

Channel 1. BC participation in ICANN Public Comment process:

- Rights Protection Mechanism (RPM) requirements. BC filed [comments](#). ICANN Staff posted its [report of comments](#).

- Collision mitigation proposal. BC filed [comments](#). ICANN staff posted its [report of comments](#). Staff is expected to post analysis/recommendations by 4-Oct, when the Board NGPC meets to consider the collisions issue ([agenda](#)).

ICANN Public Comment page is [here](#). Selected comment opportunities below:

1. DNS Risk Management Framework Report (reply comments by 5-Oct)

Board received a report from Westlake ([link](#)). Lots of process discussion, but at least they acknowledge that DNS is all about Availability, Consistency, and Integrity. (page 8)

2. Consultation on gTLD Delegation/Re-delegation User Instructions and Source of Policy & Procedures (reply comment by 22-Oct)

3. Draft Final [Report](#) on protecting IGO/INGO identifiers in all TLDs at top & 2nd level. (initial comments due 11-Oct)

The attached document includes draft BC positions on the WG recommendations, based on assessment by Elisa Cooper and Steve DelBianco. (shows in grey text at bottom of each table row. e.g. "CBUC: Support")

Thru page 9, we said "Support" based on previous BC positions and our support for TM Clearinghouse improvements to help "brands" --incl IGOs/INGOs-- at the second level. The tricky part is how to protect acronyms for groups other than Red Cross and Olympics, starting on page 10.

There are several hundred acronyms to consider ([link](#)). e.g., CAN, ISO, SCO, IFC, ECO. The WG proposal is to place all these in the Guidebook as "ineligible for delegation".

The attached draft says this is too hard a line and would prefer these orgs use Rights Objection mechanism to stop a TLD application they oppose. If their objection failed, we have seen how the GAC could exercise its power of Advice to stop a TLD, too.

Please review and indicate your agreement or objection to the attached draft positions by 6-October. Then we need a volunteer to draft the text of our comments — based on whatever recommendations are approved.

Thus far, 8 BC members signaled support for the draft position. (Elisa, Steve, Stephane, Rodenbaugh, Yahoo, Chris Chaplow, Google, Phil Corwin) Marilyn Cade does not agree with "a blanket statement of objection", although that's not what this draft position would entail.

4. [Study](#) on Whois Privacy & Proxy Service Abuse (initial comments by 22-Oct)

The BC advocated for this study. Results verify BC suspicion that bad actors use P/P to avoid identification. But there are many important findings here, and we need a volunteer to analyze and draft BC comments.

5. Revised Public Interest Commitments dispute resolution [procedure](#) (PICDRP). (initial comment by 23-Oct)

The BC advocated for public interest commitments (beyond what's in the TLD application) and should attempt to comment on the DRP. Need a volunteer....

Note: BC members are encouraged to submit individual / company comments. The BC selects topics on which to submit official positions based on member interest.

Channel 2. Support for discussion and votes of our representatives on GNSO Council

John Berard and Zahid Jamil, BC Councilors

Next Council telecon meeting is 10-Oct-2013, 18:00 UTC. [Agenda](#) and [Motions](#)
GNSO Project list is [here](#).

Item 4: motion to approve report of Whois Survey WG.

Item 5: motion to approve framework for cross-community working groups

Item 6: motion to approve charter for PDP on translation of contact information

Item 8: discuss PDP for issues not handled in the new RAA

Item 9: policy issues surrounding String Confusion for TLDs

Item 10: discussion of IGO/INGO protection

Item 11: GNSO / GAC engagement

Item 12: GNSO review

Channel 3. Supporting discussion/voting on matters before the Commercial Stakeholders Group (CSG)

Marilyn Cade, CSG Liaison

Procedure to elect GNSO chair

Planning for Buenos Aires meeting

Channel 4. BC statements and responses during public meetings (outreach events, public forum, etc.)

ICANN decision to delegate Singular and Plural forms of same string

With recent arbitrator rulings on objections, this situation has become even more perplexing. ([link](#) to DomainIncite article on pet/pets). The BC has been concerned about this since Beijing, along with advice from the GAC to "reconsider" the singular/plural decisions.

ICANN's New gTLD Program Committee "reconsidered" in its 25-Jun Resolution: "NGPC has determined that no changes are needed to the existing mechanisms in the Applicant Guidebook to address potential consumer confusion resulting from allowing singular and plural versions of the same string."

As many BC members have discussed on list, the Dispute Resolution panels are generally upholding the originally flawed findings of the experts. In one case, Dispute Resolution providers disagreed on the same string. ([link](#))

On 20-Sep, we circulated a draft BC letter by Elisa Cooper, Ron Andruff, and Andy Abrams. (2nd attachment). Marilyn supported the letter and suggested stronger language. Mike Rodenbaugh challenged assertion that singular/plural confusion is different at top-level vs second-level.

Geographic Indicator Debate

On 1-Aug a discussion thread was begun by J Scott Evans regarding the "Geographic Indicator Debate at Durban", including broader issue of GAC's role. There is no firm deadline for this issue and ICANN has not posted GAC Advice for public comment. J Scott, Stephane, and Sarah Deutsch expressed interest in drafting.