# IDN PDP Working Group 2 Telephone Conference
## *22 September 2011*

**Attendees:**

Dejan Djukic, .rs
Hiro Hotta, .jp (Chair)
Paulos Nyirenda, .mw
Siavash Shahshahani, .ir
Mary Uduma, .ng

**Staff:**

Bart Bosvinkel
Gabriella Schittek

**Apologies:**

Giovanni Seppia, .eu

1. **Update Voting Report**

   - *Bart Boswinkel* ran through the updated voting report. The main changes were to be discussed under Agenda point 2 and 3. Other changes were only minor and did not have any impact on the content.

2. **Discussion on Transition Mechanism**

   - Bart noted that section three now includes some text on a transition mechanism, in case of a "one vote per territory" scenario.

     The addition was based on the discussions held in Singapore on the subject. The additional text is trying to delineate how the transition would work from one member per territory to one vote per territory, if there is more than one member from one territory.

3. **Recap of Main Decisions on Voting**

   - The voting has also been delineated and separated from the rest of the discussion. It was highlighted that the initiation of a PDP under the Rules and Guidelines is different from the actual vote to the ccNSO Council or ICANN Board, or the end vote of a PDP. A "real" vote is to approve or reject a proposal. Therefore, a mixed model was proposed: In this case, when initiating something, the one-vote-one-member vote is suggested.

     The working group members were happy with the suggested mixed model, as it was felt it would give all members the opportunity to participate.

It was, however, noted that in cases where two ccTLDs from the same country/territory join the ccNSO at the same time, it is hard to say who is incumbent, and who is not.

It was suggested to add some text saying that in case two potential members apply more or less at the same time, they should be asked to designate the voting member.

The working group members agreed.

- It was also discussed what to do in case the ccTLDs in a territory are unable to define who the incumbent party is among themselves, due to lack of communication.

One suggestion was to let the ccNSO mediate between the parties. It was, however, felt that the ccNSO should not be required to mediate in internal issues and that this should be left to the territory to sort out. The mixed regime solution was felt being a good starting point in such cases.

## 4. Preparing Final Report

- It was noted that two different documents need to be produced: One dealing with bylaw changes when including IDN ccTLDs; the second one on the Adjustment of Rules and Guidelines. This is not part of a PDP, but the Working Group was also asked to look into this issue.

- Bart Boswinkel will make a draft of the two documents, which will be discussed at the next Working Group call on the 6th October. The draft is to be posted by the 3rd October. The Working Group should approve the report by the 11th October, which means that it can be posted around 12 – 13 October, about a week prior to the Dakar meeting. At the ccNSO meeting in Dakar, the working group will then have 30 minutes to run through the paper and to explain the report. The Working Group will then meet on 27 October, where it will have time to adjust the report, based on the feedback received.

- It was noted that some of the tables, especially those in section 6, should not be made public, as it contains personal comments which would not add any value to the broader community. It was agreed that the tables should be removed.

## 5. AOB and Next Meeting

- The next Working Group telephone conference is scheduled to take place on the 6th October 2011 at 12.00 UTC. The Chair urged those who will not be able to attend the call to send comments on the report to the email list.

- No other business was raised.