

INDEPENDENT REVIEW PROCESS

INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION
ICDR CASE NO. 01-15-0002-8061

DESPEGAR ONLINE SRL, DONUTS INC.,
FAMOUS FOUR MEDIA LIMITED,
FEGISTRY LLC, AND RADIX FZC

and

LITTLE BIRCH, LLC AND MINDS +
MACHINES GROUP LIMITED
Claimants,

and

INTERNET CORPORATION FOR ASSIGNED
NAMES AND NUMBERS
Respondent

**INDEX TO EXHIBITS IN SUPPORT OF ICANN'S RESPONSE TO CLAIMANTS'
REQUEST FOR INDEPENDENT REVIEW**

<u>EXHIBIT</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
Resp. Ex. 6	BGC Recommendation on Request 13-5
Resp. Ex. 7	Rationale for NGPC Resolution 2013.05.18.NG04

Resp. Ex. 6

RECOMMENDATION
OF THE BOARD GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE (BGC)
RECONSIDERATION REQUEST 13-5

1 AUGUST 2013¹

On 7 July 2013, Booking.com B.V. (“Booking.com”), through its counsel, Crowell & Moring, submitted a reconsideration request (“Request”). The Request was revised from Booking.com’s 28 March 2013 submission of a similar reconsideration request, which was put on hold pending the completion of a request pursuant to ICANN’s Documentary Information Disclosure Policy (“DIDP”).

The Request asked the Board to reconsider the ICANN staff action of 26 February 2013, when the results of the String Similarity Panel were posted for the New gTLD Program. Specifically, the Request seeks reconsideration of the placement of the applications for .hotels and .hoteis into a string similarity contention set.

I. Relevant Bylaws

As the Request is deemed filed as of the original 28 March 2013 submission, this Request was submitted and should be evaluated under the Bylaws that were in effect from 20 December 2012 through 10 April 2013. Article IV, Section 2.2 of that version of ICANN’s Bylaws states in relevant part that any entity may submit a request for reconsideration or review of an ICANN action or inaction to the extent that it has been adversely affected by:

¹ At its 1 August 2013 meeting, the Board Governance Committee deliberated and reached a decision regarding this Recommendation. During the discussion, however, the BGC noted revisions that were required to the draft Recommendation in order to align with the BGC’s decision. After revision and allowing for the BGC member review, the BGC Recommendation on Request 13-5 was finalized and submitted for posting on 21 August 2013.

(a) one or more staff actions or inactions that contradict established ICANN policy(ies); or

(b) one or more actions or inactions of the ICANN Board that have been taken or refused to be taken without consideration of material information, except where the party submitting the request could have submitted, but did not submit, the information for the Board's consideration at the time of action or refusal to act.

A third criteria was added to the Bylaws effective 11 April 2013, following the Board's adoption of expert recommendations for revisions to the Reconsideration process. That third basis for reconsideration, focusing on Board rather than staff conduct, is "one or more actions or inactions of the ICANN Board that are taken as a result of the Board's reliance on false or inaccurate material information." (See <http://www.icann.org/en/about/governance/bylaws#IV>.)

When challenging a staff action or inaction, a request must contain, among other things, a detailed explanation of the facts as presented to the staff and the reasons why the staff's action or inaction was inconsistent with established ICANN policy(ies). See Article IV §2.6(g) of the 20 December 2012 version of Bylaws (<http://www.icann.org/en/about/governance/bylaws/bylaws-20dec12-en.htm#IV>) and the current Reconsideration form effective as of 11 April 2013 (<http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/governance/reconsideration/request-form-11apr13-en.doc>).

Dismissal of a request for reconsideration is appropriate if the Board Governance Committee ("BGC") finds that the requesting party does not have standing because the party failed to satisfy the criteria set forth in the Bylaws. These standing requirements are intended to protect the reconsideration process from abuse and to ensure that it is not used as a mechanism simply to challenge an action with which someone disagrees, but that it is limited to situations where the staff acted in contravention of established policies.

The Request was originally received on 28 March 2013, which makes it timely under the then effective Bylaws.² Bylaws, Art. IV, § 2.5.

II. Background

Within the New gTLD Program, every applied-for string has been subjected to the String Similarity Review set out at Section 2.2.1.1 of the Applicant Guidebook. The String Similarity Review checks each applied-for string against existing TLDs, reserved names and other applied-for TLD strings (among other items) for “visual string similarities that would create a probability of user confusion.” (Applicant Guidebook, Section 2.2.1.1.1.) If applied-for strings are determined to be visually identical or similar to each other, the strings will be placed in a contention set, which is then resolved pursuant to the contention resolution processes in Module 4 of the Applicant Guidebook. If a contention set is created, only one of the strings within that contention set may ultimately be approved for delegation.

After issuing a request for proposals, ICANN selected InterConnect Communications (“ICC”) to perform the string similarity review called for in the Applicant Guidebook. On 26 February 2013, ICANN posted ICC’s report, which included two non-exact match contention sets (.hotels/.hoteis and .unicorn/.unicom) as well as 230 exact match contention sets. <http://www.icann.org/en/news/announcements/announcement-26feb13-en.htm>. The String Similarity Review was performed in accordance with process documentation posted at <http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/program-status/evaluation-panels/geo-names-similarity-process-07jun13-en.pdf>. As part of ICANN’s acceptance of the ICC’s results, a quality assurance review

² ICANN staff and the requester communicated regarding the holds placed on the Request pending the DIDP Response, and the requester met all agreed-upon deadlines, thereby maintaining the timely status of this Request.

was performed over a random sampling of applications to, among other things, test whether the process referenced above was followed.

Booking.com is an applicant for the .hotels string. As a result of being placed in a contention set, .hotels and .hoteis cannot both proceed to delegation. Booking.com will have to resort to private negotiations with the applicant for .hoteis, or proceed to an auction to resolve the contention issue. Request, page 4.

Although the String Similarity Review was performed by a third party, ICANN has determined that the Reconsideration process can properly be invoked for challenges of the third party's decisions where it can be stated that either the vendor failed to follow its process in reaching the decision, or that ICANN staff failed to follow its process in accepting that decision. Because the basis for the Request is not Board conduct, regardless of whether the 20 December 2012 version, or the 11 April 2013 version, of the Reconsideration Bylaws is operative, the BGC's analysis and recommendation below would not change.

III. Analysis of Booking.com's Request for Reconsideration

Booking.com seeks reconsideration and reversal of the decision to place .hotels and .hoteis in a non-exact match contention set. Alternatively, Booking.com requests that an outcome of the Reconsideration process could be to provide "detailed analysis and reasoning regarding the decision to place .hotels into a non-exact match contention set" so that Booking.com may "respond" before ICANN takes a "final decision." (Request, Page 9.)

A. Booking.com's Arguments of Non-Confusability Do Not Demonstrate Process Violations

The main focus of Booking.com's Request is that .hotels and .hoteis can co-exist in the root zone without concern of confusability. (Request, pages 10 – 12.) To support this assertion, Booking.com cites to the opinion of an independent expert that was not part of the string

similarity review panel (Request, pages 10-11), references the intended uses of the .hotels and .hoteis strings (Request, page 11) and the difference in language populations that is expected to be using .hotels and .hoteis (Request, page 11), references ccTLDs that coexist with interchangeable “i”s and “l”s (Request, page 11), notes the keyboard location of “i”s and “l”s (Request, page 12), and contends that potential users who get to the wrong page would understand the error they made to get there (Request, page 12).

Booking.com does not suggest that the process for String Similarity Review set out in the Applicant Guidebook was not followed, or that ICANN staff violated any established ICANN policy in accepting the String Similarity Review Panel (“Panel”) decision on placing .hotels and .hoteis in contention sets. Instead, Booking.com is supplanting what it believes the review methodology for assessing visual similarity should have been, as opposed to the methodology set out at Section 2.2.1.1.2 of the Applicant Guidebook. In asserting a new review methodology, Booking.com is asking the BGC (and the Board through the New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC)) to make a substantive evaluation of the confusability of the strings and to reverse the decision. In the context of the New gTLD Program, the Reconsideration process is not however intended for the Board to perform a substantive review of Panel decisions.. While Booking.com may have multiple reasons as to why it believes that its application for .hotels should not be in contention set with .hoteis, Reconsideration is not available as a mechanism to re-try the decisions of the evaluation panels.³

³ Notably, Booking.com fails to reference one of the key components of the documented String Similarity Review, the use of the SWORD Algorithm, which is part of what informs the Panel in assessing the visual similarity of strings. .hotels and .hoteis score a 99% on the publicly available SWORD algorithm for visual similarity. See <https://icann.sword-group.com/algorithm/>.

Booking.com also claims that its assertions regarding the non-confusability of the .hotels and .hoteis strings demonstrate that “it is contrary to ICANN policy⁴ to put them in a contention set.” (Request, pages 6-7.) This is just a differently worded attempt to reverse the decision of the Panel. No actual policy or process is cited by Booking.com, only the suggestion that – according to Booking.com – the standards within the Applicant Guidebook on visual similarity should have resulted in a different outcome for the .hotels string. This is not enough for Reconsideration.

Booking.com argues that the contention set decision was taken without material information, including Booking.com’s linguistic expert’s opinion, or other “information that would refute the mistaken contention that there is likely to be consumer confusion between ‘.hotels’ and ‘.hoteis.’” (Request, page 7.) However, there is *no* process point in the String Similarity Review for applicants to submit additional information. This is in stark contrast to the reviews set out in Section 2.2.2 of the Applicant Guidebook, including the Technical/Operational review and the Financial Review, which allow for the evaluators to seek clarification or additional information through the issuance of clarifying questions. (AGB, Section 2.2.2.3 (Evaluation Methodology).) As ICANN has explained to Booking.com in response to its DIDP requests for documentation regarding the String Similarity Review, the Review was based upon the methodology in the Applicant Guidebook, supplemented by the Panel’s process documentation; the process does not allow for additional inputs.

Just as the process does not call for additional applicant inputs into the visual similarity review, Booking.com’s call for further information on the decision to place .hotels and .hoteis in

⁴ It is clear that when referring to “policy”, Booking.com is referring to the process followed by the String Similarity Review.

a contention set “to give the Requester the opportunity to respond to this, before taking a final decision” is similarly not rooted in any established ICANN process at issue. (Request, page 9.) First, upon notification to the applicants and the posting of the String Similarity Review Panel report of contention sets, the decision was already final. While applicants may avail themselves of accountability mechanism to challenge decisions, the use of an accountability mechanism when there is no proper ground to bring a request for review under the selected mechanism does not then provide opportunity for additional substantive review of decisions already taken.

Second, while we understand the impact that Booking.com faces by being put in a contention set, and that it wishes for more narrative information regarding the Panel’s decision, no such narrative is called for in the process. The Applicant Guidebook sets out the methodology used when evaluating visual similarity of strings. The process documentation provided by the String Similarity Review Panel describes the steps followed by the Panel in applying the methodology set out in the Applicant Guidebook. ICANN then coordinates a quality assurance review over a random selection of Panel’s reviews to gain confidence that the methodology and process were followed. That is the process used for a making and assessing a determination of visual similarity. Booking.com’s disagreement as to whether the methodology should have resulted in a finding of visual similarity does not mean that ICANN (including the third party vendors performing String Similarity Review) violated any policy in reaching the decision (nor does it support a conclusion that the decision was actually wrong).⁵

⁵ In trying to bring forward this Request, Booking.com submitted requests to ICANN under the Documentary Information Disclosure Policy (DIDP). As of 25 July 2013, all requests had been responded to, including the release of the Panel process documentation as requested. See Request 20130238-1 at <http://www.icann.org/en/about/transparency>. Booking.com describes the information it sought through the DIDP at Pages 8 – 9 of its Request. The discussion of those requests, however, has no bearing on the outcome of this Reconsideration.

B. Booking.com’s Suggestion of the “Advisory Status” of the String Similarity Panel Decision Does Not Support Reconsideration

In its Request, Booking.com suggests that the Board has the ability to overturn the Panel’s decision on .hotels/.hoteis because the Panel merely provided “advice to ICANN” and ICANN made the ultimate decision to accept that advice. Booking.com then suggests that the NGPC’s acceptance of GAC advice relating to consideration of allowing singular and plural versions of strings in the New gTLD Program, as well as the NGPC’s later determination that no changes were needed to the Applicant Guidebook regarding the singular/plural issue, shows the ability of the NGPC to override the Panel determinations. (Request, pages 5-6.) Booking.com’s conclusions in these respects are not accurate and do not support Reconsideration.

The Panel reviewed all applied for strings according to the standards and methodology of the visual string similarity review set out in the Applicant Guidebook. The Guidebook clarifies that once contention sets are formed by the Panel, ICANN will notify the applicants and will publish results on its website. (AGB, Section 2.2.1.1.1.) That the Panel considered its output as “advice” to ICANN (as stated in its process documentation) is not the end of the story. Whether the results are transmitted as “advice” or “outcomes” or “reports”, the important query is what ICANN was expected to do with that advice once it was received. ICANN had always made clear that it would rely on the advice of its evaluators in the initial evaluation stage of the New gTLD Program, subject to quality assurance measures. Therefore, Booking.com is actually proposing a new and *different* process when it suggests that ICANN should perform substantive review (instead of process testing) over the results of the String Similarity Review Panel’s outcomes prior to the finalization of contention sets.

The subsequent receipt and consideration of GAC advice on singular and plural strings does not change the established process for the development of contention sets based on visual

similarity. The ICANN Bylaws require the ICANN Board to consider GAC advice on issues of public policy (ICANN Bylaws, Art. XI, Sec. 2.1.j); therefore the Board, through the NGPC, was obligated to respond to the GAC advice on singular and plural strings. Ultimately, the NGPC determined that no changes were needed to the Guidebook on this issue. (Resolution 2013.06.25.NG07, at <http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-25jun13-en.htm#2.d>.) Notably, neither the GAC advice nor the NGPC resolution focused on the issue of visual similarity (which the String Similarity Review Panel was evaluating), but instead the issue was potential consumer confusion from having singular and plural versions of the same word in the root zone. It is unclear how the NGPC's decision on a separate topic – and a decision that did not in any way alter or amend the work of an evaluation panel – supports reconsideration of the development of the .hotels/.hoteis contention set.

VIII. Recommendation And Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, the BGC concludes that Booking.com has not stated proper grounds for reconsideration and we therefore recommend that Booking.com's request be denied without further consideration. This Request challenges a substantive decision taken by a panel in the New gTLD Program and not the process by which that decision was taken. As stated in our Recommendation on Request 13-2, Reconsideration is not a mechanism for direct, de novo appeal of staff or panel decisions with which the requester disagrees, and seeking such relief is, in fact, in contravention of the established processes within ICANN. See <http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/governance/reconsideration/recommendation-nameshop-01may13-en.pdf>.

The BGC appreciates the impact to an applicant when placed in a contention set and does not take this recommendation lightly. It is important to recall that the applicant still has the

opportunity to proceed through the New gTLD Program subject to the processes set out in the Applicant Guidebook on contention. We further appreciate that applicants, with so much invested and so much at stake within the evaluation process, are interested in seeking any avenue that will allow their applications to proceed easily through evaluation. However, particularly on an issue such as visual similarity, which is related to the security and stability of the domain name system, there is not – nor is it desirable to have – a process for the BGC or the Board (through the NGPC) to supplant its own determination as to the visual similarity of strings over the guidance of an expert panel formed for that particular purpose. As there is no indication that either the Panel or ICANN staff violated any established ICANN policy in reaching or accepting the decision on the placement of .hotels and .hoteis in a non-exact contention set, this Request should not proceed.

If Booking.com thinks that it has been treated *unfairly* in the new gTLD evaluation process, and the NGPC adopts this Recommendation, Booking.com is free to ask the Ombudsman to review this matter. (See ICANN Bylaws the Ombudsman shall “have the right to have access to (but not to publish if otherwise confidential) all necessary information and records from ICANN staff and constituent bodies to enable an informed evaluation of the complaint and to assist in dispute resolution where feasible (subject only to such confidentiality obligations as are imposed by the complainant or any generally applicable confidentiality policies adopted by ICANN)”.)

Resp. Ex. 7



[GET STARTED](#)

[NEWS & MEDIA](#)

[POLICY](#)

[PUBLIC COMMENT](#)

[RESOURCES](#)

[COMMUNITY](#)

[IANA STEWARDSHIP & ACCOUNTABILITY](#)

Resources

[About ICANN](#)

[Board](#)

[Accountability](#)

[Governance](#)

[Groups](#)

[Business](#)

[Contractual Compliance](#)

[Registrars](#)

[Registries](#)

[Operational Metrics](#)

[Identifier Systems Security, Stability and Resiliency \(IS-SSR\)](#)

Minutes | [New gTLD Program Committee](#)

18 May 2013

Note: On 10 April 2012, the Board established the [New gTLD Program Committee](#), comprised of all voting members of the Board that are not conflicted with respect to the [New gTLD Program](#). The Committee was granted all of the powers of the Board (subject to the limitations set forth by law, the Articles of incorporation, Bylaws or [ICANN's Conflicts of Interest Policy](#)) to exercise Board-level authority for any and all issues that may arise relating to the [New gTLD Program](#). The full scope of the Committee's authority is set forth in its charter at <http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/new-gTLD>.

A Regular Meeting of the [New gTLD Program Committee of the ICANN Board of Directors](#) was held in Amsterdam, The Netherlands on 18 May 2013 at 17:00 local time.

Committee Chairman Cherine Chalaby promptly called the meeting to order.

In addition to the Chair the following Directors participated in all or part of the meeting: Fadi Chehadé (President and CEO), Chris Disspain, Bill Graham, Olga Madruga-Forti, Erika Mann, Gonzalo Navarro, Ray Plzak, George Sadowsky, Mike Silber, Judith Vazquez, and Kuo-Wei Wu.

Thomas Narten, [IETF Liaison](#) and Francisco da Silva, [TLG Liaison](#), were in attendance as non-voting liaisons to the committee. Heather Dryden,

A note about tracking cookies:

This site is using "tracking cookies" on your computer to deliver the best experience possible. [Read more to see how they are being used.](#)

This notice is intended to appear only the first time you visit the site on any computer. Dismiss

Initiative

-
- Policy

 - Public Comment

 - Technical Functions

 - Contact

 - Help

1. Consent Agenda

- a. [Approval of Board Meeting Minutes](#)
- b. [BGC Recommendation on Reconsideration Request 13-1 Rationale for Resolutions 2013.05.18.NG02 – 2013.05.18.NG03](#)
- c. [BGC Recommendation on Reconsideration Request 13-2 Rationale for Resolution 2013.05.18.NG04](#)

2. Main Agenda

- a. [Addressing GAC Advice from Beijing Communiqué](#)

The Chair introduced the agenda, noting that there are items on the consent agenda and then the Committee would be discussing the [GAC](#) advice received in Beijing.

1. Consent Agenda

The Chair introduced the items on the consent agenda and called for a vote. The Committee then took the following action:

Resolved, the following resolutions in this Consent Agenda are approved:

a. Approval of Board Meeting Minutes

Resolved (2013.05.18.NG01), the New [gTLD](#) Program Committee approves the minutes of the 26 March 2013, 5 April 2013 and 11 April 2013 Meetings of the New [gTLD](#) Program Committee.

b. BGC Recommendation on Reconsideration Request 13-1

Whereas, Ummah's Digital, Ltd.'s ("Ummah") Reconsideration Request, Request 13-1, sought reconsideration of the staff conclusion that the Ummah [gTLD](#) application "is ineligible for further review under the New [gTLD](#) Program," which was based on the Support Applicant Review Panel ([SARP](#)) determination that Ummah's application did not meet the criteria for financial assistance.

Whereas, the BGC recommended that Reconsideration Request 13-1 be denied because Ummah has not stated proper grounds for reconsideration, and Ummah's stay request fails to satisfy the Bylaws' requirements for a stay.

Whereas, the BGC noted that "Ummah raises some interesting issues in its Request and suggests that the Board direct that the concerns raised in Ummah's Request be included in a review of the Applicant Support Program so that the design of future mechanisms to provide financial assistance and support in the New gTLD Program can benefit from the experiences within this first round."

Resolved (2013.05.18.NG02), the New gTLD Program Committee adopts the recommendation of the BGC that Reconsideration Request 13-1 be denied on the basis that Ummah has not stated proper grounds for reconsideration and that Ummah's stay request fails to satisfy the Bylaws' requirements for a stay.

Resolved (2013.05.18.NG03), the Board directs the President and CEO to include the concerns raised in Ummah's Reconsideration Request in the review of the Applicant Support Program so that the design of future mechanisms to provide financial assistance and support in the New gTLD Program can benefit from the experiences within this first round.

Rationale for Resolutions 2013.05.18.NG02 – 2013.05.18.NG03

In July 2009, as part of the comprehensive [GNSO](#) Improvements program, the [ICANN](#) Board approved the formal Charters of four new [GNSO](#) Stakeholder Groups (see [ICANN Board Resolution 2009.30.07.09](#)).

[ICANN's](#) Bylaws at the time Reconsideration Request 13-1 was filed, called for the Board Governance Committee to evaluate and make recommendations to the Board with respect to Reconsideration Requests. See Article IV, section 3 of the Bylaws. The New gTLD Program Committee, bestowed with the powers of the Board in this instance, has reviewed and thoroughly considered the BGC's recommendation with respect to Reconsideration Request 13-1 and finds the analysis sound. The full BGC Recommendation, which includes the reasons for

recommending that the Reconsideration Request be denied can be found at:

<http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/governance/reconsideration>

Having a Reconsideration process set out in ICANN's Bylaws positively affects ICANN's transparency and accountability. It provides an avenue for the community to ensure that staff and the Board are acting in accordance with ICANN's policies, Bylaws and Articles of Incorporation.

To assure that ICANN continues to serve the global public interest by ensuring worldwide accessibility to the Internet and opportunities for operating a registry, ICANN will include the issues raised in Ummah's Request in its review of the Program so that the design of future mechanisms to provide financial assistance and support in the New gTLD Program can benefit from the experiences within this first round.

Adopting the BGC's recommendation has no financial impact on ICANN and will not negatively impact the systemic security, stability and resiliency of the domain name system.

This is an Organizational Administrative Function not requiring public comment.

c. BGC Recommendation on Reconsideration Request 13-2

Whereas, Reconsideration Request 13-2, sought reconsideration of: (1) Staff and Board inaction on the consideration of Nameshop's letter of "appeal" sent after denial of Nameshop's change request to change its applied-for string in the New gTLD Program from .IDN to .INTERNET (the "Change Request"); and (ii) the decision of the Support Applicant Review Panel ("SARP") that Nameshop did not meet the criteria to be eligible for financial assistance under ICANN's Applicant Support Program.

Whereas, the BGC recommended that Reconsideration Request 13-2 be denied because Nameshop has not stated proper grounds for reconsideration.

Whereas, the BGC concluded that the Reconsideration Request 13-2 challenges: (i) an "appeal" process that does not exist; and (i) the substantive decisions taken within the New gTLD

Program on a specific application, not the processes by which those decisions were taken and that the reconsideration process is not, and has never been, a tool for requestors to seek the reevaluation of decisions.

Resolved (2013.05.18.NG04), the New gTLD Program Committee adopts the BGC's recommendation that Reconsideration Request 13-2 be denied on the basis that Nameshop has not stated proper ground for reconsideration.

Rationale for Resolution 2013.05.18.NG04

ICANN's Bylaws at the time Reconsideration Request 13-2 was filed, called for the Board Governance Committee to evaluate and make recommendations to the Board with respect to Reconsideration Requests. See Article IV, section 3 of the Bylaws. The New gTLD Program Committee, bestowed with the powers of the Board in this instance, has reviewed and thoroughly considered the BGC's recommendation with respect to Reconsideration Request 13-2 and finds the analysis sound. The full BGC Recommendation, which includes the reasons for recommending that the Reconsideration Request be denied can be found at:

<http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/governance/reconsideration>.

Having a Reconsideration process set out in ICANN's Bylaws positively affects ICANN's transparency and accountability. It provides an avenue for the community to ensure that staff and the Board are acting in accordance with ICANN's policies, Bylaws and Articles of Incorporation.

Request 13-2 challenges an "appeal" process that does not exist, and challenges the substantive decisions taken in implementation of the New gTLD Program on a specific application and not the processes by which those decisions were taken. Reconsideration is not, and has never been, a tool for requestors to seek the reevaluation of substantive decisions. This is an essential time to recognize and advise the ICANN community that the Board is not a mechanism for direct, de novo appeal of staff (or evaluation panel) decisions with which the requester disagrees. Seeking such relief from the Board is, in itself, in contravention of established processes and policies within ICANN.

Adopting the BGC's recommendation has no financial impact on ICANN and will not negatively impact the security, stability and resiliency of the domain name system.

This is an Organizational Administrative Function not requiring public comment.

All members of the Committee voted in favor of Resolutions 2013.05.18.NG01, 2013.05.18.NG02, 2013.05.18.NG03, and 2013.05.18.NG04. The Resolutions carried.

2. Main Agenda

a. Addressing GAC Advice from Beijing Communiqué

Chris Disspain led the Committee in a discussion regarding the GAC Advice from the Beijing Communiqué, stressing that the Committee is not being asked to take any decisions today. Rather, there are goals to understand the timing of decisions to be taken in the future, with particular focus on those items that the Committee is likely to accept.

Akram Atallah provided an overview of a timeline for proposed action, focusing on those items of advice that are applicable across all strings, and noting that it is a priority to deal with those items first. The next in priority are the items that affect strings in related categories. The public comment is still open on the safeguard advice, and there will be time needed to provide the Board with a summary of those comments. A decision will be needed soon after to keep the Program on track.

The Chair summarized his understanding of the items that needed to be ready for decision soon after the close of the comment period: The safeguards applicable to all new gTLDs; IGO protections; the Registry Agreement; the GAC WHOIS principle; IOC/RC protections; and the category of safeguards for restricted access policies. While many on the Committee are eager to discuss the singular/plural issue and .Africa and .GCC, those decisions are not essential for moving forward with the Program.

Chris confirmed that there is a plan to deal with the individual

issues as well as the general issues. For the .Africa and .GCC pieces of advice, the Committee first has to consider the applicant input, as well as for .Islam and .Halal. Applicant comments also have to be considered on the groups of strings identified in the Communiqué. The advice on singular/plural and IGO protections are on track to be dealt with separately, and there is ongoing work for all other portions of the advice.

Thomas Narten pointed out that there could be a need for further public comment in the even that the NGPC takes a decision that requires further input.

Olga Madruga-Forti and Tarek Kamel both noted that it is important for the Committee to take the GAC Advice seriously and respond in a timely manner, and not to solely focus on the process that is not as well understood among all of the governments of the world. In addition, some of the focus on the issues raised in the Communiqué has gone beyond the governments.

Gonzalo Navarro agreed and urged the Committee to be proactive in its responses.

Heather Dryden confirmed that the members of the GAC worked carefully to create this Communiqué.

The President and CEO urged the Committee that, when appropriate, even if formal action or decision is not ripe, the Committee should indicate the direction in which it is leaning on some of the more sensitive areas of advice.

Chris confirmed that particularly in regards to the portion of Communiqué where the GAC indicated it needed further time for discussion, the progress on this will in part be based upon the outcomes of that further discussion. However, for some of the names identified, there are already objection processes underway and so the results of those objections may remove the need for GAC action. However, it is possible for the Committee to telegraph how it anticipates acting in regards to these items, particularly when provided along with a clear statement of the Committee's understanding of the GAC's position.

Olga agreed with Chris' suggestion.

Resp. Ex. 7

Heather stressed the import of being responsive to the GAC while still allowing the objection processes to run.

Gonzalo Navarro shared his expectation that we will see heightened government participation at the Durban meeting as a result of the Communiqué, and the messaging within the GAC and the Committee will be very important.

Bill Graham agreed with Heather that it is important to proceed with caution, and to not signal potential action by the Committee that may not be feasible if the GAC or objection process leads to a change in course.

Chris then walked the Committee through proposed responses for inclusion in Scorecard and the Committee suggested modifications throughout the document. While discussing the Scorecard, Chris confirmed that the Committee would have further discussion on the singular/plural issue at a future call of the Committee, as a decision on this point could have great impact regarding future rounds of the program. For the IGOs, the Committee will be going into consultation with the GAC, and a letter will be sent to the GAC thanking it for its willingness to engage. The Committee had previously stated to the GAC that the deadline for addressing the IGO acronym issue is in Durban, to allow the Committee to take a resolution as soon after Durban as possible. Chris also noted that addressing the GAC advice on RAA, the GAC Whois Principles and the IOC/Red Cross should be very straightforward. For the safeguard advice applicable to all strings, Chris briefly led the Committee through some proposed Scorecard language, and requested that staff provide the Committee with additional information and explanations for the proposed suggestions of how to address the GAC Advice. As it related to the safeguard advice for particular categories of strings, Chris noted that due to lack of time, it made sense to postpone a review of these items.

Chris then confirmed that the topic for the Committee's next call should be to address those areas that will have a 1A on the Scorecard, so that the Committee can take further action. He also agreed that the staff should provide an update to the community on the Committee's progress.

The Chair then called the meeting to a close.



[You Tube](#)



[Twitter](#)



[LinkedIn](#)



[Flickr](#)



[Facebook](#)



[RSS Feeds](#)



[Community Wiki](#)



[ICANN Blog](#)

Who We Are

- [Get Started](#)
- [Learning](#)
- [Participate](#)
- [Groups](#)
- [Board](#)
- [President's Corner](#)
- [Staff](#)
- [Careers](#)
- [Newsletter](#)
- [Development and Public Responsibility](#)

Contact Us

- [Offices](#)
- [Global Support](#)
- [Security Team](#)
- [PGP Keys](#)
- [Certificate Authority](#)
- [Registry Liaison](#)
- [AOC Review](#)
- [Organizational Reviews](#)
- [Request a Speaker](#)
- [For Journalists](#)

Accountability & Transparency

- [Accountability Mechanisms](#)
- [Independent Review Process](#)
- [Request for Reconsideration](#)
- [Ombudsman](#)

Governance

- [Documents](#)
- [Agreements](#)
- [AOC Review](#)
- [Annual Report](#)
- [Financials](#)
- [Document Disclosure](#)
- [Planning](#)
- [Dashboard Beta](#)
- [RFPs](#)
- [Litigation](#)
- [Correspondence](#)

Help

- [Dispute Resolution](#)
- [Domain Name Dispute Resolution](#)
- [Name Collision](#)
- [Registrar Problems](#)
- [WHOIS](#)