

## **Channel 1. BC participation in ICANN Public Comment process:**

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

1. Proposal to mitigate name collision risks from new gTLD delegations (reply closed 17-Sep)  
BC filed comments [here](#).
2. Rights Protection Mechanism (RPM) requirements (reply closed 18-Sep)  
BC filed comments [here](#).
3. 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)
4. Consultation on gTLD Delegation/Redelegation User Instructions and Source of Policy & Procedures (initial comment by 1-Oct)

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

### **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.

We have offers to draft from J Scott Evans, Stephane, and Sarah Deutsch

### **Standardized Contract for URS Providers**

ICANN decided it didn't need uniform contracts for its UDRP/URS providers. ([link](#)) Uniform contracts were a core issue for us on our comments regarding new URS providers. ([link](#) to BC comment)

Phil Corwin drafted a letter raising BC concerns and questions for ICANN leadership about this decision. We circulated this letter on 4-Sep for 14-day member review. Marilyn replied with comments, which Phil attempted to address in the attached letter. Gabi and Celia suggested we ask for a public comment period, too.

If there are no objections, our chair will send this letter to ICANN CEO and Board Chair, where it would show as Correspondence. ([link](#))

### **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). See bottom of this email for our prior thoughts about possible BC responses.

---

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

John Berard and Zahid Jamil, BC Councilors

Report on 5-Sep Council meeting ([agenda](#) and [transcript](#))

Next Council telecon meeting is 10-Oct-2013, 18:00 UTC

Agenda / motions not posted yet.

GNSO Project list is [here](#).

---

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

Marilyn Cade, CSG Liaison

---

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

*What shall we do to stop the madness of allowing both singular and plural forms of the same TLD?*

This is an issue on which the BC has been vocal 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 exact same string. ([link](#))

There's been an impressive discussion on BC list. Question is, What can the BC do now?

This element of GAC Beijing advice was never posted for public comment, so we could insist upon that as a matter of process. Moreover, events indicate that experts and dispute resolution panels are not uniformly interpreting the Guidebook standard ("so nearly resembles another that it is likely to deceive or cause confusion.") So it's time to clarify the guidebook and re-do the string similarity evaluations. There's a limited class of strings at issue, and the same panels could act quickly once they receive clearer instructions.

Also, we could enlist ALAC support to ask GAC to reiterate its concern over user confusion among singular and plural forms of the same TLD. It was disappointing that GAC didn't mention singular/plural in its Durban Advice, but events now vindicate the GAC's original concern about consumer confusion.