

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.