

10 September 2019

Manal Ismail
Chair, Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC)

RE: Status of GAC Advice in the Action Request Register (ARR)

Dear Ms. Manal Ismail,

I am writing with regard to the status of advice issued by the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) as it appears in the Action Request Register (ARR). As you are aware, the ICANN organization currently reports on the status of the GAC advice inventory at the Board-GAC Interaction Group (BGIG) meetings during ICANN meetings, [starting at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi](#). The inventories of GAC advice are also posted on the GAC website [here](#). This correspondence acts as the beginning of a new process where the status of GAC advice in the ARR is reported on following the adoption of the latest GAC scorecard by the Board. Below is additional information regarding the ARR, the review of GAC advice conducted by the ICANN org, and the full inventory of GAC advice in the ARR (see Appendix).

Background on the ARR

The ICANN org implemented the ARR at the request of former Board Chair Dr. Steve Crocker in 2015 to provide clarity and consistency to the ICANN community about the status and lifecycles of different inputs to the Board. Initially, the ARR only tracked formal advice from the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC), the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC), and the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC). In 2017, the ICANN org expanded the ARR to include advice from the GAC as well as [Correspondence](#). ICANN org is now aligning the way it publicly [reports](#) on advice from the ALAC, RSSAC, and SSAC with advice from the GAC. Future inventories and status of GAC advice will be included on the [Recommendations to the Board](#) page along with other Advisory Committee advice.

Historical Review of GAC Advice

The ICANN org conducted a review of all GAC advice from the ICANN46 GAC Beijing Communiqué to the most recent GAC Communiqué from ICANN65 Marrakech. Each GAC Communiqué was parsed to identify individual advice items. The ICANN org determined that the GAC has issued 192 individual consensus advice items and 21 follow-up to previous consensus advice items since the ICANN46 Beijing Communiqué.¹ Each of these items was categorized into one of the ARR Phases, which are explained in more detail below.

The ARR Phases

The ARR is a five-phase framework used to consistently process formal requests to the Board. Please see below explanations of each phase as it relates to GAC advice as well as a table of the items that appear in each phase. Please also see the Appendix attached to this letter for a detailed breakdown of items in each phase and actions taken on the advice.

¹ This distinction has been made to align with the GAC Communiqués, which separate the two categories into separate sections in the Communiqués.

- **Phase 1 | Acknowledge:** The GAC issued a Communiqué containing advice to the ICANN Board and the ICANN organization has not yet published the advice.
- **Phase 2 | Understand:** The ICANN Board and organization are reviewing the advice to identify any questions needing clarification. The Board and the GAC typically conduct an exchange to discuss any clarifications required before formal Board consideration.
- **Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider:** The ICANN Board is in the process of formally considering the advice via a scorecard and/or resolution. Items may appear in this phase because further Board consideration may be required. Additionally, items may appear in this phase pending input from the ICANN org or other constituencies; if so, this will be made clear to the GAC.
- **Phase 4 | Implement:** The Board has considered the advice and directed the CEO and ICANN organization to proceed with action or implementation. This action or implementation is currently underway.
- **Phase 5 | Close Request:** The ICANN organization has reviewed the advice and has determined the advice has been considered, and all directed action or implementation has been completed. The ICANN Board will review items in Phase 5 before moving them to “Closed.”
- **Closed:** The advice has been processed as much as is relevant and is considered complete; no work is outstanding from the perspective of the ICANN Board or org. Related implementation work may have been integrated into ICANN’s ongoing operations or other initiatives.

Table 1. Breakdown of GAC Advice in ARR Phases

Phase	Consensus Advice Items	Follow-up Items
Phase 1 Receive & Publish	—	—
Phase 2 Understand	—	—
Phase 3 Evaluate & Consider	18	—
Phase 4 Implement	9	—
Phase 5 Close Request	29 ²	—
Closed	136	21 ³
Total	192	21

Next Steps

As noted above, going forward, the ICANN org plans to issue a report of this nature to accompany each scorecard the Board adopts. This is designed to make sure the GAC is kept up-to-date on progress and status of items in the ARR. This also aligns with how the ICANN org

² These are items that were closed after ICANN60 | Abu Dhabi, where the [ICANN org first presented](#) the full inventory of GAC Advice items.

³ The issues addressed in Follow-up to Previous Advice are tracked via the original advice on that topic.

reports on advice from the ALAC, RSSAC, and SSAC. Additionally, the Board and org request that the GAC provide feedback on this report and whether it agrees with the assessment of the status of GAC advice.

The Board and org hope that this information is helpful to the GAC, and we look forward to the GAC's feedback and to discussing at our BGIG meeting at ICANN66 in Montreal.

Sincerely,



Maarten Botterman
ICANN Board of Directors

Appendix: Inventory and Status of GAC Advice Items since ICANN46

Additional Information on Items in Phase 1 | Receive & Publish (0 Items)

There are currently no GAC advice items in Phase 1. Items remain in Phase 1 | Receive & Publish for less than one week. The Board does not anticipate items remaining in Phase 1 at the time of the Board's reporting on GAC advice.

Additional Information on Items in Phase 2 | Understand (0 Items)

There are currently no GAC advice items in Phase 2. Items enter Phase 2 | Understand when the ICANN org staff begin to draft the Board understandings for the Board's review. Phase 2 concludes with the Board-GAC clarification call usually scheduled for each Communiqué. The Board does not anticipate items remaining in Phase 2 at the time of the Board's reporting on GAC advice.

Additional Information on Items in Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider (18 Items)

The 18 items in Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider have all been previously considered by the Board. However, the Board has not yet taken a resolution to either accept and/or implement the advice, or to not accept the advice, which would trigger the process described in the ICANN Bylaws Section 12.2(a)(x), and has deferred a formal decision pending ongoing work related to the advice. Additionally, items may appear in this phase pending input from the ICANN org or other constituencies; if so, this will be made clear to the GAC. The Board will consider revisiting these items at a future date following this work.

These items fall into the following four categories:

- **IGO Protections (11 items):** These items are pending conclusion of the GNSO PDP Working Group on IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanism. Once Curative Rights PDP and facilitated discussions conclude the Board may wish consider this advice further.
- **Red Cross/Red Crescent (3 items):** These items are pending the “Final Report on Protection of IGO and INGO Identifiers in All gTLDs Policy Development Process”. Once the GNSO Council sends final recommendations to the Board for action the Board may wish to consider this advice further.
- **GDPR and WHOIS (3 items):** These items are pending the conclusion of the GNSO Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data EPDP Phase 2. Once the GNSO Council concludes Phase 2 of th EPDP the Board may wish to consider this advice further.
- **Sensitive Strings - .RAM (1 item):** The Board may wish to go back to the GAC for clarification on the public policy rationale of this advice.

Table 2. Inventory of GAC Advice Items in Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
ICANN48 Buenos Aires Communique §4.a.i. Protection of Inter-Governmental Organisations (IGOs) (20 Nov 2013)	The GAC Advises the ICANN Board that the GAC, together with IGOs, remains committed to continuing the dialogue with NGPC on finalising the modalities for permanent protection of IGO acronyms at the second level, by putting in place a mechanism which would: 1. provide for a permanent system of notifications to both the potential registrant and the relevant IGO as to a possible conflict if a potential registrant seeks to register a domain name matching the acronym of that IGO; 2.	The NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to GAC Advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response in its scorecard: The GNSO Council approved recommendations from the expedited PDP on 20 November 2013 regarding protections for IGOs and INGOs. The GNSO forwarded its policy recommendations to the ICANN Board for further consideration. On 7 February 2014, the Board (i) adopted the policy recommendations GNSO Council's unanimous recommendations that are not inconsistent with the GAC's advice, (ii) requested additional time to consider the remaining recommendations, and (iii) decided to facilitate discussions among the relevant parties to reconcile any remaining differences

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
	<p>allow the IGO a timely opportunity to effectively prevent potential misuse and confusion; 3. allow for a final and binding determination by an independent third party in order to resolve any disagreement between an IGO and a potential registrant; and 4. be at no cost or of a nominal cost only to the IGO. The GAC looks forward to receiving the alternative NGPC proposal adequately addressing this advice. The initial protections for IGO acronyms should remain in place until the dialogue between the NGPC, the IGOs and the GAC ensuring the implementation of this protection is completed.</p>	<p>between the policy recommendations and the GAC advice on the topic. These policy recommendations and the GAC advice are still under consideration.</p> <p>On 11 July 2019 the ICANN Board Chair sent a letter notifying the GAC Chair that the GNSO Council has approved four policy recommendations that were developed by the GNSO's PDP Working Group on IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms which include the following points: no substantive changes to existing rights protection mechanisms are needed for INGOS; no specific new dispute resolution procedures should be created for IGOs; and clarifying policy guidance is to be developed as to the filing of complaints by IGOs under the existing procedures.</p> <p>The four recommendations were posted for public comment on 11 July 2019 and will close on 20 August 2019. After the public comment period closes, the Board will meet to consider whether to adopt the four recommendations. This advice item remains open for further Board consideration.</p>
<p>ICANN49 Singapore Communique</p> <p>§8 Protection of Inter- Governmental Organisation (IGO) Names and Acronyms</p> <p>(27 Mar 2014)</p>	<p>The GAC recalls its previous public policy advice from the Toronto, Beijing, Durban and Buenos Aires Communiqués regarding protection for IGO names and acronyms at the top and second levels and awaits the Board's response regarding implementation of the GAC advice.</p>	<p>The NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to GAC Advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>On 14 May 2014, the NGPC adopted (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-05-14-en#2.a) another iteration of the Scorecard (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-new-gtld-annex-1-14may14-en.pdf) and provided the following response: On 7 February 2014, the Board directed the NGPC to: (1) consider the policy recommendations from the GNSO as the NGPC continues to actively develop an approach to respond to the GAC advice on protections for IGOs, and (2) develop a comprehensive proposal to address the GAC advice and the GNSO policy recommendations for consideration by the Board at a subsequent meeting. On 13 March 2014, the NGPC forwarded to the GAC for information a draft proposal for implementing the GAC advice on IGO acronym protections at the second level. On 30 April 2014, the Board took action to adopt the GNSO policy recommendations that are not inconsistent with GAC Advice received by the Board on the topic of IGO protections. With respect to the GNSO policy recommendations that differ from the GAC Advice (including this item of GAC Advice) the Board requested additional time to consider them, and will facilitate discussions among the relevant parties to reconcile any remaining differences between the policy recommendations and the GAC advice on the topic. These policy recommendations and the GAC advice are still under consideration.</p> <p>On 11 July 2019 the ICANN Board Chair sent a letter notifying the GAC Chair that the GNSO Council has approved four policy recommendations that were developed by the</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
		<p>GNSO's PDP Working Group on IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms which include the following points: no substantive changes to existing rights protection mechanisms are needed for INGOS; no specific new dispute resolution procedures should be created for IGOs; and clarifying policy guidance is to be developed as to the filing of complaints by IGOs under the existing procedures.</p> <p>The four recommendations were posted for public comment on 11 July 2019 and will close on 20 August 2019. After the public comment period closes, the Board will meet to consider whether to adopt the four recommendations. This advice item remains open for further Board consideration.</p>
<p>ICANN49 Singapore Communique</p> <p>§4.c. Specific Strings - .ram and .indians</p> <p>(27 Mar 2014)</p>	<p>Further to its Durban Communiqué, the GAC advises the ICANN Board that: a. The GAC recognizes that religious terms are sensitive issues. The application for .ram is a matter of extreme sensitivity for the Government of India on political and religious considerations. The GAC notes that the Government of India has requested that the application not be proceeded with; and b. as noted in the Durban communiqué, the Government of India has requested that the application for .indians not proceed</p>	<p>The NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to GAC Advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>In response to the GAC's advice in the Durban Communiqué concerning .RAM and .INDIANS, on 10 September 2013, the NGPC adopted an iteration of the Scorecard (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-new-gtld-annex-1-10sep13-en.pdf) taking note of the concerns expressed in the GAC's advice. a) With respect to .RAM, in the 14 May 2014 iteration of the Scorecard (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-new-gtld-annex-1-14may14-en.pdf), the NGPC took note of the concerns expressed in the GAC's Singapore advice that "the application for .ram is a matter of extreme sensitivity for the Government of India on political and religious considerations." The NGPC also noted the applicant response to the Board from Chrysler Group LLC ("Chrysler") concerning this advice, in which Chrysler indicated that it "remains hopeful that an accommodation can be reached that addresses the Government's concerns, yet allows Chrysler to register and operate .RAM as a restricted, exclusively-controlled gTLD. Chrysler representatives are willing to meet with the Government of India to discuss the resolution of this matter at any time that is convenient for the Government." At this time, the NGPC continues to deliberate on this item of GAC advice and encourages the impacted parties to continue the noted discussions. b) With respect to .INDIANS, the NGPC notes that on 26 August 2014, the applicant for .INDIANS notified ICANN that it was withdrawing its application from the New gTLD Program.</p> <p>This advice item remains open for further Board consideration.</p>
<p>ICANN49 Singapore Communique</p>	<p>Referring to the previous advice that the GAC gave to the board to permanently protect from unauthorised use the terms associated with the International Red Cross and Red Crescent</p>	<p>The NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to GAC Advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response in its scorecard:</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>§9.I. Protection of Red Cross/Red Crescent Names (27 Mar 2014)</p>	<p>Movement – terms that are protected in international legal instruments and, to a large extent, in legislation in countries throughout the world. I. The GAC advises that, for clarity, this should also include: a. the 189 National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, in English and the official languages of their respective states of origin. b. The full names of the International Committee of the Red Cross and International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies in the six (6) United Nations Language</p>	<p>The GNSO Council approved (https://gns0.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#20131120-2) recommendations from the expedited PDP on 20 November 2013 regarding protections for IGOs and INGOs, which included protections for certain identifiers associated with the Red Cross/Red Crescent. The GNSO forwarded its policy recommendations to the ICANN Board for further consideration. On 30 April 2014, the Board took action (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-04-30-en#2.a) to adopt the GNSO policy recommendations that are not inconsistent with GAC Advice received by the Board on the topic of protections for certain identifiers of the Red Cross/Red Crescent. With respect to the GNSO policy recommendations that differ from the GAC Advice (https://gac.icann.org/board-resolutions/public/board-resolution-annex-b-20140430.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1401266393000&api=v2) (including this item of GAC Advice) the Board requested additional time to consider them, and continues to facilitate discussions among the relevant parties to reconcile any remaining differences between the policy recommendations and the GAC advice on the topic. (To note, the GNSO policy recommends that instead of reserving the RCRC national society names as advised by the GAC, the names should be bulk added to the Trademark Clearinghouse.)</p> <p>On 11 July 2019 the ICANN Board Chair sent a letter notifying the GAC Chair that the GNSO Council has approved four policy recommendations that were developed by the GNSO’s PDP Working Group on IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms which include the following points: no substantive changes to existing rights protection mechanisms are needed for INGOs; no specific new dispute resolution procedures should be created for IGOs; and clarifying policy guidance is to be developed as to the filing of complaints by IGOs under the existing procedures.</p> <p>The four recommendations were posted for public comment on 11 July 2019 and will close on 20 August 2019. After the public comment period closes, the Board will meet to consider whether to adopt the four recommendations. This advice item remains open for further Board consideration.</p>
<p>ICANN50 London Communique §5 Protection of Inter-Governmental Organisation (IGO) Names and Acronyms</p>	<p>The GAC reaffirms its advice from the Toronto, Beijing, Durban, Buenos Aires and Singapore Communiqués regarding protection for IGO names and acronyms at the top and second levels, as implementation of such protection is in the public interest given that IGOs, as created by governments under international law are objectively different rights holders; notes the NGPC’s letter of 16 June 2014 to the</p>	<p>The NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to GAC Advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>On 8 September 2014, the NGPC adopted another iteration of the Scorecard (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-new-gtld-annex-1-08sep14-en.pdf) to address this advice. At that time, the NGPC reported that it was considering available options to reconcile the differences between the GAC advice and the GNSO policy recommendations concerning protections for IGO acronyms. On 16 June 2014,</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
(25 Jun 2014)	GNSO concerning further steps under the GNSO Policy Development Process while expressing concerns that the process of implementing GAC advice has been so protracted; welcomes the NGPC's assurance that interim protections remain in place pending any such process; and confirms its willingness to work with the GNSO on outcomes that meet the GAC's concerns.	<p>the NGPC sent a letter to the GNSO Council highlighting the previously noted concerns and providing an opportunity for the GNSO to consider modifying its policy recommendations at issue in accordance with Section 16 of the GNSO's PDP Manual. (Section 16 of the GNSO's PDP Manual permits modification to approved GNSO Council policies at any time prior to final approval by the Board.) At that time, NGPC was awaiting a response from the GNSO. The NGPC agreed to continue to provide updates to the GAC, the GNSO, and the broader ICANN community about its progress to address this matter, and noted that the temporary protections afforded to IGOs remain in place while the parties continue discussions. This matter remains under consideration.</p> <p>On 11 July 2019 the ICANN Board Chair sent a letter notifying the GAC Chair that the GNSO Council has approved four policy recommendations that were developed by the GNSO's PDP Working Group on IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms which include the following points: no substantive changes to existing rights protection mechanisms are needed for INGOs; no specific new dispute resolution procedures should be created for IGOs; and clarifying policy guidance is to be developed as to the filing of complaints by IGOs under the existing procedures.</p> <p>The four recommendations were posted for public comment on 11 July 2019 and will close on 20 August 2019. After the public comment period closes, the Board will meet to consider whether to adopt the four recommendations. This advice item remains open for further Board consideration.</p>
ICANN50 London Communique §6.a.I-III Protection of Red Cross / Red Crescent Names (25 Jun 2014)	The GAC refers to its previous advice to the Board to protect permanently the terms and names associated with the Red Cross and Red Crescent, including those relating to the 189 national Red Cross and Red Crescent societies, and recalls that the protections afforded to the Red Cross and Red Crescent designations and names stem from universally agreed norms of international law and from the national legislation in force in multiple jurisdictions. Accordingly, the GAC now advises, that: i. the Red Cross and Red Crescent terms and names should not be equated with trademarks or trade names and that their protection could not therefore be adequately treated or addressed under ICANN's curative mechanisms for trademark	<p>The NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to GAC Advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>On 3 November 2014, the Board notified the GAC that it had some concerns about the advice in the London Communiqué because it appeared to be inconsistent with the framework established in the Bylaws granting the GNSO authority to recommend consensus policies to the Board, and the Board to appropriately act upon policies developed through the bottom-up consensus policy developed by the GNSO. On 25 November 2014, the GAC responded to the Board's letter. The GAC noted that it had carefully considered the Board's letter as well as the relevant section in the London Communiqué. The GAC noted that its intention was to emphasize the urgency of providing protection for Red Cross/Red Crescent names and to state the GAC's view that a solution should not be further delayed pending the outcome of a GNSO PDP. The GAC further recognized that the urgency aspect had since been addressed, as stated in the GAC Los Angeles Communiqué: "The GAC welcomes the decision of the New gTLD Program Committee (Resolution 2014.10.12.NG05) to provide temporary</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
	<p>protection; II. the protections due to the Red Cross and Red Crescent terms and names should not be subjected to, or conditioned upon, a policy development process; III. the permanent protection of these terms and names should be confirmed and implemented as a matter of priority, including in particular the names of the international and national Red Cross and Red Crescent organisations.</p>	<p>protections for the names of the International Committee of the Red Cross and International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, and the 189 National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. The GAC requests the ICANN Board and all relevant parties to work quickly to resolve the longer term issues still outstanding.”</p> <p>On 11 July 2019 the ICANN Board Chair sent a letter notifying the GAC Chair that the GNSO Council has approved four policy recommendations that were developed by the GNSO’s PDP Working Group on IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms which include the following points: no substantive changes to existing rights protection mechanisms are needed for INGOS; no specific new dispute resolution procedures should be created for IGOs; and clarifying policy guidance is to be developed as to the filing of complaints by IGOs under the existing procedures.</p> <p>The four recommendations were posted for public comment on 11 July 2019 and will close on 20 August 2019. After the public comment period closes, the Board will meet to consider whether to adopt the four recommendations. This advice item remains open for further Board consideration.</p>
<p>ICANN51 Los Angeles Communique</p> <p>§5.a.I-II - 5.b.I. Protection of Inter-Governmental Organisation (IGO) Names and Acronyms</p> <p>(15 Oct 2014)</p>	<p>a. The GAC reaffirms its advice from the Toronto, Beijing, Durban, Buenos Aires, Singapore and London Communiqués regarding protection of IGO names and acronyms at the top and second levels, as implementation of such protection is in the public interest given that IGOs, as created by governments under international law, are objectively different right holders; namely, i. Concerning preventative protection at the second level, the GAC reminds the ICANN Board that notice of a match to an IGO name or acronym to prospective registrants, as well as to the concerned IGO, should apply in perpetuity for the concerned name and acronym in two languages, and at no cost to IGOs; ii. Concerning curative protection at the second level, and noting the ongoing GNSO PDP on access to curative Rights Protection Mechanisms, the GAC reminds the ICANN Board that any such mechanism should be at no or nominal cost to IGOs; and further, in</p>	<p>The NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to GAC Advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The GNSO Council approved recommendations from the expedited PDP on 20 November 2013 regarding protections for IGOs and INGOS (https://gnso.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#20131120-2). The GNSO forwarded its policy recommendations to the ICANN Board for further consideration. On 7 February 2014, the Board (i) adopted the policy recommendations GNSO Council's unanimous recommendations that are not inconsistent with the GAC's advice, (ii) requested additional time to consider the remaining recommendations, and (iii) decided to facilitate discussions among the relevant parties to reconcile any remaining differences between the policy recommendations and the GAC advice on the topic (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-02-07-en#2.a). These policy recommendations and the GAC advice are still under consideration.</p> <p>On 11 July 2019 the ICANN Board Chair sent a letter notifying the GAC Chair that the GNSO Council has approved four policy recommendations that were developed by the GNSO’s PDP Working Group on IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms which include the following points: no substantive changes to existing rights protection mechanisms are needed for INGOS; no specific new dispute resolution procedures should be created for IGOs; and clarifying policy guidance is to be</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
	<p>implementing any such curative mechanism, b. The GAC advises the ICANN Board: i. That the UDRP should not be amended; welcomes the NGPC's continued assurance that interim protections remain in place pending the resolution of discussions concerning preventative protection of IGO names and acronyms; and supports continued dialogue between the GAC (including IGOs), the ICANN Board (NGPC) and the GNSO to develop concrete solutions to implement long-standing GAC advice.</p>	<p>developed as to the filing of complaints by IGOs under the existing procedures.</p> <p>The four recommendations were posted for public comment on 11 July 2019 and will close on 20 August 2019. After the public comment period closes, the Board will meet to consider whether to adopt the four recommendations. This advice item remains open for further Board consideration.</p>
<p>ICANN52 Singapore Communique</p> <p>§2 Protection of Names and Acronyms for Inter- Governmental Organisations (IGOs)</p> <p>(11 Feb 2015)</p>	<p>The GAC will continue to work with interested parties to reach agreement on appropriate permanent protections for names and acronyms for Inter-Governmental Organisations. This will include working with the GNSO PDP Working Group on IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms; and with IGOs and the NGPC.</p>	<p>The NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to GAC Advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The GNSO Council approved recommendations from the expedited PDP on 20 November 2013 regarding protections for IGOs and INGOS (https://gns0.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#20131120-2). The GNSO forwarded its policy recommendations to the ICANN Board for further consideration. On 7 February 2014, the Board (i) adopted the policy recommendations GNSO Council's unanimous recommendations that are not inconsistent with the GAC's advice, (ii) requested additional time to consider the remaining recommendations, and (iii) decided to facilitate discussions among the relevant parties to reconcile any remaining differences between the policy recommendations and the GAC advice on the topic (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-02-07-en#2.a). These policy recommendations and the GAC advice are still under consideration.</p> <p>On 11 July 2019 the ICANN Board Chair sent a letter notifying the GAC Chair that the GNSO Council has approved four policy recommendations that were developed by the GNSO's PDP Working Group on IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms which include the following points: no substantive changes to existing rights protection mechanisms are needed for INGOS; no specific new dispute resolution procedures should be created for IGOs; and clarifying policy guidance is to be developed as to the filing of complaints by IGOs under the existing procedures.</p> <p>The four recommendations were posted for public comment on 11 July 2019 and will close on 20 August 2019. After the public comment period closes, the Board will meet to consider whether to adopt the four recommendations. This advice item remains open for further Board consideration.</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>ICANN57 Hyderabad Communique</p> <p>§5.a.I. Protection of Red Cross/ Red Crescent/ Red Crystal Identifiers and names of national committees</p> <p>(8 Nov 2016)</p>	<p>Request the GNSO Council, as a matter of urgency, to re-examine and revise its PDP recommendations pertaining to the protection of the names and identifiers of the respective international and national Red Cross and Red Crescent organizations which are not consistent with GAC advice; and in due course</p>	<p>On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board notes that in June 2014 the Board's New gTLD Program Committee had provided the GNSO with an update on the Board's work on this topic, which highlighted the possibility of the GNSO's amending its adopted policy recommendations regarding these Red Cross names and identifiers. The Board will continue to engage with the GAC and the GNSO on this topic, and provide any guidance that it believes appropriate while respecting the community's processes and the parties' good faith attempts to reach a resolution of the issue.</p> <p>On 11 July 2019 the ICANN Board Chair sent a letter notifying the GAC Chair that the GNSO Council has approved four policy recommendations that were developed by the GNSO's PDP Working Group on IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms which include the following points: no substantive changes to existing rights protection mechanisms are needed for INGOs; no specific new dispute resolution procedures should be created for INGOs; and clarifying policy guidance is to be developed as to the filing of complaints by INGOs under the existing procedures.</p> <p>The four recommendations were posted for public comment on 11 July 2019 and will close on 20 August 2019. After the public comment period closes, the Board will meet to consider whether to adopt the four recommendations. This advice item remains open for further Board consideration.</p>
<p>ICANN58 Copenhagen Communique</p> <p>§2.a.I IGO Protections</p> <p>(15 Mar 2017)</p>	<p>Pursue implementation of (i) a permanent system of notification to INGOs regarding second-level registration of strings that match their acronyms in up to two languages and (ii) a parallel system of notification to registrants for a more limited time period, in line with both previous GAC advice and GNSO recommendations;</p>	<p>On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the Copenhagen Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board takes note of this advice and has directed the ICANN organization to investigate the feasibility of implementing a system of notification to INGOs regarding second-level registration of strings that match their acronyms. The Board also notes that the IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms Policy Development Process (PDP) is ongoing. The Board awaits the results of the PDP, and will consider the PDP results and the findings of the ICANN organization regarding feasibility of IGO notifications as it considers whether implementation of such a mechanism will be appropriate in all circumstances.</p> <p>On 11 July 2019 the ICANN Board Chair sent a letter notifying the GAC Chair that the GNSO Council has approved four policy recommendations that were developed by the GNSO's PDP Working Group on IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms which include the following points: no substantive changes to existing rights protection mechanisms are needed for INGOs; no specific new dispute resolution</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
		<p>procedures should be created for IGOs; and clarifying policy guidance is to be developed as to the filing of complaints by IGOs under the existing procedures.</p> <p>The four recommendations were posted for public comment on 11 July 2019 and will close on 20 August 2019. After the public comment period closes, the Board will meet to consider whether to adopt the four recommendations. This advice item remains open for further Board consideration.</p>
<p>ICANN58 Copenhagen Communique</p> <p>§2.a.II IGO Protections</p> <p>(15 Mar 2017)</p>	<p>Facilitate continued discussions in order to develop a resolution that will reflect (i) the fact that IGOs are in an objectively unique category of rights holders and (ii) a better understanding of relevant GAC Advice, particularly as it relates to IGO immunities recognized under international law as noted by IGO Legal Counsels; and</p>	<p>On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the Copenhagen Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board accepts this advice and will continue to facilitate discussions between the GAC and GNSO on the subject of appropriate protections for IGO acronyms.</p> <p>On 11 July 2019 the ICANN Board Chair sent a letter notifying the GAC Chair that the GNSO Council has approved four policy recommendations that were developed by the GNSO's PDP Working Group on IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms which include the following points: no substantive changes to existing rights protection mechanisms are needed for INGOS; no specific new dispute resolution procedures should be created for IGOs; and clarifying policy guidance is to be developed as to the filing of complaints by IGOs under the existing procedures.</p> <p>The four recommendations were posted for public comment on 11 July 2019 and will close on 20 August 2019. After the public comment period closes, the Board will meet to consider whether to adopt the four recommendations. This advice item remains open for further Board consideration.</p>
<p>ICANN58 Copenhagen Communique</p> <p>§2.a.III IGO Protections</p> <p>(15 Mar 2017)</p>	<p>Urge the Working Group for the ongoing PDP on IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms to take into account the GAC's comments on the Initial Report.</p>	<p>On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the Copenhagen Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board notes that the GNSO PDP Working Group on IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms is considering the comments on its Initial Report which were submitted by the GAC and a number of IGOs on this subject.</p> <p>On 11 July 2019 the ICANN Board Chair sent a letter notifying the GAC Chair that the GNSO Council has approved four policy recommendations that were developed by the GNSO's PDP Working Group on IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms which include the following points: no substantive changes to existing rights protection mechanisms are needed for INGOS; no specific new dispute resolution procedures should be created for IGOs; and clarifying policy guidance is to be developed as to the filing of complaints by IGOs under the existing procedures.</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
		<p>The four recommendations were posted for public comment on 11 July 2019 and will close on 20 August 2019. After the public comment period closes, the Board will meet to consider whether to adopt the four recommendations. This advice item remains open for further Board consideration.</p>
<p>ICANN59 Johannesburg Communique</p> <p>§1.a.I-III. Intergovernmental Organization (IGO) Protections</p> <p>(29 Jun 2017)</p>	<p>The GAC reiterates its Advice that IGO access to curative dispute resolution mechanism should: I. be modeled on, but separate from, the existing Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP) II. provide standing based on IGOs' status as public intergovernmental institutions, and III. respect IGOs' jurisdictional status by facilitating appeals exclusively through arbitration. The GAC expresses concern that a GNSO working group has indicated that it may deliver recommendations which substantially differ from GAC Advice, and calls on the ICANN Board to ensure that such recommendations adequately reflect input and expertise provided by IGOs.</p>	<p>On 23 September 2017 the Board considered the Johannesburg Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board acknowledges the GAC's Advice and its concerns. The Board reiterates that as part of a PDP, the Working Group has an obligation to duly consider all inputs received*. The Board notes that the GNSO Council has informed the Board that all public comments and input received by the PDP Working Group, including from the GAC and IGOs, have been extensively discussed by the Working Group. The Board notes, further, that the GNSO Council considers the upcoming ICANN60 meeting to be an opportunity for further discussions among the community. The Board will continue to facilitate these discussions and encourages participation in them by all affected parties.</p> <p>* From the GNSO Operating Procedures: "Public comments received as a result of a public comment forum held in relation to the activities of the WG should be carefully considered and analyzed. In addition, the WG is encouraged to explain their rationale for agreeing or disagreeing with the different comments received and, if appropriate, how these will be addressed in the report of the WG".</p> <p>On 11 July 2019 the ICANN Board Chair sent a letter notifying the GAC Chair that the GNSO Council has approved four policy recommendations that were developed by the GNSO's PDP Working Group on IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms which include the following points: no substantive changes to existing rights protection mechanisms are needed for INGOs; no specific new dispute resolution procedures should be created for IGOs; and clarifying policy guidance is to be developed as to the filing of complaints by IGOs under the existing procedures.</p> <p>The four recommendations were posted for public comment on 11 July 2019 and will close on 20 August 2019. After the public comment period closes, the Board will meet to consider whether to adopt the four recommendations. This advice item remains open for further Board consideration.</p>
<p>ICANN60 Abu Dhabi Communique</p>	<p>Review closely the decisions on this issue in order to ensure that they are compatible with these values and reflect the full factual record.</p>	<p>On 4 February 2018 the Board considered the Abu Dhabi Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board accepts the GAC advice to review closely the policy recommendations,</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>§1.a.I Intergovernmental Organization (IGO) Protections</p> <p>(1 Nov 2017)</p>		<p>including those that may differ from GAC advice and the associated public comments before taking action. The Board acknowledges the GAC's longstanding advice on the need to protect IGO acronyms in the domain name system, and appreciates the GAC's interest in the outcome of the GNSO PDP on IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Mechanisms. While the direct management of a GNSO PDP is a role for the GNSO Council, the Board does maintain strong interest in the progress of this PDP. The Board looks forward to receiving the final policy recommendations from the GNSO as well as any further GAC advice on this topic. The Board remains committed to facilitating discussions between all affected parties that may resolve any conflicts that may arise, and acknowledges its role under the ICANN Bylaws to act in the best interests of ICANN and the community, in furtherance of ICANN's Mission, consistent with the organization's Commitments and Core Values, and in accordance with the specific requirements of the Bylaws for receiving, considering, and acting on GNSO policy recommendations and GAC Advice.</p> <p>On 11 July 2019 the ICANN Board Chair sent a letter notifying the GAC Chair that the GNSO Council has approved four policy recommendations that were developed by the GNSO's PDP Working Group on IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms which include the following points: no substantive changes to existing rights protection mechanisms are needed for INGOs; no specific new dispute resolution procedures should be created for IGOs; and clarifying policy guidance is to be developed as to the filing of complaints by IGOs under the existing procedures.</p> <p>The four recommendations were posted for public comment on 11 July 2019 and will close on 20 August 2019. After the public comment period closes, the Board will meet to consider whether to adopt the four recommendations. This advice item remains open for further Board consideration.</p>
<p>ICANN61 San Juan Communique</p> <p>§1.a.IV. GDPR and WHOIS</p> <p>(15 Mar 2018)</p>	<p>Distinguish between legal and natural persons, allowing for public access to WHOIS data of legal entities, which are not in the remit of the GDPR;</p>	<p>The ICANN Board initially considered this advice on 30 May 2018. However at the time, the Board responded, "as requested by the GAC in its 17 May 2018 letter to the ICANN Board Chair, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending further discussion with the GAC.</p> <p>The Board most recently considered this item on 15 May 2019 and stated in the scorecard:</p> <p>As noted in the Barcelona scorecard, the Board monitored the progress of the EPDP, which has now concluded its Phase 1 work. The public comment on the EPDP Team Final Report closed on 17 April 2019, and ICANN org has published a report of public comments. Because the GAC stated that it "would welcome the ICANN Board's adoption the EPDP Phase 1 policy recommendations as soon as possible" and the</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>ICANN61 San Juan Communique</p> <p>§1.a.VI. GDPR and WHOIS</p> <p>(15 Mar 2018)</p>	<p>Ensure that limitations in terms of query volume envisaged under an accreditation program balance realistic investigatory cross-referencing needs</p>	<p>EPDP Team has said that it "will determine and resolve the Legal vs. Natural issue in Phase 2", the Board continues to defer action on this advice.</p> <p>The ICANN Board initially considered this advice on 30 May 2018. However at the time, the Board responded, "as requested by the GAC in its 17 May 2018 letter to the ICANN Board Chair, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending further discussion with the GAC."</p> <p>The Board most recently considered this item on 15 May 2019 and stated in the scorecard:</p> <p>The Board continues to defer action on this advice. Recommendation 3 of the EPDP Final Report states that the EPDP Team undertakes to make a recommendation pertaining to a standardised model for lawful disclosure of non-public Registration Data now that the gating questions in the charter have been answered. This will include addressing questions such as: Whether such a system should be adopted; What are the legitimate purposes for third parties to access registration data; What are the eligibility criteria for access to non-public Registration data; Do those parties/groups consist of different types of third-party requestors; What data elements should each user/party have access to?</p> <p>This advice item remains open for further Board consideration.</p>
<p>ICANN61 San Juan Communique</p> <p>§1.a.VII. GDPR and WHOIS</p> <p>(15 Mar 2018)</p>	<p>Ensure confidentiality of WHOIS queries by law enforcement agencies.</p>	<p>The ICANN Board initially considered this advice on 30 May 2018. However at the time, the Board responded, "as requested by the GAC in its 17 May 2018 letter to the ICANN Board Chair, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending further discussion with the GAC."</p> <p>The Board most recently considered this item on 15 May 2019 and stated in the scorecard:</p> <p>The Board continues to defer action on this advice. Recommendation 3 of the EPDP Final Report states that the EPDP Team undertakes to make a recommendation pertaining to a standardised model for lawful disclosure of non-public Registration Data now that the gating questions in the charter have been answered. This will include addressing questions such as: Whether such a system should be adopted; What are the legitimate purposes for third parties to access registration data; What are the eligibility criteria for access to non-public Registration data; Do those parties/groups consist of different types of third-party requestors; What data elements should each user/party have access to?</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>ICANN61 San Juan Communique</p> <p>§2.a.i. IGO Reserved Acronyms</p> <p>(15 Mar 2018)</p>	<p>Ensure that the list of IGOs eligible for preventative protection is as accurate and complete as possible.</p>	<p>This advice item remains open for further Board consideration.</p> <p>The ICANN Board initially considered this advice on 30 May 2018. However at the time, the Board responded, "The Board thanks the GAC for the clarifications provided on 15 May 2018. The Board has asked the ICANN Organization to review the advice in light of these responses and to assess the feasibility of the request. The Board will defer action on this item at this time, and in due course will engage with the GAC should further clarifications be necessary before taking action on this advice."</p> <p>The Board most recently considered this item on 15 May 2019 and stated in the scorecard:</p> <p>Following from the Board's response to the GAC's Panama Communique, the Board is aware that a feasibility study has been initiated by ICANN Org with the support of the GAC, WIPO, and OECD to ensure that the list of IGOs is as accurate and complete as possible. The Board intends to monitor the progress of this study and will engage with the GAC as necessary concerning ICANN Org's implementation of this advice.</p> <p>On 11 July 2019 the ICANN Board Chair sent a letter notifying the GAC Chair that the GNSO Council has approved four policy recommendations that were developed by the GNSO's PDP Working Group on IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms which include the following points: no substantive changes to existing rights protection mechanisms are needed for INGOS; no specific new dispute resolution procedures should be created for IGOs; and clarifying policy guidance is to be developed as to the filing of complaints by IGOs under the existing procedures.</p> <p>The four recommendations were posted for public comment on 11 July 2019 and will close on 20 August 2019. After the public comment period closes, the Board will meet to consider whether to adopt the four recommendations. This advice item remains open for further Board consideration.</p>

Additional Information on Items in Phase 4 | Implement (9 Items)

The 9 items in Phase 4 | Implement have all been previously considered by the Board, and the Board directed the ICANN President and CEO to implement the advice. The Board has provided implementation updates as of the inventory accompanying this letter. Going forward, the Board will share any implementation updates for GAC advice in a similar inventory delivered with the passage of each Scorecard. These items fall into the following four categories:

- **GDPR and WHOIS (5 items)**
- **IGO Protections (3 items)**
- **Two-Character Country Codes at the Second Level (1 item)**

Table 3. Inventory of GAC Advice Items in Phase 4 | Implement

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
ICANN61 San Juan Communique §1.b.III. GDPR and WHOIS (15 Mar 2018)	Assist in informing other national governments not represented in the GAC of the opportunity for individual governments, if they wish to do so, to provide information to ICANN on governmental users to ensure continued access to WHOIS.	On 30 May 2018 the Board considered the San Juan Communique and provided this response in its scorecard: The Board accepts this advice. ICANN org’s Government Stakeholder and IGO Engagement teams continue to facilitate regular engagement and capacity building activities with governments around the world. As part of their engagement activities, these team members continue to raise awareness about the changes to the WHOIS system related to compliance with the GDPR, and opportunities for inputs from governments. This item is currently in implementation.
ICANN62 Panama Communique §1.a.I. GDPR and WHOIS (28 Jun 2018)	Take all steps necessary to ensure the development and implementation of a unified access model that addresses accreditation, authentication, access and accountability, and applies to all contracted parties, as quickly as possible; and	On 16 September 2018 the Board considered this advice and stated in its scorecard: The Board appreciates the GAC’s communication on the sense of urgency as it relates to developing a unified access model. The Board notes that the ICANN org continues to seek input on the critical components of a unified access model for continued access to WHOIS data. The Board welcomes and encourages the GAC’s input to this process. This item is currently in implementation.

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>ICANN62 Panama Communique</p> <p>§2.a.i. Protection of IGO Identifiers</p> <p>(28 Jun 2018)</p>	<p>Maintain current temporary protections of IGO acronyms until a permanent means of protecting these identifiers is put into place;</p>	<p>On 16 September 2018 the Board considered this advice and stated in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board will continue to maintain current temporary protections of IGO acronyms pending resolution of this issue.</p> <p>This item is currently in implementation.</p>
<p>ICANN62 Panama Communique</p> <p>§2.a.II. Protection of IGO Identifiers</p> <p>(28 Jun 2018)</p>	<p>Work with the GNSO and the GAC following the completion of the ongoing PDP on IGO-INGO access to curative rights protection mechanisms to ensure that GAC advice on protection of IGO acronyms, which includes the available “small group” proposal, is adequately taken into account also in any related Board decision; and</p>	<p>On 16 September 2018 the Board considered this advice and stated in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board notes that on 9 July 2018 the Final Report from the IGO-INGO access to curative rights protection mechanisms PDP was submitted to the GNSO Council, and it is currently under review by the GNSO Council. The Board will consider any PDP recommendations that are approved by the GNSO Council and ensure that GAC advice is adequately taken into account in any Board decisions. The Board also welcomes the GAC’s desire to work with it and the GNSO and the Board is open to suggestions from the GAC as to how it believes such collaboration can constructively take place.</p> <p>This item is currently in implementation.</p>
<p>ICANN62 Panama Communique</p> <p>§2.a.III. Protection of IGO Identifiers</p> <p>(28 Jun 2018)</p>	<p>Continue working with the GAC in order to ensure accuracy and completeness of IGO contacts on the current list of IGO identifiers.</p>	<p>On 16 September 2018 the Board considered this advice and stated in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board directs the ICANN org to provide adequate resources to assist the GAC in its endeavor to ensure accuracy and completeness of IGO contacts on the list of identifiers.</p> <p>This item is currently in implementation.</p>
<p>ICANN63 Barcelona Communique</p>	<p>Ensure that its direction to the ICANN CEO to “engage with concerned governments to listen to their views and concerns and further explain the Board’s</p>	<p>On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the Barcelona Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board acknowledges that some GAC members have expressed concerns</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>§1.a.III. Two-Character Country Codes at the Second Level (25 Oct 2018)</p>	<p>decision making process” (Board Resolution 2017.06.12.01) is fully implemented including direct engagement with those governments in order to fully address their concerns.</p>	<p>regarding the process for release of two-character labels at the second-level and that the GAC has issued advice directing the ICANN org to engage with concerned governments. The Board notes that the ICANN org conducted telephonic conversations with concerned governments in May 2017 explaining the rationale and development of the framework adopted by the 8 November 2016 Board resolution. Additionally, the ICANN Board and org engaged in discussions with the GAC at the Board-GAC Recommendation Implementation (BGRI) meetings at ICANN61, ICANN62 and ICANN63. The adopted Measures also urged registry operators to engage with the relevant GAC members when a risk is identified in order to come to an agreement on how to manage it or to have a third-party assessment of the situation if the name in question was already registered, advice which the GAC provided in its Helsinki Communiqué. The Board notes that the ICANN org is developing a dedicated webpage for the GAC members to easily track the registration of two-character domain names that correspond with a specific country code and which enables GAC members to submit a request for ICANN compliance action in the event of a perceived misuse. This service will aggregate two-character second level domains automatically to a table on the GAC site, which can also be downloaded for offline analysis by GAC members. The service will run daily after all root zone files are updated, aggregating all new two-character second-level domain registrations and displaying to GAC Members. The ICANN org also describes this engagement and these tools in its memo and Historical Overview. Although the Board believes that the advice to engage with concerned governments to explain the process and rationale has been fully implemented, the Board directs the ICANN President and CEO to continue to develop the tools as noted above to allow concerned GAC members to track two-character registrations.</p> <p>The Board and the GAC discussed the development of the tool during the BGIG meeting at ICANN65 in Marrakech. The Board and the GAC noted that the implementation of the tool would be subject to further discussion during ICANN66 in Montreal. This item is currently in implementation.</p>
<p>ICANN64 Kobe Communique §1.a.I.</p>	<p>Take necessary steps to ensure that the GNSO EPDP on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data institutes concrete milestones, progress</p>	<p>On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled “GAC Advice – Kobe Communiqué: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)” in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué. The Board acknowledges this advice and while it cannot guarantee the end result,</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
WHOIS and Data Protection Legislation (14 Mar 2019)	reports and an expeditious timeline, similar to Phase 1, for concluding Phase 2 activities;	<p>because the EPDP is a community procedure that determines its own processes, the Board does support the request that the second phase of this policy development institute concrete milestones and progress reports. The Board shall convey the request via its Liaisons to the EPDP and via its communications with the GNSO Council. The Board notes that ICANN org is also providing support to the EPDP Phase 2 to support its work.</p> <p>This item is currently in implementation.</p>
ICANN64 Kobe Communique §1.a.II. WHOIS and Data Protection Legislation (14 Mar 2019)	Take necessary steps to ensure that the scope of phase 2 activities is clearly defined with a view to expeditious conclusion and implementation;	<p>On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled “GAC Advice – Kobe Communique: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)” in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communique and the San Juan Communique. The Board acknowledges this advice and while it cannot guarantee the end result, because the EPDP is a community procedure that determines its own processes, the Board does support the request that the second phase of this policy development institute concrete milestones and progress reports. The Board shall convey the request via its Liaisons to the EPDP and via its communications with the GNSO Council. The Board notes that ICANN org is also providing support to the EPDP Phase 2 to support its work.</p> <p>This item is currently in implementation.</p>
ICANN64 Kobe Communique §1.a.V. WHOIS and Data Protection Legislation (14 Mar 2019)	Facilitate swift implementation of the new Registration Directory Services policies as they are developed and agreed, including by sending distinct parts to implementation as and when they are agreed, such as the questions deferred from Phase 1;	<p>On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled “GAC Advice – Kobe Communique: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)” in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communique and the San Juan Communique. The Board accepts this advice and will do what it can, within its authority and remit, and in light of other relevant considerations, to facilitate swift implementation of new registration data directory services policies, and if possible, send distinct parts to implementation as and when they are agreed.</p> <p>This item is currently in implementation.</p>

Additional Information on Items in Phase 5 | Close Request (29 Items)

There are currently 29 GAC advice items in Phase 5. Items enter Phase 5 | Close Request when the ICANN org has reviewed the advice and has determined the advice has been considered, and all directed action or implementation has been completed. The ICANN Board will review items in Phase 5 before moving them to “Closed.” Note: the items currently in this Phase are those items that have been closed since ICANN60 | Abu Dhabi, at which time the [ICANN org first presented](#) the status of GAC advice to the GAC.

Table 4. Inventory of Phase 5 | Close Request GAC Advice Items

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>ICANN57 Hyderabad Communique</p> <p>§7.a.i. String similarity Review</p> <p>(8 Nov 2016)</p>	<p>The Board should apply the views expressed by the GAC in the letter from the GAC Chair of 28 September 2016 to the ccNSO Chair concerning the Extended Process Similarity Review Panel Working Group proposed guidelines on the second string similarity review process.</p>	<p>On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board understands that the GAC has provided comments to the ccNSO's Extended Process Similarly Review Panel Working Group, and looks forward to reviewing the final report after it has been submitted.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 3 February 2017.</p>
<p>ICANN58 Copenhagen Communique</p> <p>§4.a.i 2-Character Country/Territory Codes at the Second Level</p> <p>(15 Mar 2017)</p>	<p>Take into account the serious concerns expressed by some GAC Members as contained in previous GAC Advice</p>	<p>On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the Copenhagen Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The GAC, in its Helsinki Communiqué, reiterated the need to minimize the risk of confusion between country codes and 2-letter registrations at the second level in new gTLDs, but also conveyed the absence of consensus within the GAC on specific measures needed to address the potential for confusion. The GAC advised the Board to “urge the relevant Registry or the Registrar to engage with the relevant GAC members when a risk is identified in order to come to an agreement on how to manage it or to have a third-party assessment of the situation if the name is already registered.” In response, ICANN affirmatively required Registries/Registry Operators to take specific mandatory steps to avoid confusion with respect to the 2-character labels, and also identified several voluntary measures that Registry/Registry Operators could consider. Finally, in keeping with the GAC Advice, ICANN urged Registries/Registry Operators to the relevant Registry or the Registrar to engage with the relevant GAC members when a risk is identified in order to</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
		<p>come to an agreement on how to manage it or to have a third-party assessment of the situation if the name is already registered. Although ICANN has fully implemented the GAC’s Advice on this matter, the Board understands that some GAC members continue to feel that their concerns have not been addressed. Accordingly, the Board has directed the CEO to engage with concerned governments to listen to their views and concerns and further explain the Board’s decision-making process.</p> <p>Since then, the Board has received and responded to additional GAC advice related to 2-character domains at the second level. Most recently, the Board responded to consensus advice contained in the Barcelona Communiqué on 27 January 2019. In its response, the Board pointed to the ICANN org’s memo and Historical Overview for additional details regarding this topic. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s written response to the Barcelona communiqué of 27 January 2019.</p>
<p>ICANN58 Copenhagen Communiqué</p> <p>§4.a.II 2-Character Country/Territory Codes at the Second Level</p> <p>(15 Mar 2017)</p>	<p>Engage with concerned governments by the next ICANN meeting to resolve those concerns.</p>	<p>On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the Copenhagen Communiqué and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The GAC, in its Helsinki Communiqué, reiterated the need to minimize the risk of confusion between country codes and 2-letter registrations at the second level in new gTLDs, but also conveyed the absence of consensus within the GAC on specific measures needed to address the potential for confusion. The GAC advised the Board to “urge the relevant Registry or the Registrar to engage with the relevant GAC members when a risk is identified in order to come to an agreement on how to manage it or to have a third-party assessment of the situation if the name is already registered.” In response, ICANN affirmatively required Registries/Registry Operators to take specific mandatory steps to avoid confusion with respect to the 2-character labels, and also identified several voluntary measures that Registry/Registry Operators could consider. Finally, in keeping with the GAC Advice, ICANN urged Registries/Registry Operators to the relevant Registry or the Registrar to engage with the relevant GAC members when a risk is identified in order to come to an agreement on how to manage it or to have a third-party assessment of the situation if the name is already registered. Although ICANN has fully implemented the GAC’s Advice on this matter, the Board understands that some GAC members continue to feel that their concerns</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
		<p>have not been addressed. Accordingly, the Board has directed the CEO to engage with concerned governments to listen to their views and concerns and further explain the Board’s decision-making process.</p> <p>Since then, the Board has received and responded to additional GAC advice related to 2-character domains at the second level. Most recently, the Board responded to consensus advice contained in the Barcelona Communie on 27 January 2019. In its response, the Board pointed to the ICANN org's memo and Historical Overview for additional details regarding this topic. This item is considered complete as of the Board's written response to the Barcelona communique of 27 January 2019.</p>
<p>ICANN58 Copenhagen Communique</p> <p>§4.a.III 2-Character Country/Territory Codes at the Second Level</p> <p>(15 Mar 2017)</p>	<p>Immediately explore measures to find a satisfactory solution of the matter to meet the concerns of these countries before being further aggravated.</p>	<p>On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the Copenhagen Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The GAC, in its Helsinki Communiqué, reiterated the need to minimize the risk of confusion between country codes and 2-letter registrations at the second level in new gTLDs, but also conveyed the absence of consensus within the GAC on specific measures needed to address the potential for confusion. The GAC advised the Board to “urge the relevant Registry or the Registrar to engage with the relevant GAC members when a risk is identified in order to come to an agreement on how to manage it or to have a third-party assessment of the situation if the name is already registered.” In response, ICANN affirmatively required Registries/Registry Operators to take specific mandatory steps to avoid confusion with respect to the 2-character labels, and also identified several voluntary measures that Registry/Registry Operators could consider. Finally, in keeping with the GAC Advice, ICANN urged Registries/Registry Operators to the relevant Registry or the Registrar to engage with the relevant GAC members when a risk is identified in order to come to an agreement on how to manage it or to have a third-party assessment of the situation if the name is already registered. Although ICANN has fully implemented the GAC’s Advice on this matter, the Board understands that some GAC members continue to feel that their concerns have not been addressed. Accordingly, the Board has directed the CEO to engage with concerned governments to listen to their views and concerns and further explain the Board’s decision-making process.</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
		<p>Following discussions with the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi, the ICANN org committed to the development of a dedicated webpage for the GAC members to easily track the registration of two-character domain names that correspond with a specific country code and which enables GAC members to submit a request for ICANN compliance action in the event of a perceived misuse. During the BGIG meeting at ICANN65 in Marrakech it was discussed that the BGIG meeting at ICANN66 in Montreal could be used to discuss the two-character tool. The Board is happy to then engage with GAC members on their concerns regarding the tool in Montreal. The Board will ensure that support staff from the ICANN org is available to provide any additional assistance as needed.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's discussion with the GAC during the BGIG meeting at ICANN65 in Marrakech.</p>
<p>ICANN58 Copenhagen Communique</p> <p>§4.a.IV 2-Character Country/Territory Codes at the Second Level</p> <p>(15 Mar 2017)</p>	<p>Provide clarification of the decision-making process and of the rationale for the November 2016 resolution, particularly in regard to consideration of the GAC advice, timing and level of support for this resolution.</p>	<p>On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the Abu Dhabi Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The GAC, in its Helsinki Communiqué, reiterated the need to minimize the risk of confusion between country codes and 2-letter registrations at the second level in new gTLDs, but also conveyed the absence of consensus within the GAC on specific measures needed to address the potential for confusion. The GAC advised the Board to “urge the relevant Registry or the Registrar to engage with the relevant GAC members when a risk is identified in order to come to an agreement on how to manage it or to have a third-party assessment of the situation if the name is already registered.” In response, ICANN affirmatively required Registries/Registry Operators to take specific mandatory steps to avoid confusion with respect to the 2-character labels, and also identified several voluntary measures that Registry/Registry Operators could consider. Finally, in keeping with the GAC Advice, ICANN urged Registries/Registry Operators to the relevant Registry or the Registrar to engage with the relevant GAC members when a risk is identified in order to come to an agreement on how to manage it or to have a third-party assessment of the situation if the name is already registered. Although ICANN has fully implemented the GAC’s Advice on this matter, the Board understands that some GAC members continue to feel that their concerns have not been addressed. Accordingly, the Board has directed the CEO to</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
		<p>engage with concerned governments to listen to their views and concerns and further explain the Board’s decision-making process.</p> <p>Since then, the Board has received and responded to additional GAC advice related to 2-character domains at the second level. Most recently, the Board responded to consensus advice contained in the Barcelona Communie on 27 January 2019. In its response, the Board pointed to the ICANN org's memo and Historical Overview for additional details regarding this topic. This item is considered complete as of the Board's written response to the Barcelona communique of 27 January 2019.</p>
<p>ICANN60 Abu Dhabi Communique</p> <p>§2.a.1 Enabling inclusive, informed and meaningful participation in ICANN</p> <p>(1 Nov 2017)</p>	<p>a. The GAC advises the ICANN Board to instruct ICANN Org to: I. Develop a simple and efficient document management system that allows non-experts to easily and quickly access and identify documents, starting with defining minimal requirements that ensure that every document has a title and a date or reference number, identifies the author and indicates intended recipients, makes reference to the process it belongs to and explains the acronyms used in the document; and</p>	<p>On 4 February 2018 the Board considered the Abu Dhabi Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board accepts this advice and is committed to accountability and transparency and pursuing easily understandable and relevant information on matters of concern to all stakeholders. The Board’s commitment to these values aligns with the recently started Information Transparency Initiative (https://www.icann.org/news/blog/creating-content-governance-and-rebuilding-the-infrastructure-of-icann-s-public-sites). The Board acknowledges and agrees with the need to ensure effective and equal participation in the policy process by all stakeholders, which is in line with the Mission, Commitments, and Core Values, as expressed in the Bylaws. The Board also understands that the ICANN org currently produces monthly one-pager PDP updates, regular pre-and post-ICANN Meeting Reports and newsletters highlighting specific public comment dates, policy development milestones and participation opportunities, which are all produced in plain English and with a view toward conciseness. In addition, brief video interviews with community leaders are produced at each ICANN meeting to showcase key achievements. New courses on the ICANN Learn Online platform have been developed on various policy processes, and updated slide decks and infographics depicting the community’s work processes are available on ICANN’s website. Executive summaries of all PDP reports and other major documents are routinely translated for publication in the six official United Nations languages, and live captioning and other translation services are being used for an increasing number of community group calls. The Board will continue to encourage the ICANN organization to produce materials for community use that will facilitate</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
		<p>broad and meaningful participation from all stakeholders globally and is open to suggestions on further improvement, and will balance this against the availability of resources.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 4 February 2018.</p>
<p>ICANN60 Abu Dhabi Communique</p> <p>§2.a.II Enabling inclusive, informed and meaningful participation in ICANN</p> <p>(1 Nov 2017)</p>	<p>Produce easily understandable executive summaries, key points and synopses (using e.g. infographs, videos and other innovative ways of presenting information) for all relevant issues, processes and activities, so that also non-expert stakeholders will be able to (a) quickly determine if a particular issue is of concern to them and (b) if yes, to participate in the policy process easily and effectively, on equal footing with other stakeholders. This should be done at least, but not only, before putting issues up for public comment. Attention should be paid to using plain English (and if possible translations into other languages) in order to allow non-English native speakers to understand the issues;</p>	<p>On 4 February 2018 the Board considered the Abu Dhabi Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board accepts this advice and is committed to accountability and transparency and pursuing easily understandable and relevant information on matters of concern to all stakeholders. The Board's commitment to these values aligns with the recently started Information Transparency Initiative (https://www.icann.org/news/blog/creating-content-governance-and-rebuilding-the-infrastructure-of-icann-s-public-sites). The Board acknowledges and agrees with the need to ensure effective and equal participation in the policy process by all stakeholders, which is in line with the Mission, Commitments, and Core Values, as expressed in the Bylaws. The Board also understands that the ICANN org currently produces monthly one-pager PDP updates, regular pre-and post-ICANN Meeting Reports and newsletters highlighting specific public comment dates, policy development milestones and participation opportunities, which are all produced in plain English and with a view toward conciseness. In addition, brief video interviews with community leaders are produced at each ICANN meeting to showcase key achievements. New courses on the ICANN Learn Online platform have been developed on various policy processes, and updated slide decks and infographics depicting the community's work processes are available on ICANN's website. Executive summaries of all PDP reports and other major documents are routinely translated for publication in the six official United Nations languages, and live captioning and other translation services are being used for an increasing number of community group calls. The Board will continue to encourage the ICANN organization to produce materials for community use that will facilitate broad and meaningful participation from all stakeholders globally and is open to suggestions on further improvement, and will balance this against the availability of resources.</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>ICANN60 Abu Dhabi Communique</p> <p>§3.a.i.1-4 GDPR/WHOIS</p> <p>(1 Nov 2017)</p>	<p>The GAC advises the ICANN Board that:</p> <p>i. the 2007 GAC WHOIS Principles (attached) continue to reflect the important public policy issues associated with WHOIS services. Accordingly, ICANN should take these issues into account as it moves forward with its planning to comply with the European Union’s General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). In these principles, the GAC has notably recognized that WHOIS data (also known as Registration Directory Services) is used for a number of legitimate activities, including: 1. Assisting law enforcement authorities in investigations and in enforcing national and international laws, assisting in combatting against abusive use of internet communication technologies; 2. Assisting businesses, other organizations, and users in combatting fraud, complying with relevant laws, and safeguarding the interests of the public; 3. Combatting infringement and misuse of intellectual property; and 4. Contributing to user confidence in the Internet as a reliable and efficient means of information and communication by helping users identify persons or entities responsible for content and services online.</p>	<p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 4 February 2018.</p> <p>On 4 February 2018 the Board considered the Abu Dhabi Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board accepts this advice and directs the ICANN org to continue to seek to maintain the existing WHOIS services to the maximum extent consistent with GDPR compliance. The Board also acknowledges that the WHOIS/RDS data is used for many legitimate activities, such as those described by the community in the user stories posted on the Data Protection and Privacy webpage. The Board welcomes the GAC’s full engagement with the community on the GDPR-related discussions and is committed to continuing to facilitate this discussion in a transparent way. The Board appreciates the GAC’s articulation of the important public policy interests served by legitimate and proportionate use of WHOIS/RDS data, including this Advice and the GAC’s contribution to ICANN’s ongoing public consultation. The Board is aware of the independence of data protection authorities in the European Union, and the Board particularly seeks and appreciates GAC and individual GAC member assistance to secure the full participation of European data protection agencies in ICANN efforts to identify and agree on a GDPR compliance model that facilitates continued access to registrant information by those with a legitimate and proportionate interest in processing WHOIS/RDS data. This kind of participation is critical in maintaining a common approach to access to WHOIS/RDS data across the gTLD ecosystem that strikes the right balance among important public interests, including fundamental individual liberties.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 4 February 2018.</p>
<p>ICANN60 Abu Dhabi</p>	<p>The GAC advises the ICANN Board that:</p> <p>i. as it considers how to comply with the</p>	<p>On 4 February 2018 the Board considered the Abu Dhabi Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>Communique</p> <p>§3.b.i.1-2 GDPR/WHOIS</p> <p>(1 Nov 2017)</p>	<p>GDPR with regard to WHOIS, it should use its best efforts to create a system that continues to facilitate the legitimate activities recognized in the 2007 Principles, including by: 1. Keeping WHOIS quickly accessible for security and stability purposes, for consumer protection and law enforcement investigations, and for crime prevention efforts, through user-friendly and easy access to comprehensive information to facilitate timely action. 2. Keeping WHOIS quickly accessible to the public (including businesses and other organizations) for legitimate purposes, including to combat fraud and deceptive conduct, to combat infringement and misuse of intellectual property, and to engage in due diligence for online transactions and communications.</p>	<p>The Board accepts this advice and welcomes the GAC's full engagement with the community on the GDPR-related discussions and is committed to continuing to facilitate this discussion in a transparent way. In a 21 December 2017 blog from the ICANN org President and CEO, as well as in other fora, Göran Marby has emphasized that the organization has made it a high priority to find, to the greatest extent possible, a path forward to ensure compliance with the GDPR while maintaining proportionate access to WHOIS/RDS data for legitimate purposes. This remains a critical point on the path to find workable solutions to ensure both compliance with the law and ICANN's contracts.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 4 February 2018.</p>
<p>ICANN60 Abu Dhabi Communique</p> <p>§3.c.i.1-2 GDPR/WHOIS</p> <p>(1 Nov 2017)</p>	<p>The GAC also advises the ICANN Board to: i. seek information from its outside counsel tasked with providing guidance on GDPR issues that addresses the following issues: 1. What are the options under the GDPR to ensure the lawful availability of WHOIS/RDS data for consumer protection and law enforcement activities? In particular, are there changes to policy or the legal framework that should be considered with a view to preserving the functionality of the WHOIS to the greatest extent possible for these purposes and others also recognized as legitimate? This question includes tasks carried out in the</p>	<p>On 4 February 2018 the Board considered the Abu Dhabi Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board accepts the advice and notes that the ICANN Org has submitted these questions to the Hamilton firm and received a response. The GAC's questions regarding GDPR were shared with the Hamilton firm to consider as part of its next legal analysis. See: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gdpr-legal-analysis-part2-draft-questions-15nov17-en.pdf. Hamilton replied to the questions in its second analysis, available here: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gdpr-memorandum-part2-18dec17-en.pdf. The Board also acknowledges that the community has had access to legal input from a variety of qualified experts in EU data protection law. Because GDPR is principles-based rather than prescriptive, the Board also notes that differences of opinion and approach are reflected in these various inputs. These differences underscore the importance of direct participation by the GAC as well as relevant data protection</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
	<p>public interest and tasks carried out for a legitimate purpose, including preventing fraud and deceptive activities, investigating and combatting crime, promoting and safeguarding public safety, consumer protection, cyber-security etc. 2. What are the options under the GDPR to ensure the lawful availability of WHOIS/RDS data for the public, including businesses and other organizations? This question includes tasks carried out in the public interest and tasks carried out for a legitimate purpose, including preventing fraud and deceptive activities, investigating and combatting crime as well as infringement and misuse of 13 intellectual property, promoting and safeguarding public safety, consumer protection, cyber-security etc.</p>	<p>authorities in ICANN's dialogue with the community regarding GDPR compliance in the context of WHOIS/RDS data.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 4 February 2018.</p>
<p>ICANN60 Abu Dhabi Communique</p> <p>§3.d.l.1 GDPR/WHOIS</p> <p>(1 Nov 2017)</p>	<p>The GAC also advises the ICANN Board that: i. it is urgent to address these issues and that the GAC should be fully involved in the design and implementation of any (including interim) solution and requests that ICANN practice transparency vis-à-vis the multistakeholder community in its GDPR activities.</p>	<p>On 4 February 2018 the Board considered the Abu Dhabi Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board accepts this advice and welcomes the GAC's full engagement with the community on the GDPR-related discussions and is committed to continuing to facilitate this discussion in a transparent way. The Board is aware and receiving updates from the organization on the ongoing facilitation, under the guidance of Göran and GAC leadership, on a variety of topics that are of interest to the GAC. The organization is grateful for the opportunity to hold these ongoing dialogues. One example of this is the regular calls between the ICANN org and the GAC about GDPR. These calls provide the opportunity to discuss the context of different issues.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 4 February 2018.</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>ICANN60 Abu Dhabi Communique</p> <p>§4.a.i Applications for .amazon and related strings</p> <p>(1 Nov 2017)</p>	<p>Continue facilitating negotiations between the Amazon Cooperation Treaty Organization's (ACTO) member states and the Amazon corporation with a view to reaching a mutually acceptable solution to allow for the use of .amazon as a top level domain name.</p>	<p>On 4 February 2018 the Board considered the Abu Dhabi Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The ICANN Board accepts the GAC advice and has asked the ICANN org President and CEO to facilitate negotiations between the Amazon Cooperation Treaty Organization's (ACTO) member states and the Amazon corporation.</p> <p>On 10 March 2019 the ICANN Board considered the New gTLD applications for .AMAZON and included in the text of resolutions 2019.03.10.01 – 2019.03.10.07 "Whereas, the President and CEO facilitated discussions with various ACTO member states over the period of a year. The President and CEO has also made repeated attempts since October 2018 to engage in further facilitation discussions with ACTO member states. Despite repeated attempts, additional facilitation discussions were scheduled, but did not take place. The ICANN Board now therefore considers that it has complied with the operative GAC advice on this matter in the November 2017 Abu Dhabi Communiqué to '[c]ontinue facilitating negotiations between the Amazon Cooperation Treaty Organization's (ACTO) member states and the Amazon corporation with a view to reaching a mutually acceptable solution to allow for the use of .amazon as a top level domain name.'"</p> <p>This item is complete as of the Board's resolution of 10 March 2019</p>
<p>ICANN61 San Juan Communique</p> <p>§1.a.i. GDPR and WHOIS</p> <p>(15 Mar 2018)</p>	<p>Ensure that the proposed interim model maintains current WHOIS requirements to the fullest extent possible</p>	<p>On 30 May 2018 the Board considered the San Juan Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board accepts this advice. As outlined in section 1.12 of the Advisory Statement accompanying the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data (Temporary Specification), adopted by the Board on 17 May 2018: "To allow ICANN, Registry Operators, and Registrars to comply with the law while ensuring continued availability of Registration Data to the greatest extent possible and avoid fragmentation of the WHOIS system, the Temporary specification will provide a single, uniform framework for ICANN, Registry Operators, and Registrar regarding Registration Data directory services. The Temporary Specification also takes into account ICANN's Bylaws, which requires that, "Subject to applicable laws, ICANN shall use commercially reasonable efforts to enforce its policies relating to registration directory</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
		<p>services and shall work with Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees to explore structural changes to improve accuracy and access to generic top-level domain registration data, as well as consider safeguards for protecting such data.” Also, this balancing acknowledges that it is either expressed or implied in all of ICANN org’s agreements that the contracted party must comply with all applicable laws. Additionally, section 4 of the Advisory Statement also outlines additional steps ICANN has taken and modifications made to the Temporary Specification to ensure the changes are as narrowly tailored as possible to meet the requirements of the GDPR, while maintaining the WHOIS services to the greatest extent possible.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 30 May 2018.</p>
<p>ICANN61 San Juan Communique</p> <p>§1.a.II. GDPR and WHOIS</p> <p>(15 Mar 2018)</p>	<p>Provide a detailed rationale for the choices made in the interim model, explaining their necessity and proportionality in relation to the legitimate purposes identified;</p>	<p>On 30 May 2018 the Board considered the San Juan Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board accepts this advice. The Advisory Statement and the rationale to the Board’s resolution adopting the Temporary Specification provides a detailed rationale for the choices made in the Temporary Specification should elicit the support of the Internet community.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 30 May 2018.</p>
<p>ICANN61 San Juan Communique</p> <p>§1.a.III. GDPR and WHOIS</p> <p>(15 Mar 2018)</p>	<p>In particular, reconsider the proposal to hide the registrant email address as this may not be proportionate in view of the significant negative impact on law enforcement, cybersecurity and rights protection;</p>	<p>On 30 May 2018 the Board considered the San Juan Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board accepts this advice. ICANN org has considered the many competing viewpoints on this matter, as expressed in paragraphs 5.5.10 – 5.5.11 of the Cookbook. ICANN org also requested additional guidance from the Article 29 Working Party on this issue. The guidance received from the Article 29 Working Party on 11 April 2018 makes clear that masking email addresses is a step toward compliance with the GDPR (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/jelinek-to-marby-11apr18-en.pdf). In her letter to CEO Göran Marby, WP29 Chairperson Andrea Jelinek notes that WP29, “welcomes the proposal to introduce</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
		<p>alternative methods to contact registrants or administrative and technical contacts, without public disclosure of registrants' personal email addresses (referred to as "anonymized email, web form, or other technical means")." The approach in the Temporary Specification is designed to minimize the intrusiveness of data processing, while still providing a means to contact, but not identify, the registrant, administrative, or technical contacts.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 30 May 2018.</p>
<p>ICANN61 San Juan Communique</p> <p>§1.a.V. GDPR and WHOIS</p> <p>(15 Mar 2018)</p>	<p>Ensure continued access to the WHOIS, including non-public data, for users with a legitimate purpose, until the time when the interim WHOIS model is fully operational, on a mandatory basis for all contracted parties;</p>	<p>The ICANN Board initially considered this advice on 30 May 2018. However at the time, the Board responded, "as requested by the GAC in its 17 May 2018 letter to the ICANN Board Chair, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending further discussion with the GAC."</p> <p>The Board most recently considered this item on 15 May 2019 and stated in the scorecard:</p> <p>The Board accepts this advice. The Board notes that EPDP Recommendation 18 provides a mechanism for third-parties with legitimate interests to access to non-public gTLD registration data, and obligates the contracted parties to disclose the requested non-public data if the request passes the balancing test. The Board anticipates that this recommended model for requests for lawful disclosure of non-public registration data will be expanded upon in Phase 2, in light of Recommendation 3, which states that the EPDP Team undertakes to make a recommendation pertaining to a standardised model for lawful disclosure of non-public Registration Data now that the gating questions in the charter have been answered. This will include addressing questions such as: Whether such a system should be adopted; What are the legitimate purposes for third parties to access registration data; What are the eligibility criteria for access to non-public Registration data?; Do those parties/groups consist of different types of third-party requestors?; What data elements should each user/party have access to?</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 15 May 2019.</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>ICANN61 San Juan Communique</p> <p>§1.b.i. GDPR and WHOIS</p> <p>(15 Mar 2018)</p>	<p>Complete the interim model as swiftly as possible, taking into account the advice above. Once the model is finalized, the GAC will complement ICANN's outreach to the Article 29 Working Party, inviting them to provide their views;</p>	<p>On 30 May 2018 the Board considered the San Juan Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board accepts this advice. ICANN org considered input from the community, the GAC, and European Data Protection Authorities to refine the Temporary Specification that was ultimately adopted by the Board on 17 May 2018. The Board welcomes the GAC's continued outreach efforts to the Article 29 Working Party as the Board is required to reaffirm the Temporary Specification every 90 days following adoption.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 30 May 2018.</p>
<p>ICANN61 San Juan Communique</p> <p>§1.b.ii. GDPR and WHOIS</p> <p>(15 Mar 2018)</p>	<p>Consider the use of Temporary Policies and/or Special Amendments to ICANN's standard Registry and Registrar contracts to mandate implementation of an interim model and a temporary access mechanism; and</p>	<p>On 30 May 2018 the Board considered the San Juan Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board accepts this advice. As noted elsewhere, the Board adopted the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data on 17 May 2018 utilizing the process established in the Registrar Accreditation Agreement and Registry Agreement for adopting temporary policies or specifications.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 30 May 2018.</p>
<p>ICANN62 Panama Communique</p> <p>§1.a.ii. GDPR and WHOIS</p> <p>(28 Jun 2018)</p>	<p>Publish a status report, four weeks prior to ICANN 63.</p>	<p>On 16 September 2018 the Board considered this advice and stated in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board directs the ICANN org to continue to provide the GAC with regular updates on progress related to the development of a unified access model, in addition to providing a status report four weeks prior to ICANN63.</p> <p>On 20 August 2018 the ICANN President & CEO published a blog announcing the publication of the Draft Framework for a Possible Unified Access Model for Continued Access to Full WHOIS Data. This item is considered complete as of the CEO's blog of 20 August 2018.</p>
<p>ICANN62 Panama Communique</p>	<p>Work, as soon as possible, with those GAC members who have expressed</p>	<p>The Board initially considered this advice on 30 May 2018. However at the time, the Board responded, "The Board will defer a formal response to the</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>§3.a.i. Two-character Country Codes at the Second Level (28 Jun 2018)</p>	<p>serious concerns with respect to the release of their 2-character country/territory codes at the second level in order to establish an effective mechanism to resolve their concerns in a satisfactory manner, bearing in mind that previous GAC advice on the matter stands.</p>	<p>GAC on this advice pending further discussions with the GAC."</p> <p>The Board most recently considered this item on 27 January 2019 and stated in its scorecard: The Board acknowledges this advice and refers the GAC to the Board's responses on items §1.a.i, II, and III above in the Barcelona consensus advice section. The Board also directs the GAC to the ICANN org memo (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/implementation-memo-two-character-ascii-labels-22jan19-en.pdf) and Historical Overview (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/historical-overview-two-character-ascii-labels-22jan19-en.pdf) for additional details regarding this topic.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 27 January 2019.</p>
<p>ICANN62 Panama Communiqué §3.a.ii. Two-character Country Codes at the Second Level (28 Jun 2018)</p>	<p>Immediately take necessary steps to prevent further negative consequences for the concerned GAC members arising from the November 2016 Board Resolution.</p>	<p>The Board initially considered this advice on 30 May 2018. However at the time, the Board responded, "The Board will defer a formal response to the GAC on this advice pending further discussions with the GAC."</p> <p>The Board most recently considered this item on 27 January 2019 and stated in its scorecard: See response on item §3.a.i above [The Board acknowledges this advice and refers the GAC to the Board's responses on items §1.a.i, II, and III above in the Barcelona consensus advice section. The Board also directs the GAC to the ICANN org memo (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/implementation-memo-two-character-ascii-labels-22jan19-en.pdf) and Historical Overview (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/historical-overview-two-character-ascii-labels-22jan19-en.pdf) for additional details regarding this topic.]</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 27 January 2019.</p>
<p>ICANN63 Barcelona Communiqué §1.a.i. Two-Character</p>	<p>Explain in writing how and why it considers it is implementing GAC advice on the release of country codes at the second level.</p>	<p>On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the Barcelona Communiqué and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board resolution taken in November 2016 adopting the Measures for Letter/Letter Two-Character ASCII Labels to Avoid Confusion with Corresponding Country Codes followed a multi-year effort of community</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>Country Codes at the Second Level</p> <p>(25 Oct 2018)</p>		<p>consultation, including consideration of requests from registry operators, relevant GAC advice and individual government input. The Board took its initial action directing the ICANN org to develop an efficient procedure for the release of two-character labels following the receipt of Registry Service Evaluation Process (RSEP) requests in 2014. Over the subsequent two years, the ICANN org implemented the Measures in phases, as described in a letter from Akram Atallah in August 2015. In each phase of development, the Board directed the ICANN org to make changes to the process based on GAC advice, including advice from the Los Angeles, Singapore, and Dublin Communiqués. The Board is aware that there is some concern among GAC members that the Board did not consider the advice regarding two-characters in the Helsinki Communiqué until after the November 2016 resolution. While the Board did not formally resolve on the advice prior to the resolution of November 2016 (the Board formally resolved on the advice in December 2016), the Board would like to note that this advice was discussed within the Board prior to the resolution and was incorporated into the Measures. The November 2016 resolution states: “Whereas, in the GAC’s Helsinki Communiqué (30 June 2016), the GAC advised the Board to ‘urge the relevant Registry or the Registrar to engage with the relevant GAC members when a risk is identified in order to come to an agreement on how to manage it or to have a third-party assessment of the situation if the name is already registered.’ The advice was incorporated in the proposed measures to avoid confusion.” Since the Helsinki Communiqué, and starting with the Copenhagen Communiqué, the ICANN Board and GAC have agreed upon a new procedure for addressing GAC advice to ensure that advice is formally addressed at least four weeks prior to the subsequent ICANN meeting. This procedure is implemented by ICANN Org and has now been in place for over a year, to mutual satisfaction. The ICANN org has provided detailed explanations of this development process in their memo to the GAC dated 22 January 2019 as well as in a Historical Overview of the process. Based on the above, the Board believes it has both fully considered and implemented the GAC advice on two-character labels at the second level.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration and written response provided on 27 January 2019.</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>ICANN63 Barcelona Communique</p> <p>§1.a.II. Two-Character Country Codes at the Second Level</p> <p>(25 Oct 2018)</p>	<p>Explain in writing whether its Resolution of 8 November 2016 and its change from the preexisting release process (indicated in specification 5. 2 of the Registry Agreement, sentence 1) to a new curative process (under sentence 2) are compatible with GAC advice on this topic, or whether it constitutes a rejection of GAC advice. The GAC advises the Board to set out its explanation in writing by 31 December 2018. Previous GAC advice on this matter stands.</p>	<p>On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the Barcelona Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board sees the November 2016 resolution as compatible with and taking into account GAC advice. As stated in the November 2016 resolution: "...[T]he Board considered the public comments, the staff summary and analysis report of public comments, and GAC advice. The proposed measures were updated to take into account the public comments and GAC advice relating to the proposed measures and two-character labels." As explained in detail in the ICANN org memo and Historical Overview, Specification 5, Section 2 of the Registry Agreement provides two alternate paths for release of two-character labels at the second-level, the second of which is based on ICANN approval. Accordingly, it is within the ICANN org's remit to pursue a process by which registry operators seek approval for release of two-character labels from ICANN. The November 2016 resolution did not constitute a switch from a "release process" to a "curative process", but rather was the culmination of a multi-year process of development, which allowed for input from registry operators, GAC members and individual governments, and other community members. As expressed to the GAC throughout the development process, it was intended that a set of standard measures would be developed that could be implemented by any registry operator. The Board examined the issue with respect to ICANN's mission, commitments and core values, and believes that it adopted a resolution that is consistent with GAC advice. The Board shares the GAC's concern that use of two-character strings corresponding to country codes should not be done in a way to deceive or confuse consumers, and, based on the process described in the ICANN org memo (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/implementation-memo-two-character-ascii-labels-22jan19-en.pdf) and Historical Overview (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/historical-overview-two-character-ascii-labels-22jan19-en.pdf), believes it has implemented a solution that resolves any issues related to user confusability. The Board is not aware of any further negative consequences from the 8 November 2016 resolution regarding security, stability, or user confusability.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration and written response provided on 27 January 2019.</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>ICANN63 Barcelona Communique</p> <p>§2.a.I. IGO Protections</p> <p>(25 Oct 2018)</p>	<p>Facilitate a substantive, solutions-oriented dialogue between the GNSO and the GAC in an effort to resolve the longstanding issue of IGO protections, on which it reaffirms its previous advice, notably with respect to the creation of a curative mechanism and maintenance of temporary protections.</p>	<p>On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the Barcelona Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board stands ready to facilitate a substantive, solutions-oriented discussion should it be invited to do so by the GNSO and the GAC and is aware that a dialogue has been initiated between the GNSO and the GAC on this topic. The Board intends to consider GAC advice in accordance with the process documented in the ICANN Bylaws. The Board confirms that the interim protections afforded to IGO acronyms at the second level of the domain name system will remain in place pending the GNSO’s final recommendations and the Board’s consideration of those recommendations. The Board provided this response in the Barcelona scorecard adopted on 27 January 2019.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 27 January 2019.</p>
<p>ICANN64 Kobe Communique</p> <p>§1.a.III. WHOIS and Data Protection Legislation</p> <p>(14 Mar 2019)</p>	<p>Make available the necessary resources for Phase 2 to expeditiously advance on the complex legal issues deferred from Phase 1;</p>	<p>On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted a scorecard titled "GAC Advice – Kobe Communiqué: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)" in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué. The Board acknowledges this advice and appreciates the need to ensure that necessary resources are available for the EPDP Phase 2, including expert legal resources. While it is ultimately up to the EPDP to “expeditiously advance on the complex legal issues deferred from Phase 1”, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting through these legal issues. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 15 May 2019.</p>
<p>ICANN64 Kobe Communique</p> <p>§1.a.IV. WHOIS and Data Protection Legislation</p> <p>(14 Mar 2019)</p>	<p>Consider instituting additional parallel work efforts on technical implementations, such as that carried out by the Technical Study Group, for purposes of informing and complementing the EPDP’s Phase 2 activities;</p>	<p>On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled “GAC Advice – Kobe Communiqué: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)” in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué. The Board acknowledges this advice and understands that the GAC is requesting the ICANN Board to do all that it can, within its authority and remit and subject to budgetary constraints, to facilitate the work of the EPDP, including through “parallel efforts” such as the Technical Study Group (TSG). The Board notes that the TSG presented a Draft Technical Model at ICANN64 and received community feedback. The TSG has since completed its work and published</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
		<p>TSG01, Technical Model for Access to Non-Public Registration Data. ICANN will share the model with the European Data Protection Board (EDPB) and solicit the EDPB's feedback on specific questions related to the model. ICANN will also present the model to the European Commission before that. In regard to any other "parallel efforts", the Board will consider those as necessary but reiterates that it will take actions only within its authority and subject to budgetary considerations; the Board will not take any action that would undermine or replace the work of the EPDP. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 15 May 2019.</p>
<p>ICANN64 Kobe Communique</p> <p>§1.a.VI. WHOIS and Data Protection Legislation</p> <p>(14 Mar 2019)</p>	<p>Consider re-starting implementation processes for relevant existing policies, such as the Privacy Proxy Services Accreditation Issues Policy.</p>	<p>On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled "GAC Advice – Kobe Communique: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)" in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communique and the San Juan Communique. The Board accepts this advice. The Board believes that waiting to proceed with implementation of Privacy Proxy Services Accreditation Issues (PPSAI) Policy until the completion of the RDS EPDP is a prudent course of action. This is because the same issues that need to be resolved to finalize PPSAI implementation are under active discussion, such as controller/joint controller/independent controller issues and providing access to non-public personal contact details consistent with GDPR. This course of action will allow ICANN org and the broader community to focus resources on ensuring that GDPR-compliant requirements are finalized for existing contracted parties before proceeding to implement similar requirements for a new category of contracted parties. During the implementation phase of the EPDP ICANN org will be reviewing all ICANN policies and services which may be impacted by the new Consensus Policy and will work with the GNSO and the community to identify the appropriate course of action.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 15 May 2019.</p>
<p>ICANN64 Kobe Communique</p> <p>§2.a.I. ICANN Board Consideration of</p>	<p>Promptly meet with the CCT Review Team leadership to discuss the Board's resolution and</p>	<p>On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled "GAC Advice – Kobe Communique: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)" in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communique and the San Juan Communique. The Board acknowledges the GAC's concerns regarding the recent Board resolution in response to the Final Recommendations of the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team and accepts the advice.</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>the CCT Review Recommendations</p> <p>(14 Mar 2019)</p>		<p>The Board has initiated communications with the CCT Review Team implementation shepherds (designated by the CCT Review Team) to address the areas related to CCT recommendations, having held a call on 23 April. The Board also understands the importance of working with the community to develop a process to prioritize and establish a sustainable cadence of implementations, with a defined protocol for handling specific review recommendations differently as compared to the past reviews. The Board has publicly committed to meet with the leaders of other specific review teams and to hold a public session at ICANN65 with the ICANN community, to address the broader issues around reviews and recommendations. The Board stands by its decisions with respect to the CCT recommendations, for the reasons set forth in the letter issued in Kobe; however, the Board is reviewing the timing and communication of its responses to specific review teams to avoid surprises in the future. The Board would also like to provide further clarification of its action. As noted in the communication to the CCT review team, the “intention was and remains to fully consider and thoughtfully act on each of the recommendations in the Final Report. To be clear, the Board has not rejected any of the recommendations in the Final Report. After careful consideration of the 35 recommendations, the Board determined to address each, in one of three ways: • The Board accepted six recommendations and directed the ICANN org to develop a costing and implementation plan, to be shared with the community within six months from the Board action. We acknowledge that some members of the community believe that this timeline is unnecessarily extended; and we will review these recommendations with ICANN org to determine whether this timeline can be accelerated. • Fourteen of the recommendations directed to the Board were actions that were not directly within the Board's remit at this stage in the bottom up multistakeholder process. The Board felt that some of these recommendations were excellent. We also had questions about others. We ultimately concluded that expressing an opinion on policy recommendations outside the Board's remit at this stage may be interpreted as the Board's interfering with policy development authority allocated to the community under the ICANN Bylaws. The Board is also mindful of the relative role of the Board and ICANN org. Accordingly, we referred recommendations in this category to either the appropriate policy development body or to ICANN org to handle. Please keep in mind that the community is obligated to fully consider all input into PDPs and CCWGs, and</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
		<p>that the Board is ultimately responsible for ensuring that such input is duly considered and appropriately addressed. • Seventeen of the remaining recommendations were categorized as pending. The Board felt that recommendations in this category raised substantive questions or required more information. The Board directed ICANN org to take specific actions to resolve the pending status as soon as possible. We acknowledge that some members of the community believe that this amounts to rejecting the recommendations. This is not the case, and we will review these recommendations with ICANN org to determine whether a specific timeline can be established.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 15 May 2019.</p>
<p>ICANN64 Kobe Communique</p> <p>§2.a.II. ICANN Board Consideration of the CCT Review Recommendations</p> <p>(14 Mar 2019)</p>	<p>Possibly reconsider certain decisions on recommendations if appropriate.</p>	<p>On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled “GAC Advice – Kobe Communiqué: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)” in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué. The Board acknowledges the GAC’s concerns regarding the recent Board resolution in response to the Final Recommendations of the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team and accepts the advice. The Board has initiated communications with the CCT Review Team implementation shepherds (designated by the CCT Review Team) to address the areas related to CCT recommendations, having held a call on 23 April. The Board also understands the importance of working with the community to develop a process to prioritize and establish a sustainable cadence of implementations, with a defined protocol for handling specific review recommendations differently as compared to the past reviews. The Board has publicly committed to meet with the leaders of other specific review teams and to hold a public session at ICANN65 with the ICANN community, to address the broader issues around reviews and recommendations. The Board stands by its decisions with respect to the CCT recommendations, for the reasons set forth in the letter issued in Kobe; however, the Board is reviewing the timing and communication of its responses to specific review teams to avoid surprises in the future. The Board would also like to provide further clarification of its action. As noted in the communication to the CCT review team, the “intention was and remains to fully consider and thoughtfully act on each of the recommendations in the Final Report. To be clear, the Board has not rejected</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
		<p>any of the recommendations in the Final Report. After careful consideration of the 35 recommendations, the Board determined to address each, in one of three ways: • The Board accepted six recommendations and directed the ICANN org to develop a costing and implementation plan, to be shared with the community within six months from the Board action. We acknowledge that some members of the community believe that this timeline is unnecessarily extended; and we will review these recommendations with ICANN org to determine whether this timeline can be accelerated. • Fourteen of the recommendations directed to the Board were actions that were not directly within the Board's remit at this stage in the bottom up multistakeholder process. The Board felt that some of these recommendations were excellent. We also had questions about others. We ultimately concluded that expressing an opinion on policy recommendations outside the Board's remit at this stage may be interpreted as the Board's interfering with policy development authority allocated to the community under the ICANN Bylaws. The Board is also mindful of the relative role of the Board and ICANN org. Accordingly, we referred recommendations in this category to either the appropriate policy development body or to ICANN org to handle. Please keep in mind that the community is obligated to fully consider all input into PDPs and CCWGs, and that the Board is ultimately responsible for ensuring that such input is duly considered and appropriately addressed. • Seventeen of the remaining recommendations were categorized as pending. The Board felt that recommendations in this category raised substantive questions or required more information. The Board directed ICANN org to take specific actions to resolve the pending status as soon as possible. We acknowledge that some members of the community believe that this amounts to rejecting the recommendations. This is not the case, and we will review these recommendations with ICANN org to determine whether a specific timeline can be established.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 15 May 2019.</p>

Additional Information on Closed Items (157 Items)

Advice is considered closed once the Board has reviewed the advice, and the advice has been processed as much as is relevant and is considered complete. For advice that is considered closed, no work is outstanding from the perspective of the ICANN Board or org. Related implementation work may have been integrated into ICANN’s ongoing operations or other initiatives. Follow-up to previous advice items will be noted on open items of consensus advice related to the same topic and will be closed out after the Board adopts a scorecard with a response to the follow-up comments. Follow-up to previous advice will not be tracked in phases four or five. Note: Consensus advice items appearing as closed as of this letter were first presented in Phase 5 | Close Request to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi. These items are now considered fully complete and closed out in the ARR.

Table 5. Inventory of Closed GAC Advice Items

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>ICANN46 Beijing Communique</p> <p>§1.a.i.i.1 GAC Objections to Specific Applications</p> <p>(11 Apr 2013)</p>	<p>The GAC has reached consensus on GAC Objection Advice according to Module 3.1 part I of the Applicant Guidebook on the following applications:</p> <p>1. The application for .africa (Application number 1-1165-42560) Module 3.1: “The GAC advises ICANN that it is the consensus of the GAC that a particular application should not proceed. This will create a strong presumption for the ICANN Board that the application should not be approved.”</p>	<p>On 4 June 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The NGPC accepts this advice. The AGB provides that if "GAC advises ICANN that it is the consensus of the GAC that a particular application should not proceed. This will create a strong presumption for the ICANN Board that the application should not be approved." (AGB § 3.1) The NGPC directs staff that pursuant to the GAC advice and Section 3.1 of the Applicant Guidebook, Application number 1-1165-42560 for .africa will not be approved. In accordance with the AGB the applicant may withdraw (pursuant to AGB § 1.5.1) or seek relief according to ICANN's accountability mechanisms (see ICANN Bylaws, Articles IV and V) subject to the appropriate standing and procedural requirements.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 4 June 2013.</p>
<p>ICANN46 Beijing Communique</p> <p>§1.a.i.i.2 GAC Objections to Specific Applications</p>	<p>The GAC has reached consensus on GAC Objection Advice according to Module 3.1 part I of the Applicant Guidebook on the following applications:</p> <p>2. The application for .gcc (Application number 1-1165-42560) Module 3.1: “The GAC advises ICANN that it is the</p>	<p>On 4 June 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The NGPC accepts this advice. The AGB provides that if "GAC advises ICANN that it is the consensus of the GAC that a particular application should not proceed. This will create a strong presumption for the ICANN Board that the application should not be approved." (AGB § 3.1) The NGPC directs staff</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
(11 Apr 2013)	consensus of the GAC that a particular application should not proceed. This will create a strong presumption for the ICANN Board that the application should not be approved.	<p>that pursuant to the GAC advice and Section 3.1 of the Applicant Guidebook, Application number 1-1936-2101 for .gcc will not be approved. In accordance with the AGB the applicant may withdraw (pursuant to AGB § 1.5.1) or seek relief according to ICANN's accountability mechanisms (see ICANN Bylaws, Articles IV and V) subject to the appropriate standing and procedural requirements.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 4 June 2013.</p>
<p>ICANN46 Beijing Communique</p> <p>§1.a.i.ii.1 GAC Objections to Specific Applications</p> <p>(11 Apr 2013)</p>	<p>The GAC recognizes that Religious terms are sensitive issues. Some GAC members have raised sensitivities on the applications that relate to Islamic terms, specifically .islam and .halal. The GAC members concerned have noted that the applications for .islam and .halal lack community involvement and support. It is the view of these GAC members that these applications should not proceed.</p>	<p>On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The NGPC adopted a resolution to accept this advice at its 4 June 2013 meeting. Pursuant to Section 3.1.ii of the AGB, the NGPC and some members of the GAC met during the ICANN 47 meeting in Durban to discuss the concerns about the applications. On 24 October 2013 decisions were posted in favor of the applicant on the community objections filed by the Telecommunications Regulatory Authority of the UAE. In a 4 November 2013 letter from the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC) to the GAC Chair, the OIC requested that its letter be considered an “official opposition of the Member States of the OIC towards probable authorization by the GAC allowing the use of [...] .ISLAM and .HALAL by any entity not representing the collective voice of the Muslim people.” In a 11 November 2013 letter to the GAC Chair, the NGPC indicated that before it takes action on the strings, it will wait for any additional GAC input during the Buenos Aires meeting or resulting GAC Communiqué. The Buenos Aires Communiqué took note of the letters sent by the OIC, but did not offer any additional advice to the Board. The OIC also adopted a resolution in December 2013 communicating its official objection to the use of the applied-for .ISLAM and .HALAL TLDs. The NGPC takes note of the significant concerns expressed during the dialogue, and additional opposition raised, including by the OIC, which represents 1.6 billion members of the Muslim community. The NGPC has sent a letter to the applicant, which is available here: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-abbasnia-07feb14-en.pdf</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>ICANN46 Beijing Communique</p> <p>§1.b Safeguard Advice for New gTLDs</p> <p>(11 Apr 2013)</p>	<p>To reinforce existing processes for raising and addressing concerns the GAC is providing safeguard advice to apply to broad categories of strings (see Annex I).</p>	<p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 5 February 2014.</p> <p>The NGPC responded to this advice item referring to the two categories of string as described in Annex 1 of the Beijing Communique as follows:</p> <p>Category 1: Consumer protection, sensitive strings, and regulated markets</p> <p>On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The NGPC accepts the advice. The NGPC adopts the implementation framework attached as Annex 2 (http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-annex-2-05feb14-en.pdf) to address this advice, and directs the ICANN President and CEO, or his designee, to implement the Category 1 Safeguard advice consistent with the implementation framework. With respect to the additional advice in the Buenos Aires Communiqué on the Category 1 Safeguards, the NGPC accepts the advice to re-categorize the string .doctor as falling within Category 1 safeguard advice addressing highly regulated sectors and ensure that the domains in the .doctor TLD are ascribed exclusively to legitimate medical practitioners.</p> <p>Category 2: Restricted registration policies</p> <p>The NGPC considered this advice on several occasions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For applicants not seeking to impose exclusive registry access the NGPC passed the following resolution on 25 June 2013: Resolved (2013.06.25.NG05), the NGPC directs staff to make appropriate changes to the final draft of the New gTLD Registry Agreement, as presented in Annex I [PDF, 52 KB] attached to this Resolution, to implement the GAC's Category 2 Safeguard Advice for applicants not seeking to impose exclusive registry access. 2. For applicants seeking to impose exclusive registry access the NGPC passed the following resolution on 21 June 2015:

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
		<p>Resolved (2015.06.21.NG02), to address the GAC's Category 2.2 Safeguard Advice, the NGPC requests that the GNSO specifically include the issue of exclusive registry access for generic strings serving a public interest goal as part of the policy work it is planning to initiate on subsequent rounds of the New gTLD Program, and inform the Board on a regular basis with regards to the progress on the issue. Also, the NGPC directs the President and CEO, or his designee(s), to proceed as follows...</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration and resolution of 21 June 2015.</p>
<p>ICANN46 Beijing Communique</p> <p>§1.c.i Strings for Further GAC Consideration</p> <p>(11 Apr 2013)</p>	<p>The GAC advises the ICANN Board to: not proceed beyond Initial Evaluation with the following strings : .shenzhen (IDN in Chinese), .persiangulf, .guangzhou (IDN in Chinese), .amazon (and IDNs in Japanese and Chinese), .patagonia, .date, .spa, .yun, .thai, .zulu, .wine, .vin</p>	<p>On 4 June 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The NGPC accepts this advice. The AGB provides that "GAC advice will not toll the processing of any application (i.e., an application will not be suspended but will continue through the stages of the application process)" (AGB § 3.1). At this time, ICANN will not proceed beyond initial evaluation of these identified strings. In other words, ICANN will allow evaluation and dispute resolution processes to go forward, but will not enter into registry agreements with applicants for the identified strings for now. (Note: community objections have been filed with the International Centre for Expertise of the ICC against .PERSIANGULF, .AMAZON, and .PATAGONIA. The application for .ZULU was withdrawn.)</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 4 June 2013.</p>
<p>ICANN46 Beijing Communique</p> <p>§1.d.i Ability to Change String</p> <p>(11 Apr 2013)</p>	<p>The GAC requests a written briefing about the ability of an applicant to change the string applied for in order to address concerns raised by a GAC Member and to identify a mutually acceptable solution.</p>	<p>On 6 June 2013 the ICANN Board Chair sent a letter to the GAC Chair with a written briefing on the ability of an applicant to change its applied-for string attached as Appendix 2: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-dryden-06jun13-en.pdf</p> <p>This item is considered completed as of the Chair's letter of 6 June 2013.</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>ICANN46 Beijing Communique</p> <p>§1.e.i. Community Support for Applications</p> <p>(11 Apr 2013)</p>	<p>The GAC advises the Board: that in those cases where a community, which is clearly impacted by a set of new gTLD applications in contention, has expressed a collective and clear opinion on those applications, such opinion should be duly taken into account, together with all other relevant information.</p>	<p>On 4 June 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The NGPC accepts this advice. Criterion 4 for the Community Priority Evaluation process takes into account "community support and/or opposition to the application" in determining whether to award priority to a community application in a contention set. (Note however that if a contention set is not resolved by the applicants or through a community priority evaluation then ICANN will utilize an auction as the objective method for resolving the contention.)</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 4 June 2013.</p>
<p>ICANN46 Beijing Communique</p> <p>§1.f.i. Singular and plural versions of the same string as a TLD</p> <p>(11 Apr 2013)</p>	<p>The GAC believes that singular and plural versions of the string as a TLD could lead to potential consumer confusion. Therefore the GAC advises the ICANN Board to reconsider its decision to allow singular and plural versions of the same strings.</p>	<p>On 4 June 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>Whereas, after careful consideration of the issues, review of the comments raised by the community, the process documents of the expert review panels, and deliberations by the NGPC, the NGPC has determined that no changes to the ABG are needed to address potential consumer confusion specifically resulting from allowing singular and plural versions of the same strings; Whereas, the NGPC is undertaking this action pursuant to the authority granted to it by the Board on 10 April 2012, to exercise the ICANN Board's authority for any and all issues that may arise relating to the New gTLD Program. Resolved (2013.06.25.NG07), the 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.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 4 June 2013.</p>
<p>ICANN46 Beijing Communique</p> <p>§1.g.i</p>	<p>The GAC stresses that the IGOs perform an important global public mission with public funds, they are the creations of government under international law, and</p>	<p>On 2 July 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and passed the following resolutions:</p> <p>Resolved (2013.07.02.NG03), the NGPC confirms that appropriate</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>Protections for Intergovernmental Organisations</p> <p>(11 Apr 2013)</p>	<p>their names and acronyms warrant special protection in an expanded DNS. Such protection, which the GAC has previously advised, should be a priority. This recognizes that IGOs are in an objectively different category to other rights holders, warranting special protection by ICANN in the DNS, while also preserving sufficient flexibility for workable implementation. The GAC is mindful of outstanding implementation issues and commits to actively working with IGOs, the Board, and ICANN Staff to find a workable and timely way forward. Pending the resolution of these implementation issues, the GAC reiterates its advice to the ICANN Board that appropriate preventative initial protection for the IGO names and acronyms on the provided list be in place before any new gTLDs would launch.</p>	<p>preventative initial protection for the IGO identifiers will continue to be provided as presented in the proposed New gTLD Registry Agreement posted for public comment on 29 April 2013 <http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment/base-agreement-29apr13-en.htm> while the GAC, NGPC, ICANN Staff and community continue to actively work through outstanding implementation issues.</p> <p>Resolved (2013.07.02.NG04), the NGPC determines that pursuant to Specification 5 in the proposed New gTLD Registry Agreement posted for public comment on 29 April 2013 <http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment/base-agreement-29apr13-en.htm>, registry operators will implement temporary protections for the IGO names and acronyms on the "IGO List dated 22/03/2013" attached to this Resolution as Annex 1 [PDF, 541 KB] until the first meeting of the NGPC following the ICANN 47 Meeting in Durban.</p> <p>Resolved (2013.07.02.NG05), the NGPC will dialogue with the GAC prior to its first meeting following the ICANN 47 meeting in Durban to work through outstanding implementation issues concerning protections for IGO names and acronyms.</p> <p>Resolved (2013.07.02.NG06), if the NGPC and GAC do not reach an agreement on outstanding implementation issues for protecting IGO names and acronyms by the first meeting of the NGPC following the ICANN 47 meeting in Durban, and subject to any matters that arise during the discussions, the NGPC determines that registry operators will be required to protect only the IGO names identified on the GAC's "IGO List dated 22/03/2013" attached to this Resolution as Annex 1 [PDF, 541 KB].</p> <p>This item is considered completed as of the NGPC's resolution of 2 July 2013.</p>
<p>ICANN46 Beijing Communique</p> <p>§2.a.i Registrar Accreditation</p>	<p>The GAC advises the ICANN Board that the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement should be finalized before any new gTLD contracts are approved.</p>	<p>On 4 June 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The NGPC accepts this advice. The final draft of the RAA was posted for public comment on 22 April 2013. The new gTLD Registry Agreement was posted for public comment on 29 April 2013, and it requires all new gTLD</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
Agreement (RAA) (11 Apr 2013)		<p>registries to only use 2013 RAA registrars. The public comment reply period for the 2013 RAA closes on 4 June 2013. The NGPC intends to consider the 2013 RAA shortly thereafter.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 4 June 2013.</p>
ICANN46 Beijing Communique §3.a.i WHOIS (11 Apr 2013)	<p>The GAC urges the ICANN Board to ensure that the GAC Principles Regarding gTLD WHOIS Services, approved in 2007, are duly taken into account by the recently established Directory Services Expert Working Group.</p>	<p>On 4 June 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The NGPC accepts this advice. The NGPC notes that staff has confirmed that the GAC Principles have been shared with the Expert Working Group.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 4 June 2013.</p>
ICANN46 Beijing Communique §4.a.i International Olympic Committee and Red Cross /Red Crescent (11 Apr 2013)	<p>Amend the provisions in the new gTLD Registry Agreement pertaining to the IOC/RCRC names to confirm that the protections will be made permanent prior to the delegation of any new gTLDs.</p>	<p>On 4 June 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The NGPC accepts the GAC advice. The proposed final version of the Registry Agreement posted for public comment on 29 April 2013 includes protection for an indefinite duration for IOC/RCRC names. Specification 5 of this version of the Registry Agreement includes a list of names (provided by the IOC and RCRC Movement) that "shall be withheld from registration or allocated to Registry Operator at the second level within the TLD." This protection was added pursuant to a NGPC resolution to maintain these protections "until such time as a policy is adopted that may require further action" (204.11.26.NG03). The resolution recognized the GNSO's initiation of an expedited PDP. Until such time as the GNSO approves recommendations in the PDP and the Board adopts them, the NGPC's resolutions protecting IOC/RCRC names will remain in place. Should the GNSO submit any recommendations on this topic, the NGPC will confer with the GAC prior to taking action on any such recommendations.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 4 June 2013.</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>ICANN46 Beijing Communique</p> <p>§5.b.i Public Interest Commitments Specifications</p> <p>(11 Apr 2013)</p>	<p>The GAC requests more information on the Public Interest Commitments Specifications on the basis of the questions listed in annex II.</p>	<p>The NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to GAC Advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>On 6 June 2013, the NGPC provided a written response (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-dryden-06jun13-en.pdf) to the GAC to address the questions listed in Annex II about the Public Interest Commitments.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the publication of the NGPC's report on 7 October 2015.</p>
<p>ICANN46 Beijing Communique</p> <p>§ANNEX I. 1. WHOIS verification and checks</p> <p>(11 Apr 2013)</p>	<p>Registry operators will conduct checks on a statistically significant basis to identify registrations in its gTLD with deliberately false, inaccurate or incomplete WHOIS data at least twice a year. Registry operators will weight the sample towards registrars with the highest percentages of deliberately false, inaccurate or incomplete records in the previous checks. Registry operators will notify the relevant registrar of any inaccurate or incomplete records identified during the checks, triggering the registrar's obligation to solicit accurate and complete information from the registrant.</p>	<p>On 25 June 2013 the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of Safeguards Applicable to all New gTLDs and passed a resolution adopting the "NGPC Proposal for Implementation of GAC Safeguards Applicable to All New gTLDs" dated 19 June 2013. In its proposal the NGPC responds to this advice item as follows:</p> <p>ICANN is concluding its development of a WHOIS tool that gives it the ability to check false, incomplete or inaccurate WHOIS data as the Board previously directed staff in Board Resolutions 2012.11.08.01 - 2012.11.08.02 to begin to "proactively identify potentially inaccurate gTLD data registration in gTLD registry and registrar services, explore using automated tools, and forward potentially inaccurate records to gTLD registrars for action; and 2) publicly report on the resulting actions to encourage improved accuracy."</p> <p>https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-11-08-en#1.a Given these ongoing activities, ICANN (instead of Registry Operators) is well positioned to implement the GAC's advice that checks identifying registrations in a gTLD with deliberately false, inaccurate or incomplete WHOIS data be conducted at least twice a year. To achieve this, ICANN will perform a periodic sampling of WHOIS data across registries in an effort to identify potentially inaccurate records. ICANN will also maintain statistical reports that identify the number of inaccurate WHOIS records identified. This undertaking by ICANN would not require ICANN to provide special certifications to Registry Operators certifying the accuracy of any WHOIS data. The WHOIS verification 2 and checks would be focused on the current version of WHOIS requirements, but would eventually broaden to include directory</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
		<p>services.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's response of 19 June 2013.</p>
<p>ICANN46 Beijing Communique</p> <p>§ANNEX I. 2. Mitigating abusive activity</p> <p>(11 Apr 2013)</p>	<p>Registry operators will ensure that terms of use for registrants include prohibitions against the distribution of malware, operation of botnets, phishing, piracy, trademark or copyright infringement, fraudulent or deceptive practices, counterfeiting or otherwise engaging in activity contrary to applicable law.</p>	<p>On 25 June 2013 the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of Safeguards Applicable to all New gTLDs and passed a resolution adopting the "NGPC Proposal for Implementation of GAC Safeguards Applicable to All New gTLDs" dated 19 June 2013. In its proposal the NGPC responds to this advice item as follows:</p> <p>ICANN will include a provision in the proposed New gTLD Registry Agreement (as a mandatory Public Interest Commitment in Specification 11) (http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agn/base-agreement-specs-29apr13-en.pdf) obligating Registry Operators to include a provision in their Registry-Registrar Agreements that requires Registrars to include in their Registration Agreements a provision prohibiting Registered Name Holders from distributing malware, abusively operating botnets, phishing, piracy, trademark or copyright infringement, fraudulent or deceptive practices, counterfeiting or otherwise engaging in activity contrary to applicable law, and providing (consistent with applicable law and any related procedures) consequences for such activities including suspension of the domain name. Paragraph 2 of the PIC Specification attached as Annex II includes language to implement the GAC advice. Because the Registry Operator does not have a direct contractual relationship with the Registered Name Holder, the language proposed in the PIC Specification would require the Registry Operator to include a provision in its Registry-Registrar Agreement, which in turn requires Registrars to include a provision in their Registration Agreements prohibiting Registered Name Holders from engaging in the abusive activity listed in the GAC advice.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's response of 19 June 2013.</p>
<p>ICANN46 Beijing Communique</p> <p>§ANNEX I. 3. Security checks</p>	<p>While respecting privacy and confidentiality, Registry operators will periodically conduct a technical analysis to assess whether domains in its gTLD are being used to perpetrate security threats, such as pharming, phishing,</p>	<p>On 25 June 2013 the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of Safeguards Applicable to all New gTLDs and passed a resolution adopting the "NGPC Proposal for Implementation of GAC Safeguards Applicable to All New gTLDs" dated 19 June 2013. In its proposal the NGPC responds to this advice item as follows:</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
(11 Apr 2013)	malware, and botnets. If Registry operator identifies security risks that pose an actual risk of harm, Registry operator will notify the relevant registrar and, if the registrar does not take immediate action, suspend the domain name until the matter is resolved.	<p>ICANN will include a provision in the proposed New gTLD Registry Agreement (as a mandatory Public Interest Commitment in Specification 11) requiring Registry Operators periodically to conduct a technical analysis to assess whether domains in its gTLD are being used to perpetrate security threats, such as pharming, phishing, malware, and botnets. The provision will also require Registry Operators to maintain statistical reports 3 on the number of security threats identified and the actions taken as a result of the periodic security checks. Registry Operators will maintain these reports for the agreed contracted period and provide them to ICANN upon request. The contents of the reports will be publically available as appropriate. Because there are multiple ways for a Registry Operator to implement the required security checks, ICANN will solicit community participation (including conferring with the GAC) in a task force or through a policy development process in the GNSO, as appropriate, to develop the framework for Registry Operators to respond to identified security risks that pose an actual risk of harm, notification procedures, and appropriate consequences, including a process for suspending domain names until the matter is resolved, while respecting privacy and confidentiality. The language include in Paragraph 3 of the attached PIC Specification provides the general guidelines for what Registry Operators must do, but omits the specific details from the contractual language to allow for the future development and evolution of the parameters for conducting security checks. This will permit Registry Operators to enter into agreements as soon as possible, while allowing for a careful and fulsome consideration by the community on the implementation details.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's response of 19 June 2013.</p>
<p>ICANN46 Beijing Communique</p> <p>§ANNEX I. 4. Documentation</p> <p>(11 Apr 2013)</p>	Registry operators will maintain statistical reports that provide the number of inaccurate WHOIS records or security threats identified and actions taken as a result of its periodic WHOIS and security checks. Registry operators will maintain these reports for the agreed contracted period and provide them to ICANN upon request in connection with contractual obligations.	<p>On 25 June 2013 the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of Safeguards Applicable to all New gTLDs and passed a resolution adopting the "NGPC Proposal for Implementation of GAC Safeguards Applicable to All New gTLDs" dated 19 June 2013. In its proposal the NGPC responds to this advice item as follows:</p> <p>As detailed in #1 above, ICANN will maintain statistical reports that identify the number of inaccurate WHOIS records identified as part of the checks to identify registrations with deliberately false, inaccurate or incomplete WHOIS data. Also, as detailed in #3 above, Registry Operators will be required to</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
		<p>maintain statistical reports on the number of security threats identified and the actions taken as a result of the periodic security checks. Registry Operators will maintain these reports for the agreed contracted period and provide them to ICANN upon request. The contents of the reports will be publically available as appropriate.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's response of 19 June 2013.</p>
<p>ICANN46 Beijing Communique</p> <p>§ANNEX I. 5. Making and Handling Complaints</p> <p>(11 Apr 2013)</p>	<p>Registry operators will ensure that there is a mechanism for making complaints to the registry operator that the WHOIS information is inaccurate or that the domain name registration is being used to facilitate or promote malware, operation of botnets, phishing, piracy, trademark or copyright infringement, fraudulent or deceptive practices, counterfeiting or otherwise engaging in activity contrary to applicable law.</p>	<p>On 25 June 2013 the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of Safeguards Applicable to all New gTLDs and passed a resolution adopting the "NGPC Proposal for Implementation of GAC Safeguards Applicable to All New gTLDs" dated 19 June 2013. In its proposal the NGPC responds to this advice item as follows:</p> <p>Registry Operators will be required to ensure that there is a mechanism for making complaints to the Registry Operator regarding malicious conduct in the TLD. Section 4.1 of Specification 6 of the proposed New gTLD Registry Agreement provides that, "Registry Operator shall provide to ICANN and publish on its website its accurate contact details including a valid email and mailing address as well as a primary contact for handling inquires related to malicious conduct in the TLD, and will provide ICANN with prompt notice of any changes to such contact details." Also, Section 2.8 of the proposed New gTLD Registry Agreement provides that a, "Registry Operator shall take reasonable steps to investigate and respond to any reports from law enforcement and governmental and quasi-governmental agencies of illegal conduct in connection with the use of the TLD." ICANN operates the WHOIS Data Problem Reports System (http://www.icann.org/en/resources/compliance/complaints/whois/inaccuracy-form) , which is a mechanism for making complaints that WHOIS information is inaccurate.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's response of 19 June 2013.</p>
<p>ICANN46 Beijing Communique</p> <p>§ANNEX I. 6.</p>	<p>Consistent with applicable law and any related procedures, registry operators shall ensure that there are real and immediate consequences for the</p>	<p>On 25 June 2013 the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of Safeguards Applicable to all New gTLDs and passed a resolution adopting the "NGPC Proposal for Implementation of GAC Safeguards Applicable to All New gTLDs" dated 19 June 2013. In its proposal the NGPC responds to this advice</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>Consequences (11 Apr 2013)</p>	<p>demonstrated provision of false WHOIS information and violations of the requirement that the domain name should not be used in breach of applicable law; these consequences should include suspension of the domain name.</p>	<p>item as follows:</p> <p>As indicated in #2 above, ICANN will include a provision in the proposed New gTLD Registry Agreement (as a mandatory Public Interest Commitment in Specification 11) obligating Registry Operators to include a provision in their Registry-Registrar Agreements that requires Registrars to include in their Registration Agreements a provision prohibiting Registered Name Holders from distributing malware, abusively operating botnets, phishing, piracy, trademark or copyright infringement, fraudulent or deceptive practices, counterfeiting or otherwise engaging in activity contrary to applicable law, and providing (consistent with applicable law and any related procedures) consequences for such activities including suspension of the domain name. Consequences for the demonstrated provision of false WHOIS information are set forth in Section 3.7.7.2 of the 2013 RAA (http://www.icann.org/en/resources/registrars/raa/proposed-agreement-22apr13-en.pdf): "A Registered Name Holder's willful provision of inaccurate or unreliable information, its willful failure to update information provided to Registrar within seven (7) days of any change, or its failure to respond for over fifteen (15) days to inquiries by Registrar concerning the accuracy of contact details associated with the Registered Name Holder's registration shall constitute a material breach of the Registered Name Holder-registrar contract and be a basis for suspension and/or cancellation of the Registered Name registration." Paragraph 1 of the proposed PIC Specification includes a requirement that Registry Operator will use only ICANN accredited registrars that are party to the 2013 RAA so that these consequences are contractually required.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's response of 19 June 2013.</p>
<p>ICANN46 Beijing Communique</p> <p>§Category 1 Consumer Protection, Sensitive Strings, and Regulated</p>	<p>Strings that are linked to regulated or professional sectors should operate in a way that is consistent with applicable laws. These strings are likely to invoke a level of implied trust from consumers, and carry higher levels of risk associated with consumer harm. The following safeguards should apply to strings that are related to</p>	<p>On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The NGPC accepts the advice. The NGPC adopts the implementation framework attached as Annex 2 (http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-annex-2-05feb14-en.pdf) to address this advice, and directs the ICANN President and CEO, or his designee, to implement the Category 1 Safeguard advice</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>Markets (11 Apr 2013)</p>	<p>these sectors: 1. Registry operators will include in its acceptable use policy that registrants comply with all applicable laws, including those that relate to privacy, data collection, consumer protection (including in relation to misleading and deceptive conduct), fair lending, debt collection, organic farming, disclosure of data, and financial disclosures. 2. Registry operators will require registrars at the time of registration to notify registrants of this requirement. 3. Registry operators will require that registrants who collect and maintain sensitive health and financial data implement reasonable and appropriate security measures commensurate with the offering of those services, as defined by applicable law and recognized industry standards.4. Establish a working relationship with the relevant regulatory, or industry self-regulatory, bodies, including developing a strategy to mitigate as much as possible the risks of fraudulent, and other illegal, activities.95. Registrants must be required by the registry operators to notify to them a single point of contact which must be kept up-to-date, for the notification of complaints or reports of registration abuse, as well as the contact details of the relevant regulatory, or industry self-regulatory, bodies in their main place of business. In the current round the GAC has identified the following non-exhaustive list of strings that the above</p>	<p>consistent with the implementation framework. With respect to the additional advice in the Buenos Aires Communiqué on the Category 1 Safeguards, the NGPC accepts the advice to re-categorize the string .doctor as falling within Category 1 safeguard advice addressing highly regulated sectors and ensure that the domains in the .doctor TLD are ascribed exclusively to legitimate medical practitioners.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 5 February 2014.</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
	<p>safeguards should apply to: • Children: o .kid, .kids, .kinder, .game, .games, .juegos, .play, .school, .schule, .toys • Environmental:o .earth, .eco, .green, .bio, .organic• Health and Fitness:o .care, .diet, .fit, .fitness, .health, .healthcare, .heart, .hiv, .hospital,, .med, .medical, .organic, .pharmacy, .rehab, .surgery, .clinic, .healthy (IDN Chinese equivalent), .dental, .dentist .doctor, .dds, .physio• Financial: o capital, . cash, .cashbackbonus, .broker, .brokers, .claims, .exchange, .finance, .financial, .fianancialaid, .forex, .fund, .investments, .lease, .loan, .loans, .market, . markets, .money, .pay, .payu, .retirement, .save, .trading, .autoinsurance, .bank, .banque, .carinsurance, .credit, .creditcard, .creditunion,.insurance, .insure, ira, .lifeinsurance, .mortgage, .mutualfunds, .mutuelle, .netbank, .reit, .tax, .travelersinsurance, .vermogensberater, .vermogensberatung and .vesicherung. • Gambling:o .bet, .bingo, .lotto, .poker, and .spreadbetting, .casino• Charity:o .care, .gives, .giving, .charity (and IDN Chinese equivalent)• Education:o degree, .mba, .university• Intellectual Propertyo .audio, .book (and IDN equivalent), .broadway, .film, .game, .games, .juegos, .movie, .music, .software, .song, .tunes, .fashion (and IDN equivalent), .video, .app, .art, .author, .band, .beats, .cloud (and IDN equivalent), .data, .design, .digital, .download, .entertainment, .fan, .fans, .free, .gratis, .discount, .sale, .hiphop,</p>	

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
	<p>.media, .news, .online, .pictures, .radio, .rip, .show, .theater, .theatre, .tour, .tours, .tvs, .video, .zip</p> <p>Professional Services: o .abogado, .accountant, .accountants, .architect, .associates, .attorney, .broker, .brokers, .cpa, .doctor, .dentist, .dds, .engineer, .lawyer, .legal, .realtor, .realty, .vet</p> <p>Corporate Identifiers:o .corp, .gmbh, .inc, .limited, .llc, .llp, .ltda, .ltd, .sarl, .srl, .sal</p> <p>Generic Geographic Terms:o .town, .city, .capital10 .reise, .reisen5 .weather</p> <p>.engineering .law</p> <p>Inherently Governmental Functionso .army, .navy, .airforce</p> <p>In addition, applicants for the following strings should develop clear policies and processes to minimise the risk of cyber bullying/harassment</p> <p>.fail, .gripe, .sucks, .wtf</p> <p>The GAC further advises the Board:</p> <p>1. In addition, some of the above strings may require further targeted safeguards, to address specific risks, and to bring registry policies in line with arrangements in place offline. In particular, a limited subset of the above strings are associated with market sectors which have clear and/or regulated entry requirements (such as: financial, gambling, professional services, environmental, health and fitness, corporate identifiers, and charity) in multiple jurisdictions, and the additional safeguards below should apply to some of the strings in those sectors:</p> <p>6. At the time of registration, the registry operator must verify and validate the registrants' authorisations, charters, licenses and/or</p>	

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
	<p>other related credentials for participation in that sector. 7. In case of doubt with regard to the authenticity of licenses or credentials, Registry Operators should consult with relevant national supervisory authorities, or their equivalents.8. The registry operator must conduct periodic post-registration checks to ensure registrants' validity and compliance with the above requirements in order to ensure they continue to conform to appropriate regulations and licensing requirements and generally conduct their activities in the interests of the consumers they serve.</p>	
<p>ICANN46 Beijing Communique</p> <p>§Category 2 Restricted Registration Policies</p> <p>(11 Apr 2013)</p>	<p>1. Restricted Access As an exception to the general rule that the gTLD domain name space is operated in an open manner registration may be restricted, in particular for strings mentioned under category 1 above. In these cases, the registration restrictions should be appropriate for the types of risks associated with the TLD. The registry operator should administer access in these kinds of registries in a transparent way that does not give an undue preference to any registrars or registrants, including itself, and shall not subject registrars or registrants to an undue disadvantage.2. Exclusive AccessFor strings representing generic terms, exclusive registry access should serve a public interest goal.In the current round, the GAC has identified the following non-exhaustive list of strings that it considers to be generic terms, where the applicant</p>	<p>The NGPC considered this advice on several occasions.</p> <p>1. For applicants not seeking to impose exclusive registry access the NGPC passed the following resolution on 25 June 2013: Resolved (2013.06.25.NG05), the NGPC directs staff to make appropriate changes to the final draft of the New gTLD Registry Agreement, as presented in Annex I [PDF, 52 KB] attached to this Resolution, to implement the GAC's Category 2 Safeguard Advice for applicants not seeking to impose exclusive registry access.</p> <p>2. For applicants seeking to impose exclusive registry access the NGPC passed the following resolution on 21 June 2015: Resolved (2015.06.21.NG02), to address the GAC's Category 2.2 Safeguard Advice, the NGPC requests that the GNSO specifically include the issue of exclusive registry access for generic strings serving a public interest goal as part of the policy work it is planning to initiate on subsequent rounds of the New gTLD Program, and inform the Board on a regular basis with regards to the progress on the issue. Also, the NGPC directs the President and CEO, or his designee(s), to proceed as follows...</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration and resolution of 21 June 2015.</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
	<p>is currently proposing to provide exclusive registry access.antivirus, .app, .autoinsurance, .baby, .beauty, .blog, .book, .broker, .carinsurance, .cars, .cloud, .courses, .cpa, .cruise, .data, .dvr, .financialaid, .flowers, .food, .game, .grocery, .hair, .hotel, .hotels .insurance, .jewelry, .mail, .makeup, .map, .mobile, .motorcycles, .movie, .music, .news, .phone, .salon, .search, .shop, .show, .skin, .song, .store, .tennis, .theater, .theatre, .tires, .tunes, .video, .watches, .weather, .yachts, .???? [cloud], .??? [store], .??? [sale], .?????? [fashion], .?? [consumer electronics], .?? [watches], .?? [book], .?? [jewelry], .?? [online shopping], .?? [food]</p>	
<p>ICANN47 Durban Communique §1.6 Category 1 Safeguard Advice (18 Jul 2013)</p>	<p>The GAC has met with the NGPC to discuss the Committee's response to GAC advice contained in the Beijing Communique on safeguards that should apply to Category 1 new gTLDs. The GAC Advises the ICANN Board that:1. The GAC will continue the dialogue with the NGPC on this issue.</p>	<p>On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard: The NGPC informed the GAC that it looked forward to continuing the dialogue with the GAC on this issue. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 10 September 2013.</p>
<p>ICANN47 Durban Communique §1.8 DNS Security and Stability (18 Jul 2013)</p>	<p>The GAC shares the security and stability concerns expressed by the SSAC regarding Internal Name Certificates and Dotless Domains. The GAC requests the ICANN Board to provide a written briefing about: i. how ICANN considers this SSAC advice with a view to implementation as soon as possible. The GAC believes that all such stability and security analysis should be made publicly available prior to</p>	<p>On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard: i. The NGPC will provide a written briefing regarding how ICANN considers this SSAC advice with a view to implementation as soon as possible. The NGPC agrees with the GAC that all such stability and security analysis should be made publicly available prior to the delegation of new gTLDs. The NGPC notes the publication of the "Name Collision in The DNS" Study" and the "Dotless Domain Name Security and Stability Study Report." ii. The NGPC accepts this advice. On 5 August, ICANN opened a public comment forum on</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
	<p>the delegation of new gTLDs. ii. The GAC Advises the ICANN Board to: a. As a matter of urgency consider the recommendations contained in the SSAC Report on Dotless Domains (SAC053) and Internal Name Certificates (SAC057).</p>	<p>staff proposed efforts to mitigate potential impact resulting from name collisions as New gTLDs are delegated into the root zone. At its 13 August 2013 meeting, the NGPC affirmed that dotless domains are prohibited</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 10 September 2013.</p>
<p>ICANN47 Durban Communique</p> <p>§1.1.a.i.1 GAC Objections to Specific Applications (ref. Beijing Communiqué 1.c.)</p> <p>(18 Jul 2013)</p>	<p>The GAC has reached consensus on GAC Objection Advice according to Module 3.1 part I of the Applicant Guidebook on the following applications: The application for .amazon (application number 1-1315-58086) and related IDNs in Japanese (application number 1-1318-83995) and Chinese (application number 1-1318-5591)</p>	<p>On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>Per §3.1 of the AGB, the applicant submitted a response to the ICANN Board. Given the volume of information presented, the NGPC continues to consider the information presented by the applicant and proposes to take action at a future NGPC meeting.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 10 September 2013.</p>
<p>ICANN47 Durban Communique</p> <p>§1.1.a.i.2 GAC Objections to Specific Applications (ref. Beijing Communiqué 1.c.)</p> <p>(18 Jul 2013)</p>	<p>The GAC has reached consensus on GAC Objection Advice according to Module 3.1 part I of the Applicant Guidebook on the following applications: The application for .thai (application number 1-2112-4478).</p>	<p>On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The NGPC accepts this advice. The AGB provides that if "GAC advises ICANN that it is the consensus of the GAC that a particular application should not proceed. This will create a strong presumption for the ICANN Board that the application should not be approved." (AGB § 3.1) The NGPC directs staff that pursuant to the GAC advice and Section 3.1 of the Applicant Guidebook, Application number 1-2112- 4478 for .thai will not be approved. In accordance with the AGB the applicant may withdraw (pursuant to AGB § 1.5.1) or seek relief according to ICANN's accountability mechanisms (see ICANN Bylaws, Articles IV and V) subject to the appropriate standing and procedural requirements.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 10 September 2013.</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>ICANN47 Durban Communique</p> <p>§1.1.b.i.i. GAC Objections to Specific Applications (ref. Beijing Communique 1.c.)</p> <p>(18 Jul 2013)</p>	<p>The GAC agrees to leave the applications below for further consideration and advises the ICANN Board:i. Not to proceed beyond initial evaluation until the agreements between the relevant parties are reached. 1. The applications for .spa (application number 1-1309-12524 and 1-1619-92115). 2. The application for .yun (application number 1-1318-12524). 3. The application for .guangzhou (IDN in Chinese - application number 1-1121-22691). 4. The application for .shenzhen (IDN in Chinese - application number 1-1121-82863).</p>	<p>On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The NGPC accepts this advice. The AGB provides that "GAC advice will not toll the processing of any application (i.e., an application will not be suspended but will continue through the stages of the application process)" (AGB § 3.1). At this time, ICANN will not proceed beyond initial evaluation of these identified strings. ICANN will allow evaluation and dispute resolution processes to go forward, but will not enter into registry agreements with applicants for the identified strings, subject to the parties having reached agreement or the GAC issuing final advice prior to the close of the ICANN Public meeting in Buenos Aires.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 10 September 2013.</p>
<p>ICANN47 Durban Communique</p> <p>§1.2.a.i. .wine and .vin (ref. Beijing Communique 1.c.)</p> <p>(18 Jul 2013)</p>	<p>The GAC considered the two strings .vin and .wine and due to the complexity of the matter was unable to conclude at this meeting. As a result the GAC agreed to take thirty days additional time with a view to conclude on the matter.</p>	<p>On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The NGPC accepts this advice. The NGPC stands ready to hear from the GAC on 29 August 2013 regarding its conclusion on applications for .vin and .wine.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 10 September 2013.</p>
<p>ICANN47 Durban Communique</p> <p>§1.3.a. .date and .persiangulf (ref. Beijing Communique 1.c.)</p>	<p>The GAC has finalised its consideration of the following strings, and does not object to them proceeding: i. .date (application number 1-1247-30301) ii. .persiangulf (application number 1-2128-55439)</p>	<p>On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>ICANN will continue to process the application in accordance with the established procedures in the AGB.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 10 September 2013.</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
(18 Jul 2013)		
ICANN47 Durban Communique §1.4.a.i. .indians and .ram	The GAC advises the ICANN Board that the GAC has noted the concerns expressed by the Government of India not to proceed with the applications for .indians and .ram.	<p>On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The NGPC notes the concerns expressed in this advice.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 10 September 2013.</p>
ICANN47 Durban Communique §1.5.a.i Protection of Red Cross/Red Crescent Acronyms (18 Jul 2013)	The same complementary cost neutral mechanisms to be worked out (as above in 4.c.i.) for the protection of acronyms of IGOs be used to also protect the acronyms of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC/CICR) and the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC/FICR).	<p>The NGPC initially considered this advice on 10 September 2013. However at the time, the NGPC responded, "the NGPC acknowledged this advice and stated in the NGPC Scorecard: As noted above, the NGPC accepts the GAC advice to continue discussions with the GAC and the IGOs regarding protections of IGO acronyms. The NGPC accepts this advice to adopt any mechanism(s) that may be agreed to by the GAC and the NGPC for the protection of IGO acronyms in order to protect the acronyms of the ICRC/CICR and IFRC/FICR. Additionally, the NGPC directs staff to require registry operators to implement temporary protections for acronyms of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC/CICR) and the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC/FICR) until the first meeting of the NGPC following the ICANN 48 Meeting in Buenos Aires."</p> <p>The NGPC most recently considered this item on 8 September 2014 and stated in the scorecard:</p> <p>The NGPC accepts this advice. The mechanism to be developed to protect acronyms of IGOs will also be used to protect the acronyms of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC/CICR) and the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC/FICR).</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's final consideration of 8 September 2014</p>
ICANN47 Durban Communique	The GAC advises the ICANN Board that: i. The GAC is interested to work with the IGOs and the NGPC on a complementary	<p>On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard:</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
§1.5.c Protection of IGO Acronyms (18 Jul 2013)	cost-neutral mechanism that would: a. provide notification to an IGO if a potential registrant seeks to register a domain name matching the acronym of an IGO at the second level, giving the IGO a reasonable opportunity to express concerns, if any; and b. allow for an independent third party to review any such registration request, in the event of a disagreement between an IGO and potential registrant. ii. The initial protections for IGO acronyms confirmed by the NGPC at its meeting of 2 July 2013 should remain in place until the dialogue between the GAC, NGPC, and IGO representatives ensuring the implementation of preventative protection for IGO acronyms at the second level is completed.	5.c.i.a: The NGPC accepts the GAC advice to continue ongoing discussions with the GAC and the IGOs regarding protections of IGO acronyms. 5.c.i.b: The NGPC accepts the GAC advice to continue discussions with the GAC and the IGOs regarding protections of IGO acronyms. 5.c.ii: The NGPC accepts this advice. On 17 July 2013, the NGPC adopted a resolution requiring registry operators to continue to implement temporary protections for the precise IGO names and acronyms on the “IGO List” posted as Annex 1 to Resolution 2013.07.02NG03 – 2013.07.02.NG06 until the first meeting of the NGPC following the ICANN 48 Meeting in Buenos Aires or until the NGPC makes a further determination on the GAC Advice re IGO protections, whichever is earlier. If the NGPC and GAC do not reach an agreement on outstanding implementation issues in that timeframe, and subject to any matters that arise during the discussions, registry operators will be required to protect only the IGO names identified on the “IGO List”. http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-17jul13-en.htm#1.a This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 10 September 2013.
ICANN47 Durban Communique §1.7.a.i. Geographic Names and Community Applications (18 Jul 2013)	The GAC recommends that ICANN collaborate with the GAC in refining, for future rounds, the Applicant Guidebook with regard to the protection of terms with national, cultural, geographic and religious significance, in accordance with the 2007 GAC Principles on New gTLDs.	On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard: The NGPC accepts this recommendation. The NGPC stands ready to hear from the GAC regarding possible refinements, for future rounds, of the Applicant Guidebook with respect to the protection of terms with national, cultural, geographic and religious significance, in accordance with the 2007 GAC Principles on New gTLDs. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 10 September 2013.
ICANN47 Durban Communique §1.7.b. Geographic	The GAC reiterates its advice from the Beijing Communiqué regarding preferential treatment for all applications which have demonstrable community support, while noting community concerns	On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard: i. The NGPC accepts the reiteration of the GAC's earlier advice from the Beijing Communiqué. The NGPC accepted this advice and stated as follows:

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>Names and Community Applications</p> <p>(18 Jul 2013)</p>	<p>over the high costs for pursuing a Community Objection process as well as over the high threshold for passing Community Priority Evaluation. Therefore the GAC advises the ICANN Board to: Consider to take better account of community views, and improve outcomes for communities, within the existing framework, independent of whether those communities have utilized ICANN's formal community processes to date.</p>	<p>Criterion 4 for the Community Priority Evaluation process takes into account "community support and/or opposition to the application" in determining whether to award priority to a community application in a contention set. (Note however that if a contention set is not resolved by the applicants or through a community priority evaluation then ICANN will utilize an auction as the objective method for resolving the contention.) ii. The NGPC accepts this advice. The NGPC will consider taking better account of community views and improving outcomes for communities, within the existing framework, independent of whether those communities have utilized ICANN's formal community processes to date. The NGPC notes that in general it may not be possible to improve any outcomes for communities beyond what may result from the utilization of the AGB's community processes while at the same time remaining within the existing framework.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 10 September 2013.</p>
<p>ICANN47 Durban Communique</p> <p>§1.9.a. Registry and Registrar Agreements and Conflicts with Law</p> <p>(18 Jul 2013)</p>	<p>It was noted that there are provisions in the Registry Agreement and Registrar Accreditation Agreement that may conflict with applicable law in certain countries, in particular privacy and data retention, collection and processing law. The importance of having adequate procedures to avoid these conflicts was highlighted.</p>	<p>On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The NGPC acknowledges the GAC's highlighting of the importance of having adequate procedures to avoid conflicts between provisions in the Registry Agreement and the Registrar Accreditation Agreement and applicable law in certain countries, in particular privacy and data retention, collection and processing law. First, ICANN's Registry Agreements and Registrar Accreditation Agreements already require contracted parties to abide by applicable law; ICANN cannot and will not require any of its contracted parties to violate laws. Through its contract development, ICANN has already demonstrated its understanding of the import of allowing contracted parties to obtain waivers of provisions that would conflict with laws, such as through the inclusion of a provision in the Registrar Accreditation Agreement to address conflicts of laws related to data retention. ICANN will also be working to achieve modifications of the existing ICANN Procedure for Handling Whois Conflicts with Privacy Law, including seeking input from the GAC on modifications.</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>ICANN48 Buenos Aires Communique</p> <p>§3 .wine and .vin</p> <p>(20 Nov 2013)</p>	<p>The Board may wish to seek a clear understanding of the legally complex and politically sensitive background on this matter in order to consider the appropriate next steps in the process of delegating the two strings. GAC members may wish to write to the Board to further elaborate their views.</p>	<p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 10 September 2013.</p> <p>On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>On 28 September 2013, the NGPC noted that it stood ready to hear from GAC members as to the nature of the differences in views expressed in the advice while the NGPC analyzed. In Buenos Aires, ICANN facilitated a dialogue between the applicant for .VIN and the affected non-governmental parties. In response to the GAC's suggestion in the Buenos Aires Communiqué, the NGPC has commissioned an analysis of the legally complex and politically sensitive background on this matter in the context of the GAC advice in order to consider the appropriate next steps of delegating .WINE and .VIN. The analysis is expected to be completed so that it can be considered by the NGPC when it meets in Singapore.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 5 February 2014.</p>
<p>ICANN48 Buenos Aires Communique</p> <p>§1.a. Category 1 and Category 2 Safeguard Advice</p> <p>(20 Nov 2013)</p>	<p>The GAC highlights the importance of its Beijing advice on 'Restricted Access' registries, particularly with regard to the need to avoid undue preference and/or undue disadvantage. The GAC requests a briefing on whether the Board considers that the existing PIC specifications (including 3c) fully implements this advice.</p>	<p>On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The NGPC accepted the GAC's Beijing advice regarding Category 2 (Restricted Access). To implement the advice, the NGPC revised Specification 11 – Public Interest Commitments in the New gTLD Registry Agreement. The PIC Spec requires that “Registry Operator will operate the TLD in a transparent manner consistent with general principles of openness and non-discrimination by establishing, publishing and adhering to clear registration policies.” The NGPC accepts the advice in the Buenos Aires Communiqué. As requested, the NGPC has provided a written clarification to the GAC on whether the Board considers that the existing PIC specifications (including 3c) fully implements this advice.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 5 February 2014.</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>ICANN48 Buenos Aires Communique</p> <p>§1.b Category 1 and Category 2 Safeguard Advice</p> <p>(20 Nov 2013)</p>	<p>The GAC requests a briefing on the public policy implications of holding auctions to resolve string contention (including community applications).</p>	<p>On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The NGPC accepts this advice. The NGPC will provide a briefing to the GAC regarding the public policy implications of holding auctions to resolve string contention (including community applications).</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 5 February 2014.</p>
<p>ICANN48 Buenos Aires Communique</p> <p>§1.c. Category 1 and Category 2 Safeguard Advice</p> <p>(20 Nov 2013)</p>	<p>The GAC considers that new gTLD registry operators should be made aware of the importance of protecting children and their rights consistent with the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child.</p>	<p>On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The NGPC acknowledges the GAC's view. ICANN will contact all new gTLD registry operators to make them aware of the importance of protecting children and their rights consistent with the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 5 February 2014.</p>
<p>ICANN48 Buenos Aires Communique</p> <p>§1.d Category 1 and Category 2 Safeguard Advice</p> <p>(20 Nov 2013)</p>	<p>The GAC advises the ICANN Board to re-categorize the string .doctor as falling within Category 1 safeguard advice addressing highly regulated sectors, therefore ascribing these domains exclusively to legitimate medical practitioners. The GAC notes the strong implications for consumer protection and consumer trust, and the need for proper medical ethical standards, demanded by the medical field online to be fully respected.</p>	<p>On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The NGPC accepts the advice. The NGPC adopts the implementation framework attached as Annex 2 <http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-annex-2-05feb14-en.pdf> to address this advice, and directs the ICANN President and CEO, or his designee, to implement the Category 1 Safeguard advice consistent with the implementation framework. With respect to the additional advice in the Buenos Aires Communiqué on the Category 1 Safeguards, the NGPC accepts the advice to re-categorize the string .doctor as falling within Category 1 safeguard advice addressing highly regulated sectors and ensure that the domains in the .doctor TLD are ascribed exclusively to legitimate medical practitioners.</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>ICANN48 Buenos Aires Communique</p> <p>§1.e Category 1 and Category 2 Safeguard Advice</p> <p>(20 Nov 2013)</p>	<p>The GAC welcomes the Board's communication with applicants with regard to open and closed gTLDs, but seeks written clarification of how strings are identified as being generic.</p>	<p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 5 February 2014.</p> <p>On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The NGPC accepts the advice in the Buenos Aires Communiqué. As requested in in the Buenos Aires Communiqué, the NGPC has provided a written clarification to the GAC of how strings are identified as being generic.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 5 February 2014.</p>
<p>ICANN48 Buenos Aires Communique</p> <p>§2.a.i.1.a. .guangzhou (IDN in Chinese), .shenzhen (IDN in Chinese), and .spa</p> <p>(20 Nov 2013)</p>	<p>The GAC advises the ICANN Board not to proceed beyond initial evaluation until the agreements between the relevant parties are reached: the application for .guangzhou (IDN in Chinese – application number 1-1121-22691)</p>	<p>On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The NGPC accepts this advice. ICANN received notice on 6 December 2013 that the applicants for .GUANGZHOU and .SHENZHEN are withdrawing their applications for consideration from the New gTLD Program. The NGPC will inform the GAC of this new information.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 5 February 2014.</p>
<p>ICANN48 Buenos Aires Communique</p> <p>§2.a.i.1.b. .guangzhou (IDN in Chinese), .shenzhen (IDN in Chinese), and .spa</p>	<p>The GAC advises the ICANN Board not to proceed beyond initial evaluation until the agreements between the relevant parties are reached: the application for .shenzhen (IDN in Chinese – 1-1121-82863)</p>	<p>On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The NGPC accepts this advice. ICANN received notice on 6 December 2013 that the applicants for .GUANGZHOU and .SHENZHEN are withdrawing their applications for consideration from the New gTLD Program. The NGPC will inform the GAC of this new information.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 5 February 2014.</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
(20 Nov 2013)		
<p>ICANN48 Buenos Aires Communique</p> <p>§2.a.i.1.c. .guangzhou (IDN in Chinese), .shenzhen (IDN in Chinese), and .spa</p>	<p>The GAC advises the ICANN Board not to proceed beyond initial evaluation until the agreements between the relevant parties are reached: the applications for .spa (application number 1-1309-12524 and 1-1619-92115)</p>	<p>On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The NGPC accepts this advice. ICANN will not enter into registry agreements with applicants for the identified string at this time. The NGPC notes concern about concluding the discussions with the applicants and will request the GAC to (1) provide a timeline for final consideration of the string, and (2) identify the “interested parties” noted in the GAC advice.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 5 February 2014.</p>
<p>(20 Nov 2013)</p> <p>ICANN48 Buenos Aires Communique</p> <p>§2.b. GAC Objections to Specific Applications (ref. Beijing Communiqué 1.c.) - .yun</p>	<p>The GAC notes that the application for .yun (application number 1-1318-12524) has been withdrawn.</p>	<p>On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The NGPC accepts this advice. ICANN received notice on 15 November 2013 that the applicant of application number 1-1318-12524 for .YUN was withdrawing its applications for consideration from the New gTLD Program. Since application number 1-1318-12524 has been withdrawn, the remaining application for the .YUN string (application 1-974-89210) should continue through the stages of the application process.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 5 February 2014.</p>
<p>(20 Nov 2013)</p> <p>ICANN48 Buenos Aires Communique</p> <p>§2.c GAC Objections to Specific Applications (ref.</p>	<p>The GAC welcomes the Board's acceptance of its advice in the Durban Communiqué on the application for .thai.</p>	<p>The Board reviewed this item and presented it as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 1 November 2017.</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
Beijing Communiqué 1.c.) - .thai (20 Nov 2013)		
ICANN48 Buenos Aires Communique §2.d GAC Objections to Specific Applications (ref. Beijing Communiqué 1.c.) - .amazon (20 Nov 2013)	The GAC sought an update from the Board on the current status of the implementation of the GAC Advice for .amazon	On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard: ICANN has commissioned an independent, third-party expert to provide additional analysis on the specific issues of application of law at issue, which may focus on legal norms or treaty conventions relied on by Amazon or governments. The analysis is expected to be completed in time for the ICANN Singapore meeting so that the NGPC can consider it in Singapore. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 5 February 2014.
ICANN48 Buenos Aires Communique §5.a.i. Special Launch Program for Geographic and Community TLDs (20 Nov 2013)	The GAC recognizes the importance of the priority inclusion of government and locally relevant name strings for the successful launch and continued administration of community and geographic TLDs. The GAC appreciates that the Trademark Clearing House (TMCH) is an important rights protection mechanism applicable across all the new gTLDs and has an invaluable role to fulfill across the new gTLD spectrum as a basic safety net for the protection of trademark rights. The GAC Advises the ICANN Board that ICANN provide clarity on the proposed launch program for special cases as a matter of urgency.	On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard: The NGPC accepts this advice. ICANN published materials in December 2013 to provide clarity to the community on the proposed launch program for special cases. (https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/about/trademark-clearinghouse/launch-application-guidelines-19dec13-en.pdf). Additionally, the NGPC has provided a briefing to the GAC on this issue. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 5 February 2014.

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>ICANN48 Buenos Aires Communique</p> <p>§6.a.i. Protection of Red Cross/Red Crescent Names</p> <p>(20 Nov 2013)</p>	<p>The GAC advises the ICANN Board: i. that it is giving further consideration to the way in which existing protections should apply to the words “Red Cross”, “Red Crescent” and related designations at the top and second levels with specific regard to national Red Cross and Red Crescent entities; and that it will provide further advice to the Board on this.</p>	<p>On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The NGPC accepts this advice.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 5 February 2014.</p>
<p>ICANN48 Buenos Aires Communique</p> <p>§7.a. .islam and .halal</p> <p>(20 Nov 2013)</p>	<p>GAC took note of letters sent by the OIC and the ICANN Chairman in relation to the strings .islam and .halal. The GAC has previously provided advice in its Beijing Communiqué, when it concluded its discussions on these strings. The GAC Chair will respond to the OIC correspondence accordingly, noting the OIC's plans to hold a meeting in early December. The GAC chair will also respond to the ICANN Chair's correspondence in similar terms</p>	<p>On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The NGPC adopted a resolution to accept this advice at its 4 June 2013 meeting. Pursuant to Section 3.1.ii of the AGB, the NGPC and some members of the GAC met during the ICANN 47 meeting in Durban to discuss the concerns about the applications. On 24 October 2013 decisions were posted in favor of the applicant on the community objections filed by the Telecommunications Regulatory Authority of the UAE. In a 4 November 2013 letter from the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC) to the GAC Chair, the OIC requested that its letter be considered an “official opposition of the Member States of the OIC towards probable authorization by the GAC allowing the use of [...] .ISLAM and .HALAL by any entity not representing the collective voice of the Muslim people.” In a 11 November 2013 letter to the GAC Chair, the NGPC indicated that before it takes action on the strings, it will wait for any additional GAC input during the Buenos Aires meeting or resulting GAC Communiqué. The Buenos Aires Communiqué took note of the letters sent by the OIC, but did not offer any additional advice to the Board. The OIC also adopted a resolution in December 2013 communicating its official objection to the use of the applied-for .ISLAM and .HALAL TLDs. The NGPC takes note of the significant concerns expressed during the dialogue, and additional opposition raised, including by the OIC, which represents 1.6 billion members of the Muslim community. The NGPC has sent a letter to the applicant, which is available here: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-abbasnia-07feb14-en.pdf</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
		<p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 5 February 2014.</p>
<p>ICANN49 Singapore Communique</p> <p>§1 Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) Functions: US Government Announcement</p> <p>(27 Mar 2014)</p>	<p>The GAC received a briefing from Assistant Secretary Larry Strickling of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration regarding the announcement of 14 March 2014 that the United States Government would transition key Internet domain name functions to the global multistakeholder community. This is a timely step in the process of making Internet governance truly global, and marks major progress in the development of a multi-stakeholder model. The GAC also notes that a number of conditions were stated in the announcement in order that this transition be effected. The GAC welcomes that ICANN will convene global stakeholders to develop a proposal for this transition and takes note of the preliminary timeline proposed by ICANN (http://www.icann.org/en/about/agreement/s/iana/functions-transfer-process-14mar14-en.pdf). The GAC is willing to participate in, and contribute to, this process and underlines that the consultations and discussions should reach out to all parties, including those governments that are not presently members of the GAC and also not part of the ICANN multistakeholder community. The GAC also recommends that ICANN make full use of existing events and fora to ensure a broader engagement in these</p>	<p>The ICANN Board Chair provided the GAC Chair with a scorecard of the Board's responses to the GAC's non-new gTLD concerns raised in the ICANN49 Singapore Communique as an annex to a letter dated 5 June 2014. The Board provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board welcomes the input of the GAC and other governments that are not presently members of the GAC as ICANN convenes global stakeholders to develop a proposal for the transition of NTIA's stewardship of the IANA functions. At the ICANN 49 Meeting in Singapore during the 24 March session, ICANN launched a multistakeholder-designed process to gather the community's views and contributions to address how the mechanisms for the transition of NTIA's stewardship of the IANA functions should occur. Additionally, on 8 April 2014, ICANN posted a "Call for Public Input: Draft Proposal, Based on Initial Community Feedback, of the Principles and Mechanisms and the Process to Develop a Proposal to Transition NTIA's Stewardship of the IANA Functions." To ensure that the eventual proposal is community- driven and enjoys broad support, ICANN is committed to collecting and incorporating input and feedback from the global stakeholder community, and intends to recognize discussion in other for a as appropriate.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board Chair's letter of 5 June 2014.</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
	important discussions, including the forthcoming NETmundial meeting (Brazil, 23-24 April 2014), and the Internet Governance Forum (Turkey, 2-5 September 2014).	
<p>ICANN49 Singapore Communique</p> <p>§5 Singular and Plural Versions of the Same String</p> <p>(27 Mar 2014)</p>	<p>The GAC reiterates the Beijing advice that allowing singular and plural versions of the same strings could lead to consumer harm. Permitting this practice risks confusing internet users and could make users more vulnerable to deceptive practices that exploit this confusion.</p>	<p>On 14 May 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The NGPC acknowledges the GAC’s reiteration of its advice in the Beijing Communiqué, which advised the Board to reconsider its decision to allow singular and plural versions of the same strings. The NGPC adopted a resolution (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2013-06-04-en#1.a) to accept this advice at its 4 June 2013 meeting, and on 25 June 2013, the NGPC considered whether to allow singular and plural versions of the same string. The NGPC adopted a resolution resolving that no changes were 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 (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2013-06-25-en#2.d). The NGPC notes that this topic may be of further discussion by the community as it considers future rounds of the New gTLD Program.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.</p>
<p>ICANN49 Singapore Communique</p> <p>§6 WHOIS</p> <p>(27 Mar 2014)</p>	<p>The GAC notes the work being accomplished by the Expert Working Group on New gTLD Directory Services (WHOIS). The GAC will work inter-sessionally on privacy issues up until the ICANN 50 London meeting.</p>	<p>The ICANN Board Chair provided the GAC Chair with a scorecard of the Board's responses to the GAC’s non-new gTLD concerns raised in the ICANN49 Singapore Communique as an annex to a letter dated 5 June 2014. The Board provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>On 9 May 2014, ICANN notified the GAC Chair that it was in support of ensuring that the high level meeting scheduled for London was a success, and that additional funding for travel would be made available to assist with having representation from a wide range of representatives from countries at the high level meeting.</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>ICANN49 Singapore Communique</p> <p>§7 Data Retention and Data Provision Waivers</p> <p>(27 Mar 2014)</p>	<p>The GAC welcomes the explanation provided to the GAC by ICANN in relation to the state of play of the granting of the Data Retention Specification waiver foreseen in the Registrar Accreditation Agreement, in compliance with national laws. Some members asked ICANN not to take legal action against those Registrars in order to fulfill their data retention requirements pending a decision on these waivers. They further recalled that waivers might be necessary for data provision requirements accordingly in the Registry Agreement.</p>	<p>This item is considered complete as of the Board Chair's letter of 5 June 2014.</p> <p>The ICANN Board Chair provided the GAC Chair with a scorecard of the Board's responses to the GAC's non-new gTLD concerns raised in the ICANN49 Singapore Communique as an annex to a letter dated 5 June 2014. The Board provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board appreciates the opportunity provided by the GAC to discuss this important matter in Singapore. ICANN continues to make progress in evaluating requests from registrars to waive certain data retention requirements under the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement ("2013 RAA"). Recently, ICANN reported (https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-3-2014-05-22-en) that it had made a preliminary determination that it is prepared to grant three (3) data retention waiver requests in a limited scope submitted by registrars 1API GmbH, ingenit GmbH & Co. KG and RegistryGate GmbH (the "Registrars") under the 2013 RAA. As required by the process, the waiver request and supporting documentation was posted for public comment, which public comment period will remain open until 22 June 2014. ICANN will continue to process requests from registrars according the Process for Handling Registrar Data Retention Waiver Requests (https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/waiver-request-process-2013-09-13-en) and provide periodic updates to the community as appropriate.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board Chair's letter of 5 June 2014.</p>
<p>ICANN49 Singapore Communique</p> <p>§10 Accountability and Transparency</p> <p>(27 Mar 2014)</p>	<p>The GAC agreed on a revised charter for continuation of the Board-GAC Recommendation Implementation Review Team (BGRI), with responsibility for progressing relevant recommendations from the final report of the Accountability and Transparency Review Team (ATRT2). Some areas of the report are the subject of ongoing GAC working groups and some are GAC internal matters, which will feed into the overall</p>	<p>The ICANN Board Chair provided the GAC Chair with a scorecard of the Board's responses to the GAC's non-new gTLD concerns raised in the ICANN49 Singapore Communique as an annex to a letter dated 5 June 2014. The Board provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board welcomes the report that the GAC agreed on a revised charter for continuation of the Board-GAC Recommendation Implementation Review Team. The Board will continue to work with the GAC to make progress on relevant recommendations from the ATRT 2 Report.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board Chair's letter of 5 June 2014.</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
	<p>ATRT2 process. The GAC has established a working group to develop guidelines on ICANN-government and IGO engagement, and will work with the ICANN Global Stakeholder Engagement team, and within the BGRI process, to progress relevant recommendations from the ATRT2 report.</p>	
<p>ICANN49 Singapore Communique</p> <p>§13 NETmundial Meeting</p> <p>(27 Mar 2014)</p>	<p>The GAC expresses its thanks for a briefing provided by Ambassador Benedicto Fonseca of Brazil on the NET mundial meeting to be held in Sao Paulo on 23-24 April 2014.</p>	<p>On 30 July 2014 the Board took the following resolutions:</p> <p>Resolved (2014.07.30.13), the Board hereby directs the CEO to continue to support the emerging initiatives, relating to addressing the outcomes of the NETmundial meeting and the NETmundial Principles, as well as the recommendations of the Panel on Global Internet Cooperation and Governance Mechanisms.</p> <p>Resolved (2014.07.30.14), the Board highly encourages all parties interested in the Internet ecosystem and Internet governance to continue participation in these emerging initiatives and notes the importance of active and committed participation by all stakeholders.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's resolution of 30 July 2014.</p>
<p>ICANN49 Singapore Communique</p> <p>§11.I.a. Tracking of Key Issues</p> <p>(27 Mar 2014)</p>	<p>The GAC requests that the Board consider ways in which ICANN and the GAC can work more closely in ensuring that key issues are tracked in a more concise and structured way, so that the GAC is able to provide timely and comprehensive advice. For example, the multiple streams of activity being dealt with regard to Registrar Accreditation Agreement, data protection, and data retention issues, WHOIS (e.g. Expert Working Group, privacy and proxy services, etc). The GAC would benefit</p>	<p>The ICANN Board Chair provided the GAC Chair with a scorecard of the Board's responses to the GAC's non-new gTLD concerns raised in the ICANN49 Singapore Communique as an annex to a letter dated 5 June 2014. The Board provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board will coordinate with the GAC to develop agenda items with key issues, which could be presented through webinars, written briefings or other methods that may be helpful to the GAC to track key issues in a concise and structured way so that the GAC is able to provide timely and comprehensive advice.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board Chair's letter of 5 June 2014.</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
	<p>from some form of comprehensive overview by ICANN of such related issues prior to the meetings.</p>	
<p>ICANN49 Singapore Communique</p> <p>§12.I.a. Briefings on Compliance</p> <p>(27 Mar 2014)</p>	<p>The GAC requests that the Board facilitate ICANN staff briefings for each meeting on compliance with ICANN safeguards for registry operators, registrars and registrants.</p>	<p>The ICANN Board Chair provided the GAC Chair with a scorecard of the Board's responses to the GAC's non-new gTLD concerns raised in the ICANN49 Singapore Communique as an annex to a letter dated 5 June 2014. The Board provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>ICANN stands ready to provide periodic updates to the GAC regarding the activities carried out by the Compliance Department on the effective implementation of the Safeguards, including possibly at ICANN meetings, or through webinars. ICANN looks forward to hearing from the GAC about establishing convenient times and methods of providing the updates that would be informative and effective for GAC members. In the meantime, please refer to the links below for published material about ICANN Contractual Compliance activities and updates. 1. For monthly briefings on compliance activities, refer to http://www.icann.org/en/resources/compliance/update 2. For monthly statistical reporting across the regions, the compliance types and reporters, refer to https://features.icann.org/compliance 3. To learn more about the most common complaints ICANN receives that may be in violation of the agreements and/or consensus policies, refer to http://www.icann.org/en/resources/compliance/complaints 4. For the latest Notices of Breach, Suspension, Termination and Non-Renewal, refer to http://www.icann.org/en/resources/compliance/notices 5. For the ICANN Contractual Compliance Annual Report, refer to http://www.icann.org/en/resources/compliance/reports 6. For the Audit Program, refer to http://www.icann.org/en/resources/compliance/audits</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board Chair's letter of 5 June 2014.</p>
<p>ICANN49 Singapore Communique</p> <p>§14.I.a. High Level</p>	<p>The GAC requests that additional funding for travel be provided to ensure that the high level meeting scheduled for London has representation from the widest range of countries, including Ministers and their staff from developing countries, in line</p>	<p>The ICANN Board Chair provided the GAC Chair with a scorecard of the Board's responses to the GAC's non-new gTLD concerns raised in the ICANN49 Singapore Communique as an annex to a letter dated 5 June 2014. The Board provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>On 9 May 2014, ICANN notified the GAC Chair that it was in support of</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
Meeting (27 Mar 2014)	with existing GAC travel support guidelines.	ensuring that the high level meeting scheduled for London was a success, and that additional funding for travel would be made available to assist with having representation from a wide range of representatives from countries at the high level meeting This item is considered complete as of the Board Chair's letter of 5 June 2014.
ICANN49 Singapore Communique §2.a.i Safeguard Advice Applicable to all new gTLDs and Category 1 (consumer protection, sensitive strings and regulated markets) and Category 2 (restricted registration policies) Strings (27 Mar 2014)	The GAC requests clarification from the New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC) on a number of implementation issues. These relate to the implications of changes in WHOIS verification and checks for the accuracy of WHOIS generally and for law enforcement and end users; security checks to detect risks of harm (eg phishing, malware, botnets etc); complaint mechanisms; verification and validation of Category 1 registrants' credentials and the lack of binding nature of the public interest commitments; operation of the Public Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Procedure; and restricted registration policies (Category 2). These queries are set out in more detail in an Attachment to this communiqué.	On 6 June 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard: The NGPC provides written clarification to the GAC on the requested implementation issues in Annex 2 [https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-new-gtld-annex-2-06jun14-en.pdf] This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration and written response of 6 June 2014.
ICANN49 Singapore Communique §3.1.a. Community Applications (27 Mar 2014)	The GAC reiterates its advice from the Beijing and Durban Communiqués regarding preferential treatment for all applications which have demonstrable community support. The GAC advises ICANN to continue to protect the public interest and improve outcomes for communities, and to work with the applicants in an open and transparent	On 14 May 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard: The NGPC accepts the reiteration of the GAC's earlier advice regarding community applications. The NGPC will continue to protect the public interest and improve outcomes for communities, and to work with the applicants in an open and transparent manner in an effort to assist those communities within the existing framework.

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
	<p>manner in an effort to assist those communities. The GAC further notes that a range of issues relating to community applications will need to be dealt with in future rounds.</p>	<p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.</p>
<p>ICANN49 Singapore Communique</p> <p>§4.a. Specific Strings - .spa</p> <p>(27 Mar 2014)</p>	<p>Regarding the applications for .spa, the GAC understands that the relevant parties in these discussions are the city of Spa and the applicants. The GAC has finalised its consideration of the .spa string and welcomes the report that an agreement has been reached between the city of Spa and one of the applicants.</p>	<p>On 14 May 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The NGPC accepts this advice and acknowledges that the GAC has finalized its consideration of the .SPA string and the report that an agreement has been reached between the City of Spa and one of the applicants. The NGPC notes that there is no GAC advice pursuant to Module 3.1 of the Applicant Guidebook. As a result, the applications will proceed through the normal process.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.</p>
<p>ICANN49 Singapore Communique</p> <p>§4.b. Specific Strings - .amazon</p> <p>(27 Mar 2014)</p>	<p>The GAC expresses its concerns with the time the Board is taking in evaluating the GAC Objection Advice on the application of the domain name .amazon, as stated in the GAC communiqué, approved in Durban, last July. Therefore the GAC urges the ICANN Board to settle as a high priority its decision according to Module 3.1 part I of the Applicant Guidebook.</p>	<p>On 14 May 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>On 14 May 2014, the NGPC accepted the GAC advice identified in the GAC Register of Advice as 2013-07-18-Obj-Amazon, and directed the President and CEO, or his designee, that the applications for .AMAZON (application number 1-1315-58086) and related IDNs in Japanese (application number 1-1318-83995) and Chinese (application number 1-1318-5581) filed by Amazon EU S.à r.l. should not proceed. By adopting the GAC advice, the NGPC noted that the decision was without prejudice to the continuing efforts by Amazon EU S.à r.l. and members of the GAC to pursue dialogue on the relevant issues. Refer to NGPC Resolution 2014.05.14.NG03 for additional details.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.</p>
<p>ICANN49 Singapore Communique</p>	<p>The GAC notes the NGPC Resolution 2014.03.22.NG01 concerning .wine and .vin as well as its rationale. In the final</p>	<p>On 14 May 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard:</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>§4.d. Specific Strings - .wine and .vin (27 Mar 2014)</p>	<p>deliberation of the Board there appears to be at least one process violation and procedural error, including in relation to ByLaws Article XI--A, Section 1 subsection 6 which states: "6. Opportunity to Comment. The Governmental Advisory Committee, in addition to the Supporting Organizations and other Advisory Committees, shall have an opportunity to comment upon any external advice received prior to any decision by the Board." The GAC therefore advises that the Board reconsider the matter before delegating these strings. The GAC needs to consider the above elements more fully. In the meantime concerned GAC members believe the applicants and interested parties should be encouraged to continue their negotiations with a view to reach an agreement on the matter.</p>	<p>On 4 April 2014, the NGPC adopted resolutions in response to the GAC's advice in the Singapore Communiqué concerning the applications for .WINE and .VIN. In its action, the NGPC: (1) accepted the GAC advice identified in the Singapore Communiqué as it relates to the applications for .WINE and .VIN; (2) considered whether there may have been a process violation or procedural error, and concluded that there has been no process violation or procedural error under the Bylaws; and (3) directed the President and CEO to not commence the contracting process for the applications for .WINE and .VIN for 60 days (from the date the resolutions are posted) in order to provide additional time for the relevant impacted parties to negotiate, which they are encouraged to do. The NGPC also recommended that the full Board consider the larger implications of legally complex and politically sensitive issues such as those raised by GAC members, including whether ICANN is the proper venue in which to resolve these issues, or whether there are venues or forums better suited to address concerns such as those raised by GAC members in relation to the .WINE and .VIN applications.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.</p>
<p>ICANN50 London Communique §1 Transition of US Stewardship of IANA and Strengthening ICANN Accountability (25 Jun 2014)</p>	<p>The GAC is committed to engaging with the current processes dealing with transition of US Government stewardship of IANA; and strengthening ICANN accountability. The GAC will participate in both processes by nominating the Chair and four additional GAC members for formal membership of the coordination group and working group respectively, to provide a balanced representation of governmental interests. The GAC will ensure that geographic, linguistic and gender diversity are reflected. GAC participants in the groups will consult with, and facilitate information flows across, the broader GAC membership. The GAC</p>	<p>The Board reviewed this item and presented it as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 1 November 2017.</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
	<p>recognizes the need for it to comment on the final draft proposals from the IANA stewardship transition coordination group and the ICANN accountability working group before the public comment periods.</p>	
<p>ICANN50 London Communique</p> <p>§4 Protection of Children</p> <p>(25 Jun 2014)</p>	<p>The GAC reiterates its advice in the Buenos Aires Communiqué that new gTLD registry operators should be made aware of the importance of protecting children and their rights consistent with the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child.</p>	<p>On 8 September 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The NGPC accepts this advice. In the 5 February 2014 iteration of the scorecard, the NGPC acknowledged the GAC's view, and directed ICANN to contact all new gTLD registry operators to make them aware of the importance of protecting children and their rights consistent with the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. To implement this, ICANN includes a notice in the materials provided to all registry operators after executing the Registry Agreement notifying them of the importance of protecting children and their rights consistent with the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. ICANN will continue to provide this notice to all new registry operators.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.</p>
<p>ICANN50 London Communique</p> <p>§8 Accountability and Transparency</p> <p>(25 Jun 2014)</p>	<p>The GAC was briefed by the Board--GAC Recommendation Implementation Working Group (BGRI) and agreed to specific ATRT2 recommendations being progressed by the BGRI as follows: o Development of a formal process for the Board to notify and request GAC advice (Recommendation 6.4) – Document current process and seek comment on options for improvements. o Bylaw changes to formally implement the documented process for Board--GAC Bylaws consultation developed by the BGRI (Recommendation 6.5) – GAC advises the Board that there are no</p>	<p>The Board considered the Second Accountability and Transparency Review Team (ATRT2) Recommendations on 26 June 2014 and passed the following resolutions:</p> <p>Resolved (2014.06.26.14), the Board accepts all ATRT2 Recommendations and directs the President and CEO, through his designee(s), to proceed with implementation. For recommendation 6, focusing on enhancing the relationship between the GAC and the Board, the Board agrees that the BGRI-WG shall continue to assist with the implementation of several sub-recommendations pertaining to the GAC, and directs the President and CEO to provide required support to the GAC and the BGRI-WG to continue their assessment and implementation planning work.</p> <p>Resolved (2014.06.26.15), the President and CEO is directed to regularly report to the community and the Board on the status of implementation of the ATRT2 recommendations, including key performance indicators and other</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
	<p>further requests for Bylaws amendments, in light of the new gTLDs, and hence sees no need for Board action on this to be further delayed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Regularisation of senior officials' meetings (Recommendation 6.7) – GAC agrees that regular high level meetings are beneficial, and will examine ways to maximize their benefits and continually improve the way they are arranged and scheduled. o GAC to use opportunities to provide input to ICANN policy development processes (Recommendation 10.2) – GAC noted that the GAC-GNSO Consultation Group is addressing this. 	<p>relevant metrics.</p> <p>The text of the resolution also states "...Whereas, the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) and the Board-GAC Recommendation Implementation Working Group (BGRI-WG) have considered the ATRT2 Recommendations relating to GAC activities and are engaged in implementation planning."</p> <p>Given that the Board considered the GAC's consideration of this advice, this item is considered complete as of 26 June 2014.</p>
<p>ICANN50 London Communique</p> <p>§9 Human Rights</p> <p>(25 Jun 2014)</p>	<p>GAC noted the written analysis on ICANN's procedures and policies in the light of human rights, fundamental freedoms and democratic values, prepared by experts of the Council of Europe. The GAC noted that there is a developing interest in the ICANN community to include human rights issues in future discussions.</p>	<p>The Board reviewed this item and presented it as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 1 November 2017.</p>
<p>ICANN50 London Communique</p> <p>§10 Protection of Geographic Names in gTLDs</p> <p>(25 Jun 2014)</p>	<p>The GAC provided a briefing, led by the sub-group on geographic names of the working group on future gTLD issues, to the community on protection of geographic names in future new gTLD application rounds. Further work will be done on this matter and new updates will be provided at the next ICANN meeting.</p>	<p>On 8 September 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The NGPC acknowledges the GAC's work on the topic of protection of geographic names for future rounds of the New gTLD Program, and looks forward to additional updates from the GAC on this topic.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.</p>
<p>ICANN50 London Communique</p>	<p>The GAC convened an open session for the community to inform about and</p>	<p>The Board considered the Second Accountability and Transparency Review Team (ATR2) Recommendations on 26 June 2014 and passed the following</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>§11 GAC Open Forum</p> <p>(25 Jun 2014)</p>	<p>exchange views on the GAC and its working methods, in accordance with recommendation 6.1.a of the ATRT2 report.</p>	<p>resolutions:</p> <p>Resolved (2014.06.26.14), the Board accepts all ATRT2 Recommendations and directs the President and CEO, through his designee(s), to proceed with implementation. For recommendation 6, focusing on enhancing the relationship between the GAC and the Board, the Board agrees that the BGRI-WG shall continue to assist with the implementation of several sub-recommendations pertaining to the GAC, and directs the President and CEO to provide required support to the GAC and the BGRI-WG to continue their assessment and implementation planning work.</p> <p>Resolved (2014.06.26.15), the President and CEO is directed to regularly report to the community and the Board on the status of implementation of the ATRT2 recommendations, including key performance indicators and other relevant metrics.</p> <p>The text of the resolution also states "...Whereas, the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) and the Board-GAC Recommendation Implementation Working Group (BGRI-WG) have considered the ATRT2 Recommendations relating to GAC activities and are engaged in implementation planning."</p> <p>Given that the Board considered the GAC's consideration of this advice, this item is considered complete as of 26 June 2014.</p>
<p>ICANN50 London Communique</p> <p>§2.a.i.-2.b.i. Safeguard Advice Applicable to all new gTLDs and Category 1 (consumer protection, sensitive strings and regulated markets) and Category 2</p>	<p>The GAC advises the Board to call on the NGPC to provide the GAC with a comprehensive and satisfactory response to the legitimate concerns raised in the Beijing and Singapore Communiqués. The GAC considers that the current responses offered to the GAC fail to address a number of important concerns, including: 1) the process for verification of WHOIS information; 2) the proactive verification of credentials for registrants of domain names in regulated and highly regulated industries (the relevant Category 1 strings); 3) the proactive</p>	<p>On 8 September 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The NGPC accepts this advice, and has provided written responses to the concerns raised by the GAC in the Beijing and Singapore Communiqués. See https://www.icann.org/resources/correspondence/crocker-to-dryden-2014-09-02-en. The NGPC provided its responses to the GAC more than five weeks prior to ICANN meetings in order to give sufficient time for the GAC to assess and provide feedback. In addition, the NGPC stands ready to schedule a conference call with interested members of the GAC, if helpful, to discuss further the concerns raised by the GAC.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>(restricted registration policies) strings</p> <p>(25 Jun 2014)</p>	<p>security checks by registries; 4) the Public Interest Commitments Dispute Resolution Process PICDRP, which is not defined as to length of procedure or outcome; and 5) discrimination in restricted TLDs. (See Annex to London Communiqué). The GAC advises that the Board to provide its responses to GAC advice at least four weeks prior to ICANN meetings in order to give sufficient time to the GAC to assess and provide feedback on these complicated matters.</p>	
<p>ICANN50 London Communique</p> <p>§3.a.1-2. Specific Strings - .africa</p> <p>(25 Jun 2014)</p>	<p>Consistent with the new gTLD applicant guidebook, the GAC provided consensus advice articulated in the April 11 2013 communiqué that the Dot Connect Africa (DCA) application number 1--1165--42560 for dot Africa should not proceed. The GAC welcomes the June 2013 decision by the New gTLD Program Committee to accept GAC advice on this application. The GAC notes the recent action taken to put on hold the ZACR African Union Commission endorsed application due to the Independent Review Panel (IRP) mandated by ICANN Bylaws. The GAC advises: 1. The ICANN Board to provide timely communication to the affected parties, in particular to provide clarity on the process and possible timelines 2. The ICANN Board that, following the release of the IRP recommendation, the Board should act expeditiously in prioritising their deliberations and delegate .africa pursuant of the registry agreement signed between ICANN and ZACR.</p>	<p>On 8 September 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The NGPC accepts this advice. The NGPC will continue to provide timely communication to the affected parties concerning the .AFRICA application. With respect to the release of the IRP recommendation, the ICANN Bylaws require that “[w]here feasible, the Board shall consider the IRP Panel declaration at the Board’s next meeting.” (Article IV, Sec. 3)</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>ICANN50 London Communique</p> <p>§3.b. Specific Strings - .spa</p> <p>(25 Jun 2014)</p>	<p>The GAC welcomes the NGPC's acceptance of the GAC advice on .spa. The GAC reiterates its advice (https://gacweb.icann.org/display/GACADV/2014-03-27-spa) on the issue that "the relevant parties in these discussions are the city of Spa and the applicants." The GAC therefore seeks NGPC's clarification on whether its explanation that "the applications will proceed through the normal process" means it will follow the Applicant Guidebook taking into consideration the GAC advice.</p>	<p>On 8 September 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>Yes. ICANN will follow the Applicant Guidebook taking into consideration the GAC advice. -Because neither of the .SPA applications were the subject of GAC advice pursuant to Module 3.1 of the Applicant Guidebook, both applications for .SPA remain active and will continue to be processed pursuant to the procedures of the AGB. Because there is more than one application for the .SPA TLD, the applicants will need to resolve the contention set pursuant to the procedures established in Module 4 of the Applicant Guidebook before ICANN will enter into a Registry Agreement with the prevailing applicant.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.</p>
<p>ICANN50 London Communique</p> <p>§3.c. Specific Strings - .wine/.vin</p> <p>(25 Jun 2014)</p>	<p>There was further discussion on the issue of .wine/.vin, but no agreement was reached because of the sensitive nature of the matter. The matter of .wine and .vin was raised at the High Level Governmental Meeting, where some members expressed concerns in terms of ICANN's accountability and public policy. These concerns are not shared by all members.</p>	<p>On 8 September 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The NGPC thanks the GAC for its update on the .wine/.vin TLD applications.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.</p>
<p>ICANN50 London Communique</p> <p>§7.a.1 WHOIS</p> <p>(25 Jun 2014)</p>	<p>The GAC notes that there continue to be range of initiatives being progressed relevant to WHOIS, including outcomes from the WHOIS Review Team and the recently finalised report of the Expert Working Group on gTLD Directory Services. Many of the issues under discussion and analysis have public policy dimensions, including privacy, law enforcement, consumer protection and public safety. a. The GAC requests that: I.</p>	<p>The NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to GAC Advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Correspondence from the Board on this topic states: "Following our discussion on 13 January 2014, we wish to provide you with responses to some of the GAC advice items raised in its Los Angeles Communique and discussed on the conference call. The attached document addresses GAC advice regarding implementation of WHOIS-related safeguards; security risks safeguard advice; the Public Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Process; and the WHOIS roadmap."</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
	<p>ICANN make further efforts to explain and clarify the linkages between the full range of WHOIS activity for the benefit of GAC and the community between now and the Los Angeles meeting, to ensure that WHOIS activity adequately reflects GAC's earlier comments and concerns. ICANN should also consider the implications of short, restrictive comment deadlines for community workload. The GAC suggests that ICANN conduct a session for the community on these issues in Los Angeles.</p>	<p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's report of 7 October 2015.</p>
<p>ICANN51 Los Angeles Communique</p> <p>§1 Transition of US Stewardship of IANA and Strengthening ICANN Accountability</p> <p>(15 Oct 2014)</p>	<p>The GAC advises the ICANN Board that:</p> <p>i. The GAC and its Members will be working actively through the Cross Community Working Groups established on: a. Development of an IANA stewardship transition proposal on naming related functions; and b. ICANN accountability and governance. GAC notes that key operational details for the ICANN accountability and governance work stream are still being developed in the community. ii. The IANA transition process should be guided by consensus based decisions and serve the public interest with clearly implementable, transparent and verifiable accountability mechanisms that satisfy requirements of all affected stakeholders. iii. The concept of public interest should be seen as encompassing the larger interest of the different communities affected by Internet Governance processes and not be limited to the interests and objectives of any</p>	<p>The Board considered the CCWG's recommendations on 16 October 2016 (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-10-16-en#2.d) and took the following resolution:</p> <p>Resolved (2014.10.16.16), the Board commits to following the following principles when considering the Cross Community Working Group Recommendations on Enhancing ICANN Accountability and Governance:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. These principles apply to consensus-based recommendations from the Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability and Governance. 2. If the Board believes it is not in the global public interest to implement a recommendation from the Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability and Governance (CCWG Recommendation), it must initiate a dialogue with the CCWG. A determination that it is not in the global public interest to implement a CCWG Recommendation requires a 2/3 majority of the Board. 3. The Board must provide detailed rationale to accompany the initiation of dialogue. The Board shall agree with the CCWG the method (e.g., by teleconference, email or otherwise) by which the dialogue will occur. The discussions shall be held in good faith and in a timely and efficient manner, to find a mutually acceptable solution. 4. The CCWG will have an opportunity to address the Board's concerns and

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
	<p>group or set of stakeholders. iv. It is crucial to make sure accountability processes are guided by the necessary public policy considerations in addition to a technical perspective. It is crucial to make sure these processes are structured in a way that all stakeholders are involved – including governments – in order to ensure that the final outcome of the exercise is also considered legitimate by all participants.</p>	<p>report back to the Board on further deliberations regarding the Board's concerns. The CCWG shall discuss the Board's concerns within 30 days of the Board's initiation of the dialogue.</p> <p>5. If a recommendation is modified through the CCWG, it is returned back to the Board for further consideration. The CCWG is to provide detailed rationale on how the modification addresses the concerns raised by the Board.</p> <p>6. If, after modification, the Board still believes the CCWG Recommendation is not in the global public interest to implement the CCWG Recommendation, the Board may send the item back to the CCWG for further consideration, again requiring a 2/3 vote of the Board for that action. Detailed rationale for the Board's action is again required. In the event the Board determines not to accept a modification, then the Board shall not be entitled to set a solution on the issue addressed by the recommendation until such time as CCWG and the Board reach agreement.</p> <p>The item is considered complete as of the Board's resolution of 16 October 2016.</p>
<p>ICANN51 Los Angeles Communique</p> <p>§6 Protection of Red Cross/Red Crescent Names</p> <p>(15 Oct 2014)</p>	<p>The GAC welcomes the decision of the New gTLD Program Committee (Resolution 2014.10.12.NG05) to provide temporary protections for the names of the International Committee of the Red Cross and International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, and the 189 National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. The GAC requests the ICANN Board and all relevant parties to work quickly to resolve the longer term issues still outstanding.</p>	<p>The NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to GAC Advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>As noted in the GAC's advice the NGPC took action to provide temporary protections for the names of the International Committee of the Red Cross and International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, and the 189 National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. The matter of permanent protections is an open item of advice. The GNSO Council approved recommendations from the expedited PDP on 20 November 2013 regarding protections for IGOs and INGOs, which included protections for certain identifiers associated with the Red Cross/Red Crescent (https://gns0.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#20131120-2). The GNSO forwarded its policy recommendations to the ICANN Board for further consideration. On 30 April 2014, the Board took action to adopt the GNSO policy recommendations that are not inconsistent with GAC Advice received by the Board on the topic of protections for certain identifiers of the Red Cross/Red Crescent (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-04-30-en#/2.a). With respect to the GNSO policy</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
		<p>recommendations that differ from the GAC Advice (including this item of GAC Advice) the Board requested additional time to consider them, and continues to facilitate discussions among the relevant parties to reconcile any remaining differences between the policy recommendations and the GAC advice on the topic (https://gac.icann.org/board-resolutions/public/board-resolution-annex-b-20140430.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1401266393000&api=v2). (To note, the GNSO policy recommends that instead of reserving the RCRC national society names as advised by the GAC, the names should be bulk added to the Trademark Clearinghouse.)</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's report of 7 October 2015.</p>
<p>ICANN51 Los Angeles Communique</p> <p>§7 WHOIS</p> <p>(15 Oct 2014)</p>	<p>The GAC notes that there are a wide range of WHOIS-related issues that have significant workload implications for both the GAC and the wider community. This includes: • Accuracy: Findings and Methodology from the Pilot Accuracy Report. • Conflicts with National Privacy Laws. • Privacy/Proxy Accreditation issues. • Implementation of Thick WHOIS. • GNSO PDP Working Group on Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information • Implementation of 2013 RAA requirements and the new gTLD Program. • Next steps for gTLD Directory Services Expert Working Group Report. The GAC requests a Road Map that identifies linkages and timelines between and among the above issues, in order to enable the GAC to collaborate with other parties to prioritize such work and rationalize timelines and deadlines.</p>	<p>The ICANN Board Chair provided written responses, including the requested roadmap, in a letter dated 22 January 2015: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-schneider-22jan15-en.pdf. The letter states:</p> <p>Following our discussion on 13 January 2014, we wish to provide you with responses to some of the GAC advice items raised in its Los Angeles Communiqué and discussed on the conference call. The attached document addresses GAC advice regarding implementation of WHOIS-related safeguards; security risks safeguard advice; the Public Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Process; and the WHOIS roadmap.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Chair's letter of 22 January 2015.</p>
<p>ICANN51 Los Angeles Communique</p>	<p>The GAC notes that new gTLD registry operators have submitted RSEP (Registry Service Evaluation Process) requests to</p>	<p>The Board considered this advice and the general topic of Introduction of Two-character Domain Names in the New gTLD Namespace on 16 October 2014 and took the following resolution:</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>§8 Release of 2-Character Names at the Second Level (15 Oct 2014)</p>	<p>ICANN in order to use two-character labels at the second level of their TLD. The GAC recognized that two-character second level domain names are in wide use across existing TLDs, and have not been the cause of any security, stability, technical or competition concerns. The GAC is not in a position to offer consensus advice on the use of two-character 8 second level domains names in new gTLD registry operations, including those combinations of letters that are also on the ISO 3166-1 alpha 2 list. In considering these RSEP requests, and consistent with the Applicant Guidebook, the GAC considers that the public comment period is an important transparency mechanism, and in addition asks that relevant governments be alerted by ICANN about these requests as they arise. The GAC will review the use of country and territory names at the second level and advise the ICANN Board in due course.</p>	<p>Resolved (2014.10.16.14), the proposed registry service for the release of two-character domains in the gTLD namespace does not create a reasonable risk of a meaningful adverse effect on security and stability, and the Board authorizes the President and CEO, or his designee(s), to develop and implement an efficient procedure for the release of two-character domains currently required to be reserved in the New gTLD Registry Agreement, taking into account the GAC's advice in the Los Angeles Communiqué.</p> <p>In its rationale for this resolution, the Board states "The Board is taking action at this time to direct the President and CEO to develop and implement an efficient process to permit the release of two-character names in New gTLDs, taking into account the GAC's advice in the Los Angeles Communiqué."</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's resolution of 16 October 2014.</p>
<p>ICANN51 Los Angeles Communique §9 Human Rights, International Law and ICANN (15 Oct 2014)</p>	<p>The GAC continued its discussions from the London meeting concerning possible application of human rights and international law to ICANN activities. The GAC will work inter-sessionally to assess a range of issues including legal considerations and the possible role of human rights considerations.</p>	<p>The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary. This item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 1 November 2017.</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>ICANN51 Los Angeles Communique</p> <p>§10 Accountability and Transparency</p> <p>(15 Oct 2014)</p>	<p>The GAC was briefed by the Board-GAC Recommendation Implementation Working Group (BGRI-WG) and agreed to specific ATRT2 Recommendations being progressed as follows: a. Development of a formal process for the Board to notify and request GAC advice (Recommendation 6.4) – Continue to seek comments on current processes and options for improvement, b. Bylaw changes to formally implement the documented process for Board- GAC Bylaws consultation developed by the BGRI-WG (Recommendation 6.5) – In its meeting with the ICANN Board, the GAC was advised that this will not proceed in its current form and will be subject to further consideration. c. The GAC to convene a High Level Meeting on a regular basis (Recommendation 6.7) – Continue to seek comments on guidelines for GAC High Level Governmental Meetings. The GAC also discussed the role of the GAC in the Nominating Committee in light of recommendations made by the recent report of the Board Working Group on Nominating Committee (NomCom). The GAC will continue consideration of this issue inter-sessionally with the aim of providing advice at the ICANN 52 meeting.</p>	<p>The Board reviewed this item and presented it as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 1 November 2017.</p>
<p>ICANN51 Los Angeles Communique</p> <p>§11</p>	<p>The GAC again convened a community session, led by the sub-group on geographic names of the working group on future gTLD issues, on protection of geographic names in future new gTLD</p>	<p>The Board reviewed this item and presented it as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 1 November 2017.</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
Protection of Geographic Names in gTLDs (15 Oct 2014)	application rounds. Community input is being sought, via the GAC website, until 31 October 2014. The GAC looks forward to working with the community on ways to coordinate efforts on this issue, including a community session to be held during the ICANN 52 meeting.	
ICANN51 Los Angeles Communique §12 GAC Open Forum (15 Oct 2014)	The GAC convened an open session for the community to inform about and exchange views on the GAC and its working methods, in accordance with Recommendation 6.1.a of the ATRT2 Report. Similar sessions were held at the London meeting and at the Internet Governance Forum in Istanbul.	The Board reviewed this item and presented it as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 1 November 2017.
ICANN51 Los Angeles Communique §2.a.I-V. Safeguard Advice Applicable to all new gTLDs and Category 1 (consumer protection, sensitive strings and regulated markets) and Category 2 (restricted registration policies) strings	a. The GAC strongly advises the ICANN Board to focus its attention on the following: i. Implementation of WHOIS Related-Safeguards: 1. Provide the GAC with a comprehensive scorecard indicating steps and timelines regarding all streams of work related to the WHOIS accuracy safeguard; 2. Complete the Pilot study on WHOIS accuracy, including assessment of identity validation, and share the findings in a timely manner for review at the ICANN 52 meeting; 3. Initiate steps towards Phase 3 (identity verification) of WHOIS, including undertaking a cost-benefit analysis of implementation options; and 4. Commit to defining the process to address and resolve inaccurate WHOIS records and respond to non-compliance reports. ii.	The NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to GAC Advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response in its scorecard: This GAC advice was the subject of an exchange between some members of the GAC and the NGPC. Following the exchange on 13 January 2014, the NGPC provided the GAC with responses in a 22 January 2105 letter (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-schneider-22jan15-en.pdf) to some of the GAC advice items raised in its Los Angeles Communique and discussed on the conference call regarding implementation of WHOIS-related safeguards; security risks safeguard advice; the Public Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Process; and the WHOIS roadmap. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's report of 7 October 2015.

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
(15 Oct 2014)	<p>Security Risks 1. Inform the GAC and provide GAC members an opportunity to contribute inter-sessionally about the ongoing consultation on the framework for Registries to respond to security risks; 2. Inform the GAC of the findings of this consultation no later than three weeks before the ICANN 52 meeting; and 3. Ensure an interim mechanism is in place to effectively respond to security risks. iii. Public Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Process 1. Modify the dispute resolution process to ensure that non-compliance is effectively and promptly addressed, in particular for cases requiring urgent action. iv. Verification and Validation of Credentials for Category 1 Strings Associated with Market Sectors with Clear and/or Regulated Entry Requirements 1. Reconsider the NGPC's determination not to require the verification and validation of credentials of registrants for the highly regulated Category 1 new gTLDs. The GAC believes that for the limited number of strings in highly regulated market sectors, the potential burdens are justified by the benefits to consumers; reconsider the requirement to consult with relevant authorities in case of doubt about the authenticity of credentials; and reconsider the requirement to conduct periodic post-registration checks to ensure that Registrants continue to possess valid credentials; and 2. Ensure the issues (verification/ validation; post- registration</p>	

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
	<p>checks; consultation with authorities) are addressed in the review process for any subsequent rounds of new gTLDs. v. Category 2 Safeguards: Ensuring Non-Discriminatory Registration Policies 1. Amend the PIC specification requirement for Category 2 new gTLDs to include a non-discriminatory requirement to provide registrants an avenue to seek redress for discriminatory policies.</p>	
<p>ICANN51 Los Angeles Communique</p> <p>§3.a.I-II. Reviews of First Round of New gTLDs and Preparation for Subsequent Rounds</p> <p>(15 Oct 2014)</p>	<p>The GAC advises the ICANN Board that:</p> <p>i. The review processes should be conducted and finalised before policy for the further gTLD rounds is developed and should include community--wide engagement on the issues of 6 communication to and access by developing countries and regions, and all aspects of the framework for community--based gTLDs. ii. Appropriate and realistic timeframes should be applied to the review processes to ensure that all lessons of the most recent round are captured, and to avoid further stressing the capacity of both ICANN and the community to do the necessary work.</p>	<p>The Board considered Planning for Future gTLD Application Rounds on 17 November 2014 and passed the following resolutions:</p> <p>Resolved (2014.11.17.11), the Board notes the effort in progress within the GNSO to identify areas where the GNSO believes that policy advice can be clarified or where it wishes to provide additional policy advice applicable to future application rounds, and looks forward to the results of this work, to ensure that key policy areas are addressed for future rounds.</p> <p>Resolved (2014.11.17.12), the Board notes that the GNSO has invited (http://gnso.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#201406) the NGPC to provide input to the GNSO Council to identify areas that may be appropriate for discussion for an evaluation of the current gTLD application round and for possible adjustments for subsequent application procedures. The Board appreciates the request and has identified, in addition to the GNSO analysis of the Applicant Guidebook and the current application round, a set of topics (included as Annex A https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-a-17nov14-en.pdf) that may be appropriate for discussion by the GNSO."</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's resolution of 17 November 2014.</p>
<p>ICANN51 Los Angeles Communique</p>	<p>The GAC has concerns about the consistency of the Community Priority Evaluation Process, following the rejection of a number of applications.</p>	<p>The NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to GAC Advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response in its scorecard:</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>§4.a.i. Community Priority Evaluation Process (15 Oct 2014)</p>	<p>There is a need to ensure that criteria for community priority treatment are applied consistently across the various applications. a. The GAC requests the ICANN Board: i. To look into this matter and urges the Board to examine the feasibility of implementing an appeal mechanism in the current round in case an applicant contests the decision of a community priority evaluation panel</p>	<p>In a 28 April 2015 letter, the NGPC responded to the GAC's advice concerning community priority evaluations (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-schneider-28apr15-en.pdf). The NGPC noted that at its 12 -14 October meeting, it took action to address perceived inconsistent and unreasonable Expert Determinations resulting from the New gTLD Program String Confusion Objections process. As part its rationale, the NGPC also considered whether it was appropriate to expand the scope of a proposed review mechanism to include other Expert Determinations, which could include the Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) Expert Determinations. The NGPC determined that to promote the goals of predictability and fairness, establishing a review mechanism more broadly may be more appropriate as part of future community discussions about subsequent rounds of the New gTLD Program. Applicants have already taken action in reliance on many of the Expert Determinations, including signing Registry Agreements, transitioning to delegation, withdrawing their applications, and requesting refunds. Allowing these actions to be undone now would not only delay consideration of all applications, but would raise issues of unfairness for those that have already acted in reliance on the Applicant Guidebook. The NGPC recommended that the development of rules and processes for future rounds of the New gTLD Program (to be developed through the multistakeholder process) should explore whether there is a need for a formal review process with respect to Expert Determinations more broadly, including CPE determinations.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's report of 7 October 2015.</p>
<p>ICANN52 Singapore Communique §3 Protection of Names and Acronyms for Red Cross/Red Crescent</p>	<p>The GAC welcomes the steps taken to implement the NGPC resolution adopted in Los Angeles on 12 October 2014. The GAC reiterates its advice to the Board to pursue its consultations in order to confirm permanent protection of the Red Cross and Red Crescent terms and names in the current and future new gTLD rounds.</p>	<p>The NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to GAC Advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>As noted in the GAC's advice the NGPC took action to provide temporary protections for the names of the International Committee of the Red Cross and International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, and the 189 National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. The matter of permanent protections is an open item of advice. The GNSO Council approved recommendations from the expedited PDP on 20 November 2013 regarding protections for IGOs and INGOs, which included protections for certain</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
(11 Feb 2015)		<p>identifiers associated with the Red Cross/Red Crescent (https://gnso.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#20131120-2). The GNSO forwarded its policy recommendations to the ICANN Board for further consideration. On 30 April 2014, the Board took action to adopt the GNSO policy recommendations that are not inconsistent with GAC Advice received by the Board on the topic of protections for certain identifiers of the Red Cross/Red Crescent (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-04-30-en#/2.a). With respect to the GNSO policy recommendations that differ from the GAC Advice (including this item of GAC Advice) the Board requested additional time to consider them, and continues to facilitate discussions among the relevant parties to reconcile any remaining differences between the policy recommendations and the GAC advice on the topic (https://gac.icann.org/board-resolutions/public/board-resolution-annex-b-20140430.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1401266393000&api=v2). (To note, the GNSO policy recommends that instead of reserving the RCRC national society names as advised by the GAC, the names should be bulk added to the Trademark Clearinghouse.)</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's report of 7 October 2015.</p>
<p>ICANN52 Singapore Communique</p> <p>§4 Framework of Interpretation Working Group (FOIWG) Report</p> <p>(11 Feb 2015)</p>	<p>The GAC notes the work of the ccNSO FOIWG, and its efforts to provide interpretive clarity to RFC1591. The GAC welcomes the FOIWG's recognition that, consistent with the GAC's 2005 Principles, the ultimate authority on public policy issues relating to ccTLDs is the relevant government. As such, nothing in the FOIWG report should be read to limit or constrain applicable law and governmental decisions, or the IANA operator's ability to act in line with a request made by the relevant government.</p>	<p>The Board considered this advice and the general topic of the Adoption of the Framework of Interpretation for ccTLD Delegations and Redelegations on 25 June 2014 and took the following resolutions:</p> <p>Resolved (2015.06.25.07), the Board directs the President and CEO, or his designee(s), to develop an implementation plan for the recommendations for community consideration through a public comment, and to implement the plan when finalized.</p> <p>Resolved (2015.06.25.08), the Board requests the ccNSO to appoint as soon as possible a small advisory team of subject matter experts to remain available to assist ICANN staff on implementation questions that arise during the development of the implementation plan, and inform ICANN of the appointments.</p> <p>In its Rationale for Resolutions 2015.06.25.07 – 2015.06.25.08 the Board: "Based on its mandate the Framework of Interpretation Working Group (FOIWG) developed a framework of interpretation of current policy, to provide</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
		<p>"a clear guide to IANA and the ICANN Board" on how ICANN is expected to interpret the current policies in its day-to-day operations. The work of the FOIWG resulted in a set of recommendations determined by the working group to be needed to provide clarity to ICANN's processes. The Board is ratifying these recommendations now, following adoption of the recommendations by the ccNSO Council and non-objection from the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC), and the formal communication of the recommendations to the Board in March 2015."</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration and resolution 25 June 2015.</p>
<p>ICANN52 Singapore Communique</p> <p>§5 Accountability and Transparency</p> <p>(11 Feb 2015)</p>	<p>The GAC will write to the Board, before the Buenos Aires meeting, providing details of progress on implementing relevant ATRT2 Recommendations, including those that are completed.</p>	<p>The Board reviewed this item and presented it as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 1 November 2017.</p>
<p>ICANN52 Singapore Communique</p> <p>§6 WHOIS</p> <p>(11 Feb 2015)</p>	<p>The GAC notes the receipt of a comprehensive briefing provided by the Board on the wide range of WHOIS-related activities currently underway across ICANN and the community.</p>	<p>The Board provided a comprehensive response to GAC advice from the ICANN51 (Los Angeles) meeting addressing WHOIS-related safeguards; security risks safeguard advice; the Public Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Process; and the WHOIS roadmap (see https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-schneider-22jan15-en.pdf)</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's response of 22 January 2015.</p>
<p>ICANN52 Singapore Communique</p> <p>§9</p>	<p>The GAC decided to establish a Working Group on Human Rights Issues and the Application of International Law as these matters relate to ICANN activities. The GAC will also monitor community</p>	<p>The Board reviewed this item and presented it as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 1 November 2017.</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
International Law, Human Rights and ICANN (11 Feb 2015)	developments and consider how any GAC initiatives can complement any such developments.	
ICANN52 Singapore Communique §10 Public Safety and Law Enforcement (11 Feb 2015)	The GAC agreed to establish a Working Group on Public Safety and Law Enforcement.	The Board reviewed this item and presented it as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 1 November 2017.
ICANN52 Singapore Communique §1.a.i - 1.d.i. Safeguards Advice Applicable to all new gTLDs and Category 1 (consumer protection, sensitive strings and regulated markets) and Category 2 (restricted registration policies) strings (11 Feb 2015)	a. The GAC urges the NGPC to: i. publicly recognize these commitments as setting a best practices standard that all Registries involved with such strings should strive to meet. In addition, b. The GAC recommends: i. that ICANN suggest to those Registries for which such commitments have not yet been taken and for which contracts have already been signed with ICANN, that they review means and ways of introducing such provisions in view of the public policy concerns. This could also help to raise confidence in Internet-based commerce. c. The GAC urges the NGPC to: i. consider refining the PICDRP and/or to consider developing a “fast track” process for regulatory authorities, government agencies, and law enforcement to work with ICANN contract compliance to effectively respond to issues involving	The NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to GAC Advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response in its scorecard: On 28 April 2015, the NGPC provided a response to the GAC regarding its advice about verification and validation of strings representing highly regulated sectors (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-schneider-28apr15-en.pdf). As noted in the response, the NGPC informed the GAC that discussions are taking place within the ICANN community regarding the possible establishment of a “Trust Mark” that would provide consumers with certification that the credentials or licenses of a registrant in a highly regulated sector have been validated and verified. It would: (a) reward those who engage in “best practices” by verifying and validating credentials; and (b) help consumers differentiate between those websites for which credentials have been verified and validated and those for which they have not. With respect to developing a “fast track” PICDRP for regulatory authorities, government agencies, and law enforcement, in the 28 April 2015 correspondence noted above, ICANN committed that it will acknowledge complaints submitted by governments and consumer protection agencies within two business days. ICANN further committed that complaints that appear to be wellfounded will be handled expediently, regardless of the source

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
	<p>serious risks of harm to the public. Finally, with regard to the GAC's Beijing Category 2 advice, d. The GAC urges the NGPC to:</p> <p>i. provide greater clarity as to the mechanisms for redress in the event registrants believe they have been unduly discriminated against.</p>	<p>of the complaint, and will commit to expedite processing of complaints based on factors such as the severity of the alleged breach and the harm that may result. With respect to the request to provide greater clarity regarding the mechanisms for redress in the event registrants believe they have been unduly discriminated against, the NGPC provided written clarification to the GAC in a 11 June 2015 letter (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-schneider-11jun15-en.pdf).</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's report of 7 October 2015.</p>
<p>ICANN52 Singapore Communique</p> <p>§7.a.i - 7.b.i Release of Two- Letter Codes and Country Names at the Second Level</p> <p>(11 Feb 2015)</p>	<p>a. The GAC advises the Board to: i. amend the current process for requests to release two-letter codes to establish an effective notification mechanism, so that relevant governments can be alerted as requests are initiated. Comments from relevant governments should be fully considered. b. The GAC further advises the Board to: i. extend the comment period to 60 days. These changes should be implemented before proceeding with pending and future requests. A list of GAC Members who intend to agree to all requests and do not require notification will be published on the GAC website.</p>	<p>The Board considered this advice item on 12 February 2015 and took the following resolution:</p> <p>Resolved (2015.02.12.16), the Board accepts the advice of the GAC from the 11 February 2015 GAC Communiqué regarding the release of two-letter codes at the second level in gTLDs. The Board directs the President and CEO, or his designee(s), to revise the Authorization Process for Release of Two-Character ASCII Labels and proceed immediately as follows: • Implement improvements to the process to alert relevant governments when requests are initiated. Comments from relevant governments will be fully considered. • For new requests, the comment period will be for 60 days. • For requests with pending or completed comment periods, extend or re-open the comment period so that each request will undergo 60 days of comment period in total.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's resolution of 12 February 2015.</p>
<p>ICANN52 Singapore Communique</p> <p>§8.a.i. Country and Territory Names</p> <p>(11 Feb 2015)</p>	<p>The GAC advises the Board that ICANN should work with the GAC to develop a public database to streamline the process for the release of country and territory names at the second level, as outlined in Specification 5. The database will inform whether individual GAC Members intend to agree to all requests, review them case by case, or not agree to any. The</p>	<p>The Board considered this advice item on 18 May 2017 and the general topic of Responding to Registry Operator Requests and GAC Advice Regarding the Release of Second-Level Country and Territory Names in New gTLDs and took the following resolution:</p> <p>Resolved (2017.05.18.09), the President and CEO, or his designee(s), is directed to take all steps necessary to grant ICANN approvals for the release of country and territory names at the second-level to the extent the relevant government has indicated its approval in the GAC's database.</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
	absence of input from a government will not be considered as agreement.	<p>Resolved (2017.05.18.10), the President and CEO, or his designee(s), is directed to continue to engage with the GAC to (1) collaborate on possible enhancements to the GAC database to document approvals for the release of country and territory names at the second-level, (2) to periodically remind GAC members to update or offer their determination within the GAC's database, and (3) report back to the Board if there is support for a different approach to generally release the second-level country and territory names.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's resolution of 18 May 2017.</p>
<p>ICANN53 Buenos Aires Communique</p> <p>§2 Protection for Inter-Governmental Organisations (IGOs)</p> <p>(24 Jun 2015)</p>	<p>Consistent with previous GAC advice in previous Communiqués regarding protection for IGO names and acronyms at the top and second levels, the GAC takes note of the progress made by the informal “small group” towards developing mechanisms in line with previous GAC advice, and calls upon the small group to meet in the near term with a view towards developing a concrete proposal for these mechanisms before the next ICANN meetings in Dublin; and welcomes the preventative protections that remain in place until the implementation of permanent mechanisms for protection of IGO names and acronyms at the top and second levels.</p>	<p>On 18 October 2015 the NGPC considered the Abu Dhabi Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>On 16 July 2015, the “small group” of representatives of IGOs, the GAC and the NGPC met and outlined a draft proposal for dealing with the protection of IGO acronyms (the “Proposal”). The Proposal will be circulated to the GAC and the GNSO for review and consideration. As previously discussed, on 30 April 2014 the Board took action requesting additional time to consider certain GNSO consensus policy recommendations that differ from advice from the GAC to the Board with respect to protections for IGO names and acronyms, among other things. Subject to additional input received from the relevant parties about the Proposal, it is anticipated that the Board will need to consider whether or not to adopt the Proposal and to address any remaining open consensus policy recommendations from the GNSO on the topic.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 18 October 2015.</p>
<p>ICANN53 Buenos Aires Communique</p> <p>§3 Accountability and Transparency Review Team 2</p>	<p>The GAC confirmed the status of its implementation of GAC-related ATRT2 recommendations as conveyed to the Board in its letter of 8 May 2015, noting that work in several areas is ongoing as a process of continuous improvement. With regard to recommendation 6.8, the GAC agreed on guidelines for engaging governments and for coordination</p>	<p>The Board reviewed this item and presented it as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 1 November 2017.</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
(ATRT2) (24 Jun 2015)	between the GAC and the ICANN Global Stakeholder Engagement staff.	
ICANN53 Buenos Aires Communique §4 Community Priority Evaluation (24 Jun 2015)	The GAC continues to keep under review the community application process for new gTLDs, noting that it does not appear to have met applicant expectations. The GAC looks forward to seeing the report of the ICANN Ombudsman on this matter following his current inquiry and will review the situation at its meeting in Dublin.	<p>On 18 October 2015 the NGPC considered the Abu Dhabi Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The NGPC acknowledges that the GAC continues to keep under review the community application process for new gTLDs. As alluded to by the GAC, at the 20 January 2015 meeting of the ICANN Board Governance Committee (BGC), the BGC authorized the Ombudsman to proceed with his “own motion” investigation regarding issues of fairness around the transparency of the Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) process and applicants’ ability to provide materials to the panel conducting the CPE process. The NGPC notes that the Ombudsman published his report on 13 October 2015, which is available for review at the following: https://omblog.icann.org/.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 18 October 2015.</p>
ICANN53 Buenos Aires Communique §1.a.i. gTLD Safeguards (24 Jun 2015)	The GAC recommends that the NGPC create a list of commended public interest commitment (PIC) examples related to verification and validation of credentials for domains in highly regulated sectors to serve as a model. These public interest commitments could demonstrate a best practice for other gTLD registry operators. For example the PIC for .bank appears to have taken steps to provide confidence to consumers that they can rely on the bona fide of the Registrants listed. Relevant stakeholders should be identified and encouraged to devise a set of PICs that work well for the protection of public interests in each of the new gTLDs related to highly regulated sectors.	<p>On 18 October 2015 the NGPC considered the Abu Dhabi Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>ICANN is in the process of creating a list of the Public Interest Commitments (PICs) included the Registry Agreements for the TLDs associated with “highly regulated” industries as identified in the NGPC’s implementation framework of the GAC’s Category 1 Safeguard advice (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-new-gtld-annex-2-05feb14-en.pdf). ICANN anticipates publishing this information on its website. Additionally, the NGPC acknowledges that various industry-led efforts are currently underway to establish a set of initiatives and best practices regarding registry standards of behaviour in online operations. Industry-led initiatives have focused on using a form of “trust mark” that signals to endusers that the website they are engaging with has been vetted by impartial, independent third party evaluators. The NGPC continues to monitor the progress being made in the community on these matters. With respect to identifying relevant stakeholders and encouraging them to devise a set of PICs that work well for</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
		<p>the protection of public interests in new gTLDs related to “highly regulated” sectors, the NGPC notes that on 30 September 2015, the NGPC sent to the GNSO and the ALAC a proposal from a community member to establish a highly regulated string PICs review committee. In that letter, the NGPC noted that consistent with ICANN’s bottom-up multistakeholder model, the proposal might be considered by the GNSO and the ALAC.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 18 October 2015.</p>
<p>ICANN53 Buenos Aires Communique</p> <p>§1.b.i. gTLD Safeguards</p> <p>(24 Jun 2015)</p>	<p>The GAC additionally recommends that the ICANN community creates a harmonised methodology to assess the number of abusive domain names within the current exercise of assessment of the new gTLD program.</p>	<p>On 18 October 2015 the NGPC considered the Abu Dhabi Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>OThe NGPC notes that the ICANN community is considering the issue of abusive domain names as part of the current exercise of assessing the New gTLD Program. Specifically, as part of its Affirmation of Commitments (https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/affirmation-of-commitments-2009-09-30-en) with the U.S. Department of Commerce, ICANN has committed to conducting a regular review of how the New gTLD Program has impacted competition, consumer choice and consumer trust in the Domain Name System. The Competition, Consumer Choice and Consumer Trust (CCT) Review is comprised of metrics recommended by an Implementation Advisory Group, and adopted by the Board. These metrics include, but are not limited to, the items below related to abusive domain names: • Number of reported data security breaches. • Quantity and relative incidence of Domain Takedowns. • Quantity and relative incidence of spam from domains in new gTLDs, and relative incidence of fraudulent transactions caused by phishing sites in new gTLDs. • Quantity and relative incidence of detected phishing sites using new gTLDs. • Quantity and relative incidence of detected botnets and malware distributed using new gTLDs, and incidence of sites found to be dealing in or distributing identities and account information used in identity fraud. • Number of complaints to police agencies alleging fraud or misrepresentation based on – or traced to – domain names.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 18 October 2015.</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>ICANN53 Buenos Aires Communique</p> <p>§1.b.II. gTLD Safeguards</p> <p>(24 Jun 2015)</p>	<p>The GAC additionally recommends that the NGPC clarifies its acceptance or rejection of Safeguard advice. It would be useful to develop a straightforward scorecard on all elements of GAC Safeguard advice since the Beijing 2013 GAC Communiqué in order to clarify what elements of GAC advice have been implemented, what remains a work in progress, and what has not been accepted for Implementation. In any instances of complete or partial rejection of the Advice, the GAC urges the NGPC to clarify the milestones intended to be followed in order to seek a potentially “mutually acceptable solution” as mandated by ICANN’s Bylaws.</p>	<p>On 18 October 2015 the NGPC considered the Abu Dhabi Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The NGPC has prepared an overall summary scorecard outlining the elements of the GAC’s safeguard advice since the April 2013 Beijing Communiqué, and the actions that the NGPC has taken to address the safeguard advice. The summary scorecard, which is titled “GAC Safeguard Advice re: the New gTLD Program (18 October 2015)” is provided at the following: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-new-gtld-annex-2-18oct15-en.pdf</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 18 October 2015.</p>
<p>ICANN54 Dublin Communique</p> <p>§1.a.I. gTLD Safeguards: Current Round</p> <p>(21 Oct 2015)</p>	<p>The GAC advises and urges the Board to develop and adopt a harmonized methodology for reporting to the ICANN community the levels and persistence of abusive conduct (e.g., malware, botnets, phishing, pharming, piracy, trademark and/or copyright infringement, counterfeiting, fraudulent or deceptive practices and other illegal conduct) that have occurred in the rollout of the new gTLD program.</p>	<p>On 3 February 2016 the Board considered the Dublin Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board accepts this advice and notes the ongoing work of the community, including the GAC, on developing a framework to help guide Registry Operators as they implement the requirement in the New gTLD Registry Agreement to “periodically conduct a technical analysis to assess whether domains in the TLD are being used to perpetrate security threats, such as pharming, phishing, malware, and botnets. Registry Operator will maintain statistical reports on the number of security threats identified and the actions taken as a result of the periodic security checks. Registry Operator will maintain these reports for the term of the Agreement unless a shorter period is required by law or approved by ICANN, and will provide them to ICANN upon request.” To this end, a Framework Drafting Team was formed in July 2015. It is composed of 44 representatives from the GAC PSWG (9), Registries (30) and Registrars (5). The Registries and Registrars produced the first draft of a best practices Framework for the Drafting Team to review and provide feedback. In the spirit of mutual agreement, the group is working collaboratively together to with the view to ultimately publish a final draft</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
		<p>Framework for public comment. The next steps are for the Drafting Team to discuss feedback, and once provided, and it is anticipated the Drafting Team will have an in person meeting during ICANN 55. Additionally, in the 18 October 2015 iteration of the GAC-NGPC Scorecard, the NGPC noted that the ICANN community is considering the issue of abusive domain names as part of the current exercise of assessing the New gTLD Program (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-new-gtld-annex-1-18oct15-en.pdf). The Scorecard lists the various reviews and metrics where this matter is being analyzed.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 3 February 2016.</p>
<p>ICANN54 Dublin Communique</p> <p>§2.a.i. Future gTLD Rounds</p> <p>(21 Oct 2015)</p>	<p>The GAC advises the Board that before defining the modalities for future rounds, a rigorous assessment of all public policy related aspects of the current round should be undertaken, taking into account the advice given by the GAC on this subject since the beginning of the New gTLD process, including advice relating to community-wide engagement on the issues of communication to and access by developing countries and regions; and advice regarding past policy decisions taken by the Board to reserve the Red Cross and Red Crescent designations and names.</p>	<p>On 3 February 2016 the Board considered the Dublin Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board accepts this advice and acknowledges that as part of the reviews and activities related to evaluating the New gTLD Program, there is an opportunity for rigorous assessment of the public policy related aspects of the current round of the Program. There are a number of reviews currently underway including, but not limited to, Rights Protection reviews, Program Implementation reviews, and Economic studies. Additionally, on 23 December 2015, ICANN announced the individuals selected to serve on the team that will review the New gTLD Program in relation to competition, consumer trust and consumer choice (CCT) as called for by ICANN's Affirmation of Commitments signed with the U.S. Department of Commerce. While there is a not a separate Public Policy review contemplated as part of the New gTLD Program reviews, the Board notes that public policy matters often arise in the discussion and analysis of specific topics, and are therefore considered an analyzed in the reports. The current status of all of the ongoing reviews is available here: https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/reviews. The Board stands ready to receive input and advice from the GAC on public policy related aspects matters of Program reviews, in particular, as they relate to concerns of governments, particularly matters where there may be an interaction between ICANN's policies and various laws and international agreements or where they may affect public policy issues (see ICANN Bylaws Art. XI, Sec. 2.1.a: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance/bylaws-en/#XI).</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
		<p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 3 February 2016.</p>
<p>ICANN54 Dublin Communique</p> <p>§3.a.I. Protection for IGOs</p> <p>(21 Oct 2015)</p>	<p>The GAC advises the Board to facilitate the timely conclusion of discussions of the “small group” and the NGPC in an effort to resolve the issue of IGO protections.</p>	<p>On 3 February 2016 the Board considered the Dublin Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>On 16 July 2015, the “small group” of representatives of IGOs, the GAC and the NGPC met and outlined a draft proposal for dealing with the protection of IGO acronyms (the “Proposal”). The Proposal is under review and will be circulated to the GAC and the GNSO for review and consideration. As previously discussed, on 30 April 2014 the Board took action requesting additional time to consider certain GNSO consensus policy recommendations that differ from advice from the GAC to the Board with respect to protections for IGO names and acronyms, among other things. Subject to additional input received from the relevant parties about the Proposal, it is anticipated that the Board will need to consider whether or not to adopt the Proposal and to address any remaining open consensus policy recommendations from the GNSO on the topic.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 3 February 2016.</p>
<p>ICANN54 Dublin Communique</p> <p>§4.a.I - 4.a.IV. Community Priority Evaluation</p> <p>(21 Oct 2015)</p>	<p>The GAC advises the Board that: i. the GAC reiterates previously expressed concerns that the Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) process has not met the expectations of applicants and notes that all the successful applications are currently the subject of dispute resolution procedures; ii. the GAC expects the current specific problems faced by individual applicants to be resolved without any unreasonable delay, and in a manner in which justified community interests are best served; iii. the GAC notes possibly unforeseen consequences</p>	<p>On 3 February 2016 the Board considered the Dublin Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board acknowledges that the GAC continues to keep under review the community application process for new gTLDs. At the 20 January 2015 meeting of the ICANN Board Governance Committee (BGC), the BGC authorized the Ombudsman to proceed with his “own motion” investigation regarding issues of fairness around the transparency of the Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) process and applicants’ ability to provide materials to the panel conducting the CPE process. The Ombudsman published his report on 13 October 2015, which is available for review at the following: https://omblog.icann.org/. Additionally, the Board notes that it previously provided input to the GNSO on suggested areas for possible policy development for subsequent rounds of the New gTLD Program. In its 24</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
	<p>for community applicants of recourse by competing applicants to other accountability mechanisms; and the specific challenges faced by some community applicants in auctions when in competition with commercial applicants; iv. the GAC will take into account the final report of the ICANN Ombudsman on this issue when preparing the GAC's input into the GNSO's review of issues for improving procedures relating to community--based applications in the next gTLD round; and the Competition, Trust and Consumer Choice Review (CCT) under the Affirmation of Commitments.</p>	<p>November 2014 letter to the GNSO, the Board identified CPE and community applications as a topic that the Board believes would be appropriate for discussion in an evaluation of the current gTLD application around and for possible adjustments for subsequent application procedures (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-robinson-24nov14-en.pdf). The Board notes that the Preliminary Issue Report on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures (31 August 2015; https://gnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/filefield_48041/subsequent-procedures-prelim-issue-31aug15-en.pdf) includes a discussion of community applications, taking note of the concerns raised by the GAC in various Communiqués. The Preliminary Issue Report is a precursor to the GNSO considering whether or not to undertake a policy development process. (See Section 4.4.5 of the Preliminary Issues Report). At its 17 December 2015 meeting, the GNSO Council adopted a resolution to initiate a PDP to consider and analyze issues discussed in the Final Issue Report on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 3 February 2016.</p>
<p>ICANN54 Dublin Communique</p> <p>§5.a.i. - 5.c.II.</p> <p>Use of 2-letter Country Codes and Country Names at the Second Level</p> <p>(21 Oct 2015)</p>	<p>The GAC reiterates its advice on this issue and a. advises the Board that: i. comments submitted by the relevant Governments be fully considered regardless of the grounds for objection. b. The GAC further advises the Board to: i. be mindful of governments' capacity limitations and asks the Board to facilitate simplification of the process for providing comments to address their concerns. c. With respect to new requests for release, the GAC advises the Board to: i. task ICANN to work with the GAC Secretariat to address the technical issues with comment forms and in the interim ii. offer alternative means for comments.</p>	<p>On 3 February 2016 the Board considered the Dublin Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board has concerns with the GAC advice noting that the two-character comments consideration process launched on 6 October "is not consistent with GAC advice which recommended that governments' comments be fully considered." The process (https://www.icann.org/resources/two-character-labels-archive) for evaluating comments states, "Comments will be reviewed and considered by ICANN in determining whether to authorize the release of requested Letter/Letter Two-Character ASCII Labels. ICANN will evaluate comments in light of the standard in the registry agreement..." Since the standard established in the registry agreement is confusion with the corresponding country code, comments will be evaluated against such standard. Comments not pertaining to confusion might be directed to other recourse mechanisms outside of the Authorization Process, such as the registry Abuse Point of Contact. The Board would like to clarify that all</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
		<p>comments from relevant governments are fully considered under the current process. The Board has also taken into consideration input from the Registry Stakeholder Group expressed in its 9 November 2015 letter to the Board (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/diaz-to-crocker-09nov15-en.pdf). As part of ICANN's consideration of submitted comments, staff has performed outreach to governments to seek clarification of comments previously submitted. This further demonstrates ICANN's ongoing consideration of comments received, regardless of the grounds for the comment. The Board stands ready to hear from the GAC if it has a different understanding or specific concerns about comments being "fully considered". With respect to governments' capacity limitations and working with the GAC Secretariat to address the technical issues with comment forms, the Board notes that staff held multiple webinars with members of the GAC to work through these issues and governments are continuing to submit comments via the Authorization Process.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 3 February 2016.</p>
<p>ICANN54 Dublin Communique</p> <p>§6.a.i. Visas</p> <p>(21 Oct 2015)</p>	<p>The GAC advises the Board that it should investigate options for optimising visa approval procedures, including appropriate liaison in advance with the national government of the country hosting the meeting; and that the GAC is available to assist in this regard.</p>	<p>Each meetings page now outlines a guide to visa requirements and preparations necessary for country of meeting. This item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 1 November 2017.</p>
<p>ICANN55 Marrakech Communique</p> <p>§1.a.i - 1.b.i. Future gTLDs Rounds: Public Policy Issues</p> <p>(9 Mar 2016)</p>	<p>a. The GAC therefore reiterates previous advice to the Board to: I. ensure that a proper assessment of all relevant aspects of the new gTLD program is made, taking into account feedback from all stakeholders, and that development of future rounds should be based on the conclusions of this assessment. b. The GAC advises the Board to: I. give particular priority to awareness raising in,</p>	<p>The Board reviewed this item and presented it as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 1 November 2017.</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
	and facilitating applications from, underserved regions.	
<p>ICANN55 Marrakech Communique</p> <p>§2.a.i. Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Issues</p> <p>(9 Mar 2016)</p>	<p>The GAC advises the Board to allow sufficient time for GAC consideration of possible advice on these important public policy issues and requests that the Board meets with the GAC prior to considering adoption of the Privacy Proxy Services Accreditation Issues PDP Final Report. The ICANN 56 meeting would be an appropriate opportunity to consider these issues further.</p>	<p>The Board considered this advice item on 15 May 2016 and the general topic of GNSO Policy Recommendations concerning the Accreditation of Privacy and Proxy Services and took the following resolutions: Resolved (2016.05.15.07), the Board thanks the GNSO for completing the Board-requested Policy Development Process (PDP) and acknowledges receipt of the PDP Final Report and the GNSO Council's Recommendations Report concerning the final PDP recommendations. Resolved (2016.05.15.08), the Board identifies that more time is required to consider the final PDP recommendations, including time for the provision and consideration of GAC advice, if any will be provided. The Board anticipates taking further action on the recommendations at the first Board meeting following the ICANN56 Public Meeting in Helsinki, Finland.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's resolution of 15 May 2016.</p>
<p>ICANN55 Marrakech Communique</p> <p>§3.a.i. Work scheduling and workload management</p> <p>(9 Mar 2016)</p>	<p>The GAC advises the Board to I. facilitate an exchange at ICANN 56 between all the SOs and ACs regarding how work requiring community input is scheduled and managed by the respective SO and AC communities, particularly for issues of broad interest across the community as a whole. The GAC considers that a joint SO/AC review will permit the Board to better assess the level of concurrent work the community can manage. This exchange should include consideration of: i. how different community priorities are balanced; and ii. how this process can maximise community participation in policy development processes.</p>	<p>The Board reviewed this item and presented it as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 1 November 2017.</p>
<p>ICANN56 Helsinki Communique</p>	<p>The GAC advises the ICANN Board that the starting point for development of policy on further releases of new gTLDs</p>	<p>On 28 October 2016 the ICANN Board Chair wrote to the GAC Chair to inform the GAC of the Board's delay in providing a formal response to the Helsinki Communique due to the considerable effort required to complete the IANA</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>§1.a.i. Future gTLDs Policies and Procedures</p> <p>(30 Jun 2016)</p>	<p>should first take into consideration the results of all relevant reviews of the new gTLD round and determine which aspects and elements need adjustment.</p>	<p>transition. (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-schneider-28oct16-en.pdf) On 13 December 2016 the Board considered the Helsinki Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board accepts the advice and continues to monitor the work of the community regarding reviews of the current round of the New gTLD Program and the policy development work for subsequent rounds of the New gTLD Program. The Board notes that it does not control the timing of the work of the community.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 13 December 2016.</p>
<p>ICANN56 Helsinki Communique</p> <p>§1.a.i.a. Future gTLDs Policies and Procedures</p> <p>(30 Jun 2016)</p>	<p>Requirements with regard to interoperability, security, stability and resiliency should be met.</p>	<p>On 28 October 2016 the ICANN Board Chair wrote to the GAC Chair to inform the GAC of the Board's delay in providing a formal response to the Helsinki Communique due to the considerable effort required to complete the IANA transition. (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-schneider-28oct16-en.pdf) On 13 December 2016 the Board considered the Helsinki Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board accepts this advice. The Board expects that requirements with regard to interoperability, security, stability and resiliency will be the subject of discussion building up to subsequent rounds of the New gTLD Program. The Board encourages the GAC to continue to participate in these discussions. While the Board will not propose the requirements as these must come from the community, the Board will share with the GAC the report on how these requirements will be met.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 13 December 2016.</p>
<p>ICANN56 Helsinki Communique</p> <p>§1.a.i.b. Future gTLDs</p>	<p>An objective and independent analysis of costs and benefits should be conducted beforehand, drawing on experience with and outcomes from the recent round.</p>	<p>On 28 October 2016 the ICANN Board Chair wrote to the GAC Chair to inform the GAC of the Board's delay in providing a formal response to the Helsinki Communique due to the considerable effort required to complete the IANA transition. (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-schneider-28oct16-en.pdf) On 13 December 2016 the Board considered the Helsinki Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
Policies and Procedures (30 Jun 2016)		<p>The Board accepts the advice, noting that the Board is not in a position to manage the content and timeline of the ongoing community reviews. Board recognizes that the CCT Review Team is concluding its work and understands that the Review Team is looking at the issues noted in the GAC’s advice, and such recommendations from the Review Team could be incorporated into the policy development work on subsequent rounds of the New gTLD Program.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 13 December 2016.</p>
ICANN56 Helsinki Communique §1.a.i.c. Future gTLDs Policies and Procedures (30 Jun 2016)	There should be an agreed policy and administrative framework that is supported by all stakeholders.	<p>On 28 October 2016 the ICANN Board Chair wrote to the GAC Chair to inform the GAC of the Board's delay in providing a formal response to the Helsinki Communique due to the considerable effort required to complete the IANA transition. (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-schneider-28oct16-en.pdf) On 13 December 2016 the Board considered the Helsinki Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board accepts this advice and will follow the process established in the ICANN Bylaws concerning the policy development process. As provided in Section 12.2 of the Bylaws, “The Board shall notify the Chair of the Governmental Advisory Committee in a timely manner of any proposal raising public policy issues on which it or any of the Supporting Organizations or Advisory Committees seeks public comment, and shall take duly into account any timely response to that notification prior to taking action.”</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 13 December 2016.</p>
ICANN56 Helsinki Communique §1.a.ii. Future gTLDs Policies and Procedures	All measures available to the Board should be used to ensure that a comprehensive and measured approach to further releases of new gTLDs is taken in a logical, sequential and coordinated way rather than through parallel and overlapping efforts and/or timeframes that	<p>On 28 October 2016 the ICANN Board Chair wrote to the GAC Chair to inform the GAC of the Board's delay in providing a formal response to the Helsinki Communique due to the considerable effort required to complete the IANA transition. (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-schneider-28oct16-en.pdf) On 13 December 2016 the Board considered the Helsinki Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board accepts this advice while noting that the Board is not in position to</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
(30 Jun 2016)	may not be agreed by all relevant interests.	<p>manage the community timeline. The Board will of course share the GAC's advice with the community as appropriate. The Board is consulting with the GNSO regarding the work plan and timeline for the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group (WG), as the Board agrees it would be helpful to understand whether the GNSO believes that the entirety of the current New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP must be completed prior to advancing a new application process for new gTLDs. The GNSO responded to the Board's enquiry by letter on 16 August and 25 October, including a synthesis of responses gathered from various GNSO Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies, and the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 13 December 2016.</p>
<p>ICANN56 Helsinki Communique</p> <p>§2.a.I-II. Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Issues</p> <p>(30 Jun 2016)</p>	<p>The GAC advises the ICANN Board that:</p> <p>I. the recommendations set forth by the GNSO PDP Working Group on Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Issues (PPSAI) raise important public policy issues highlighted by the GAC in its comments on the PPSAI's Initial Report.</p> <p>II. the Board should ensure that the dialogue on constructive and effective ways to address GAC concerns is continued.</p>	<p>On 28 October 2016 the ICANN Board Chair wrote to the GAC Chair to inform the GAC of the Board's delay in providing a formal response to the Helsinki Communique due to the considerable effort required to complete the IANA transition. (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-schneider-28oct16-en.pdf) On 13 December 2016 the Board considered the Helsinki Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board accepts this advice and will continue to encourage dialogue on constructive ways to address GAC concerns as the policy implementation continues.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 13 December 2016.</p>
<p>ICANN56 Helsinki Communique</p> <p>§2.a.III-IV. Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation</p>	<p>III. if the Board resolves to adopt the PPSAI recommendations, it should direct the Implementation Review Team (IRT) to ensure that the GAC concerns are effectively addressed in the implementation phase to the greatest extent possible. IV. GAC input and feedback should be sought out as</p>	<p>On 28 October 2016 the ICANN Board Chair wrote to the GAC Chair to inform the GAC of the Board's delay in providing a formal response to the Helsinki Communique due to the considerable effort required to complete the IANA transition. (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-schneider-28oct16-en.pdf) On 13 December 2016 the Board considered the Helsinki Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board accepts this advice. The Board notes that members of the Public</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>Issues (30 Jun 2016)</p>	<p>necessary in developing a proposed implementation plan, including through participation of the Public Safety Working Group on the Implementation Review Team.</p>	<p>Safety Working Group have joined the Implementation Review Team, and the Board encourages the Implementation Review Team to continue to work with the Public Safety Working Group to address the concerns expressed by the GAC regarding accreditation of privacy/proxy service providers.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 13 December 2016.</p>
<p>ICANN56 Helsinki Communique §2.a.V. Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Issues (30 Jun 2016)</p>	<p>V. If, in the course of the implementation discussions, policy issues emerge, they should be referred back to the GNSO for future deliberations in consultation with the GAC on potential enhancements to privacy and proxy service accreditation.</p>	<p>On 28 October 2016 the ICANN Board Chair wrote to the GAC Chair to inform the GAC of the Board's delay in providing a formal response to the Helsinki Communique due to the considerable effort required to complete the IANA transition. (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-schneider-28oct16-en.pdf) On 13 December 2016 the Board considered the Helsinki Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board accepts this advice and will use the existing processes in the Bylaws and the Board-GAC Consultation Process to address any additional advice from the GAC regarding accreditation of privacy/proxy service providers. The Board notes that ICANN's existing Consensus Policy Implementation Framework allows for new policy issues that emerge during implementation to be referred back to the appropriate policy making body, in this case, the GNSO.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 13 December 2016.</p>
<p>ICANN56 Helsinki Communique §3.a.i. Two-letter country/territory codes at the second level (30 Jun 2016)</p>	<p>The GAC advises the ICANN Board to urge the relevant Registry or the Registrar to engage with the relevant GAC members when a risk is identified in order to come to an agreement on how to manage it or to have a third-party assessment of the situation if the name is already registered.</p>	<p>On 28 October 2016 the ICANN Board Chair wrote to the GAC Chair to inform the GAC of the Board's delay in providing a formal response to the Helsinki Communique due to the considerable effort required to complete the IANA transition. (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-schneider-28oct16-en.pdf) On 13 December 2016 the Board considered the Helsinki Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board accepts this advice. In adopting its resolution in Hyderabad regarding two-letter codes at the second level (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-11-08-en#2.a), the Board explicitly accepted the GAC advice contained in its</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
		<p>Singapore Communiqué dated 11 February 2015. Specifically, the Board directed ICANN to revise the process for the release of two-letter codes at the second level as follows: • To implement improvements to the process to alert relevant governments when requests are initiated. Comments from relevant governments will be fully considered. • For new requests, the comment period will be for 60 days. • For requests with pending or completed comment periods, extend or re-open the comment period so that each request will undergo 60 days of comment period in total.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 13 December 2016.</p>
<p>ICANN56 Helsinki Communiqué</p> <p>§4.a.I-II.</p> <p>Use of 3-letter codes in the ISO-3166 list as gTLDs in future rounds</p> <p>(30 Jun 2016)</p>	<p>The GAC advises the ICANN Board to: i. encourage the community to continue in depth analyses and discussions on all aspects related to a potential use of 3-letter codes in the ISO-3166 list as gTLDs in future rounds, in particular with regard to whether such a potential use is considered to be in the public interest or not. ii. keep current protections in place for 3-letter codes in the ISO-3166 list in place and not to lift these unless future indepth discussions involving the GAC and the other ICANN constituencies would lead to a consensus that use of these 3-letter codes as TLDs would be in the public interest.</p>	<p>On 28 October 2016 the ICANN Board Chair wrote to the GAC Chair to inform the GAC of the Board's delay in providing a formal response to the Helsinki Communiqué due to the considerable effort required to complete the IANA transition. (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-schneider-28oct16-en.pdf) On 13 December 2016 the Board considered the Helsinki Communiqué and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board takes note that there is a Cross-Community Working Group working on the use of 3-letter ISO codes at the top level: “Cross-Community Working Group on Use of Country/Territory Names as TLDs” (https://ccnso.icann.org/en/workinggroups/ccwg-unct.htm). The Working Group presented a status report and Interim Paper to the community at ICANN57 in Hyderabad. Based on feedback received, the Working Group will refine the paper and publish it for public comment. For future rounds of the New gTLD Program, the Board acknowledges GAC member participation in the work of the Policy Development Process concerning Subsequent Procedures of the New gTLD Program. The Board notes that the matter of reserved top level domain names is within the scope of the policy development work.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 13 December 2016.</p>
<p>ICANN56 Helsinki Communiqué</p>	<p>a. The GAC advises the ICANN Board to: i. pursue its engagement with both the GAC and the GNSO on the issue of IGO</p>	<p>On 28 October 2016 the ICANN Board Chair wrote to the GAC Chair to inform the GAC of the Board's delay in providing a formal response to the Helsinki Communiqué due to the considerable effort required to complete the IANA</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>§5.a.i. - 5.b.i. Protection of IGO Names and Acronyms (30 Jun 2016)</p>	<p>protections in an effort to reconcile differences between GNSO and GAC advice on this topic while remaining responsive to concerns laid out in GAC advice issued since the Toronto Communiqué; Taking into account the number of individuals who have joined both the Board and the GNSO since the GAC first brought this issue to the attention of the ICANN Community, b. The GAC advises the ICANN Board to: i. engage the IGOs in its discussions (both within the Board and with the GNSO) where appropriate, given that the IGOs are best-placed to comment upon the compatibility of any proposals with their unique status as non-commercial, publicly-funded creations of government under international law.</p>	<p>transition. (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-schneider-28oct16-en.pdf) On 13 December 2016 the Board considered the Helsinki Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board accepts the advice. The Board sent a letter to the GNSO Council regarding the next steps in reconciling GAC advice and GNSO policy recommendations with respect to the protection of IGO acronyms in the domain name system (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-austin-et-al-04oct16-en.pdf). Included in the letter was the proposal of the “small group” for dealing with the protection of IGO acronyms at the second level. As noted in the letter, the Board believes that the most appropriate approach for the Board in this matter is to help facilitate a procedural way forward for the reconciliation of GAC advice and GNSO policy prior to the Board formally considering the substantive policy recommendations. Additionally, the Board stated that it hoped to continue discussion on this topic with the GAC and GNSO in Hyderabad. Following these discussions in Hyderabad, the Board proposed a facilitated dialogue between the GAC and the GNSO as a possible path forward.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 13 December 2016.</p>
<p>ICANN57 Hyderabad Communique §1.a.i. Future gTLDs Policies and Procedures: Process and Timing (8 Nov 2016)</p>	<p>The GAC reiterates its advice contained in the Helsinki Communique concerning process and timing with regard to development of future gTLD policies and procedures.</p>	<p>On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board accepts this advice and confirms that it will continue to monitor the work of the community regarding reviews of the current round of the New gTLD Program and the policy development work for subsequent rounds of the New gTLD Program.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 3 February 2017.</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>ICANN57 Hyderabad Communique</p> <p>§2.a.i. Mitigation of Domain Name Abuse</p> <p>(8 Nov 2016)</p>	<p>To provide written responses to the questions listed in Annex 1 to this Communique no later than five weeks before the ICANN 58 meeting in Copenhagen.</p>	<p>On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board directs the ICANN CEO to provide the requested responses.</p> <p>On 8 February 2017 Göran Marby, ICANN President & CEO, provided the written responses in a letter to Thomas Schneider, then current chair of the GAC: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/marby-to-schneider-08feb17-en.pdf</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of Marby's letter of 8 February 2017.</p>
<p>ICANN57 Hyderabad Communique</p> <p>§3.a.i. Two-letter country/territory codes at the second level</p> <p>(8 Nov 2016)</p>	<p>Clearly indicate whether the actions taken by the Board as referred to in the resolution adopted on 8 November 2016 are fully consistent with the GAC advice given in the Helsinki Communique.</p>	<p>On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>As mentioned during the ICANN Board meeting at ICANN 57, the topic of two-character domain names corresponding to country codes had been thoroughly examined over the past two years; at least five public comment periods on the topic as well as discussions with the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC). As mentioned at the meeting, the Board examined the issue with respect to ICANN's mission, commitments and core values, and commented that the Board shared the GAC's concern that use of two-character strings corresponding to country codes should not be done in a way to deceive or confuse consumers. The Board's position is that the adopted resolution is consistent with the GAC's advice on the topic.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 3 February 2017.</p>
<p>ICANN57 Hyderabad Communique</p> <p>§3.a.ii. Two-letter country/territory codes at the</p>	<p>Always communicate in future the position of the Board regarding GAC advice on any matter in due time before adopting any measure directly related to that advice.</p>	<p>On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board will be implementing a new process for consideration and processing of GAC advice, starting with the ICANN 58 Copenhagen Communique. This process is intended to support greater clarity and improve collaboration.</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
second level (8 Nov 2016)		This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 3 February 2017.
ICANN57 Hyderabad Communique §4.a.I. Protection of IGO Names and Acronyms (8 Nov 2016)	To take action and engage with all parties in order to facilitate, through a transparent and good faith dialogue, the resolution of outstanding inconsistencies between GAC advice and GNSO recommendations with regard to the protection of IGO acronyms in the DNS and to report on progress at ICANN 58.	<p>On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>Based on the Board's understanding, the Board accepts this advice. We note that at ICANN58 the Board proposed that the GAC and the GNSO engage in a facilitated, good faith discussion to attempt to resolve the outstanding inconsistencies. This suggestion reflects the Board's wish, as expressed in its response to the GAC's Helsinki Communique, to facilitate a procedural way forward for the reconciliation of GAC advice and GNSO policy prior to the Board formally considering the substantive policy recommendations. The Board acknowledges that any outcome of any dialogue between the affected parties is conditioned on, and will be reviewed according to, the GAC's and the GNSO's own internal processes.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 3 February 2017.</p>
ICANN57 Hyderabad Communique §4.a.II. Protection of IGO Names and Acronyms (8 Nov 2016)	That a starting basis for resolution of differences between GAC Advice and existing GNSO Recommendations would be the small group compromise proposal set out in the October 4, 2016 letter from the ICANN Board Chair to the GNSO, namely that ICANN would establish all of the following, with respect to IGO acronyms at the second level: • a procedure to notify IGOs of third-party registration of their acronyms; • a dispute resolution mechanism modeled on but separate from the UDRP, which provides in particular for appeal to an arbitral tribunal instead of national courts, in conformity with relevant principles of	<p>On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board thanks the participants in the IGO small group that worked to produce the October 2016 proposal, which is likely to provide useful points for consideration as the GAC and the GNSO continue to work to resolve the remaining differences between GAC advice and GNSO policy recommendations. The Board acknowledges the ongoing GNSO's Policy Development Process regarding curative rights protections for IGOs and other organizations, and urges all parties to work towards a practicable and timely resolution of the outstanding issues.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 3 February 2017.</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
	international law; and • an emergency relief (e.g., 24-48 hours) domain name suspension mechanism to combat risk of imminent harm.	
<p>ICANN57 Hyderabad Communique</p> <p>§4.a.III. Protection of IGO Names and Acronyms</p> <p>(8 Nov 2016)</p>	<p>That, to facilitate the implementation of the above advice, the GAC invites the GNSO Working Group on Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms to take the small group proposal into account.</p>	<p>On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board accepts this advice and notes that the GNSO Council has confirmed that the GNSO Working Group in question has reviewed the proposal.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 3 February 2017.</p>
<p>ICANN57 Hyderabad Communique</p> <p>§4.a.VI. Protection of IGO Names and Acronyms</p> <p>(8 Nov 2016)</p>	<p>That, until such measures are implemented, IGO acronyms on the GAC-provided list remain reserved in two languages.</p>	<p>On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>Pending completion of the facilitated dialogue, temporary protections continue to remain in place. New gTLD Registry Operators continue to be required to reserve the IGO names and acronyms as per the "IGO List dated 22/03/2013" (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-new-gtld-annex-1-item-1b-02jul13-en.pdf).</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 3 February 2017.</p>
<p>ICANN57 Hyderabad Communique</p> <p>§5.a.II. Protection of Red Cross/ Red Crescent/ Red Crystal Identifiers and names of</p>	<p>Confirm the protections of the Red Cross and Red Crescent names and identifiers as permanent.</p>	<p>On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board notes that the Bylaws prescribe the mechanisms by which Consensus Policies are developed by the community as well as the Board's scope for actions based on the community's consensus. As a temporary measure, the Board required New gTLD registry operators to reserve from registration the following identifiers of the Red Cross/Red Crescent: Second level names of the Int'l Committee of the Red Cross and Int'l Federation of Red Cross Societies, names of the 189 national societies (in English and</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>national committees</p> <p>(8 Nov 2016)</p>		<p>associated national language), and the acronyms ICRC, IFRC, CICR, FICR (in UN6); as identified in the GAC Register of Advice (see 2014-03-27- RCRC).</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 3 February 2017.</p>
<p>ICANN57 Hyderabad Communique</p> <p>§6.a.i. Underserved Regions</p> <p>(8 Nov 2016)</p>	<p>Take required action to enable implementation of GAC Underserved Regions activities, including but not limited to capacity building and participation in ICANN policy processes.</p>	<p>On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The ICANN organization is helping the GAC Underserved Region and Public Safety Working Groups in organizing workshops to support capacity building for diverse and efficient participation at GAC and in ICANN policy development processes in general. These workshops started in Africa in January 2017 and will take place in other underserved regions as appropriate and following the Under-served Region Working Group work plan. The Board looks forward to receiving the GAC's recommendations in order to enable inclusiveness and diversity amongst all stakeholders, especially in underserved regions.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 3 February 2017.</p>
<p>ICANN57 Hyderabad Communique</p> <p>§8.a.i. Enhancement of mutual cooperation and understanding</p> <p>(8 Nov 2016)</p>	<p>Engage in enhanced and more regular communication with the GAC and Supporting Organisations with a view to fostering better mutual understanding of each other and of procedures in the ICANN framework.</p>	<p>On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board accepts this advice and will continue to look for ways to engage in more regular communication to foster better mutual understanding with the GAC and Supporting Organizations.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 3 February 2017.</p>
<p>ICANN57 Hyderabad Communique</p> <p>§8.a.II.</p>	<p>Engage in enhanced and more regular communication with the GAC with a view to foster mutual understanding of the nature and purposes of the GAC's advice on issues of public policy and related to</p>	<p>On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board accepts this advice. The Board will continue the practice implemented with the Helsinki and Hyderabad communiques to hold a meeting</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>Enhancement of mutual cooperation and understanding</p> <p>(8 Nov 2016)</p>	<p>international and national law, and also with a view to better understand the GAC's expectations and the Board's deliberations related to the implementation of GAC advice.</p>	<p>between the Board and the GAC approximately four weeks after a Communique is issued to ensure that the Board has a clear understanding of the GAC advice issued.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 3 February 2017.</p>
<p>ICANN57 Hyderabad Communique</p> <p>§8.a.III. Enhancement of mutual cooperation and understanding</p> <p>(8 Nov 2016)</p>	<p>Make it a regular practice to schedule a post-Communiqué Board-GAC meeting to ensure mutual understanding of its provisions, either at the relevant ICANN meeting or in a call four weeks of a Communiqué being issued.</p>	<p>On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board accepts this advice and reiterates its intentions described in 8.a.II [Hyderabad Communique]</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 3 February 2017.</p>
<p>ICANN57 Hyderabad Communique</p> <p>§8.a.IV. Enhancement of mutual cooperation and understanding</p> <p>(8 Nov 2016)</p>	<p>Consider publicly posting draft resolutions in advance of Board Meetings.</p>	<p>On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board has considered this advice. The Board continues to examine various ways to improve transparency of its processes. The Board has instituted an ongoing dialogue with the GAC, via regular calls to discuss the GAC Communiqués. It is also the intent of the Board to provide the GAC with a scorecard reflecting its consideration of GAC advice, in advance of upcoming ICANN meetings. However, after due considerations, the Board does not deem it feasible, at this time, to publicly post draft resolutions in advance of Board Meetings</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 3 February 2017.</p>
<p>ICANN58 Copenhagen Communique</p>	<p>Request the GNSO without delay to re-examine its 2013 recommendations pertaining to the protections of Red Cross and Red Crescent names and identifiers</p>	<p>On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the Copenhagen Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board accepts this advice and has requested that the GNSO Council</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>§1.a.i Protection of the Red Cross and Red Crescent designations and identifiers (15 Mar 2017)</p>	<p>(defined as “Scope 2” names in the GNSO process) which were inconsistent with GAC Advice.</p>	<p>consider possible modifications to its 2013 recommendations relating to the protections of Red Cross and Red Crescent names and identifiers identified as “Scope 2 Identifiers” within the GNSO “Final Report on Protection of IGO and INGO Identifiers in All gTLDs Policy Development Process.”² The Board will continue to engage with the GAC and the GNSO on this topic, and provide any guidance that it believes appropriate while respecting the community’s processes and the parties’ good faith attempts to reach a resolution of the issue.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 12 June 2017.</p>
<p>ICANN58 Copenhagen Communique §3.a.i Mitigation of Domain Name Abuse (15 Mar 2017)</p>	<p>Provide written responses to the questions listed in the Follow-up Scorecard attached to this Communiqué, no later than 5 May 2017 for appropriate consideration by the GAC before the ICANN 59 meeting in Johannesburg, taking into account that the ICANN President and CEO will act as contact point for the GAC in this matter.</p>	<p>On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the Copenhagen Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board has directed the ICANN CEO to respond to the additional questions and engage in a separate dialogue with interested GAC members including the GAC Public Safety Working Group. The ICANN organization’s draft response was sent to the GAC Chair on 30 May 2017 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/marby-to-schneider-30may17-en.pdf). The ICANN organization will discuss the draft response with interested members of the GAC before finalizing the response.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 12 June 2017.</p>
<p>ICANN59 Johannesburg Communique §Follow-up 1 2-Character Country Codes at the Second Level (29 Jun 2017)</p>	<p>With respect to the 2-Character Country Codes at the Second Level GAC Copenhagen Communiqué Advice (para VI.4), the GAC; a) welcomes and appreciates the decision made by ICANN Board directing the President and CEO of ICANN or his designee(s) to take necessary actions for satisfactory resolution of the concerns raised in that Advice; and b) welcomes the announcement made by the President</p>	<p>The Board did not respond to follow-up to previous advice until the ICANN61 San Juan Communiqué. In general, follow-up to previous advice will be tracked on open advice items related to the same topic.</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
	<p>and CEO of ICANN of his intention to create a task force to resolve the concerns mentioned in the above communiqué. In this regard the GAC proposes that the mandate and working methods of the above mentioned Task Force be determined in consultation with GAC leadership and GAC members, and other interested parties.</p>	
<p>ICANN59 Johannesburg Communique</p> <p>§Follow-up 2 Red Cross Red Crescent Protections</p> <p>(29 Jun 2017)</p>	<p>The GAC welcomed the GNSO's re-convening of the Protection of IGO-INGO Identifiers in All gTLDs PDP Working Group in order to re-examine the recommendations on protections for Red Cross and Red Crescent identifiers following the most recent GAC advice in its Copenhagen Communique. GAC representatives look forward to contributing to its work accordingly.</p>	<p>The Board did not respond to follow-up to previous advice until the ICANN61 San Juan Communiqué. In general, follow-up to previous advice will be tracked on open advice items related to the same topic.</p>
<p>ICANN59 Johannesburg Communique</p> <p>§Follow-up 3 Registration Directory Services (RDS) and Data Protection Rules</p> <p>(29 Jun 2017)</p>	<p>GAC Members attended the cross-community sessions dedicated to discussion of the Next Generation RDS Policy Development Process (PDP) and the EU General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). The GAC supports any efforts by the ICANN Board, Organisation and Community, to: (1) define the purpose of collection and use of RDS Data Elements, with input from relevant experts, including from the GAC; (2) explore solutions, including guidance and technical implementation, to address Data Protection requirements; and (3) to align deliveries of the Next Generation</p>	<p>The Board did not respond to follow-up to previous advice until the ICANN61 San Juan Communiqué. In general, follow-up to previous advice will be tracked on open advice items related to the same topic.</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
	RDS PDP with the timing of changing regulations across the world.	
<p>ICANN59 Johannesburg Communique</p> <p>§Follow-up 4 Geographic Names as Top- Level Domains</p> <p>(29 Jun 2017)</p>	<p>GAC Members welcomed and participated in the cross-community sessions held at ICANN59 on geographic names at the top level. The GAC considers that any further process of policy review and development should: (a) continue to allow all stakeholder groups to participate equally; (b) take into account the history and rationale of the arrangements currently in place; and (c) apply an evidence-based policy approach to any proposals for future arrangements. Regarding the use of geographic names at the top level, the GAC recalls its advice and positions as stated in the following documents: •GAC Principles and Guidelines for the Delegation and Administration of Country Code Top Level Domains (2005), paragraphs 4.1.1. , 4.1.2. and 8.3. • GAC Principles Regarding New gTLDs (2007), sections 1.2 , 2.1 ,2.2, 2.3, 2.4 , 2.7 and 2.8. • GAC Nairobi Communique (2010): Application of 2007 Principles. • GAC Durban Communique (2013): Future application of 2007 Principles. • GAC Helsinki Communique (2016): 3-letter codes.</p>	<p>The Board did not respond to follow-up to previous advice until the ICANN61 San Juan Communique. In general, follow-up to previous advice will be tracked on open advice items related to the same topic.</p>
<p>ICANN59 Johannesburg Communique</p> <p>§Follow-up 5 Competition,</p>	<p>The GAC was briefed on the work of the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team by members of the team. GAC Members will continue to follow the work of the team as it finalizes its recommendations.</p>	<p>The Board did not respond to follow-up to previous advice until the ICANN61 San Juan Communique. In general, follow-up to previous advice will be tracked on open advice items related to the same topic.</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team (CCT-RT)</p> <p>(29 Jun 2017)</p>		
<p>ICANN59 Johannesburg Communique</p> <p>§Follow-up 6 New gTLDs: Policy Issues</p> <p>(29 Jun 2017)</p>	<p>The GAC reviewed the range of issues with public policy implications that are being considered by the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group. Options for better mapping of issues and feedback on GAC inputs will be explored with the working group.</p>	<p>The Board did not respond to follow-up to previous advice until the ICANN61 San Juan Communiqué. In general, follow-up to previous advice will be tracked on open advice items related to the same topic.</p>
<p>ICANN59 Johannesburg Communique</p> <p>§Follow-up 7 Challenges for Inclusive and Meaningful Engagement with ICANN Work</p> <p>(29 Jun 2017)</p>	<p>The GAC expressed concerns to the Board and other parts of the ICANN community that there are increasing challenges to effective and meaningful GAC participation in a range of ICANN activities including important policy development work currently being carried out in multiple working groups. This, in the GAC's view, is becoming an increasingly challenging element. Possibilities for improving this situation could be: a) the setting of priorities among different work streams in the ICANN framework; and b) the provision of documentation that would allow stakeholders with limited resources to more easily understand and assess the issues and relevance of work streams, and facilitate their active participation.</p>	<p>The Board did not respond to follow-up to previous advice until the ICANN61 San Juan Communiqué. In general, follow-up to previous advice will be tracked on open advice items related to the same topic.</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>ICANN60 Abu Dhabi Communique</p> <p>§Follow-up 1 Application for .amazon and related strings</p> <p>(1 Nov 2017)</p>	<p>The GAC met with representatives of the Amazon corporation and discussed developments regarding the company's applications, particularly in light of the recent Independent Review Panel Final Declaration. The GAC and Amazon representatives noted a proposal aimed at providing a mutually acceptable solution vis-à-vis the objections previously expressed by the Amazon Cooperation Treaty Organization's (ACTO) member states. The GAC took note of statements made by ACTO member state representatives to the effect that they would submit such a proposal to their competent authorities. The GAC also discussed the request from the ICANN Board, pursuant to Board Resolutions 2017.10.29.02 and 2017.10.29.03, in which the Board asks the GAC: 1. If it has i. Any information to provide to the Board as it relates to the "merits-based public policy reasons" regarding the GAC's Advice that the Amazon applications should not proceed; or ii. any other new or additional information to provide to the Board regarding the GAC's advice that the Amazon applications should not proceed. 2. If the GAC has any such information, to provide it to the Board by the end of the ICANN 61 meeting. Several GAC members expressed concerns about elements contained in this Board decision, which might set a worrisome precedent both in terms of process and substance. In that context, the GAC will</p>	<p>The Board did not respond to follow-up to previous advice until the ICANN61 San Juan Communiqué. In general, follow-up to previous advice will be tracked on open advice items related to the same topic.</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
	<p>consider further how to react to the Board's request. However, and without prejudging how this should be linked to the Board's request, the GAC converged on the interest of providing additional information. The GAC expressed the need to find a mutually acceptable solution in the case of the .amazon gTLD applications for the countries affected and for the Amazon corporation. Several GAC members expressed serious concerns about both the process followed to date in this matter and the merits of the applications from the Amazon company. A statement from the governments of Brazil and Peru summarizing their concerns in this regard will be incorporated into the record of the meeting. The GAC draws the attention of all parties to the final transcript of the relevant sessions where these issues were discussed, these will be available here: https://schedule.icann.org/event/CbHz/gacmeeting-with-amazoncom.</p>	
<p>ICANN60 Abu Dhabi Communique</p> <p>§Follow-up 2 2-Character Country Codes at the 2nd Level</p> <p>(1 Nov 2017)</p>	<p>Several GAC members expressed their strong concern that the ICANN CEO's response to previous GAC statements on this issue have not addressed the specific matters raised in Section 5 of the Johannesburg Communique. This concern was discussed at the GAC's meeting with the ICANN Board in August 2017. The GAC expects further efforts by ICANN Org to address, by appropriate mechanisms and with priority, concerns</p>	<p>The Board did not respond to follow-up to previous advice until the ICANN61 San Juan Communique. In general, follow-up to previous advice will be tracked on open advice items related to the same topic.</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
	relating to this issue, as well as initiatives to improve communications between GAC members and ICANN Org.	
<p>ICANN60 Abu Dhabi Communique</p> <p>§Follow-up 3 Red Cross and Red Crescent Protections</p> <p>(1 Nov 2017)</p>	<p>Following its most recent advice adopted in the Copenhagen and Johannesburg Communiqués, the GAC welcomed the progress made by the GNSO's re-convened PDP Working Group on the Protection of IGO-INGO Identifiers in All gTLDs, tasked with reexamining the GNSO's past recommendations on the protection of Red Cross and Red Crescent designations, names and identifiers – particularly of the names of national Red Cross and Red Crescent societies. The GAC noted that the acronyms of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC, CICR, MCCC) and of the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC, FICR) are defined to fall outside of the remit of the reconvened GNSO Working Group and recalled its advice (Durban Communiqué, 2013) that these acronyms be made to benefit from the same cost neutral mechanisms to be worked out for the protection of acronyms of IGOs.</p>	<p>The Board did not respond to follow-up to previous advice until the ICANN61 San Juan Communiqué. In general, follow-up to previous advice will be tracked on open advice items related to the same topic.</p>
<p>ICANN61 San Juan Communique</p> <p>§Follow-up 1 Applications for dot Amazon and related strings</p>	<p>The GAC received an update from several of its members regarding the proposal submitted by Amazon.com at ICANN 60. The GAC understands that member governments of the Amazon Cooperation Treaty Organization (ACTO) have established a process for analyzing the proposal, and that this analysis is</p>	<p>On 30 May 2018 the Board considered the San Juan Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board appreciates the update on the review by Amazon Cooperation Treaty Organization (ACTO) member governments of the Amazon.com proposal submitted at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi. The Board acknowledges that the GAC has in its letter included in the San Juan Communiqué referred the Board to the Advice regarding this topic in the GAC Abu Dhabi Communiqué</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
(15 Mar 2018)	<p>progressing. The GAC was informed that Amazon.com and Board members have made themselves available to assist if requested. The GAC considered Board Resolutions 2017.10.29.02 and 2017.10.29.03. The GAC decided, in a spirit of good cooperation, to reply to the Board's request for any additional information the GAC wishes to provide regarding the .amazon case. The GAC's letter to the Board is attached to this Communique.</p>	<p>(see the Board's reply to the letter here: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/chalaby-to-ismail-03apr18-en.pdf). The Board stands ready to move this issue forward at the conclusion of these discussions in accordance with the related Board resolution. Meanwhile, the Board will assess the progress made in the discussions and will consider how to move this process forward.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 30 May 2018.</p>
<p>ICANN61 San Juan Communique</p> <p>§Follow-up 2 2-Character Country/Territory Codes at the 2nd Level</p> <p>(15 Mar 2018)</p>	<p>Some GAC members note that important concerns regarding the release of 2-Character Country/Territory codes at the 2nd Level, as expressed in previous GAC advice, still remain. The GAC also notes the availability of certain measures to mitigate governments concerns with regard to the release of 2 letter codes at the second level. Some GAC members noted that the current measures have not been used. Some GAC members considered that these measures are insufficient. The GAC intends to follow up on implementation of the proposed initiative at ICANN62, bearing in mind that all previous GAC advice on the matter stands.</p>	<p>On 30 May 2018 the Board considered the San Juan Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board notes the GAC's concerns regarding this topic. The Board stands ready to continue to engage with the concerned governments on this issue and looks forward to further updates on this topic.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 30 May 2018.</p>
<p>ICANN62 Panama Communique</p> <p>§Follow-up 1 GDPR and</p>	<p>The GAC recognizes that the Board deferred four items of GAC advice. The GAC urges the Board to take steps to address these issues.</p>	<p>On 16 September 2018 the Board considered this advice and stated in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board will continue to take steps to address these in cooperation with the GAC, and in accordance to any guidance or clarification ICANN org might receive from the DPAs and the European Data Protection Board. Any</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>WHOIS</p> <p>(28 Jun 2018)</p>		<p>guidance and clarification will inform ICANN org’s continued work on a possible unified access model and will also be provided to the GNSO EPDP team to inform its work on a legally sound consensus policy for a gTLD registration data and access model. Insofar as the EPDP considers these deferred items in its consideration of the Temporary Specification, the Board may revisit the GAC advice with the passage of any consensus policy recommendations.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 16 September 2018.</p>
<p>ICANN63 Barcelona Communique</p> <p>§Follow-up 1 GDPR and WHOIS</p> <p>(25 Oct 2018)</p>	<p>We emphasize the GAC consensus advice from ICANN62 that urged ICANN to take all steps necessary to ensure the development and implementation of a unified access model that addresses accreditation, authentication, access and accountability, and applies to all contracted parties. We welcome ICANN's efforts to facilitate the necessary community discussion through the Unified Access Model papers and emphasize the need to drive these discussions towards concrete and timely results.</p>	<p>On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the Barcelona Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board acknowledges and appreciates this follow-up on the GAC’s advice regarding GDPR and WHOIS. ICANN org continues to solicit community input on a possible unified access model with the aim of diminishing the legal risks for contracted parties and in order to create a predictable and consistent user experience. In relation to this and as raised at ICANN63, in order to inform the EPDP and the Community, the ICANN org is forming a technical study group to explore possible technical solutions for accrediting, authenticating and providing access to non-public registration data. ICANN org will continue to keep the community apprised and updated.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 27 January 2019.</p>
<p>ICANN63 Barcelona Communique</p> <p>§Follow-up 2 Dot Amazon Applications</p> <p>(25 Oct 2018)</p>	<p>The GAC welcomes the 16 September 2018 Board resolution on the .Amazon applications directing the ICANN President and CEO “to support the development of a solution that would allow the .AMAZON applications to move forward in a manner that would align GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) advice and inputs on this topic”. The GAC notes that the rationale of the 16</p>	<p>On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the Barcelona Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board acknowledges and appreciates this follow-up on the GAC’s advice regarding the .AMAZON applications. Following the Board resolution on .AMAZON at ICANN63, a Reconsideration Request was filed by the ACTO member states on 5 November 2018. The Board took action on this Reconsideration Request on 16 January 2019, including a resolution that “encourages a high level of communication between the President and CEO and the relevant stakeholders, including the representatives of the Amazonian</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
	<p>September 2018 Board resolution states that “[t]he Board is taking this action today to further the possibility of delegation of the .AMAZON applications...while recognizing the public policy issues raised through GAC advice on these applications”. The GAC recalls its latest advice on the matter where “[t]he GAC recognizes the need to find a mutually acceptable solution” for the Amazon countries and for the applicant, and calls upon the Board to continue facilitating work that could result in such a solution (GAC Communiqué, Abu Dhabi, 1 November 2017).</p>	<p>countries and the Amazon corporation, between now and ICANN 64, and directs the President and CEO to provide the Board with updates on the facilitation process in anticipation of revisiting the status of the .AMAZON applications at its meeting at ICANN64”. The Board also notes the most recent letter of 18 December 2018 from the ICANN org President & CEO to the GAC Chair regarding the facilitation process between the ACTO member states and the Amazon corporation, led by ICANN org. ICANN org notes in the letter that over the last 12 months it has put great effort into working with ACTO member states and the Amazon Corporation to develop a solution for the delegation of .AMAZON that would be of mutual benefit to the peoples of the Amazon region, as well as the Amazon Corporation. It is for this reason, that both the Board and ICANN org believe that the recent turn of events is truly unfortunate and sincerely hope that we can move forward together in a constructive and positive manner towards the best possible outcome for all parties concerned.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 27 January 2019.</p>
<p>ICANN63 Barcelona Communique</p> <p>§Follow-up 3 Protection of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Designations and Identifiers</p> <p>(25 Oct 2018)</p>	<p>The GAC welcomes the progress made in the process of reconciliation between the GAC’s consistent advice and the GNSO’s past policy determinations on the issue of the protection of the Red Cross and Red Crescent designations and identifiers and marks its appreciation for the inclusive consultative process conducted under the auspices of the GNSO’s reconvened Working Group on the Red Cross and Red Crescent names. The Board is encouraged to adopt the GNSO Council’s recommendations, which regard the reservation of the list of names of the 191 National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies in relevant languages, as well as of the international organizations within the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement. The GAC notes that</p>	<p>On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the Barcelona Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board acknowledges and appreciates this follow-up on the GAC’s advice regarding the Protection of the Red Cross and Red Crescent designations and identifiers. The Board notes, however, that prior to any Board action the transparency provisions in Section 3.6 of the ICANN Bylaws require that the Board: (1) provide a reasonable opportunity for the public to comment on proposed policies that substantially affect the operation of the Internet or third parties; and (2) request the GAC’s opinion where public policy concerns may be affected. Accordingly, the Board intends to take into account any public comments and GAC advice that may be timely received when it considers the GNSO’s policy recommendations. Please also see the Board’s response to item §2.a.I above regarding IGO Protections.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 27 January 2019.</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
	<p>the issue of the acronyms of the two international organizations within the Movement (ICRC and IFRC) were not covered under the abovementioned GNSO process and recalls standing GAC Advice that the temporary protections presently accorded to these acronyms remain in place until such time an appropriate resolution of this issue is reached.</p>	
<p>ICANN63 Barcelona Communique</p> <p>§Follow-up Joint Statement Follow-up to the joint statement by ALAC and GAC (Abu Dhabi, 2 November 2017)</p> <p>(25 Oct 2018)</p>	<p>The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) and the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) thank the ICANN Board for its response to their joint statement “Enabling inclusive, informed and meaningful participation at ICANN”, issued at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 2 November 2017. In its response, the Board referred to the Information Transparency Initiative (ITI), launched in January 2018, which hopefully will lead to the creation of a document managing system that – as required by the ALAC and the GAC – will allow, even to non-expert stakeholders, a quick and easy access to ICANN documents. However, its development will take time. According to the ICANN website, its delivery is expected in December 2019. In their joint statement, the ALAC and the GAC also asked ICANN to produce executive summaries, key points and synopses for all relevant issues, processes and activities – something that could be implemented without delay. In its response, the Board referred to the</p>	<p>On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the Barcelona Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board notes that the GAC has provided clarification on this advice in a letter from the GAC Chair to Cherine Chalaby of 20 December 2018. The Board thanks the GAC for this clarification. The Board affirms its response to the original advice, in which it stated: “The Board accepts this advice and is committed to accountability and transparency and pursuing easily understandable and relevant information on matters of concern to all stakeholders. The Board’s commitment to these values aligns with the recently started Information Transparency Initiative (https://www.icann.org/news/blog/creating-contentgovernance-and-rebuilding-the-infrastructure-of-icann-spublic-sites). The Board acknowledges and agrees with the need to ensure effective and equal participation in the policy process by all stakeholders, which is in line with the Mission, Commitments, and Core Values, as expressed in the Bylaws” (see the Abu Dhabi scorecard). Additionally, the Board understands that the ICANN organization is currently undertaking a review of the relevant interface and format of public comment proceedings. The Board intends to direct the ICANN organization to explore specific improvements to public comments, including the use of summaries, that can allow the community to quickly identify the questions being asked in each proceeding. The Board notes that the provision of timely and comprehensible information on all other relevant topics will mean additional financial and staff resources will be needed. In view of the current budgetary constraints, the Board intends to consult with the ICANN organization to consider the feasibility of prioritizing possible topics for ongoing improvements</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
	<p>current offer of monthly newsletters, pre- and post-meeting reports and video interviews, as well as to the ICANN Learn online platform. All these initiatives are commendable and likely to improve access to information and content regarding ICANN activities. However, they are not enough to reach the goal that the ALAC and GAC have in mind. Particularly in policy development processes, non-expert stakeholders need executive summaries to be able to quickly determine, whether a particular issue is of concern to them, and if yes, to participate in the process easily and effectively, on equal footing with other stakeholders, even if ICANN is not in their full-time focus. Summaries should be provided at least, but not only, on issues put out for public comment. Clear and up-to-date information to facilitate quick understanding of relevant issues and high interest topics is key for inclusive, informed and meaningful participation by all stakeholders, including non-experts. In the context of the IANA transition process, ICANN was able to offer timely and comprehensible information by breaking down complex issues into understandable components, which allowed interaction within the entire community. The ALAC and the GAC are now asking from ICANN that the same level of effort be made and the same service be provided to the community concerning information on all other relevant issues.</p>	<p>in this area.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 27 January 2019.</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
<p>ICANN64 Kobe Communique</p> <p>§Follow-up 1 Follow Up: Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs</p> <p>(14 Mar 2019)</p>	<p>The GAC recalls its advice in the ICANN56 Helsinki Communiqué, which states that the development of policy on further releases of new gTLDs needs to fully consider all the results of the relevant reviews and analyses to determine which aspects and elements need adjustment. The GAC advised the Board to address and consider these results and concerns before proceeding with new rounds.</p>	<p>On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled “GAC Advice – Kobe Communiqué: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)” in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué. As noted in the Helsinki Scorecard, the Board accepted the advice and monitored the work of the community regarding reviews of the current round of the New gTLD Program and the policy development work for subsequent rounds of the New gTLD Program. All of the Bylaws- and Board-committed reviews related to the 2012 round of new gTLDs have been completed. The Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group anticipates delivering its Final Report in the second half of calendar year 2019. The Board will consider the policy recommendations when the community completes its work and the recommendations are brought to the Board.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 15 May 2019.</p>
<p>ICANN65 Marrakech Communique</p> <p>§Follow-up 1 .AMAZON applications</p> <p>(27 Jun 2019)</p>	<p>The GAC asks the Board to explain in writing whether and why it considers that its decision to proceed with the .AMAZON applications, based on a proposal that the eight Amazon countries considered did not address their concerns, complies with GAC Advice.</p>	<p>On 8 September 2019 the Board considered the Marrakech Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>In its 15 May 2019 resolution, the Board directed the ICANN org President and CEO “to continue processing the .AMAZON applications according to the policies and procedures of the New gTLD Program in accordance with Board resolutions 2019.03.10.01-07 and in recognition of all input received relating to the .AMAZON applications.”</p> <p>In the rationale of this resolution, the Board provided information on the Board’s decision-making process leading up to the resolution. Specifically, the Board stated that it “recognizes the need to balance concerns of all those involved, and to act fairly and transparently at all times. Indeed, the Board has considered the concerns raised regarding the .AMAZON applications at every stage of their processing through the New gTLD Program. However, the Board was also cognizant of the time that lapsed since the .AMAZON applications were submitted in 2012, and since the Amazon corporation prevailed in its Independent Review Process (IRP) against ICANN in July 2017. Since that time, the ICANN Board and org engaged with the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC), ACTO, and the Amazon corporation in pursuit of a mutually acceptable solution, as evidenced by the numerous meetings, proposals, and</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
		<p>letters received on the topic of the .AMAZON applications over the past few years.”</p> <p>Further, the Board noted in the rationale that “[i]n reviewing the proposal from the Amazon corporation, the Board considered whether it had done its due diligence and had the relevant material to make a decision regarding the proposal, whether the Board's actions followed established processes and were in accordance with ICANN Bylaws, and whether the actions taken by the Board are within ICANN's mission. The Board also considered issues of fairness and whether the parties had been given sufficient time to reach a reasonable solution.</p> <p>“Ultimately, the Board determined that it has done its due diligence based on its review of the .AMAZON applications and the concerns raised throughout every stage of the life of the applications.¹⁴ Specifically, the Board took into account how the .AMAZON applications fit into the broader New gTLD Program. The Amazon corporation applied for the .AMAZON applications in 2012, pursuant to the Applicant Guidebook (AGB). The Applicant Guidebook, which either in part or in whole was subject to over 50 comment periods within ICANN, was also developed over three years of intensive community discussion. The GAC raised over 80 discrete issues which were addressed in an intensive face-to-face consultation, and issues such as protections for geographic names, as well as the abilities for individual governments to flag concerns and for the GAC to provide advice to the Board on applications, were added to the AGB. ICANN committed to funding objections raised by governments, if needed.</p> <p>“The .AMAZON applications were first evaluated pursuant to the AGB and determined not to be geographic names set aside for protections or requiring governmental approval. As discussed above, there were “Early Warnings” submitted by individual governments against the .AMAZON applications, and there was an additional challenge raised, a Community Objection brought by the Independent Objector, Alain Pellet. The Independent Objector raised issues it saw as of concern to the inhabitants of the Amazonian region, including human rights related concern. Following the AGB process, an independent expert panelist considered the Independent Objector's</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
		<p>arguments, and ultimately dismissed the objection based on a detailed decision issued in January 2014 wherein the human rights and other arguments were considered. Both the Independent Objector and the expert panelist are noted for their scholarship in this area.</p> <p>“The GAC, in its July 2013 Durban Communiqué, advised the Board on a consensus basis that the .AMAZON applications should not proceed. The Board followed that advice and, ultimately, the IRP discussed at length above was filed. Based on the IRP Final Declaration, the Board re-engaged with the GAC and sought additional advice and clarification. The resulting GAC advice from Abu Dhabi is now the operable GAC advice on this issue, wherein the GAC advised the Board to “[c]ontinue facilitating negotiations between the Amazon Cooperation Treaty Organization’s (ACTO) member states and the Amazon corporation with a view to reaching a mutually acceptable solution to allow for the use of .amazon as a top level domain name.” The Board accepted that advice and has been acting in accordance with the advice in every subsequent decision on the .AMAZON applications—from the October 2018 decision to allow the .AMAZON applications to proceed through the AGB process, through the January 2019 decision on ACTO’s Reconsideration Request, and in the March 2019 decision to allow another four weeks of discussions between the parties in addition to the year of facilitation that has passed since the Board’s acceptance of the Abu Dhabi advice.</p> <p>“The Board has therefore met the GAC advice from Abu Dhabi, in that the ICANN org President and CEO facilitated discussions between the two parties for over a year. Likewise, the Board has received sufficient input and had the necessary materials to make this decision, as listed below. Even when the Board received a letter from Drs. van Ho and Doyle of the Schools of Law at the Universities of Essex and Middlesex, respectively, setting out potential additional human rights concerns in moving forward with the .AMAZON applications, the Board considered this new input in light of the required AGB process and the substantial human rights-related briefings raised earlier in the application evaluation process, and identified that there were no new issues raised that hadn’t already been considered across the long and intensive path that the .AMAZON applications have followed.”</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
		<p>The Board understands that some GAC members have concerns regarding this resolution but hopes that the above provides additional insight into the reasons why the Board has taken the action that it has.</p> <p>Finally, the Board notes the Reconsideration Request from the Government of Colombia regarding the Board's 15 May 2019 resolution. The BAMC issued a recommendation to deny the request on 14 August 2019 which the Board adopted on 8 September 2019.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2019.</p>
<p>ICANN65 Marrakech Communique</p> <p>§Follow-up 2 Two-Character Country Codes as Second Level Domain Names (27 Jun 2019)</p>	<p>The GAC remains concerned that GAC advice on the procedure for the release of country codes at the second level under new gTLDs was not taken into consideration as intended, and advises that meaningful steps be taken to ensure this does not happen in the future. Moreover, the GAC notes the provision of a search tool by ICANN. GAC Members have highlighted that the effectiveness of the tool is still being evaluated. The GAC urges ICANN to continue to engage with concerned GAC members in order to address their concerns.</p>	<p>On 8 September 2019 the Board considered the Marrakech Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board is aware of the ongoing concerns among some GAC members regarding the consideration of GAC advice on the procedure for the release of two-character country codes at the second level under new gTLDs. The ICANN org has provided detailed explanations of its process and the Board's consideration of relevant GAC Advice in a memo to the GAC dated 22 January 2019 as well as in a Historical Overview of the process. The Board also notes that during the BGIG meeting at ICANN65 in Marrakech it was discussed that the BGIG meeting at ICANN66 in Montreal could be used to discuss the two-character search tool. Between now and ICANN66, the Board recommends that GAC members use the tool to gain experience and to note any concerns, where appropriate.</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2019.</p>
<p>ICANN65 Marrakech Communique</p> <p>§Follow-up 3 WHOIS and Data Protection</p>	<p>The GAC recalls its GAC Kobe Communiqué Advice and welcomes the actions being taken on the 2nd phase of the EPDP.</p>	<p>On 8 September 2019 the Board considered the Marrakech Communique and provided this response in its scorecard:</p> <p>The Board appreciates the GAC's follow-up on the Kobe advice. The Board recalls its response to the Kobe Communique, in which the Board noted that "while it cannot guarantee the end result, because the EPDP is a community procedure that determines its own processes...[t]he Board shall convey the</p>

Advice Item	Advice Text	Actions Taken
(27 Jun 2019)		<p>request[s] via its Liaisons to the EPDP and via its communications with the GNSO Council.” Additionally, as noted in the Board’s response to the Kobe Communique, the Board continues to understand that “the GAC is requesting the ICANN Board to do all that it can, within its authority and remit and subject to budgetary constraints, to facilitate the work of the EPDP.”</p> <p>This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2019.</p>