

Notes IDN PDP Working Group 2 Telephone Conference

14 April 2011

Attendees:

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

Support Staff:

Bart Boswinkel
Gabriella Schitteck

Apologies:

Giovanni Seppia, .eu

1. Agenda Approval

- The proposed agenda was approved.

2. Action Points From Previous Meeting

- The only action point, to post a discussion paper on the "Pro's and con's" to a "one-vote-per-territory"-concept on the email list had been done.

3. Discussion on the "One Vote Per Territory" Issue

- It was discussed whether it should be mentioned in the WG2 report, that if it is decided to allocate one vote to several members in a territory, technical problems might occur when allocating the vote.

Reasons raised against including this argument were that the voting principles should be separated from the voting mechanisms. It was felt that there should be an agreement of principles first, as the technical issue is a separate part of the discussions.

However, it was agreed that the technical problems could be mentioned in the overall summary, as the community needs to be informed about the possible problems, which could occur when opting for that principle.

- It was furthermore questioned why the treatment of IDN ccTLDs equal as ascii ccTLDs was considered being a 'pro' argument for one vote per territory.

It was explained that the thought was that if they would be treated equally by the ccNSO, they would be treated equally within their territory. However, it was agreed that it could be argued both ways.

- As an alternative to both options (one vote per member, versus one vote per territory), it was suggested to create an interim IDN Supporting Organisation, which would merge with the ccNSO once all issues had been solved.

However, it was felt that this would only be postponing the issue.

Furthermore, it was warned that this could blur the perception of the IDN ccTLDs as being ccTLDs and it was felt that this should be avoided. The fact that IDN ccTLDs are representing territories should not be ignored, otherwise there is a risk that cc's would start getting mixed up with gTLDs. It was pointed out that the difference of a IDN ccTLD and a ccTLD is only the difference in how their territories have their names written down.

The group was reminded that one of the major issues in the IDN Fast Track was whether IDN ccTLDs should be forced into a contract and therefore pay financial contributions – which would be moving them into gTLD space. With a joint effort by the ccTLD Community and the GAC, it was decided that they should be treated as ccTLDs. In order to avoid this discussion happening again, IDN ccTLDs need to be included as fast as possible in the ccNSO as full members, as this is also the only way they can influence and be influenced by ccNSO produced policies, if any.

- It was noted that the report states two options: One vote per member versus one vote per territory. The working group needs to reach a decision on one preferred option before presenting their work to the community, which means that the Working Group members need to state whether they rather agree with alternative 1 (one vote per member) or 2 (one vote per territory).

Bart Boswinkel will therefore within two weeks send out an updated version of the Discussion paper, including the voting mechanism issue also in the context of the ccNSO rules and guidelines and also listing pro' and con' arguments.

The Working Group members will then be encouraged to state their preference either on the email list, or during the coming Working Group call, which will focus on reaching a preferred principle.

- It was noted that currently, with the exception of Egypt, all ascii and IDN ccTLDs in a territory are delegated to the same manager, which could be perceived as a general trend.

It was, however, pointed out that some territories had not yet received their IDNs, because of ongoing disputes within their territory on who shall receive the management – which also underlines the possible problems if choosing a “one vote per territory”-option.

4. Next Call

- It was agreed that the next Working Group call would be held on Thursday, 12 May at 12.00 UTC

5. AOB

It was agreed to include additional arguments in the discussion paper, in favour of the 'one-vote-per-territory' concept: If multiple IDN ccTLD's are run by one and the same manager, a one vote per member system could potentially overwhelm the votes of (IDN) ccTLD's in other territories and unduly determine the outcome of a ccNSO voting process. On a one vote perterritory basis, one has to make a distinction between what is happening internally in a territory and in general. A one vote per member voting system would also dilute the votes.