

# **IDN PDP WG 2 Telephone Conference Notes**

*21 October 2010*

## Attendees:

Dejan Djukic, .rs  
Demi Getschko, .br  
Hiro Hotta, .jp  
Siavash Shahshahani, .ir

## Staff:

Bart Boswinkel  
Gabiella Schitteck

### **1. Agenda approval**

- The proposed agenda was approved.

### **2. Action points from the last call**

- Action point 1: Contact ICANN staff on scope of definition of membership. Done, included in the updated version of the discussion document. It is now up to the Working Group to clarify the scope and to decide whether to include this in the interim report.
- Action point 2: Fees paragraph in bylaws. Done, included in updated version of discussion document. Currently, there are no fees paid by ccNSO members. A note was added that any financial contribution to the ccNSO shall not be confused with ICANN's cost of operations, which is a bilateral relation.
- Action point 3: Update document to include results from last meeting. Done, especially part about voting.
- Action point 4: Start drafting on membership definition. Not completed, as at this stage there is no clarity where the Working Group wants to take the definition; whether it would like to link it to just one member, or leave it as implicit as it is right now – if a definition would be included, it would jump ahead to be an almost final recommendation.

### **3. Discussion**

#### **3.1 Membership/3.4 Voting**

- Discussions were held on whether ccTLDs with multiple strings or ascii ccTLDs can enjoy multiple memberships and whether any recommendations from the Working Group regarding this should be precise, or leave space for ambiguity regarding multiple membership.

- It was felt that the principle “one vote per territory”, instead of one per delegated string should be kept. A suggestion was to allow for associated membership, with one “main” member of the territory being entitled to vote. The territory itself should define who the “main member” will be. It was noted that IDN PDP Working Group 1 had agreed that ascii ccTLDs and IDN ccTLDs should be treated similar, which might not be applicable with an “associate” versus “full” membership. It was decided to try to capture the various scenarios in the Interim Report, where the consequences of each scenario are listed and then let the membership decide on what model they prefer. It was noted there should be a default procedure to solve the cases where it would not be possible to reach consensus in the territory on who is the main member is, or how to vote.
- The issue of variants was raised. However, It was felt that since IDN PDP Working Group 1 had not dealt with this issue yet, the working group should wait with discussing the issue until IDN PDP Working Group 1 had defined a solution. It was also noted that variants probably would not be an issue, as they were just different ways of defining the same ccTLD.

### **3.2 Eligibility and Selection of Councillors for ccNSO Council**

- It was discussed whether two or more representatives from the same country could be elected to the ccNSO Council. The group was informed that one of the fundamental issues when setting up the ccNSO was to avoid having too many candidates from one region. It was felt that if the principle “One vote per territory” would be kept, there would be no need for the working group to look into this issue, as it was felt unlikely that such a situation would arise— and if it did, it would be the choice of the members in the voting phase.
- It was also felt that in the case of Nominations and Seconding, sticking to the principle “one vote per territory” would solve the problem. However, alternatives, such as nominating a representative eligible for voting, would also be listed in the report as a list of alternatives.

### **3.3 Initiation of PDP**

- There was general agreement to replace “10 members” by “10 votes” for an initiation of a PDP process. It was clarified that this would not actually initiate a full-blown PDP, but it would initiate an Issues Report, based on which the Council would decide on whether to launch a PDP, or not. Some discussions were held on whether to replace the 10 votes by a percentage number instead, as membership would grow. However, it was advised to stick to absolute numbers, rather than dealing with percentages.

### **3.4 Voting**

- See discussion under 3.1/3.3
- The working group was asked to revisit the results of discussions, as captured in the discussion paper.

- It was mentioned that tied voting in a territory might become an issue. However, if the territories would be tasked to internally decide which vote should be counted for their territory, then there would be no problem with counting the votes. It was felt that the membership needed to be informed and asked whether this would be a good way forward. It was also mentioned that the ccNSO might have to think of coming up with an interim process in cases where territories have not been able to take a decision in a timely manner, not to disadvantage them.

### **3.5 Quorum**

- The working group felt that if the principle “one vote per territory” would be kept, the issue of quorum would already be resolved.

### **3.6 Scope of PDP**

- Referring to the conclusion of the previous call, it was felt that there would be no need for adjustment of this issue.

## **4. Timeline toward Cartagena meeting**

- The suggested timeline for the next upcoming telephone conferences and meetings was approved:

Friday 5 November: Draft interim report by Chairs and Bart

Thursday 11 November: Working Group conference call

Friday 19 November: Publish interim report for public comment

December: Physical Working Group meeting in Cartagena

- It was clarified that remote participation will be possible at the Cartagena meeting through telephone and/or Adobe Connect.
- The Interim Report should be published as soon as possible after the 11 November call, in order to let the group have a look at it before the next conference call.

## **5. AOB**

- No items were noted.