JULIA CHARVOLEN:	Welcome everyone to the BMSPC call on Thursday, 27ᵗʰ February 2014 at 17:30 UTC. On today's call we have Tijani Ben Jemaa, Oksana Prykhodko, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Maureen Hilyard, Rudi Vansnick, Roberto Gaetano and Eduardo Diaz. Dev Anand Teelucksingh will be joining us very shortly. We have no apologies so far. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Ariel Liang, and myself Julia Charvolen.
	May I please remind all participants to please state your names before speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you and over to you, Tijani.
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Thank you Julia. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is another call for the BMSPC. Today, as you've noticed, we'll discuss two points especially, which are the electoral definitions and the interaction with the candidates. First of all, do you agree with this Agenda? Is there any opposition to this Agenda or any…? Okay, agreement, good. I'll continue.
	I'll go to Item #3 of the Agenda, which is the electoral definition. You'll remember that last time we said that the BCEC Members cannot vote in any case, because the Rules of Procedure prevent them from voting. We said by similarity, more or less, that Members of the NomCom will not vote either, and this was contested by people who said there is rationale behind not knowing the BCEC Members' votes, but there is no rationale for the NomCom Members.
	More or less they are right. There is no connection between the… The candidates don't go through the NomCom, so there's no reason to

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.

EN

prevent the Members of NomCom from voting. I ask you if you agree that we change our decision of the last call, and permit today for the NomCom Members to vote. If you agree, please put a green check. Eduardo, please?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Just for clarification – when you say "NomCom" what do you mean?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: NomCom Members. You have NomCom Members. For example for [inaudible 00:02:51] you have NomCom Members, don't you? Those Members are…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The ICANN Nominating Committee.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay, thank you so much, the ICANN NomCom.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Rudi?

RUDI VANSNICK: Thank you Tijani. I'm just wondering if there could be any conflict of decision, due to the fact that if a candidate in our list is a candidate in a NomCom list… What about that situation? They know about it, we don't now about it.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, but the rationale for the BCEC was that those people evaluated the candidate, and that's why they can't vote on this candidate. For the Members of the NomCom, even if one of the candidates in this competition is also a candidate on the NomCom, even if they evaluated him or her in the NomCom, there is no connection with this kind of election. It's a little bit different. I'm asking if you agree with that. If you want to oppose go ahead, but tell me why. If there is no comments please… Go ahead Maureen.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Just for clarification on what we're actually voting for, we're actually voting on the fact that NomCom ALAC Members can actually vote in this election – is that what we're voting on?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No. Maureen, there is not only the ALAC Members who will vote, there is also a replacement for candidates. We have three candidates from the ALAC Members and we'll get replacements for them. One of the replacements may be a Member of the NomCom. That's why the question is there now. Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Can you state again what we're voting for, so everyone's clear? Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Do you agree that At-Large Members of the NomCom are allowed to vote in this election, this competition? Assuming they are part of the electorate, for sure. Okay. If you agree, please put a green check. Okay. Good. I can say that we're all in agreement, more or less, except Roberto. Roberto, don't vote. He's not a Member of the Committee.

Thank you all. Now we changed our decision of last call. Now Members of the NomCom are permitted to vote. Second point – interaction with candidates. You'll remember that last time we decided that only an interaction through Wiki would be permitted, but people reacted to that and find that more or less impossible, because not all the At-Large Members can have a log-in for the Wiki so they can ask questions. This is the first point.

The second point is they find that direct interaction is more useful and more significant for them, and they wanted to have at least one call, besides the Wiki. We can use the Wiki, but we'll try to find a way to make use of it, because of this problem of log-ins. Besides this interaction on the Wiki, can we decide that we permit a call for interaction with the candidates? Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ:	I have two things. One is to the previous point about the electorate definitions. As this group, are we allowed to vote for the ALAC Director? That's the first question. Can you answer that now?
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	You mean the BMSPC Members? Sure, yes.
EDUARDO DIAZ:	The reason I'm asking is because I think there is a misconception, at least in AFRALO, because Garth believes that me, as part of this Committee, cannot vote for the Director. So I'll talk to him and explain that, that this Group is the one that can vote.
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Eduardo, I'll explain why. This Group is only for process. We don't evaluate, we don't decide on the candidate – anything. It's not our job. We are here for the process only, so there is no reason why you can't vote. Second question?
EDUARDO DIAZ:	Thank you for that clarification. To the point of interaction with the candidates, I participated yesterday at an ALAC meeting and I know what trouble people have in the decision that was made before. I said before, having an interaction with the candidates, where people ask questions, I don't think that will be useful. I meant mostly because of asking question.

I think there should be an interaction, and I didn't think about that. I think somebody mentioned it yesterday, that what we should have I some kind of debate between the candidates. We should get the candidates online for a couple of hours, we send them one, two or three questions – and I'll suggest that these questions are related to [inaudible 00:10:09] sessions of the Summit – and we send these questions ahead of time.

We select a moderator to have the debate flow, and then prepare one or two questions that will not extend to the candidates, and we'll ask them during the call. If it's a debate-type thing, that I would love to have, because otherwise, when people start asking questions they'll get different answers and it might be that one person will ask all these questions. That's my recommendation. I am for that interaction with the candidates. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Eduardo. Maureen, please?

MAUREEN HILYARD: I agree with Eduardo. I think it's a good idea to actually allow the candidates to have an opportunity to present their views, but I think that we need to do it in a really controlled environment, and that the questions are selected beforehand and that there's an independent moderator who takes control of the discussions – probably a Q&A session more than a debate, as such.

The thing is that a debate isn't common in most cultures, whereas the American culture very much involve themselves in debates. It may not be appropriate for other cultures and they may feel that their polarizing viewpoint may disadvantage some candidates from others.

I think that it needs to be in a controlled situation with questions being co-selected and [posted? 00:12:23] to the candidates beforehand so they prepare a brief presentation, so that it doesn't go on for ages, but so that they are able to provide their responses in a more controlled environment. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Maureen. Oksana please?

OKSANA PRYKHODKO: Thank you Tijani. First of all, Eduardo raised two questions. Firstly about [inaudible 00:13:09], and I don't see any problems with the [inaudible] because [inaudible] sent to the staff, and staff can post it on the Wiki. It's really very commonplace to hear the whole set of questions and answer in one place. Heidi, could you please confirm the possibility of this?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I'm sorry, could you repeat that?

OKSANA PRYKHODKO: Is it possible to send each question for you, to be posted on the Wiki?

EN

HEIDI ULLRICH: What I'm hearing is whether it would be possible for the BMSPC to send questions to staff…

OKSANA PRYKHODKO: No. Every Member of At-Large can send questions to you and you will post it on the Wiki.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, we can do that. that's possible.

OKSANA PRYKHODKO: Yes, and the candidates can also answer through you, yes?

HEIDI ULLRICH: What I would suggest is that they answer directly on the Wiki. There would be a Wiki page set up, and then we'd post all the questions noting who asked them, and then we'd ask the candidates to respond to them, either on the Wiki or perhaps, if you decide to have a briefing call, then you could collect the questions that you'd like the candidates to answer on the call.

OKSANA PRYKHODKO: So there is no technical problem with this, no?

EN

HEIDI ULLRICH: No. The only concern would be that at the moment, unless people are logged into the Wiki, they cannot post questions on the Wiki. They'll have to log in and then they can post their questions directly. The easiest way is for them to just send it to staff and we can post them on the Wiki.

OKSANA PRYKHODKO: Thank you very much. Another question is, what about the [inaudible 00:15:17]. I fully support this idea. I would like to discuss the process of selecting questions. For example, if any RALO has to have the right to put at least one question, or what is the process of selection of questions? Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Oksana. Dev?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. I think I'd [have a hand in controlling? 00:16:03] the debate or Q&A conference call session with the candidate is a good one. I do have some concerns, and that's to do with the timeframe we have before the votes start on the 16th of March. There are two things. One – there are five candidates involved. That means that the call will have to be really structured and each candidate gets three minutes, say, to answer a question.

Given that there are five candidates, that's potentially 15 minutes used in responding to any one question or giving an opening or closing statement. It's going to be… I'd say it'd have to be two hours long.

That's the first thing. The second thing is you also have to find a time that's appropriate for all the regions, a middle of the road time for this session, because I don't think there's time enough to have two separate calls for it.

Thirdly, and this is something I'd have a great concern about, is whether transcripts can be made available for those… Not all the ALSes are going to attend the call, let's be realistic. However, I'd want the material from the call to be available to the RALOs so that they can make the best informed decision, should they choose to do so, when they have to deliberate and make opinions about candidates.

The transcript really has to come out very soon after that call, because if you look at the timing, assuming you'd have to schedule a call next week with the candidates – say March 6th or Friday 7th – then the transcripts have to be available around the 10th or 11th. Again, it really has to do with the RALOs being able to read transcripts and make a decision about which candidate they propose to be the At-Large Director, and to advise the RALO Chairs accordingly.

Those are my concerns. I'd urge for staff to definitely have a rapid turnaround on the transcripts. I know everything that requires transcribing is important, but this is critical in timing. Those are my concerns. I say this because in 2010 there was no transcript provided for that call, so in a sense, only those persons who were able to attend the call were able to really benefit from the discussion.

I don't think the majority of At-Large really benefitted, because unless they took the time to listen to the recording of the call – which I doubt –, so transcripts are very crucial, because it allows a lot of material to be

understood and read easily. Not just the transcripts. I'm sorry to take so long, but transcripts also have to be translated as well, unless the Spanish and French channels would be transcribed also. Okay, thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Dev. Coming back to what Eduardo proposed… I have another hand? No. Okay. What Eduardo proposed was to have a debate and not a Q&A session. He proposed that we take one or two of the themes of the Summit and have a debate about them. I don't believe this is what people are expecting.

Both sides – the At-Large Members and the candidates – are expecting questions asked by the At-Large Members and answers from the candidates, because they want an interaction between both sides. I agree that it's important to have a direct interaction with each other. The concern was the time, and Dev is 100% right.

I think that we have to go in the direction of a Q&A session when moderated with the timekeeper, because if you let the candidate be free they'll take all the time to speak. So we need a timekeeper, and we need to decide on the slots for each question and how long a candidate can speak for, so that all candidates have the same chance and the same opportunity. This is one way to do it.

If you have other points of view, we listed three or four interventions. If the others have other points of view, please don't hesitate. Oksana, yes please, go ahead. [pause] We'll wait for Oksana. Again, I'll ask the following question: do you think that it's better to have a Q&A session,

EN

or a debate session, as Eduardo proposed? If you agree with the Q&A please put a green check. If you don't agree, put a cross in it. Okay. Rudi?

RUDI VANSNICK: What about a Q&A in the first round and a debate in the second round?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No. Rudi, we are speaking about a Q&A session or a debate session before the first round. When we reach the second round we'll be there and we'll vote, because first of all the interaction should be with all the candidates. For the second round we only have three and we'll not have time to do it. All the question is now is for the interaction before the first round. This is what's on the table. Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD: Yes, you just answered my question and that was, we are voting on just the first round at the timed Q&A, on a phone call – is that correct?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Could you please repeat that?

MAUREEN HILYARD: I was just asking, for this vote, we're voting on a Q&A session on a phone call for the candidates – is that correct?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, that's right. Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ: For clarification, what does a Q&A mean? That we give them a question and they all answer that question? Or people ask questions at random? What's the format?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: There are two proposals in this case – one proposal was made by one of the Members of this Committee, which is preparing the questions in advance, giving them to the candidates, and during the session the candidates will answer those questions. This is one way to do it. The second way is to come to the session and each Member can ask any question they want, and they can ask it to all the candidates or only one candidate.

This is the second format. If we agree on a Q&A session we'll go to the second question, which is what kind of questions do we want. Are they prepared questions for all the candidates, or are they live questions?

EDUARDO DIAZ: I might be confused between a debate and a Q&A. Basically, what I mentioned before about the debate, it wasn't a people debate with each other, it's really a question and answer [inaudible 00:26:26] everybody to answer. But it's okay. I'm sorry. Tijani, are we voting first on whether we want to do a Q&A versus a debate? Can we define debate then? I'm not sure.

EN

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I really don't understand your question.

EDUARDO DIAZ: My question is, you're asking if we'd do a Q&A interaction with the candidates, and if you're asking that question it's because the next question will be whether we want to do a debate, right? Or not?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: The second question will be, do you want them to prepared questions, given to the candidates before the call, or do you want the questions asked during the call.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay. So we're voting on whether we want to do a Q&A first. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. A Q&A session, do you agree? If you agree please put a green check. Okay. Eduardo… Dev… I see a lot of green checks. Okay. Now I see Oksana didn't vote. Okay. Good. Now that we're okay with the Q&A session, do you want them to be prepared questions in advance and given to the candidates so that they prepare them before coming to the call, or do you want live questions?

HEIDI ULLRICH:	Tijani, Oksana has her hand raised.
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	I don't see it. She has a green tick. Okay, now I have Olivier and Eduardo. Olivier please.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	I know I'm not part of this Working Group but I was just going to mention one thing with regards to questions being asked for candidates. It's very likely – in fact, it's 100% sure – that whoever will be selected as the Board Director is going to have to be able to express their ideas, not with prepared questions when they're on the Board, but with matters as they arise.

In order to make sure we've managed to find the best person at being able to answer questions, and just comes to them without being able to prepare for several days or prepare a text that they can read… In order to make sure that they're going to be operational on the Board, we probably need to have unprepared questions.

Or if the questions are prepared I'd suggest that maybe this Working Group could prepare the questions in advance and then not transmit them to any of the candidates and therefore only allow the candidates the knowledge of those questions when they're on the call. Then one is able to gauge whether they're able to express themselves or not. That's all. Thank you.

EN

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier for this.   I see Eduardo, he's agreeing with you. Oksana wants to speak.

OKSANA PRYKHODKO: Thank you. I fully agree with Olivier, and actually I'd like to give each candidate an opportunity to express his or her vision, and I don't see any sense in questions and answers during the call, because it's possible to do it through the Wiki.   The only reason for the call is to hear their opinion and their possibility to express their opinion.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much Oksana. We now have two opinions expressed. I want to know the other opinions. Do you agree with prepared questions not given to the candidates? A yes from Eduardo. Rudi?

RUDI VANSNICK: Thank you Tijani. I'm just wondering, what about having two prepared questions and two non-prepared questions, in order to be able to be able to evaluate the difference between someone who's able to prepare answers, and them responding to the non-prepared ones?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Rudi.   This would be possible because we'll have the questions on the Wiki.   Those are questions that are prepared, and people have time to answer and they'll write their answers on the Wiki. Then we have the live interaction, which will give you the sense of the live reaction of the candidates. Next, Dev.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you Tijani. I think as always the devil's in the detail. I thought about unprepared questions, and I agree with the concept. I guess what I'm also thinking about is that potentially you could wind up with a situation where basically a RALO is unable to ask their question to be answered by the candidate. I understand we need [time to? 00:33:22] structuring the questions [inaudible] prepared question, or unprepared question, or whatever ratio is decided on.

But I'm also thinking that you want to have a question from each RALO, no? I'd just ask what the rest of the group thinks about that. I think potentially, if you have two or three questions, the chances are that the RALOs are not going to be able to have their [questions answered? 00:34:00] by the candidates, at least not on the call.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Dev. I confess that I don't understand you, because the quality of the sound is very bad. I don't know why. Normally I hear you very well. If the others understood what you said, that's okay. I didn't understand. I don't even know what your concern is.

HEIDI ULLRICH: If I may try to repeat that? Dev is concerned that all of the RALOs will not be able to ask a question on the teleconference. He's saying that it would be good that at least one question could be asked from each of the RALOs. I hope I've said that correctly Dev, in brief.

EN

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, I see. I will give the floor to Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I just want to comment again. I think that if we let the candidates have an opening statement, we can then go ahead and ask two or three questions that they don't know about, and all of them can answer the same question, and then we have a closing statement. I think if we do it in that format then we'll have a rounded vision of what each candidate has to say. That's my comment. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Just to say, I don't know why this Working Group wants to reinvent the wheel. At the last election process there was a call that took place, and I think the feedback that we got about it was that it worked very well. I've put a link now on the chat about this, and it's got the full Agenda of the call, available for people to look at.

That's exactly what you're designing at the moment. I've just heard, "An introduction by each of the candidates, so they have time for an interaction…" Then you can see here there's a candidate debate on key issues facing At-Large, so maybe each of the candidates can talk about the issues, and then there's questions and answers, which goes in a rotating fashion between the different RALOs, and that answers Dev's concern.

Perhaps you could take this as a starting point, and maybe amend it if you think there should be an amendment into it. It looks to me as though all the rules already exist, or at least it was an example of things working well. The only difference I would suggest is because there are now five candidates rather than only three, one would make the call a standard 120 minutes long, two hours.

There's even a good timing when you look at it. 13:00 UTC. You've got midnight Sydney, 21:00 Hong Kong, 14:00 CEC. The only thing is 5:00 PSC and 8:00 ESP, but that's [inaudible 00:37:30] on the Americas. Even Buenos Aires is at 10:00, so even the timing seems to be quite pleasant. I note on this occasion that it actually happened on a Saturday. No need to do it on a Saturday though, because we know that staff is not working on weekends. Apart from that, this looks like quite a good thing to look at as a starting point. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much Olivier, you are right. More than that, I will tell you that Sunday was intended to be Sunday, because everyone can be on the call. Nobody is taken up with their work or their job, etcetera. Sunday was a good choice, but we can choose another day if it's better. I agree with you that we don't have to reinvent the wheel. We have something and we can make use of it.

I think that for the prepared question we already have the Wiki, which will serve for the prepared questions. This interaction is more of a live interaction with the candidates, and I think the schedule for the 2010 call can be used. It's very good. Is there any comment on that? Okay. Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Tijani, let's go ahead and mold this Q&A and define the format offline. Let's try to select a date, if that's okay. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: You are okay with the proposal of Olivier? Okay. First I want to know what the point of view is of the whole group on the proposal of Olivier's. Do you all agree on that? I think it is a good proposal, yes. Okay. We are going towards a consensus on that. Now, selecting the date. I have thought about it and I have a proposal. I propose the 6th of March.

As Dev said, after this Q&A interaction, the RALOs have to consult between themselves. Each RALO has to consult with each community, so they can decide on whom they will vote if they will have a direct vote. Also, Members of ALAC who vote on their own behalf may want to have the point of view of the community.

So we need this Q&A session as early as possible, so that we'll leave a certain time for the RALOs to interact internally and between RALOs. Do you agree on the 6th of March? Okay, Eduardo. Okay, Dev. Okay, Rudi. We can say we are more or less reaching a consensus on the 6th of March for this call, this live interaction between the candidates and At-Large Members.

Now, I have another issue that I want to debate with you, and that's for each step of the process, if we have a tie, we need to break it. We have the rules, which state we can do second election to break a tie. If we don't manage to break the tie in the second election, we go to the tie-

EN

breaking methods. For this second election, I have a question for you. Shall we re-do the election exactly as we did the first one?

I'll explain. If we had the five candidates and we are in the first round, we want to drop two of them, and we do the vote, we'll reach the following result: we'll have one first, one second, and we'll have two thirds with the same score, and the fifth is the least one. Here we cannot drop two. We have one to drop, yes, it's clear, but with the second we have two with the same score, so we have to break this tie.

We'll go to the second election. I ask you: shall we re-do the election as we did the first one, with the five candidates? I don't think so, because if we do the election with the five candidates, and with the 20 electorates, the same people, I believe that the same people will vote for the same people and we'll have the same result. So the most intelligent way is to have a vote between the two people who have the same score. Do you agree with this method?

Nothing in the rules explain how to do it. Do you agree with this method? Do you have any other…? Please go ahead Rudi.

RUDI VANSNICK: Thank you Tijani. Is the initial goal for the first round of voting to obtain a final slate of three, or is the goal to have the slate with five?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No, to have three. We start with five. After the first round we have to get three only on the slate.

RUDI VANSNICK: Okay, thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. Second we have Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I have a question. If we have five candidates and we have 20 people voting, what happens if everybody gets four votes? It's a tie.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Eduardo, what is the question?

EDUARDO DIAZ: The question is, in the first round, in which we're eliminating two of the five, if we have 20 people voting there is the possibility that everyone gets four votes each, meaning there is a tie for everyone.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, it's possible. In that case we'd re-do all the vote.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay.

EN

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Just to confirm, with regards to the first round, we're doing the voting by ranking all of the candidates, correct? It's similar to how we handle delegates from the At-Large to the NomCom. Is that correct?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Everyone will be voting for one candidate, and we'll see who has the least votes and we'll drop them. Two of them will be dropped.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: So to confirm, we're not using the "instant runoff", which is similar to how we vote for the NomCom delegates? There, we rank the candidates in order of most preferred to least preferred, and then the bottom two are then removed. That's how I thought this first round would be done. What I'm potentially hearing is a different method. Maybe Olivier is going to try and fight it, so I'll put my hand down.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Olivier, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Tijani. Dev is absolutely correct. We're not using instant runoff. I think Tijani explained it. In both the first round, second round, and maybe there might be a need for a third round, each member of the electorate will vote for one person. There is indeed a possibility that in the first round each running candidate will get four votes.

The rules, when it comes to them, say there should then be a second vote done on those candidate that are tied, because that is a tie. It looks as though if people remain with their votes, and you end up with a tie again, at that point it looks as though one has to flick a coin to end up selecting our Board Candidate, which is probably the worst case that this would be.

I sincerely hope, as a result, that not all candidates would obtain four votes, because we'd be in real trouble if that were the case. It would just make us look like a total set of idiots. That's one thing. The concern that Tijani has is, let's say you've got a tie for third place, the first round goes and you've got two candidates that are clearly ahead and then you've got two candidates that have the same number of votes.

There is nothing in our Rules of Procedure that actually talks about that, so this is where Tijani is suggesting that we'd then need a round for the third place. Unfortunately, in the Rules of Procedure that were drafted and agreed, it basically mentions that the first round is all the candidates and the second round needs to have three candidates.

If we had a first round with two people having a high number of votes – let's say five votes – and the next two people have got four votes, and the last person has two votes. So that's 20 votes in total. We wouldn't be able to say, "Well, the ones with five votes are automatically selected for the second round and the ones after that are not." There is no provision for this, so we'd need to choose a third candidate from that list, hence the potential solution, or suggested solution from Tijani to have a round to select the third person in the top three. A bit confusing

and embarrassing, but that's how it is at the moment. I hope that makes it clear.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much Olivier. It's very clear. Thank you very much. I repeat that if we do the election, as we did for the first time, there are very few possibilities that we'd have different results, since we have the same people, the same voters, and the same candidates. We'd probably have the same result.

The best way for me is to hold an election between only the two people having the same score, and in that case we might have a different result. People who didn't vote for them will vote, and we don't know to whom they will vote, so we'd have a new result. This is my point of view. If you have another one please tell me. Any other opinions? What do you prefer? Do you agree with my proposal? This is one question. Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Can you restate the proposal again please? Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. The proposal is the following: if we have two with the same score, at third place, or perhaps we might have three having the same score at the third position – that means we'll have three persons at third place; the last one has the same score – in that case we'll run an election between people who have the same score, only. We'll not re-do the election as it was done the first time. This is the proposal. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Tijani. Just rereading the voting process Rules of Procedure, as they're given at the moment – and thank you Heidi for putting this on the chat – I have noted one thing. It does say in there, "If there are more than three candidates on the final candidate list the first vote of the electorate will use an accepted voting method that will allow the three most preferred candidates to be selected."

What I've noticed is it says, "…Will use an accepted voting method," and I wonder whether that is up to the choice of this Committee to choose what voting method they wish to have. I do retract from what I said earlier with regards to just having everyone voting for just one candidate, would there be a chance – and this is for this Committee to decide perhaps – to have a first round that uses instant runoff, and then the round after that just asks for one candidate to be selected? That's my question. It's not even a suggestion, it's just something I'm throwing here and it's for you to decide. I have a feeling that might be a possibility. I don't know whether it will help or not though.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Olivier, please detail the method you're proposing.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm not proposing any method, I'm just saying that the "accepted voting method" appears to be what needs to be chosen by this Committee. The BMSPC is the Committee that will choose the accepted voting method, so that's for you to choose it.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I know, but what can the method be that makes us avoid a tie?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: This is what we've been… The first vote is going to be an instant runoff, or at least was in the past. The second vote is a regular vote. The first round is going to be instant runoff – this is my proposition… I'll start again. The first round, instant runoff system where you rank the candidates in terms of preference. The second round is going to be a regular vote where you just vote for one candidate, and the third round, and so on, will also be just one at a time.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, very good.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's my proposal. It's not cast in stone, it's a proposal. You can choose to go for it or not. That's all.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I know. When we are ranking all the candidates, don't you think we could have a tie too?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think it's less likely to have an exact tie when ranking the candidates with a 20-people electorate than if each person has just one vote. That said, Murphy's Law says that we might end up with a most complicated

situation, but the instant runoff voting was the one that produces the most spread of candidates. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. Rudi?

RUDI VANSNICK: I'm just thinking about what if we could use a kind of [ballot? 00:56:48] to vote, in the sense that each voter has the possibility to give one, two or three as a value, to three candidates. We need to have three from the first round. The reason I'm proposing this is that we'll have less difficulties, or less equality in voting. What do you think about that?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: You are proposing a weighted vote? Okay. Eduardo please.

EDUARDO DIAZ: I like the idea of the ranking for the first round, but I'll say that if the possibility there to have a tie is less, my question is why don't we do this ranking for all the rounds? That way we'll be less likely to have ties. That's my comment. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Eduardo. Olivier? No, Dev please.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: I was really surprised… That's why I was I raising the issue of the instant runoff. I think the instant runoff voting would definitely be for the first round. I really don't see the problem with using instant runoff voting with the three candidates in the second round, because it will still work. Even though there are three candidates, they are ranked accordingly and the one with the highest rank in that case would win, unless there's a tie for that first place.

In which case, the third place candidate in that scenario would then be removed and then the third vote would just retain those two candidates, and of course you repeat until one gets more than 50%. I would say instant runoff voting throughout. I don't see an issue for not having it in the second round when you only have three candidates.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Dev, for the second round, if we use the same model, we will never have [a consensus vote? 00:59:30], because you are always ranking people. So it's first place, second place. We need 50% of votes. This is the question. I think for the second round it's impossible to do this method. We can use it for the first round, but for the second round I don't see how we can do it. Now I have Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Tijani. Whilst in the first round there is no mention about what type of voting is to be used, the second round is a little bit more explicit in the Rules of Procedure. Rule 19.11.4 mentions: "When there are three candidates remaining, there will be a vote of the

EN

electorate. Should one candidate receive more than 50% of votes cast, that candidate will be declared the winner."

On that point, I think that assumes then that it's a majority vote. It's not an instant runoff vote. That's why I think the second round cannot have that, but the first round certainly is not determined, and it says, "An accepted voting method," so you're very welcome to use instant runoff in the first one, if you deem it prudent.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. Any other comments or opinions? If not, I will ask you if you're okay with the instant runoff method for the first round, which is ranking the candidates and not giving a vote for one candidate. For the first round. I see that Rudi is okay. Okay. It is okay. We'll go for this method for the first round. Very good. I am really [fed up? 01:01:44] now, because it was a problem for me. There is a big problem.

For the second round now, if we have a tie, we will also run a second vote and in this case we'll also do the vote between people who have the same score, or we'll re-do the whole election, as we did the first time. It's the same question that I asked for the first round. I ask it again for the second round. I'm sure that if we choose to re-do the election, as we did the first time, we'll not have any change. Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Just a clarification point – if I look at the rules that Olivier mentioned, and that are in the chat – in the second round, if we have three candidates, one of them needs to have 50% more to win, or is it just a

EN

majority; the one that gets the most votes? That's a clarification, thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Eduardo, for the second round it's compulsory to have more than 50% of the votes.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay, so if we have three candidates and none of them get 50% of the votes then we go to a third round, is that correct?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. Thank you. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you very much. I think Eduardo just contradicted himself unfortunately. The majority is actually a number larger than half of the total. That's how majority is defined, so it is indeed more than 50%. For a majority vote someone has to have more than 50% to win – not just to have a larger share than the others. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ: It has to do with semantics. I meant [inaudible 01:04:18] the biggest number of votes, which is not necessarily 50%. Yes, I agree with Olivier's comments, yes.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, that's what I understood, yes. Thank you. Now everything is clear for the first round. For the second round again, it is the last time, I will ask it: if we have a tie, and we have to run the vote again, we'll not run it for all the candidates, we'll run it only for the two or three people who have the same score. Is that okay? No opposition? Dev?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Just to confirm also, based on past experiences with instant runoff voting, we have to make sure that it's clear to the electorate that they have to give a preference for all of the five candidates. They can't just rank one and not put a ranking for all the other candidates. Then the instant runoff voting would not work properly.

So you have to make sure, similar to how we had it in our Rules of Procedure – I believe it's still there – that when we do the instant runoff voting all candidates have to be ranked. That's all we have to emphasize when the vote goes out. That's it

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Well noted. Heidi please? I know there is the ALT call. I know.

HEIDI ULLRICH:	Exactly. That was one of the points. We do have another call on this line in 21 minutes, but I didn't quite get the second point about the second round, phase one. Tijani, could you please state that clearly again?
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	If for the second round, the first time we do it on Sunday, if we have a tie we'll have to break the tie and run the vote again, a second time. We'll have to run it again, not for all the candidates, but only for the two or three people who have the same score. Is that clear?
HEIDI ULLRICH:	You're saying this is for the second round, phase one, on Sunday? I've just heard Dev say that no, that would be electronically. Could you please clarify when this second…?
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	The first round will be done electronically. The second round will be done face-to-face, except for those who'll be absent, and for those we'll see if we can do it by telephone or electronically. We'll see. We'll see who's absent and then we'll decide according to the position of those people. Is it possible to reach them easily by telephone or not? Etcetera.
HEIDI ULLRICH:	Okay. So I'm clear on the first one, but again please bring me back to Sunday now. On Sunday, in Singapore, we're going to have the second round, phase one. We're likely to have three candidates by then. If

there is a tie, if all three of those received the same amount of votes, then what?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Then we will run the vote again a second time, assuming that people may change their mind – the electorate.

HEIDI ULLRICH: So that voting process will be instant runoff?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No-no, they will choose only one candidate.

HEIDI ULLRICH: By which means will they choose that candidate on Sunday, if there's a tie? On Sunday, in Singapore, if there are three candidates left that all received the same score during the first round, what happens? By what means…?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: If there is a tie we will run the same election with the same method a second time. If it doesn't work, if we still have the same score for the three we will go to the tie-breaking methods. We decided that face-to-face we will do a [inaudible 01:09:29].

EN

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. I'm not following, I'm sorry, I'm not following. When you say the "same vote", does that mean the same exact vote of the five candidates using instant runoff voting again?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No-no. Suppose for the second round we'll start with three candidates, won't we? We will run the vote and if we have a tie… First, if we don't have one that gets more than 50% of the vote, we'll go to a second round, phase two. We will drop the last one. If we have two persons who have the same score, at the last position, we may repeat the vote for those two persons who have the least score.

In any case, we'll to go phase two because we wouldn't have more than one with 50%. Is it clear for you?

HEIDI ULLRICH: No. I think we maybe need to take this offline to clarify this.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. We can write it down so that it will be clear.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you very much. Sorry if I'm being obtuse about this.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. Olivier?

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Tijani. Heidi, this is actually described in the Rules of Procedure. The explanation of it is provided in the Rules of Procedure. 19.11.4 speaks about the time when there are three candidates remaining, there will be a vote of the electorate. Should one candidate receive more than 50% of the votes cast, that candidate will be declared the winner. If not, the candidate with the least votes will be removed.

If there is a tie for last position, then if sufficient time remains, the BMSPC will run the tied election over again, in case voter positions have changed. That whole election will be run again. This can be done just once in any given step of the process, and that's what Tijani has mentioned. Then in 19.11.5 it talks about when there are two candidates remaining, and if there's a tie in that again, the BMSPC will run the tied election over again, in case voter positions have changed.

19.11.6 then says if there's no time to run the tied election again, as called for in 19.11.4, and 19.11.5, a random selection by a method determined by the BMSPC will be used to identify the candidate to be removed. That's what Tijani has mentioned there.

It effectively says it will be a draw at that point, for the candidate to be removed, and that of course for 19.11.5, if we just have two candidates remaining and there is a tie on that, then it will have to be a draw between those two candidates. That's all. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. Thank you for the explanation. I think that now we'll stop the call. If you have any other questions or opinions to express

EN

then please go ahead, because we have to… No other opinions? Okay. Thank you very much for coming. I think it was productive. It is a headache. It's not easy to manage, but we will try. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm sorry but this Committee has explicitly said, "Needs to determine what type of random selection it's going to use." "Random selection by a method determined in advance by the BMSPC to be used to identify the candidate to be removed."

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. We decided on that on the last call, and we said that we have the choice between two methods – the electronic method, the random software, or the draw. Since we are face-to-face, the most transparent method is a draw.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Perfect. If that's clear then that's fine. Thank you, that's all.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: It's very clear. Thank you very much. Thank you everyone. Have a good night, a good day. Bye bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]