

Subject: Policy Calendar for 8-Mar-2022 Open BC member meeting
Date: Monday, March 7, 2022 at 2:43:20 PM Eastern Standard Time
From: Steve DelBianco
To: BC List
Attachments: BC Input to EC for Toolbox.pdf

Here's the Policy Calendar for the open BC meeting on 8-Mar at 18:30 UTC (also in attachment "policy calendar.pdf")

Channel 1. BC participation in ICANN Public Comment process:

On 1-Mar we [supported](#) the [Proposed ICANN bylaws change to let IDN ccTLDs join the ccNSO](#).

On 24-Feb we [responded](#) to Board questions about next steps with SSAD Operational Design Analysis (ODA), drafted by Steve.

On 7-Feb we [filed comment](#) on the [ICANN Draft FY23-27 Operating and Financial Plan and Draft FY23 Operating Plan and Budget](#). Thanks to Tim Smith, Lawrence, and Jimson.

Selected [ICANN Public Comments](#) and other opportunities for the BC to comment:

1. [Name Collision Analysis Project \(NCAP\) Study](#) has 2 new SSAC documents for comment, by 18-Mar.

Goal is to understand the root cause of most name collisions, and the impact of name collisions.

[A Perspective Study of DNS Queries for Non-Existent Top-Level Domains Case Study of Collision Strings](#)

We commented on NCAP Study 1 back in Mar-2020, thanks to Mark Svancarek and Steve.

We need volunteer(s) to comment on these 2 new reports.

2. Policy Status Report: Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP). Comments close 19-Apr.

This [report](#) will frame the charter for Phase 2 WG on a PDP to review all ICANN Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs). ICANN seeks comments on:

1. **Efficiency:** Does UDRP provide trademark holders with a quick / cost-effective way to resolve domain name disputes?
2. **Fairness:** Does UDRP allow all relevant rights and interests of the parties to be considered and ensure procedural fairness for all concerned parties?
3. **Addressing Abuse:** Has the UDRP effectively addressed abusive registrations of domain names?

We need volunteer(s) to draft comment on this report, drawing on experience using the UDRP.

3. BC advocacy on **NIS2** with the European Parliament, led by Drew Bennett.

On 3-Mar the BC provided input to the [EC initiative against counterfeiting](#) (attached).

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

Marie Pattullo and Mark Datysgeld are our GNSO Councilors.

Previous council meeting was 17-Feb. See [Agenda](#), [Transcript](#), and [Zoom recording](#).

No resolutions were adopted, other than an appointment for Fellowship Program.

Discussions most relevant to BC included:

Pages 39-48 of the [Transcript](#) show a discussion of Standardized Access/Disclosure (SSAD).

[ICANN Org Presentation](#) on 20-Dec.

On 4-Jan staff circulated this [paper on options to proceed](#).

On 12-Jan [Council organized a webinar](#) for EPDP Phase 2 members.

On 24-Jan the [ICANN Board wrote this letter to Council](#), regarding EPDP Phase 2 Next Steps.

On 25-Jan ICANN published the [Operational Design Assessment \(ODA\)](#), including this:

“ICANN org’s analysis of the EPDP Phase 2 recommendations shows that the recommendations appear to be in the public interest. However, the ICANN Board will have additional considerations before deciding if the recommendations are within the best interests of ICANN and the ICANN community, which could call other aspects of the public interest into question.”

On 27-Jan Council met with the Board to discuss ODA

Steve represents BC on a [Council small team](#) to review [SSAD ODA](#).

Our [assignment](#) is to respond to the [Board’s 24-Jan Letter to Council](#).

On 16-Feb, the small team had its second call. Staff compiled [questions](#) in order to gather input to council and surface any “common threads”.

On 24-Feb Steve submitted [this response](#), drawing on Sep-2021

BC/IPC [joint minority statement](#) on EPDP Phase 2 final report (where BC voted No).

Next Council meeting is 9-Mar at 16:30 UTC. Highlights from [Agenda](#) and [documents](#):

Consent Agenda: CPH reappoints Becky Burr to ICANN Board seat 13.

Item 5: Discuss response from small team on [Operational Design Assessment \(ODA\)](#) for a System for Standardized Access/ Disclosure (SSAD). The BC submitted [this response](#) to the small team on 24-Feb.

Item 6: discuss SubPro Operational Design Phase (ODP), for [final report](#) on subsequent rounds of new gTLDs.

Item 7: discuss DNS Abuse Small Team, with co-leads Mark Datysgeld and Paul McGrady.

Item 8: dialogue with ICANN Org global domains and strategy department (GDS).

Other Council items:

1. Zak Muscovitch and Arinola Akinyemi are on the [Transfer Policy Review Working Group \(PDP Charter\)](#). See [WG Timeline and Progress](#).

On 10-Feb, Zak and Arinola provided a presentation and summary of the work of the Transfer Policy Working Group and the BC had a discussion of transfer locks, beginning at 22:00 of our [Zoom replay](#). Due to time constraints, only the Post-Creation transfer lock was discussed. Howard Neu suggested that a shorter post-creation lock could be desirable in order to facilitate earlier transfers, however it was noted that intra-registrar pushes could likely still be effected during a Post-Creation lock. Susan Kawaguchi suggested that a longer Post-Creation lock would be desirable in order to assist with brand enforcement efforts. **A further call with interested BC members is advisable to have a fuller discussion.**

On the following Transfer Policy WG call, Zak and Arinola shared a brand owner's perspective with the BC, as captured by WG Staff's notes:

"The Business Constituency had a brief discussion on locks and wanted to share some feedback from brand owners in the BC: Desire to keep the 60-day post-creation day lock; if too short could compel the brand owner to redo the UDRP. From a brand perspective was that the 60-day lock for post creation could prevent having to redo UDRP enforcement."

BC members interested in Transfer Policy WG call on 15-Feb can listen to it [here](#), and follow the [Wiki page](#).

2. The Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement (CCOICI) completed its assignment for the Task Force to review the existing Statement of Interest (SOI) requirements (see chapter 6 of the [GNSO Operating Procedures \[gnso.icann.org\]](#)). Thanks to Susan Kawaguchi and Imran Hossen for volunteering to participate in this Task Force.
3. Suzan Kawaguchi represents the BC on the Registration Data Accuracy WG.
4. Steve represents the BC on a small team to review the staff paper [Modifying Consensus Policies](#).

The staff [Discussion Draft](#) suggests 6 ways to change GNSO procedures regarding existing policies.

Calls on 14-Dec & 10-Jan focused on process for approving recommended changes to PDP Manual & templates, ODP, and implementation guidelines. We drafted [this letter](#) to send to Org and interested board members.

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

Tim Smith is the CSG Liaison for the BC.

Since the BC last met on 24-Feb, we have held these meetings to discuss CSG common interests.

CSG Membership with GNSO Appointed Board Members on Tuesday 1 March at 16:00 UTC.

CSG representatives from IPC, ISPCP and BC were joined by Matthew Shears, Avri Doria and Becky Burr. During this one hour informal session, CSG sought input from Board members on the EC's recently published Study on DNS Abuse and inquired about the Board's DNS abuse working group, which they described as a critical issue and on the agenda for the weekend meeting in advance of ICANN 73.

Also discussed were the ongoing collaborative exchanges between GNSO Council and the Board on SSAD ODA which they felt was productive.

The topic of prioritization of work within ICANN and how to address backlog of recommendations and implementation was our final topic, during which we were advised that CSG will be invited to assign a representative to meet with Org and other SO/ACs for 4-5 meetings in the coming month with the goal of finalizing the prioritization pilot that is planned to launch in the coming months.

GAC PSWG and CSG Call on Thursday 3 March at 15:00UTC.

This regularly scheduled session enables CSG to engage with the GAC Public Safety Working Group to discuss issues of common concern and progress that is being made on such matters.

The EC Study on DNS Abuse was presented as the latest input on addressing online abuse generally and the value of access to WHOis for a variety of stakeholders.

The topic of malicious vs. compromised domains was also discussed and while the GAC has not discussed this issue in detail, it was noted that compromised domains result in an additional victim – the registrant.

CSG finds these regular exchanges to be valuable and will continue to schedule these to coincide with future ICANN meetings.

Joint Session – ICANN Board and CSG on Tuesday 8 March at 1630 UTC

This meeting was held just prior to the BC Open Membership meeting at ICANN 73 during which discussion topics were led separately by each of the CSG constituency groups.

Registration for ICANN73 is required to join online sessions on [the schedule](#).

See [GNSO Policy Briefing ICANN73 Edition](#) and [ICANN73 Policy Outlook Report](#)