One-Territory/One-Vote
or
One-Member/One-Vote

Matter of Principle or Expediency?
Not Decidable by Principle

• Creation of cc’s was originally an act of convenience, not of principle. No mention of sovereignty, principle of subsidiarity, or definition of ‘country/territory’ in RFC 1591.

• Designation of territory IDNs as cc’s was an act of convenience, not principle, prompted by political considerations, e.g., WSIS.

• Violating one-member/one vote formula may be construed as unprincipled.
Major Practical Objection to One-Member/One-Vote

• Gives ‘undue power’ to territories with IDN registries, especially those with multiple IDNs.
• In particular single registries running several domains are endowed with multiple votes.

Possible response:
• Should ccNSO parallel GAC in constituent units or is this a community of experts?
• Single registry representing multiple domains already exists.
Practical Difficulties of One-Territory/One-Vote Scheme

- Technical difficulties of dividing up one vote, quorum and deadlines.
- If the registries of a territory do not reach an amicable understanding about having a single representative, likely that the government designee will become ccNSO representative.
- Possible consequence: An incumbent ccNSO member in good standing may be kicked out or have its vote reduced without due process.