

I feel that the most appropriate cap \*of the options given\* would be option (3) - 3% of votes cast

I believe that a large proportion of Nominet members are members solely for the large discount on registrations, rather than to be involved in the operations of Nominet (just as a large proportion of shareholders of PLCs are shareholders for the capital gains/dividends rather than the voting rights). Because of this, I think having any cap should be based on votes cast, not total votes.

As we've seen recently a 10% cap on votes cast would mean that any single large member would effectively be able to block a change to much of the MofA, even if all the rest of the voters (except one) vote to accept the changes (although this wasn't the case at the recent EGM, it did become apparent that it could have been the case), so I think the cap should be set lower - eg 3%

I don't think one member one vote is appropriate because members registering more domains are automatically potentially more affected by changes to do with Nominet's governance.

(BTW - In the consultation paper I noticed that Appendices (2) and (3) had 'Dtot' being the total number of domains - should this possibly be the total number of domains registered by the voting members rather than the absolute total - it would give a different result, with more weight being given to smaller members who vote than if the total number of domains was used).

However, I'm not convinced that one member should have MANY times the voting power of another as is the case with any of the proposals except (4), so...

I would like to see a non-linear formula used for determining the number of votes, this would mean that members registering fewer domains would become more 'enfranchised' sooner.

For instance a simple logarithmic table:

0 registrations = 1 vote

1 registration = 2 votes

10 registrations = 3 votes

100 registrations = 4 votes

1000 registrations = 5 votes

etc (there would probably not need to be a 'cap' at all with this type of vote weighting...) would meet the requirements of Nominet's articles, be easy to understand, and would stop pile-em-high members from taking control of Nominet. (you could potentially use a different base, eg base 2 instead of base 10 to give more relative power to members registering more domains)

Another thing to consider is a 'voting quorum'. If a low number of members vote, then any caps start becoming distorted - eg if less than 33 members vote, a cap of 3% of votes cast becomes problematic!

Paul Smith