* 1. **Communication between the candidates and the At-Large Community prior to the selection start:**

The first BMSPC call decided that the At-Large community, and the electorate members in particular can ask questions to the candidates through the mailing list and the wiki page only. The proposal of a live call was rejected.

This made some of the candidates very upset. A second BMSPC teleconference allowed for a call to be organized for live interaction.

I propose that guidelines can be created to include such kind of practical procedure that will make all the selection rounds (2014, 2017, 2020,…) using the same tools of communication

* 1. **Proxies for the electorate members who happen to be candidates:**

Jean Jacques argued that since he was dropped from the first round, he is allowed to recover his voting right instead of the proxy chosen by EURALO to replace him.

This was a serious problem for the BMSPC because the new rules didn’t address this possibility.

But looking in the ICANN Bylaw, we found the following paragraph:

No person who serves in any capacity (including as a liaison) on any Supporting Organization Council shall simultaneously serve as a Director or liaison to the Board. If such a person accepts a nomination to be considered for selection by the Supporting Organization Council or the At-Large Community to be a Director, the person shall not, following such nomination, participate in any discussion of, or vote by, the Supporting Organization Council or the committee designated by the At-Large Community relating to the selection of Directors by the Council or Community, until the Council or committee(s) designated by the At-Large Community has selected the full complement of Directors it is responsible for selecting.

Why it was a hard problem? Because the NARALO selected 2 Proxies to replace Alan and Evan without specifying who is replacing who. If we accepted the request of Jean Jacques, we will obliged to do the same for Evan, but we don’t know who was the replacement of Evan.

I think that the RoP should address this point and I can advise that the amendment be harmony with the ICANN Bylaw.

* 1. **Voting method:** (also addressed by Alan and Cheryl document)

No mention in the RoP of the voting method(s) to be used for the selection. The BMSPC received remarks (not real complaints but strong remarks) regarding the use of the Instant Runoff Vote method used for the first round to rank the candidates. It is clear that the voting method couldn’t be the same when we have to shorten the list of candidates and when we have to choose between 2 candidates only. Several methods exist:

* + 1. Single Transferable Vote (STV).
    2. Preferential vote
    3. Instant Runoff  Vote (IRV)
    4. Simple majority
    5. Etc.

I think that we have to define clearly the goal of each phase of the selection, and choose the right method for each of them. As proposed in the Monday call, consulting an expert in voting systems is a wise approach to find the best method for each phase.

The voting methods should be included in the guidelines.

* 1. **First round**

As it is mentioned now in the RoP, we can’t declare at the conclusion of the first round a candidate as winner even if he/she get more than 50% of the vote cast. I think this is wrong. The first round should shorten the list to 3 candidates, but in the mean time, if we have a clear winner, we shouldn’t waste more time in the selection process.

* 1. **Ties breaking:** (also addressed by the Alan and Cheryl document)

This is also one of the problems faced during the 2014 selection. When a had a tie between Sébastien and Alan, we run a tie breaking vote between the 2 tied candidates. Alan argue that we should re run the whole vote between the 3 candidates (including Rinalia who had a better score). The tie may happen at several points of the selection process:

* + 1. First round:
       - Tie between the 3 (or more) most preferred candidates
       - Tie between the second and the third
       - Tie between the third and the forth
       - Etc.
    2. Second round
       - With 3 candidates:
         * Tie between the 3 candidates
         * Tie between the second and the third
       - With only 2 candidates:
         * Tie between the 2 candidates

The tie breaking process must be clearly detailed. While I understand the rational of Alan, I’m not sure it is more democratic.

Those are the points I raised during the Monday call.

Now, I would like to comment on the proxy issue raised by Alan and Cheryl: They propose that we add to the RoP that the vote of the replacement of a candidate, who happen to be electorate member but couldn’t vote according to the RoP, be directed by the candidate.

I am afraid I don’t understand that. Why he/she was prevented from voting? Because of the conflict of interest. So how can we let him/her direct the vote of his/her replacement? In this case, we had better allow him/her to vote. It will be simpler since the result will be the same.