrastructure? So as you mentioned, some of the infrastructure investments are in the health and education sector. Rebuilding schools and rebuilding health clinics. So I think that even when we're talking about rebuilding these types of health and education facilities, we need to be thinking more broadly about how they fit into the long term economic development strategy of the country.

So, you know just to give an example. If we are rebuilding a rural school, rather than building the infrastructure exactly as it once was, you know before the earthquake, perhaps there's ways that we can think about rebuilding that school so that it simultaneously functions as a local skill development center. It could be a place where we invest in low cost technologies to bring vocational and skill development opportunities to rural populations in Nepal. Just to give an example.

Another example is that the Nepali government had in the initial phase of reconstruction talked about building business recovery centers where small businesses that lose their physical structure could operate out of these recovery centers for a short period of time until they were able to rebuild their own buildings. Well, is there a way that we can now take these business recovery centers and repurpose them as incubators for small and medium enterprises or, again, as skill development or vocational training centers?

I mentioned road networks. Is there a way that we can rebuild road networks in such a way that actually creates new kinds of economic linkages that would stimulate economic activity and job creation in the economy? So these are the types of, you

know the ways in which the type of rebuilding and the nature of these infrastructure investments could influence long term economic development.

I think there's also, you know the point we were making in the report is also that there are direct employment effects of reconstruction. And that we need to make sure we're maximizing those direct employment effects, both in terms of quantitative and quality. And I think this sort of, again, speaks to a separate question that was asked in the chat box about linking sort of the reconstruction effort to skilled workers in Nepal. Or even return migrant. This is the point that I was making a little bit earlier about labor market information systems.

So the bulk of reconstruction, the burden of reconstruction, actually falls on households. The way that reconstruction is envisioned is that the government is essentially giving housing grants to households to rebuild their homes. But right now there's really no system that links skilled construction workers to these individual households that are tasked with essentially rebuilding their own homes. So one of the mechanisms that we actually proposed in the report is a wage subsidy that would enable households that right now are complaining that they can't even afford to hire laborers on their individual construction sites. That can be accessed by households to actually employ skilled workers. And that this wage subsidy could also act as a mechanism for linking workers to these opportunities in reconstruction that they may not actually have access to at the time. You know at the current time.

So this is just an example of how these labor market systems can work better, like I said, to maximize the quality and quantity of these direct employment. In addition to linking some of these physical infrastructure investments to social and economic priorities that would stimulate indirect job creation over a longer time horizon. So I hope that that kind of gets at answering multiple of these questions that have come up around broader economic development strategies. And perhaps Prachi can give a quick answer to the question on sectoral strategies, which also came up. What are the specific sectors that we're talking about?

Prachi Agarwal:

Thanks, Greg. So to answer your question, yes, we looked at various sectors that the government is now focusing on and the planning commission has declared as high priority growth sectors, including tourism, agro processing, micro hydropower. And

we suggest in the report how in sectors such as these, skill development initiatives should be aligned with sectors such as these so that then when the sector does come up there is skilled labor in the market to work in these industries.

And in addition, sectors that would have long term economic impact in a country also include those that promote institutions so far at this point. So products like rice and oil and these are the products that Nepal used to export at one point but now is importing. So enhancing agro processing industries, enhancing the mechanical and agriculture will help import, substitute these imports. As well as promoting these products that Nepal and rely on, such as growing its diversity, such as yak wool for pashmina. Medicinal plants. And - so medical and aromatic plants. And these are all sectors that will lead to long term economic impact. Thank you.

Kristin O'Planick:

Great. Thank you. And we are just about out of time, so we'll quickly wrap up. We've got a question from Anastasia. What about jobs that are maybe medium quality but better than what workers currently have? Is it our place to decide for them? It's not always possible or sustainable to create only high quality jobs. So, Neha, maybe you can try to briefly respond to that.

Neha Misra:

Sure. Thank you so much, Anastasia, for the question. And I really like this question in a lot of ways. I think what we're trying to say is that, and I hope that we showed you from the presentation today, and if you get to read the report, that there are actually a lot of opportunities to create good jobs that are not being taken advantage of. And one of my frustrations, Anastasia, and others on the call is that a lot of times in the migration field I hear people say, well, isn't it better that they're migrating to Qatar to work as a domestic worker or a construction sector Nepali workers, even if it is a low wage often precarious job because it's better than not having a job at home? And I think what we're trying to show in this research and what we're trying to show in our presentation today is that those are not the only options.

So, of course, it is not our place to decide for workers. They should have choice. And that's I think the exact point that we were trying to make today. Workers should have a choice. It's the responsibility of government and the responsibility of donors who are putting money into these types of programs to make sure that workers have options for good jobs. The option does not have to be no work or

precarious work. There are ways to create good jobs in an economy both in the destination countries where migrant workers go and in the origin countries if governments were thinking more strategically, more long term and really focused in inclusive growth that brought the voices of the workers into it.

So I agree completely. We should not decide for them. But we should give workers real choices. And as the research shows, there are a lot of opportunities to create decent work and good jobs in Nepal.

Kristin O'Planick: Thank you. And just one final question from me as we wrap up this webinar. To any of our speakers. Is there a place, a country, where you have seen this being done well or has been done well? A place that could be kind of a proof of concept for the things that you're talking about.

Neha Misra: I'll just start. This is Neha again. On the migration side, we are seeing countries start to understand that just sending out migrant workers to work in low wage sectors to meet the demand for cheap labor is maybe not the best strategy. So countries like the Philippines and India increasingly that are starting to really focus on - *[Coughing]* – excuse me. Really starting to focus on trying to build the skills of their workers before they go abroad so that they can migrate into what people call higher skilled sectors. So like nursing, for example, or high tech sectors that may be less precarious. And that may not be as exploitative where workers are maybe able to bring their families. Can stay longer term for example. And not have to pay high recruitment fees of things like that. And so we are seeing countries on the migration side try to focus on skill development while workers are still in the home country so that they can abroad. And then they bring skills back with them. Which is a really great way we think to focus on sustainable development. Greg or Sonia?

Kristin O'Planick: Great. Greg, did you have an –

Gregory Randolph: Sure. Sure. I can mention a couple examples. So I think, Kirstin, that we haven't quite seen a country that has you know at the outset of a recovery and reconstruction effort made a comprehensive and holistic redevelopment and reconstruction plan that encompasses all the different dimensions, you know that

we're talking about in this report. So we don't have a person best practice or proof of concept here. But we do have a few different examples of instances which countries have utilized elements of the broader plan that we put forward in this report.

So one example is that China following the 2008 earthquake that took place there, really thought strategically and carefully about how to make infrastructure investments in ways that were sort of maximized locally economy's productivity and efficiency and job creation capacity. And so there's been actually some very rigorous empirical studies that have been done to show that the local economy in that region of China that was affected by the 2008 earthquake has experienced significant economic growth benefits as a result of the reconstruction effort.

The limitations of those studies is that they don't really look very sort of critically at the labor market in terms of quantity or quality of jobs that were created through the reconstruction effort. But we do know that there, you know that reconstruction effort was leveraged to create economic growth at least in that context. So one could assume that there would also be strategies that would enable us to promote good job creation alongside that growth.

And then another example that I wanted to mention is that the – some of the Pacific island nations following the 2004 tsunami were quite proactive in engaging their diaspora communities in the reconstruction effort. And so many of those island nations have very large, at least as a share of their population, very large migrant worker populations, and populations in diaspora. So that's one example of where diaspora communities were closely engaged in reconstruction efforts.

So I think if we look at a combination of these different experiences, we can start to build a kind of best practice catalog of policy instruments and tools that can be used by countries like Nepal that are facing multiple challenges alongside the challenge of reconstruction following disaster.

Kristin O'Planick:

All right. Thank you so much for that. And thank you to all of our presenters today for sharing this research. I think it's been a valuable contribution to the learning of this community. And thank you to our participants who joined us from all over. I

know for some of you it is getting very late into the night. So with that, we will close for today. The recording, the PowerPoint presentation and the link to the report will be available on Micro Links within the coming couple weeks. And you will receive an email letting you know when that is up. Thank you again and have a good rest of your day.