
GISELLA GRUBER: I'd like to greet everyone. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening to everyone. Welcome to today's Joint Board Candidate Evaluation Committee and Board Member Selection Process Committee Working Group call, on Monday, 11th of August at 16:00 UTC. On today's call we have Tijani Ben Jemaa, Murray McKercher, Roberto Gaetano, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Oksana Prykhodko, Maureen Hilyard, Siranush Vardanyan and Dev Anand Teelucksingh.

We have apologies noted from Carlos Aguirre. From staff we have Kathy Schnitt, Silvia Vivanco, and myself, Gisella Gruber. If I could please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes? I hope I haven't left anyone off the roll call. If I have, would you be so kind as to say your name now. If not, over to you, Tijani. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Gisella. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the call of the BMSPC and BCEC, the joint call, for the evaluation of the 2014 selection process. Agenda Item #2 is the adoption of the Agenda. Do you have any remarks about the Agenda? I see no hands. I'll go further. One moment please. As you know, the selection for the 2014 has been done. The last phase was done in Singapore. It was done in two phases.

The first phase was the identification of possible candidates, and verification and evaluation of the candidates' applications, and the selection of those who fulfilled the criteria. That was done by the BCEC.

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.

The second phase was the running of the election. That was done by the BMSPC, besides [unclear 00:02:30] oversight on the whole process.

The aim of this call is to enumerate the problems faced, and provide a proposal for remediation. Another aim is to propose any actions to improve the selection process for the upcoming round. This is, if you want, the aim of the call. If you have any remarks about that, please speak up. Seeing no hands, we'll go to Item #3, which is the discussion of the 2014 selection process and [the results 00:03:19].

Here I'll ask you to give your points of view. I can begin, if you want? I remark that there was a problem about proxy. People who were candidates and were from the Electorate have manifested their reading, to recover that write-up working, when they've been eliminated. This was a problem. We tried to find a way to solve it, and finally, the way we did, people were [confused 00:05:01] of the way we did it.

I think that we have to fix it in our rules for the future, so that there's no interpretation. Also, there was a small problem of communication between candidates, and the Electorate, and the At-Large community as a whole. If you remember, the BMSPC, when we had our first call, the decision was not to make a call, but to use only the discussion list. The candidates weren't happy with that, and we made another decision to make the call, and it was very well done. This also must be clearly mentioned in our rules.

If it's not in the Rules of Procedure, we have to make a guide for the future. Also, there was a problem of voting methods. Not everyone was agreed on the method, even if we discussed it very long in length, in the

BMSPC call. The decision was [unclear 00:05:29]. Everyone was okay with the decision, but Alan Greenberg especially was not happy with it. I think that in the future we have to mention exactly the voting method for each round.

As you've seen, the document sent by Alan and Cheryl also spoke about the voting methods. They also spoke about tie breaking. The proposal was to not break the tie between the two sides, the two persons, but to re-run the whole vote. That means that even the one who has the greatest score has to run the election again, with the two other tied persons. This is the proposal of Alan and Cheryl.

Also, they spoke about the proxies. Here there is a proposal that people who state the proxy for someone who is a candidate, has to [cut the vote 00:06:55], directed by the candidate. This is the proposal of Alan and Cheryl. Lastly, the London selection, they proposed that the [whole 00:07:12] for the London selection has to be known from the beginning.

Those are more or less the problems I identified. Please, if you have a comment or if you have other problems, please speak up. Roberto?

ROBERTO GAETANO:

In the BCEC we had a discussion, just after the elections, and we brainstormed on the problems. We had a list of issues. I thought I had [unclear 00:08:06] actually in April. I just resent this message to you, and copied it to staff, as to whether this can be used as a basis for discussion. There were a set of points that we feel, within the BCEC, could be improved. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Roberto. Frankly speaking, I didn't understand what you said, because of the quality of the line. If someone understood, can you please summarize what he said? Roberto, I think I caught one thing – that you sent something about some remarks you had, as BCEC Chair. If it's that, that's okay. If you have other things to say, I'm afraid I didn't understand. Perhaps you can have a dial-out, Roberto?

In the meantime, are there other comments? Alan is not yet here, and Alan would have remarks, I'm sure.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan may not be expecting to be on this joint call, because I know I certainly wasn't. I'm happy to be here, but I had no indication or idea that we were required. We were asked to make some feedback and recommendations, and we did so. It may very well be that Alan isn't available, because Alan didn't know he needed to be available. I'm just nowhere else at 2:00 am, that's all.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Cheryl. I asked for your remarks, your advice, and your recommendations because of your expertise.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I understand that, and we gave that. I'm just saying that Alan might not be here because he may not realize, as I didn't, that we were asked to be here.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No problem, but we know exactly the position of Alan now, because of this document. I would like the members of the BCEC and the BMSPC to speak up and to give their remarks, the problems they perhaps noticed, that I didn't notice. Any remarks about what I said? Any remarks about the document Cheryl and Alan sent? Murray?

MURRAY MCKERCHER: I was with the BCEC and Roberto in the early part of the first process. As Roberto stated – it was a little difficult to hear him – there were a number of administrative improvements we thought we could take to the process. I may have access to the report from Roberto, but I don't have it in front of me. That was the first phase of the process. It sounded to me as though some of the issues were at the second phase. I wasn't in Singapore to absorb all of that. I'm trying to, at the moment, absorb what Cheryl and Alan have put together.

I thought our process went quite well, but could be improved up. I just wanted to make that statement. If anyone has anything else, I'm just going to leave it and someone else can take the floor. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Murray. Any other remarks? Olivier, do you have any remarks? I don't see any hands, so...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Tijani, I just have one remark. I'd like to be able to scroll in the documents, and at the moment the scrolling isn't enabled. Thank you. That's all. I'm just discovering the document, I'm afraid, because just a few hours ago I thought I'd be busy, so...

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Olivier, I received it this morning. I sent it to the whole list. I'm sorry for the short notice. It's something that I asked them, if you want, in a friendly way, to help us with. This is a document that helps a lot. I thank them very much. Even if we cannot today do everything, we'll have another call with this document, and with what I said, the point I raised, so that everyone can think about them. Perhaps we can exchange via email and have another call to have the final recommendations. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Tijani. For the record, I'm pleased with the fact that this document is there. I'm just saying I haven't had time to read it yet. I'm also pleased with your suggestion that we have another call, further down the road. What I've heard so far, regarding the voting and the method of voting, etcetera, is also a concern that I've had, as the person who was meant to be organizing the many different rounds that we ended up having.

I thought it was an absolute headache to change the method of voting halfway through and choose between the instant run-off and everything else on there. I'm also concerned that people are getting confused on this. It would be of help to have a scenario-building system, where I think if there were only two candidates, you don't need to have a

complicated method of voting, with instant run-off and all that stuff. If there are more, then maybe a different type of voting.

Certainly, what we did this time around, was particularly long-winded. As luck has it, if we had a very clear winner, it would have been easy, but we did not have a very clear winner in the early times, and so it was perhaps more cumbersome than it could have been, had we had something clearer than this. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Olivier. Do you know then, Olivier, if we had had a clear winner from the first round, would we be obliged to run the second round, because the first round would be to shorten the list to three? Now, with the proposal from Alan and Cheryl, and also with my proposal, we have to declare the one who has more than 50% from the first round as the winner. I hope the whole group will be okay with that, because it's wasting lots of time.

If you have a clear winner, you don't have to run the second round. It's really wasting time. Thank you Olivier. Any other remarks? Any other comments? It seems we'll have a very short call today, because I don't see anyone wanting to discuss this. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

I have a follow-up on this. I see Roberto Gaetano, I see Dev on the queue, and Cheryl has seen Maureen on the queue, whilst I don't see Maureen on the queue.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Now I see them all. Olivier, you will lower your hand now?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I have a follow-up, just to let you know, reading the paper on this single transferable vote and so on, I'll look at the various issues that we do have with that. I can definitely see some issues when you have got the second and third candidates that all have the same number of votes, or if all three candidates have exactly the same number of votes. Guess what? It happens. We'll have to find something about that. I'll refrain from following up. I see there's a long queue now.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. Roberto?

ROBERTO GAETANO: In fact, Murray has summarized what I had to say. Basically, immediately after finishing our work, we had a brainstorming and we had a "Lessons Learnt" short document. That was stipulated, but that was quite a while ago, just before Singapore. Then that was never discussed, because we had more urgent issues. I have just sent a copy of that document to you and staff, and I don't know, maybe that can also be circulated to the whole group as a basis for discussion, if you think that the recommendations that the BCEC came up with can be included in the process or not.

I've sent it to you and to staff, and then it's up to you whether you want to have it circulated and put as a document for discussion, for the whole group. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Roberto. I will. I'll send it to the whole group. Dev?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. I think one of the things that comes to mind about the whole process was when the final candidate list was first proposed, there's a process whereby all the candidates approved by the BCEC are listed, as are those that were received by the BCEC but were not didn't make the cut. Then those additional candidates then have to get the support of three RALOs in order to be put on the final candidate list.

What unfortunately happened – and I could be wrong – is I think there wasn't effectively enough time, between the announcement, which was literally the end of January, to mid-February, when the final candidate list had to be done. My question is, how then do those candidates... They weren't available on any conference calls or anything of that sort, for any of the At-Large to even consider these candidates. I guess that's my question – how can this be improved?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Dev. Yes, it's a point that we can raise. I think that besides the review of the Rules of Procedure, we have to have a guide that will be set for the election for the whole time. This can be amended or changed whenever we want or need to change it. It should be a guide that makes clear and takes into account the time for each phase and for each thing.

For example, for the people who will be added on the slate, yes, you're right, we need some time to discuss among the RALOs, because, for example, they need three RALOs to agree on them, so some discussion is needed. We can inform on the discussion and make it formal. We can decide on a certain method of discussion for adding people onto the slate. All those points can be discussed. I added this point to my list. Thank you Dev.

The last one on the list is Maureen. Go ahead please, and then Cheryl.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you. I guess, as a member of the BCEC, I just want to add that we had a lot of discussion about this whole process before the elections, because I felt that there was a lot of confusion, and there wasn't enough understanding by the voters about the process. It wasn't clear. Although the process was actually stipulated and stated, the Committee, like we discussed at length the process, and wanted to clarify some of the situations, I believe that the problems that were raised were legitimate. We do need to improve on them.

I think we've just got to make sure that the process is clear for the candidates and the voters, and I think that the... I only had a brief read of Cheryl and Alan's recommendations. I think this is something that we do need to look at. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much Maureen. You are right that perhaps the process wasn't clear for everyone. Even if we set up with the help of Alan a

timeline for the whole process, with a clear date, etcetera, this wasn't enough for people to understand well and be aware of the whole process. You're right. That's why I said perhaps we need a guide for the whole process, so that people will be aware of everything. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you Tijani. Thank you to both you and Roberto for including me and Alan in the preparation for this joint call, where your two Working Groups are to review the processes that you've just completed. As harbingers of the original Whitepaper, all that went on during the development of this system, and of course, having penned a few Rules of Procedure in our day, we do have great interest in this.

I'd suggest that our views are purely from an external point of view, and it was envisaged that your two Working Groups and Committees would always be in a position to build a better model at the closure of these processes, remembering of course that these processes only occur every few years. In some cases, where a circumstance may very well occur, and perhaps it's even more likely than a future tie, you do have a likelihood that a single candidate will come forward as much as a tied set will come forward, as a result of your processes.

That's something that we can certainly address quite reasonably in rules, and of course the ALAC's new Rules of Procedure did go some way, in their re-write, to what we would had hoped would properly capture that experience, through the 2014 rounds.

In retrospect, they made it clear that some of the intent of the community and the intent of the Whitepaper, when these rules and

guidelines were developed, back in the dim, dark days of the ALAC review process that led to getting Seat 15 on the Board, have probably not been transferred to the new rules in a clear and unambiguous way.

The tweaks to the ALAC Rules of Procedure that Alan and I have ruminated over for ALAC's consideration, are, we believe, a good way – perhaps not 100% perfect, because we're only human – forward in making sure that wasn't to happen in the future. In fact, because there is a big lump of time between these processes, you can write as many guidelines, rules and testaments as you like. Truth be known, people who haven't done it before are not really going to understand, unless they look to the rules.

Some changes to build a better model do need to be enshrined in hard text, so that they are in the rules and the Chair of an At-Large Advisory Committee, at any time, can look to those rules, as can all those involved, and go, "Ah, this is how the systems run." Now, you mentioned some issues with communication and methodologies, which are not to do with the mechanisms of selections as such.

They certainly would be best built within guidelines, because a guideline, which can be an annex to the Rules of Procedure, is more able to be tinted with and developed and grow, to a better model, with the foundations and experience of each subsequent round, so that those who have the greatest knowledge of the process – in other words the BMSPC and the BCEC – can make sure that any learnings they have, any mechanism they found most useful, can be preserved for the consideration of a future run.

Remember, it is the consideration of the future run, because the internal mechanisms – and that would include communication and timeline development – really do belong to the newly created for purpose committees that you’re all part of. That said, Dev raised a point that made me put my hand up, about the mechanism whereby an overwhelmingly and popular individual, supported by no less than three RALOs, can be returned to a slate, if it’s not been added or maintained by the culling process of the BCEC.

That is a mechanism, Dev, that we’ve very hard-wrought and argued for, as a way to ensure for parts of the community who’ve had little faith in the potential of this process, for it to be successful. Those who particularly wanted aspects of universal suffrage – in other words, we’re all on At-Large, and that has a vote – the Electorate is much larger.

The balance for that not being the outcome in the community discussions and the Whitepaper, was to give this safety net mechanism, which can allow for overwhelmingly popular supported candidates to be returned, recognizing that that process may mean that some part of due diligence, or in some cases more confidential information that the BCEC is privy to, may not be known by the community. There you go, that just happens some times.

In the absence of universal suffrage – and I’m not a supporter of that, in fact I’m quite anti that – you would have to come up with another mechanism that is better than this potential for this person, overwhelming supported by three RALOs, to be brought back on. I don’t particularly mourn the fact that there is or is not a lot of time in any timeline for this to happen. This time, I think, you all knew that the

timelines were extraordinarily tight. Therefore it was going to be difficult to have anything much longer than that.

Next time you probably won't have this process going on back-to-back with an overhaul of the At-Large Advisory Committee Rules of Procedure, so there should be no reason why processes like this shouldn't be able to get started much earlier. Dev, that concern that you raised, should be null and void in future rounds, because it should be able to be planned again in the timeline design.

You've all talked about how confusing it was, and how the candidates don't know what's going on, and indeed the community, the Electorate – and for heaven's sake, there was only 20-odd of you – were also confused. If that's not a good reason to understand why people like me fear what on earth would happen if one went down towards universal suffrage, I can't imagine a better example.

If a few of you, the ALAC, 15 people, and those representatives of the RALO, i.e. another five – that's a fairly small group of Electorates – who really should have known what the hell was going on, because as leaders appointed they should be very au fait with rules and requirements. I can't imagine what sort of dog's breakfast would turn out if we had everybody trying to muddle through what goes on.

Olivier, you raised some points on scenario risks on tie breaking. Alan and I really have ruminated over this grace deal, and we think what we've put together as proposed changes should mean that that does not occur, or has an extraordinarily low likelihood of occurring, because of a

two-factor process. One is that a 50% plus one is able to be declared, even if you are in the process of getting down to the three.

You don't have to run to get the three if needs be. Also, for a single cycle, you run the whole thing again if there is a tie, and what that does is, whilst it avoids what we've described as strategic voting, where parts of the Electorate could support a non-preferred candidate, to ensure that their candidate does... It's highly complicated in these transferable vote systems. There's a whole bunch of ways you can skin the cat.

The highly savvy amongst future Electorate may be able to play those games. They are games, and they can end up with some fairly scary outcomes sometimes. That doesn't come in to play where you re-run with your full slate. What usually happens is people re-think and go, "Ah, well, if this is a total tie, I have the opportunity to cast my vote this way as opposed to that."

That said, if you do get a tie the second time around, the final proposal, which is already in the existing Rules of Procedure, is for a tie breaking mechanism. What we've embellished the existing rule to mean is that it has to be a mechanism that's not just by a trusted third-party, but is independently verifiable. That would mean subject to an external audit or crosscheck, should the community or Electorate should call it. Sorry to waffle on so long guys. I do think there were some historical aspects that needed to be clarified here.

Obviously, I would remain – as would Alan, I'm sure I could speak on his behalf – more than happy to assist either your two Sub-Committees, mull over these changes we've proposed, further, and of course, Olivier,

if and when the ALAC wishes to look at these Rules of Procedure proposed changes, we'd also be happy to speak to that as well. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much Cheryl. Thank you for this extensive explanation. For sure there are a lot of problems for the tie breaking, and I understood very well what you and Alan explained in your document. There is also another risk. The risk is that perhaps we would have the same result, because the same Electorate would vote on the same people. The most logical result would be the same result.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Tijani, that is a smaller risk than you would think, in the experience of most real-world systems when they run. There is a linkage to making sure that risk is lower, and that is that the reporting has to be very carefully managed. In other words, you actually make sure that there is no way anyone can work out who voted for who. This is where the sanctity of how confidential the voting process goes. In the absence of that, or where you have a risk of directed vote or managed vote, then yes, that is higher.

If you do have a system where there is confidence in the privacy of the vote, then that should not be as high risk. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Cheryl. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. I have had some time now to read through the suggested bylaw changes, and I have several observations. The first observation I have is that if you have more than three candidates, who [unclear 00:40:13] minimum number of rounds, it will be [unclear]. If you have a first round, of single transferable vote – STV – that will reduce the list to three candidates.

Then there's a second round of an un-named type of vote that doesn't actually specify what the voting method will be, as described in 19.11.4. Then there's a third round, in 19.11.5, to select the last person. That's how it's shown at the moment. That's the minimum number of rounds. If you have ties in between, there is no method for 19.11.3 to resolve a tie, if there are more than three candidates, and if the single transferable vote yields people where there is a tie in the STV method.

That would probably have to be dealt with. Then in 19.11.4, the second round, I understand the method for the tie is to re-run the same vote again. I have doubts as to whether people at that point, when you get down to three candidates, will change their mind. Where there are two candidates, again, if we run the tied election again in case voter positions have changed, well, we can't change that anyway, so I'm find with it. These are my observations so far. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You don't have to go through the three layers, if you've got a 50% plus one in any of the prior layers. It's not that you have to do 3, 4 and 5, it's if there is an outcome in 1, then this is how you can deal with them. They're not... They're consequential, but only if you don't have a majority winner at the earlier stage. You do have to have a mechanism to get to at least a small enough slate for the processes to work effectively. That means down to at least three. It could be down to two or down to one, but at least three.

You probably want to work some scenarios with those particular changes we proposed to the bylaws, but I'm not sure that that's just the work of your joint Sub-Committees here tonight. I think that would need to go beyond that. If you were going to fiddle with your Rules of Procedure then that's a matter for the whole of the ALAC, and you'd obviously want to be very careful to dot the I's, cross the T's, and make sure that all the scenario risks have been done.

Of course, the reason... You pointed out there was no instruction on whether or not it was an STV or another mechanism of voting. One would hoped that within a process, only one mechanism of voting will be deployed, to reduce confusion. We didn't want to mandate that only one mechanism of voting would be used, but with an STV you should be able to get a slate of three, and indeed quite likely to get a 50% plus one, almost as opposed to a slate of three, but if needs be down to a slate of three.

There is nothing hard and fast in these rules that can't be reconsidered, but of course what Alan and I have done is come up with what we hope will be good food for thought, and what we believe certainly in some of

them, such as the proxy, etcetera, are necessary embellishments on existing rules or explanations, on existing rules, to keep them in-line, with the intent of either the original Whitepaper, or of the Rules of Procedure as they were re-writ. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Cheryl. Yes, Olivier, the improvement proposed by Alan and Cheryl, is that for the first round, while we are ranking the candidates, to take only three? If we have in this round one of the candidates with more than 50% of the votes, perhaps he or she will be declared winner. That is, for me, a very big improvement. Thank you. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

This is very well understood, I have absolutely no question about the 50% plus one method, but I do have two concerns. The first one I'll repeat again. We have not had 50% plus one in our recent votes, and so we've ended up with a system where we've had a leader and a few people trailing behind. We've had a system also where the second and third have been at the same level. There are chances but they've been at the same level.

Or in fact the second would be trailing behind and the third and the fourth would be at the same level. What do you do when we have a tie between the third and the fourth and you need to reduce yourself to three people, using the single transferable vote? This is the question I'm asking. We need to find a way to resolve a tie in the STV.

The second point, and what I hear from Cheryl, she advocates that in the second round and the third round, when we go from three to two, and then from two to one, we also use the single transferable vote. I'm afraid that's not possible, because the STV can only work through ranked voting and multi-seat constituencies. We're dealing here with a single seat.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I did not say that it had to be a [CT 00:47:29], and that's why we haven't said that. I understand a [CT] very well. I live in a country that does preferential voting as an art form. Believe me, there are more ways to skin a cat in these things than you can possibly imagine. The bottom ranks would come off, and your preferences should not... You should either get three or a 50% plus one.

Now, we haven't suggested that an STV is to continue to be used. You can rank between two. You can rank to get down to two, but you can't rank beyond that. If you are still getting a tie, you have one run of re-running it, to allow people to change their minds, if there is time to do so, or you go to a random choice. There's nothing wrong with a random choice being brought in early in the system than was currently done.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Are you saying from three to two would still use STV?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm not advocating that you do do that, just that you have a vote that allows you to choose between one to three candidates. You could have

a system that says, “Just check one box.” You could have a system that says, “Check two boxes,” or you could have a system that says, “Check all three boxes in preferential order.” That really doesn’t bother me one way or the other.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: What I would suggest then is that this Committee makes at least a proposal or a recommendation about the type of voting that would be used from three to two and from two to one, because there was definitely some confusion and...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If you’re going to do that, I would strongly encourage you, Olivier, to have expert advice on these electoral systems. That is not Alan and I. You can be very easily baffled by the bullshit that goes along with each of the choices you will make. You can create an identical problem with almost any of the choices you may make.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Maybe that would be a proposed Action Item, to get an expert on this. I’m thoroughly concerned about it. That’s all.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier and Cheryl. I want to highlight that the document sent by Alan and Cheryl is the basis of a reflection. Everyone, from both Committees, has to think about it and has to send their remarks and comments about this document, and on other points that are not raised

here, so that at the end we'll end with recommendations that can be implemented.

If we don't manage to find a way to get three people from the whole slate from the first round, we have to find a voting way to have only three persons. You said if we have a tie between the third and the fourth. Yes, that's a problem, and it has to be addressed. We have to think about it, and perhaps we have to consult an expert, as Cheryl said. This is about the voting method. Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD:

My query related to the confusion that existed at the time of the election. I didn't feel it was satisfactorily answered. That was an explanation as to why we reduced, when we've got greater than three candidates, to a slate of three, and then include this extra voting process? I just needed to know, why isn't it directly reduced to the final two candidates, unless there is a tie and you'd need to resolve the second candidate? Can someone explain that to me please?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Maureen, that's what we should be able to do with these proposed changes.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Maureen, it was explained in the document sent by Alan and Cheryl why we want it to be done in two rounds. It's explained well. It's the spirit of the Whitepaper. If you read the document you'll understand why it was

done in this way. Thank you very much Maureen. Cheryl, do you want to speak?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I will, only because as I understand it, certainly it was our intention, that the new proposals to the Rules of Procedure that Alan and I are bringing to you, should allow for exactly that, Maureen. Perhaps you will need to have time to digest it, but it should indeed have allowed for other than a slate of five that ended up with three people, all of whom have an absolutely equal vote. From a full Electorate, that should be a very unlikely amount. Part of the problem is also of course that you've got, at the moment, an Electorate that is an equal 20, and at some point some of the masts will go against you.

That's why we've said to run it once again, if you don't have time then make a random choice from a tie, as a tie breaker. That's the fastest and probably fairest way of sorting that out. It seems to me like you all have a lot more than just the vote to think about. I gather there is also some admin and suggestions for changes. If you would like to have more information and discussion on the specific, on just the voting and proxy issues, which is all Alan and I addressed, I'm sure we can provide you with more information and more scenario options.

Indeed, Olivier, I'd highly recommend that if not for these Sub-Committee, certainly for your At-Large Advisory Committee, you get some expert advice. We did go through and have a webinar explanation, back when we were doing the Whitepaper, from the people who run Big Pulse, back in the dim and distant past. I don't know

whether staff will be able to locate the transcript or recording of that community meeting, but that might also help explain some of the finer arts of the choices between instant run-offs and STVs, etcetera.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Cheryl. I think we've reached #4 in the Agenda, which is next steps. I propose, as next steps, that with this document of Alan and Cheryl, with the document of Roberto's, that I will send you, with the points that I raised and will send you via email, we have to think about all this and we have to discuss it on the mailing list over the next two weeks. In two weeks we'll have another call. This is my proposal.

What do you think about that? I don't see... Very good. Okay. We have support from Olivier, from Roberto... From everyone. Thank you very much. Action Items: Tijani to send the Roberto's document, and the points he raised during the call, to the list. All those documents, all those ideas, have to be discussed on the mailing list over two weeks, and we'll have another call in two weeks to finalize our recommendations. That's very good. Any Other Business? We have two minutes to go now. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Tijani. You just gave an Action Item to send the documents to the mailing list. To which mailing list?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

To the BCEC/BMSPC Joint Call Mailing List.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I don't think there's one mailing list for that, but I think it's probably sensible to send it to both mailing lists then. The question that I have is that if that's the case, if we reply, not all of us are on both mailing lists, which means that our emails would bounce from the other email and you wouldn't be able to read the emails from the other side.

What I was going to ask staff was to make sure that it just goes into moderation and then that staff would then use the moderation bit to unblock messages, so that they could actually flow from one list to another, so they would be on both lists. Otherwise we're going to have two separate discussions on each of the mailing lists.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Olivier. I think Gisella's already noted that. I want to give you the reply from two candidates, because I sent an email to all the candidates to ask them about their remarks, their comments – anything they wanted to say about the process. I had only two responses, from the two French candidates. Jean-Jacques said that he's okay with the process. He finds it very clear and very fair with many things. Sebastian said that he wants an external evaluation. He said that he cannot send that via email and he will discuss it with me.

Those are the reactions of the two candidates that responded to my email. Thank you very much. I think we can close this call. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. This call is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]