**GAC Advisor Status**

As of 07 September 2022

**Notes:**
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN74 Virtual Policy Forum Communique (June 2022)

### Action Request: Action Request Number

**Comment**: ICANN47 Durban Communique

**Date Issued**: 11/20/2013

**Date Closed**: 9/10/13

**Action**: Follow up

**Follow up from**: ICANN

**Item**: The GAC has extended the timeline for the .ISLAM and .RAM applications until 16 September 2013.

**Description**: The GAC has extended the timeline for the .ISLAM and .RAM applications until 16 September 2013.

**Current Phase**: Review

**Status Update [Public]**


**Board Resolution Link**


**Board Scorecard Link**


**Date Opened**: 11/20/2013

**Due Date**: 12/27/13

**Date Closed**: 7/18/2013

**Action**: Follow up

**Follow up from**: ICANN

**Item**: The GAC has extended the timeline for the .ISLAM and .RAM applications until 12/27/13.

**Description**: The GAC has extended the timeline for the .ISLAM and .RAM applications until 12/27/13.

**Current Phase**: Review

**Status Update [Public]**


**Board Resolution Link**


**Board Scorecard Link**


**Date Opened**: 11/20/2013

**Due Date**: 12/27/13

**Date Closed**: 7/18/2013

**Action**: Follow up

**Follow up from**: ICANN

**Item**: The GAC has extended the timeline for the .ISLAM and .RAM applications until 12/27/13.

**Description**: The GAC has extended the timeline for the .ISLAM and .RAM applications until 12/27/13.

**Current Phase**: Review

**Status Update [Public]**


**Board Resolution Link**


**Board Scorecard Link**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request Number</th>
<th>Action Request: Action Taken</th>
<th>Date Issued</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Date Closed</th>
<th>Status Update (Public)</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Date Closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-002412</td>
<td>Action Requested: Action</td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>6/29/17</td>
<td>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 (in Chinese – 1-1619-92115) was discussed at the GAC's meeting with the ICANN Board in August 2017. The GAC was pleased to note that the applicants for .GUANGZHOU and .SHENZHEN are withdrawing their applications for consideration from the New gTLD Program. The NGPC will form the GAC of this new information. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 5 February 2014.</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-02-05-en#1.a">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-02-05-en#1.a</a></td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-2014-02-05.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-2014-02-05.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-002421</td>
<td>Action Requested: Action</td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>11/1/2013</td>
<td>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 (in Chinese – 1-1619-92115) was discussed at the GAC's meeting with the ICANN Board in August 2017. The GAC was pleased to note that the applicants for .GUANGZHOU and .SHENZHEN are withdrawing their applications for consideration from the New gTLD Program. The NGPC will form the GAC of this new information. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 5 February 2014.</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-02-05-en#1.a">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-02-05-en#1.a</a></td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-2014-02-05.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-2014-02-05.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001235</td>
<td>Action Requested: Action</td>
<td>7/18/2013</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>7/10/19</td>
<td>The GAC advised the ICANN board not to proceed beyond initial evaluation until the agreements between the relevant parties are reached. The application for .shenzhen (in Chinese – 1-1619-92115) was discussed at the GAC's meeting with the ICANN Board in August 2017. The GAC was pleased to note that the applicants for .GUANGZHOU and .SHENZHEN are withdrawing their applications for consideration from the New gTLD Program. The NGPC will form the GAC of this new information. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 5 February 2014.</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-02-05-en#1.a">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-02-05-en#1.a</a></td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-2014-02-05.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-2014-02-05.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001249</td>
<td>Action Requested: Action</td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>The GAC advised the ICANN board not to proceed beyond initial evaluation until the agreements between the relevant parties are reached. The application for .shenzhen (in Chinese – 1-1619-92115) was discussed at the GAC's meeting with the ICANN Board in August 2017. The GAC was pleased to note that the applicants for .GUANGZHOU and .SHENZHEN are withdrawing their applications for consideration from the New gTLD Program. The NGPC will form the GAC of this new information. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 5 February 2014.</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-02-05-en#1.a">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-02-05-en#1.a</a></td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-2014-02-05.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-2014-02-05.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001251</td>
<td>Action Requested: Action</td>
<td>1/20/13</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>1/20/13</td>
<td>The Board may wish to seek a clearer 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.</td>
<td>2/19/14</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-02-05-en#1.a">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-02-05-en#1.a</a></td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-2014-02-05.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-2014-02-05.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other interested parties.**

*GAC leadership and GAC members, and methods of the above mentioned Task Force to resolve the concerns mentioned in the above paragraph. b) the President and CEO of ICANN of his intention to create a task force to resolve the issues raised in that Advice; and (ii) the ICANN or his designee(s) to take necessary action for satisfactory resolution of the concerns raised in that Advice, and (iii) welcomes the announcement made by 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 order to consider the appropriate next steps of delegating .VIN and .WINE. The analysis is expected to be completed so that it can be considered by the NGPC when it meets in Singapore. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 5 February 2014.

**Follow-up 2**

The GAC considers the two strings. GAC members may wish to take thirty days additional time with a view to conclude on the matter in order to consider the appropriate next steps of delegating .VIN and .WINE. The analysis is expected to be completed so that it can be considered by the NGPC when it meets in Singapore. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 5 February 2014.

**Follow-up 3**

The GAC considers the two strings, an end-view, 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 in order to consider the appropriate next steps of delegating .VIN and .WINE. The analysis is expected to be completed so that it can be considered by the NGPC when it meets in Singapore. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 5 February 2014.

**Follow-up 4**

The GAC considered the two strings, an end-view, 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 in order to consider the appropriate next steps of delegating .VIN and .WINE. The analysis is expected to be completed so that it can be considered by the NGPC when it meets in Singapore. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 5 February 2014.

**Follow-up 5**

The GAC considered the two strings, an end-view, 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 in order to consider the appropriate next steps of delegating .VIN and .WINE. The analysis is expected to be completed so that it can be considered by the NGPC when it meets in Singapore. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 5 February 2014.

**Follow-up 6**

The GAC considered the two strings, an end-view, 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 in order to consider the appropriate next steps of delegating .VIN and .WINE. The analysis is expected to be completed so that it can be considered by the NGPC when it meets in Singapore. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 5 February 2014.

**Follow-up 7**

The GAC considered the two strings, an end-view, 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 in order to consider the appropriate next steps of delegating .VIN and .WINE. The analysis is expected to be completed so that it can be considered by the NGPC when it meets in Singapore. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 5 February 2014.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request Number</th>
<th>Action Taken</th>
<th>Action Request</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Date Closed</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
<th>Date Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001365</td>
<td>Board</td>
<td>Action Request</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>5/30/18</td>
<td>On 30 May 2018 the Board considered the 2-letter name space and provided this response to its communique. The Board notes the GAC's concerns regarding this topic. The Board stands ready to continue engaging with the concerned governments on this issue and looks forward to further updates on this topic. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 30 May, 2018.</td>
<td>2018-10-04</td>
<td>9/10/19</td>
<td>Notice-2017-06-12-en</td>
<td>Notice-2017-06-12-en.pdf</td>
<td>3/15/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001366</td>
<td>Board</td>
<td>Action Request</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>5/30/18</td>
<td>On 30 May 2018 the Board considered the 2-letter name space and provided this response to its communique. The Board notes the GAC's concerns regarding this topic. The Board stands ready to continue engaging with the concerned governments on this issue and looks forward to further updates on this topic. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 30 May, 2018.</td>
<td>2018-10-04</td>
<td>9/10/19</td>
<td>Notice-2017-06-12-en</td>
<td>Notice-2017-06-12-en.pdf</td>
<td>3/15/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The GAC agreed on a revised charter for the GAC in June 2013. This item is considered complete as of the Board Chair's letter of 5 June 2014.

The GAC submitted the ATRT2 report. Progress relevant recommendations from this report are considered completed. This item is considered complete as of the Chair's letter of 6 June 2013. 

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 an annex to a letter dated 5 June 2014. The Board provided this response in its scorecard: The Board welcomes the report that the GAC agreed on a revised charter for the GAC in June 2013. This item is considered complete as of the Chair's letter of 6 June 2013.

Since then, the Board has received and responded to additional GAC advice related to the ATRT2 recommendations. For example, 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.

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. 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. Since then, the Board has received and responded to additional GAC advice related to the ATRT2 recommendations.

In its scorecard: 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. Since then, the Board has received and responded to additional GAC advice related to the ATRT2 recommendations. For example, 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Number</th>
<th>Action Request Date</th>
<th>Alert Phase</th>
<th>Accountable by</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Document Update (Public)</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001298</td>
<td>12/14/14</td>
<td>Accountability &amp; Transparency</td>
<td>December 14</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/resolutions-board-materials/resolutions-2014-12-14#3">https://www.icann.org/resolutions-board-materials/resolutions-2014-12-14#3</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001292</td>
<td>10/15/14</td>
<td>Accountability &amp; Transparency</td>
<td>October 15</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001298</td>
<td>8/24/15</td>
<td>Accountability &amp; Transparency</td>
<td>August 24</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Board acknowledged the ICANN73 Virtual Annual General Meeting Communique on 26 January 2022. The Board also discussed the ICANN72 Virtual Annual General Meeting Communique on 24 November 2021.

The Board acknowledged the ICANN72 Virtual Annual General Meeting Communique on 16 January 2022. The Board also discussed the ICANN72 Virtual Annual General Meeting Communique on 24 November 2021.

The Board notified it that it would like to issue an Implementation Plan for the ICANN73 Virtual Annual General Meeting Communique.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Action Number</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Date Closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-004830</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/2018-03-23-ia">Documents</a></td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/2018-03-23-ia">Documents</a></td>
<td>11/1/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-004820</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/2018-03-23-ia">Documents</a></td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/2018-03-23-ia">Documents</a></td>
<td>11/1/17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Follow-up to previous advice**

The Board reviewed the item and determined that formal response was not necessary. Follow-up to previous advice will be tracked on open advice items related to the same topic.

**Date Issued**

- 9/10/19
- 7/10/19

**Task**: Continue discussing negotiations between the Amazon Corporation and the ICANN. Further facilitate discussions with the Amazon Corporation and discuss 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 as it is the perception generally expressed by the Amazon Cooperation Treaty Organization's (ACTO) member states. The GAC task force of comments 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 Resolution 2019.03.10.07, for additional facilitation discussions with 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 GAC Board now therefore considers that it has complied with the operative GAC advice on this matter in the November 2017 Abu Dhabi Communiqué to continue facilitating negotiations between the Amazon Cooperation Treaty Organization's (ACTO) member states and the Amazon Cooperation Treaty Organization with a view to reaching a mutually acceptable solution to allow the use of amazon as a top level domain name. The Board recognizes the efforts of the Global Accreditation Center (GAC) in facilitating negotiations and discussion with the Amazon Cooperation Treaty Organization (ACTO) member states and the Amazon Cooperation Treaty Organization with a view to reaching a mutually acceptable solution to allow for the use of Amazon as a top level domain name. This item is complete as of the Board’s resolution of 10 March 2019.

**Follow-up to previous advice**

The Board reviewed this item and determined that formal response was not necessary. Follow-up to previous advice will be tracked on open advice items related to the same topic.

**Date Closed**

- 9/10/19
- 7/10/19
On 30 May 2018 the Board considered the San Juan Communiqué and provided this response in its scorecard. The Board appreciates the update on the review by Amazon Co-operative Treaty Organization (ACTO) member governments of the Amazon.com proposal submitted at ICANN in Abu Dhabi. The Board acknowledges that the ACTO 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 (see the Board’s reply to the letter here: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/compendium/boards-to-commission-sanju61-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. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 30 May 2018.

On 30 May 2018 the Board considered the San Juan Communiqué and provided this response in its scorecard. The Board appreciates the update on the review by Amazon Co-operative Treaty Organization (ACTO) member governments of the Amazon.com proposal submitted at ICANN in Abu Dhabi. The Board acknowledges that the ACTO 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 (see the Board’s reply to the letter here: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/compendium/boards-to-commission-sanju61-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. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 30 May 2018.

On 30 May 2018 the Board considered the San Juan Communiqué and provided this response in its scorecard. The Board appreciates the update on the review by Amazon Co-operative Treaty Organization (ACTO) member governments of the Amazon.com proposal submitted at ICANN in Abu Dhabi. The Board acknowledges that the ACTO 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 (see the Board’s reply to the letter here: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/compendium/boards-to-commission-sanju61-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. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 30 May 2018.

On 30 May 2018 the Board considered the San Juan Communiqué and provided this response in its scorecard. The Board appreciates the update on the review by Amazon Co-operative Treaty Organization (ACTO) member governments of the Amazon.com proposal submitted at ICANN in Abu Dhabi. The Board acknowledges that the ACTO 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 (see the Board’s reply to the letter here: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/compendium/boards-to-commission-sanju61-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. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 30 May 2018.

On 30 May 2018 the Board considered the San Juan Communiqué and provided this response in its scorecard. The Board appreciates the update on the review by Amazon Co-operative Treaty Organization (ACTO) member governments of the Amazon.com proposal submitted at ICANN in Abu Dhabi. The Board acknowledges that the ACTO 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 (see the Board’s reply to the letter here: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/compendium/boards-to-commission-sanju61-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. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 30 May 2018.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status Update Number</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Action Taken</th>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Date Closed</th>
<th>Date Issued</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
<th>Date Updated</th>
<th>Date of Issue</th>
<th>GAC</th>
<th>NGPC</th>
<th>Board Chair</th>
<th>Board Resolution Number</th>
<th>Board Resolution Date</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-24</td>
<td>Category 1 and 2 Safeguard Advice</td>
<td>The GAC has advised the ICANN Board to consider the safeguard advice consistent with the ICANN organizational mission and values, and the commitments and responsibilities of the ICANN Board of Directors.</td>
<td>9/10/13</td>
<td>9/10/13</td>
<td>9/10/13</td>
<td>9/10/13</td>
<td>9/10/13</td>
<td>9/10/13</td>
<td>9/10/13</td>
<td>9/10/13</td>
<td>9/10/13</td>
<td>9/10/13</td>
<td>9/10/13</td>
<td>9/10/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-26</td>
<td>Category 1 and 2 Safeguard Advice</td>
<td>The GAC has advised the ICANN Board to consider the safeguard advice consistent with the ICANN organizational mission and values, and the commitments and responsibilities of the ICANN Board of Directors.</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-27</td>
<td>Category 1 and 2 Safeguard Advice</td>
<td>The GAC has advised the ICANN Board to consider the safeguard advice consistent with the ICANN organizational mission and values, and the commitments and responsibilities of the ICANN Board of Directors.</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-29</td>
<td>Category 1 and 2 Safeguard Advice</td>
<td>The GAC has advised the ICANN Board to consider the safeguard advice consistent with the ICANN organizational mission and values, and the commitments and responsibilities of the ICANN Board of Directors.</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-31</td>
<td>Category 1 and 2 Safeguard Advice</td>
<td>The GAC has advised the ICANN Board to consider the safeguard advice consistent with the ICANN organizational mission and values, and the commitments and responsibilities of the ICANN Board of Directors.</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-33</td>
<td>Category 1 and 2 Safeguard Advice</td>
<td>The GAC has advised the ICANN Board to consider the safeguard advice consistent with the ICANN organizational mission and values, and the commitments and responsibilities of the ICANN Board of Directors.</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-35</td>
<td>Category 1 and 2 Safeguard Advice</td>
<td>The GAC has advised the ICANN Board to consider the safeguard advice consistent with the ICANN organizational mission and values, and the commitments and responsibilities of the ICANN Board of Directors.</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-37</td>
<td>Category 1 and 2 Safeguard Advice</td>
<td>The GAC has advised the ICANN Board to consider the safeguard advice consistent with the ICANN organizational mission and values, and the commitments and responsibilities of the ICANN Board of Directors.</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-39</td>
<td>Category 1 and 2 Safeguard Advice</td>
<td>The GAC has advised the ICANN Board to consider the safeguard advice consistent with the ICANN organizational mission and values, and the commitments and responsibilities of the ICANN Board of Directors.</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-41</td>
<td>Category 1 and 2 Safeguard Advice</td>
<td>The GAC has advised the ICANN Board to consider the safeguard advice consistent with the ICANN organizational mission and values, and the commitments and responsibilities of the ICANN Board of Directors.</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-43</td>
<td>Category 1 and 2 Safeguard Advice</td>
<td>The GAC has advised the ICANN Board to consider the safeguard advice consistent with the ICANN organizational mission and values, and the commitments and responsibilities of the ICANN Board of Directors.</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-45</td>
<td>Category 1 and 2 Safeguard Advice</td>
<td>The GAC has advised the ICANN Board to consider the safeguard advice consistent with the ICANN organizational mission and values, and the commitments and responsibilities of the ICANN Board of Directors.</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Request/Action Item Number</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Date Issued</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Item Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Current Phase</td>
<td>Status Update</td>
<td>Board Resolution Link</td>
<td>Board Resolution Link</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-004736</td>
<td>ICANN Community Forum GAC Communiqué</td>
<td>2/22/21</td>
<td>CCT Review and Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The AGV is reviewing a coordinated approach to the implementation of the specific Recommendations from the CCT Review ahead of the potential launch of a new round of gTLDs. Previous AGV advice issued in Montreal (KANAI6) related correspondence with the ICANN Board and subsequent discussions, the latest on 23rd March 2021 via KANN70, the AGV looks forward to periodically updating the ongoing consideration of the above mentioned advice, and, in particular, the Recommendations marked as &quot;preliminary&quot; or &quot;high priority&quot;: namely 1, 3, 5, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34 and 36. For example through a tracking tool that identifies the status of such a Recommendation in terms of which comments are taking it forward, how it will be implemented and when it is expected to be completed.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/board-materials/resolutions-2021-06-11-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/board-materials/resolutions-2021-06-11-en.pdf</a></td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/board-materials/resolutions-2021-06-11-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/board-materials/resolutions-2021-06-11-en.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-004679</td>
<td>ICANN70 Virtual Policy Forum GAC Communiqué</td>
<td>2/22/21</td>
<td>CCT Review and Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The Board is discussing the implementation of the specific Recommendations from the CCT Review ahead of the potential launch of a new round of gTLDs. Previous AGV advice issued in Montreal (KANAI6), related correspondence with the ICANN Board and subsequent discussions, the latest on 23rd March 2021 via KANN70, the AGV looks forward to periodically updating the ongoing consideration of the above mentioned advice, and, in particular, the Recommendations marked as &quot;preliminary&quot; or &quot;high priority&quot;: namely 1, 3, 5, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34 and 36. For example through a tracking tool that identifies the status of such a Recommendation in terms of which comments are taking it forward, how it will be implemented and when it is expected to be completed.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/board-materials/resolutions-2021-06-11-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/board-materials/resolutions-2021-06-11-en.pdf</a></td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/board-materials/resolutions-2021-06-11-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/board-materials/resolutions-2021-06-11-en.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-004674</td>
<td>ICANN57 Virtual Community Forum GAC</td>
<td>1/19/21</td>
<td>CCT Review and Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The AGV is reviewing a coordinated approach to the implementation of the specific Recommendations from the CCT Review and Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs. Previous AGV advice issued in Montreal (KANAI6), related correspondence with the ICANN Board and subsequent discussions, the latest on 23rd March 2021 via KANN70, the AGV looks forward to periodically updating the ongoing consideration of the above mentioned advice, and, in particular, the Recommendations marked as &quot;preliminary&quot; or &quot;high priority&quot;: namely 1, 3, 5, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34 and 36. For example through a tracking tool that identifies the status of such a Recommendation in terms of which comments are taking it forward, how it will be implemented and when it is expected to be completed.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-004676</td>
<td>ICANN58 Virtual Policy Forum GAC</td>
<td>1/22/21</td>
<td>CCT Review and Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The AGV is discussing the implementation of the specific Recommendations from the CCT Review and Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs. Previous AGV advice issued in Montreal (KANAI6), related correspondence with the ICANN Board and subsequent discussions, the latest on 23rd March 2021 via KANN70, the AGV looks forward to periodically updating the ongoing consideration of the above mentioned advice, and, in particular, the Recommendations marked as &quot;preliminary&quot; or &quot;high priority&quot;: namely 1, 3, 5, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34 and 36. For example through a tracking tool that identifies the status of such a Recommendation in terms of which comments are taking it forward, how it will be implemented and when it is expected to be completed.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Request/Action</td>
<td>Action Request Number</td>
<td>Communique/Forum</td>
<td>Date Issued</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Item Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Status Update/Actions</td>
<td>Board Resolution Link</td>
<td>Board Resolution Link</td>
<td>Date Closed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001262</td>
<td>ICANN61 Buenos Aires Communique</td>
<td>6/24/15</td>
<td>GAC</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The GAC worked to reconcile its Addendum Report on Evaluation of New gTLDs (section 1.1.4), and in light of the constructive discussions which took place with the Board, and the wider ICANN community at ICANN61, as well as the GAC follow-up action from ICANN60 (notated in paragraph 5. of Section VI) and considering the Board Statement therein (dated 20 May 2021), allows the elevation of the Board to the related suggestions referred to 9 &amp; under section “Issues of importance to the GAC” of this Communique.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-004788</td>
<td>ICANN61 London Communique</td>
<td>6/24/15</td>
<td>Evaluation Priority</td>
<td>Community Engagement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-H0167</td>
<td>ICANN68 Dublin Communique</td>
<td>9/27/16</td>
<td>Community Priorities</td>
<td>Do not interpret this advice as the Board’s endorsement or recommendation of a specific recommendation for action.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>On 18 October 2015 the NGPC considered the Abu Dhabi Communique and provided this advice and provided this response in its scorecard: 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” 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: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/new-gtld-2015-10-18-en#2.b">https://www.icann.org/en/new-gtld-2015-10-18-en#2.b</a>. On 18 October 2015 the NGPC considered the Abu Dhabi Communique and provided this advice and provided this response in its scorecard: 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” 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: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/new-gtld-2015-10-18-en#2.b">https://www.icann.org/en/new-gtld-2015-10-18-en#2.b</a>. On 18 October 2015 the NGPC considered the Abu Dhabi Communique and provided this advice and provided this response in its scorecard: 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” 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: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/new-gtld-2015-10-18-en#2.b">https://www.icann.org/en/new-gtld-2015-10-18-en#2.b</a>. On 18 October 2015 the NGPC considered the Abu Dhabi Communique and provided this advice and provided this response in its scorecard: 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” 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: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/new-gtld-2015-10-18-en#2.b">https://www.icann.org/en/new-gtld-2015-10-18-en#2.b</a>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-H0168</td>
<td>ICANN69 Auckland Communique</td>
<td>9/27/16</td>
<td>Community Engagement</td>
<td>Do not interpret this advice as the Board’s endorsement or recommendation of a specific recommendation for action.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>On 12 September 2014 the Board noted the recommendations of the Full ACCF Multiparty Technical Expert Group (TM) and the Full ACCF Technical Expert Group (TEG). The Board noted that the TEG and TM had conducted their work under the direction of the Full ACCF and that their recommendations were to be considered by the Board and the ICANN community. The Board expressed its appreciation for the work of the ACCF and welcomed the ACCF’s recommendations for further consideration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request Number</td>
<td>Action Request: Action</td>
<td>Communique</td>
<td>ICANN46 Beijing</td>
<td>ICANN54 Dublin</td>
<td>Date Issued</td>
<td>Date Closed</td>
<td>Current Phase</td>
<td>Board Resolution Link</td>
<td>Board Scorecard Link</td>
<td>Date Source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The GAC advises the Board that it has verified previously expressed concerns that the Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) process has not met the expectations of applicants and noted that the successful applications are currently the subject of an appeal-resolution procedure. In the CPE, 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. The GAC notes possible enforcement problems if the CPE results in excessive costs of resource by compelling applicants to other unresolved mechanisms. The specific challenges faced by some community applicants in situations where in competition with commercial applicants, or in the GAC, call into account the final report of the ICAAN/ICANN46 as the issue when proposing the CPE input into the ICAAN/ICANN54 review of issues for improving procedures related to community-based applications in the new-gTLD round and the Competition, Trust and Consumer Review (CCT) under the multistakeholder process. The GAC notes issues regarding the CPE and the Community Priority Evaluation Process, following the rejection of a number of applications. There is a need to ensure that criteria for community priority treatment are applied consistently across the various applications. A. The GAC requests the ICAAN/ICANN54 to: 1. Tackle into this matter and also consider the Board should examine the feasibility of implementing an appeal mechanism in the current round as an applicant contest the decision of a community priority evaluation panel in the GNSO’s review of issues for improving procedures related to community-based applications in the new-gTLD round and the Competition, Trust and Consumer Review (CCT) under the multistakeholder process. The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary.

The GAC advises the Board that it has verified previously expressed concerns that the Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) process has not met the expectations of applicants and noted that the successful applications are currently the subject of an appeal-resolution procedure. In the CPE, 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. The GAC notes possible enforcement problems if the CPE results in excessive costs of resource by compelling applicants to other unresolved mechanisms. The specific challenges faced by some community applicants in situations where in competition with commercial applicants, or in the GAC, call into account the final report of the ICAAN/ICANN46 as the issue when proposing the CPE input into the ICAAN/ICANN54 review of issues for improving procedures related to community-based applications in the new-gTLD round and the Competition, Trust and Consumer Review (CCT) under the multistakeholder process. The GAC notes issues regarding the CPE and the Community Priority Evaluation Process, following the rejection of a number of applications. There is a need to ensure that criteria for community priority treatment are applied consistently across the various applications. A. The GAC requests the ICAAN/ICANN54 to: 1. Tackle into this matter and also consider the Board should examine the feasibility of implementing an appeal mechanism in the current round as an applicant contest the decision of a community priority evaluation panel in the GNSO’s review of issues for improving procedures related to community-based applications in the new-gTLD round and the Competition, Trust and Consumer Review (CCT) under the multistakeholder process.

The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary.
### ANNEX I. 6. Number Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Date Issued</th>
<th>Date Closed</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Boardواقم Link</th>
<th>Status Update (Public)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Registry operators will require that registrants who collect and communicate data implement reasonable and appropriate security measures commensurate with the offering of those services, as defined by applicable law and recognized industry standards.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>6/19/13</td>
<td>5/18/17</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-02-05-en#1.a">https://www.icann.org/en/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-02-05-en#1.a</a></td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-02-05-en#2.b">https://www.icann.org/en/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-02-05-en#2.b</a></td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. GAC should have the ability to reject or impose suspension on registrants, in accordance with Section 6 of Specification 11, which obligates Registry Operators to verify the accuracy of the domain name (“a whois domain name”) against whom the domain name is registered.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>5/18/17</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-02-05-en#1.a">https://www.icann.org/en/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-02-05-en#1.a</a></td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-02-05-en#2.b">https://www.icann.org/en/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-02-05-en#2.b</a></td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**AR-004784**

**AR-004730**

**AR-001268**

**Request Number**

**Action Request:**

Communique

Forum GAC

ICANN71 Virtual Policy Communique

Community Forum GAC

ICANN70 Virtual Communique

ICANN49 Singapore Communique

**Date Issued:**

6/21/21

3/25/21

3/27/14

**Date Input:**

6/7/21

6/1/21

6/5/14

**Description:**

The GAC welcomes the explanation provided to the GAC by ICANN in relation to the status of any of the granting of the Data Retention Specification waiver requests in the Registrar Accreditation Agreement, in compliance with national laws. Some members asked ICANN not to take legal action against these 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.

**Current Phase:**

The GAC requested the status by ICANN of the waivers in the Registrar Accreditation Agreement and was informed that requests are currently being processed. The GAC emphasized the importance of data retention and asked ICANN for periodic updates on the status of the processing of these requests.

**Status Update (Public):**

The Board took action on the ICANN71 Virtual Communique on 30 June 2021:

https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-ismail-07apr21-en.pdf The Board also discussed the ICANN70 Communique, including the issues of importance, at the 1 June 2021 Board-GAC Interactions Group (BGIG) meeting:


The Board acknowledged the ICANN70 Communique on 7 April 2021:

https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-ismail-07mar21-en.pdf The Board also discussed the ICANN71 Virtual Communique, including the issues of importance, at the 5 June 2021 Board-GAC meetings.

**Board Resolution Link:**


6/7/21

**Board Scorecard Link:**


6/7/21

**Date Closed:**

10/5/21

6/1/21

6/5/14

**Description:**

ICANN supports the development of proposed contract provisions applicable to all gTLDs to address several important issues related to the measurement, attribution, and reporting of abuse and improvements to the measurement, attribution, and reporting of abuse are also much needed, and the GAC will continue to closely follow developments within the community interested in such issues.

**Current Phase:**

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.

**Status Update (Public):**

The Board acknowledged the ICANN70 Communique on 7 April 2021:

https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-ismail-07mar21-en.pdf The Board also discussed the ICANN71 Virtual Communique, including the issues of importance, at the 5 June 2021 Board-GAC meetings.

**Board Resolution Link:**


6/7/21

**Board Scorecard Link:**


6/7/21

**Date Closed:**

10/5/21
The GAC recognizes the work on DNS Abuse that has taken place within the ICANN Community since ICANN71, including the Contracted Parties’ publication of a trusted identifier framework. The GAC follows developments in the area of voluntary measures with interest, as exemplified by the work of the DNS Abuse Institute. The GAC notes positive steps taken in the monthly publication of compliance reporting, and developments shared during the Contracted Parties Community Outreach Session held in support of making progress in being made to provide reporting of abuse, which was highlighted by the GAC. The GAC also notes the work being undertaken to gain access to DNS Abuse Registry information and supports this as another step to help understand the DNS Abuse landscape. The GAC hopes this would enable a more productive anti-abuse dialogue within the community, and may inform efforts within the community or refined contractual improvements to enable a reduction of the harms caused by DNS abuse. Additionally, the GAC highlights the valuable case studies, clarifies the difference across in the internet-occupied, and provides recommendations on how the different actors (e.g., registrars, registrars, resellers, hosting providers, registrants, etc.) can respond to DNS abuse that takes place within the different layers of the DNS system. While not all harmful or illegal activities covered by the study fall into ICANN’s remit, the GAC is an important venue for governments to discuss DNS abuse and work toward solutions that can be accomplished both within and outside ICANN. Additionally, the GAC expressed appreciation for the DNS Security Facilitation Initiative Technical Study Group’s Final Report, commissioned by the ICANN CEO, which addressed root-level DNS security, infrastructure and recommended actions for ICANN org to facilitate and promote security. The GAC notes the cross-portfolioing, the forthcoming launch of a Centralized Abuse Reporting Tool (CART), and the need for improved contract provisions: abuse reporting at the registrar and registry levels, more detailed breakdowns of the types of DNS abuse measured, and realizability of raw aggregated data. The GAC welcomes the launch of a live, centralized abuse reporting tool by the community in response to recommendations made in both SAR115 and the GAC07 Forum on 24 November 2021: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-ismail-2021-11-24.pdf. The Board also discussed the ICANN74 Virtual Annual General Meeting Communique during the community outreach session, at the 6 February 2022 Board-GAC Interactions Group (BGIG) meeting.

The GAC discussed the ICANN74 Virtual Annual General Meeting Communique, including the issues of importance, at the 24 May 2022 Board-GAC Interactions Group (BGIG) meeting.

The GAC discussed the ICANN74 Virtual Community Forum Communiqué, including the issues of importance, at the 24 May 2022 Board-GAC Interactions Group (BGIG) meeting.

The GAC discussed the ICANN74 Policy Forum Communiqué on 24 June 2022. The ICANN74 Policy Forum Communiqué did not contain Consensus GAC Advice. The Board-GAC Interactions Group (BGIG) meeting on 24 June 2022 discussed the "Issues of Importance" noted in the ICANN74 Policy Forum Communiqué, which included topics such as System for Standardized Access and Disclosure (SSAD) of gTLD Registration Data, Subsequent Rights of New gTLDs, EPDR and Specific Contract Rights Protection for gTLDs, Accuracy of Registration Data, DNS Abuse Mitigation, Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP), and New gTLD Auction Provisions.

The GAC discussed the ICANN74 Virtual Annual General Meeting Communique on 24 January 2022. The ICANN74 Virtual Annual General Meeting Communique did not contain Consensus GAC Advice. The Board-GAC Interactions Group (BGIG) meeting on 24 January 2022 discussed the "Issues of Importance" noted in the ICANN74 Virtual Annual General Meeting Communique, which included topics such as System for Standardized Access and Disclosure (SSAD) of gTLD Registration Data, Subsequent Rights of New gTLDs, EPDR as Specific Contract Rights Protection for gTLDs, Accuracy of Registration Data, DNS Abuse Mitigation, Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP), and New gTLD Auction Provisions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request Number</th>
<th>Action Request</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Issue Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Issue Update (Public)</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
<th>Date Closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#9-10M14</td>
<td>ICANN47 Durban Communique</td>
<td>11/1/21</td>
<td>ICANN47 Durban Communique</td>
<td>ICANN considers this advice with a view to implementation as soon as possible. The GAC believes that all such stability and security concerns should be made publicly available prior to the delegation of new gTLDs. The GAC believes the ICANN Board to be a matter of urgency. The GAC recommends the ICANN Board to take all necessary measures to ensure that full and proper consideration is given to the advice in the GAC’s report on this topic.</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/gac-board-resolution-16jan22-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/gac-board-resolution-16jan22-en.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#23-17</td>
<td>ICANN47 Durban Communique</td>
<td>4/11/13</td>
<td>ICANN47 Durban Communique</td>
<td>ICANN considers this advice with a view to implementation as soon as possible. The GAC believes that all such stability and security concerns should be made publicly available prior to the delegation of new gTLDs. The GAC believes the ICANN Board to be a matter of urgency. The GAC recommends the ICANN Board to take all necessary measures to ensure that full and proper consideration is given to the advice in the GAC’s report on this topic.</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/gac-board-resolution-16jan22-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/gac-board-resolution-16jan22-en.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#26-14</td>
<td>ICANN70 Virtual Communique</td>
<td>12/14</td>
<td>ICANN70 Virtual Communique</td>
<td>Registry operators will maintain redacted 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 GAC upon request in connection with contractual obligations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request Number</td>
<td>Action Requested</td>
<td>Current Phase</td>
<td>Status Update [Public]</td>
<td>Board Resolution Link</td>
<td>Board Resolution Link</td>
<td>Date Issued</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-004102</td>
<td>Request Number</td>
<td>11/6/19</td>
<td>11/6/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/6/19</td>
<td>The GAC advises the Board to take all possible steps to ensure that the GDN2 is up and running within the Phase 5 Implementation Plan. The GAC will review the progress and provide an update at the end of Phase 5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-004103</td>
<td>Request Number</td>
<td>11/6/19</td>
<td>11/6/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/6/19</td>
<td>The GAC advises the Board to take all possible steps to ensure that the GDN2 is up and running within the Phase 5 Implementation Plan. The GAC will review the progress and provide an update at the end of Phase 5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-004101</td>
<td>Request Number</td>
<td>11/6/19</td>
<td>11/6/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/6/19</td>
<td>The GAC advises the Board to take all possible steps to ensure that the GDN2 is up and running within the Phase 5 Implementation Plan. The GAC will review the progress and provide an update at the end of Phase 5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On 25 August 2018 the Board considered the Amazon Registrar and provided this response in its scorecard. The Board acknowledges and appreciates this follow-up on the GAC’s advice reporting the AMRDN applications. Following the Board resolution on AMRDN at KUALA LUMPUR, a reconsideration request was filed by the 22 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 Amazon countries and the ICANN Corporation, between now and ICANN 55, and directs the President and CEO to provide the Board with updates on the facilitation process in anticipation of revisiting the status of the AMRDN applications at its meeting at KUALA LUMPUR.” 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 Board and ICANN org, which states: “As of the time of this letter, we have no update on the status of the AMRDN applications other than that the letter was sent. The President and CEO will continue to work with ICANN org members and the Amazon Corporation to develop a solution for the delegation of AMRDN 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 GAC org believe that the board is not to change its mind and we remain hopeful that we can soon harmonize our processes and continue progress towards the best possible outcome for all parties concerned.” This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 27 January 2019.

On 27 January 2019 the Board reviewed the Barcelona Communique and provided this response in its scorecard. The Board acknowledges and appreciates this follow-up on the GAC’s advice reporting the AMRDN applications. Following the Board resolution on AMRDN at KUALA LUMPUR, a reconsideration request was filed by the 22 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 Amazon countries and the ICANN Corporation, between now and ICANN 55, and directs the President and CEO to provide the Board with updates on the facilitation process in anticipation of revisiting the status of the AMRDN applications at its meeting at KUALA LUMPUR.” 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 Board and ICANN org, which states: “As of the time of this letter, we have no update on the status of the AMRDN applications other than that the letter was sent. The President and CEO will continue to work with ICANN org members and the Amazon Corporation to develop a solution for the delegation of AMRDN 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 GAC org believe that the board is not to change its mind and we remain hopeful that we can soon harmonize our processes and continue progress towards the best possible outcome for all parties concerned.” This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 27 January 2019.

On 25 August 2018 the Board considered the Amazon Registrar and provided this response in its scorecard. The Board acknowledges and appreciates this follow-up on the GAC’s advice reporting the AMRDN applications. Following the Board resolution on AMRDN at KUALA LUMPUR, a reconsideration request was filed by the 22 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 Amazon countries and the ICANN Corporation, between now and ICANN 55, and directs the President and CEO to provide the Board with updates on the facilitation process in anticipation of revisiting the status of the AMRDN applications at its meeting at KUALA LUMPUR.” 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 Board and ICANN org, which states: “As of the time of this letter, we have no update on the status of the AMRDN applications other than that the letter was sent. The President and CEO will continue to work with ICANN org members and the Amazon Corporation to develop a solution for the delegation of AMRDN 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 GAC org believe that the board is not to change its mind and we remain hopeful that we can soon harmonize our processes and continue progress towards the best possible outcome for all parties concerned.” This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 27 January 2019.

On 27 January 2019 the Board reviewed the Barcelona Communique and provided this response in its scorecard. The Board acknowledges and appreciates this follow-up on the GAC’s advice reporting the AMRDN applications. Following the Board resolution on AMRDN at KUALA LUMPUR, a reconsideration request was filed by the 22 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 Amazon countries and the ICANN Corporation, between now and ICANN 55, and directs the President and CEO to provide the Board with updates on the facilitation process in anticipation of revisiting the status of the AMRDN applications at its meeting at KUALA LUMPUR.” 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 Board and ICANN org, which states: “As of the time of this letter, we have no update on the status of the AMRDN applications other than that the letter was sent. The President and CEO will continue to work with ICANN org members and the Amazon Corporation to develop a solution for the delegation of AMRDN 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 GAC org believe that the board is not to change its mind and we remain hopeful that we can soon harmonize our processes and continue progress towards the best possible outcome for all parties concerned.” This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 27 January 2019.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request Number</th>
<th>Action Request</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Date Issued</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status Notes</th>
<th>Scorecard-Link</th>
<th>Resolution-Link</th>
<th>Date-Closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001321</td>
<td>ICANN67 Hyderabad Communique</td>
<td>Enhance ment of mutual cooperation and understand ing</td>
<td>11/8/16</td>
<td>Engage in enhanced and more regular communication with the GAC and supporting organizations with a view to fostering better mutual understanding of each other and of processes in the IETF.</td>
<td>On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and provided this response in its scorecard. 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. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 3 February 2017.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/s/2017-02-03-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/s/2017-02-03-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>2/3/17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001320</td>
<td>ICANN67 Hyderabad Communique</td>
<td>Enhance ment of mutual cooperation and understand ing</td>
<td>11/8/16</td>
<td>Engage in enhanced and more regular communication with the GAC with a view to fostering mutual understanding of the nature and purposes of the GAC. 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. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 3 February 2017.</td>
<td>On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and provided this response in its scorecard. The Board accepts this advice. The Board will continue the practice implemented with the includes and Hyderabad communique to hold a meeting 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’s expectations and the Board’s obligations related to the implementation of GAC advice.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/s/2017-02-03-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/s/2017-02-03-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>2/3/17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001319</td>
<td>ICANN67 Hyderabad Communique</td>
<td>Enhance ment of mutual cooperation and understand ing</td>
<td>11/8/16</td>
<td>Engage in enhanced and more regular communication with the GAC with a view to fostering mutual understanding of the nature and purposes of the GAC. 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. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 3 February 2017.</td>
<td>Make it a regular practice to schedule a post-Communique Board-GAC meeting to discuss the Board’s implementation of recommendations, either at the relevant GNSO meeting or in a call four weeks of a Communique being issued.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/s/2017-02-03-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/s/2017-02-03-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>2/3/17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001318</td>
<td>ICANN67 Hyderabad Communique</td>
<td>Enhance ment of mutual cooperation and understand ing</td>
<td>11/8/16</td>
<td>Engage in enhanced and more regular communication with the GAC with a view to fostering mutual understanding of the nature and purposes of the GAC. 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. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 3 February 2017.</td>
<td>Consider publicly posting draft resolutions in advance of Board Meetings.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/s/2017-02-03-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/s/2017-02-03-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>2/3/17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001317</td>
<td>ICANN67 Hyderabad Communique</td>
<td>Enhance ment of mutual cooperation and understand ing</td>
<td>11/8/16</td>
<td>Consider publicly posting draft resolutions in advance of Board Meetings.</td>
<td>The Board continued to examine various ways to improve transparency of its proposals. The Board has instituted an ongoing dialogue with the GAC, via regular calls to discuss the GAC Communique. 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 GNSO 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. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 3 February 2017.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/s/2017-02-03-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/s/2017-02-03-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>2/3/17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001316</td>
<td>ICANN67 Hyderabad Communique</td>
<td>Enhance ment of mutual cooperation and understand ing</td>
<td>11/8/16</td>
<td>Consider publicly posting draft resolutions in advance of Board Meetings.</td>
<td>The Board has continued to examine various ways to improve transparency of its proposals.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/s/2017-02-03-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/s/2017-02-03-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>2/3/17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001315</td>
<td>ICANN67 Hyderabad Communique</td>
<td>Enhance ment of mutual cooperation and understand ing</td>
<td>11/8/16</td>
<td>Engage in enhanced and more regular communication with the GAC and supporting organizations with a view to fostering better mutual understanding of each other and of processes in the IETF.</td>
<td>The Board continued to examine various ways to improve transparency of its proposals.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/s/2017-02-03-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/s/2017-02-03-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>2/3/17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001314</td>
<td>ICANN67 Hyderabad Communique</td>
<td>Enhance ment of mutual cooperation and understand ing</td>
<td>11/8/16</td>
<td>Engage in enhanced and more regular communication with the GAC and supporting organizations with a view to fostering better mutual understanding of each other and of processes in the IETF.</td>
<td>The Board continued to examine various ways to improve transparency of its proposals.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/s/2017-02-03-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/s/2017-02-03-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>2/3/17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001313</td>
<td>ICANN67 Hyderabad Communique</td>
<td>Enhance ment of mutual cooperation and understand ing</td>
<td>11/8/16</td>
<td>Engage in enhanced and more regular communication with the GAC and supporting organizations with a view to fostering better mutual understanding of each other and of processes in the IETF.</td>
<td>The Board continued to examine various ways to improve transparency of its proposals.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/s/2017-02-03-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/s/2017-02-03-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>2/3/17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001312</td>
<td>ICANN67 Hyderabad Communique</td>
<td>Enhance ment of mutual cooperation and understand ing</td>
<td>11/8/16</td>
<td>Engage in enhanced and more regular communication with the GAC and supporting organizations with a view to fostering better mutual understanding of each other and of processes in the IETF.</td>
<td>The Board has continued to examine various ways to improve transparency of its proposals.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/s/2017-02-03-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/s/2017-02-03-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>2/3/17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001311</td>
<td>ICANN67 Hyderabad Communique</td>
<td>Enhance ment of mutual cooperation and understand ing</td>
<td>11/8/16</td>
<td>Engage in enhanced and more regular communication with the GAC and supporting organizations with a view to fostering better mutual understanding of each other and of processes in the IETF.</td>
<td>The Board has continued to examine various ways to improve transparency of its proposals.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/s/2017-02-03-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/s/2017-02-03-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>2/3/17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The above table provides a summary of the actions requested, their status, and the links to the relevant Board resolutions and scorecards.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request Number</th>
<th>Action Request</th>
<th>Date Issued</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-004735</td>
<td>GAC71 Virtual Annual General Meeting Communique</td>
<td>3/25/21</td>
<td>EPDP Phase 1 Policy Implementation</td>
<td>1.a.i</td>
<td>The GAC notes its previous advice within the ICANN70, 71, 72, 73, 74, and 75 Communiques with regard to Phase 1 of the EPDP on gTLD Registration Data and the request for “a detailed work plan identifying an updated milestone schedule to complete its work.” The GAC highlights with “continued concern that the Phase 1 Implementation Review Team (IRT) lacks a current published implementation timeline.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-005012</td>
<td>GAC72 Virtual Community Forum Communique</td>
<td>5/24/22</td>
<td>EPDP Phase 1 Policy Implementation</td>
<td>1.a.i</td>
<td>The GAC notes its previous advice within the ICANN70, 71, 72, 73, 74, and 75 Communiques with regard to Phase 1 of the EPDP on gTLD Registration Data and the request for “a detailed work plan identifying an updated milestone schedule to complete its work.” The GAC welcomes the detailed work-plan provided by ICANN org to the IRT prior to ICANN73 and notes that the expected Data Protection Agreements (DPAs) between ICANN org and Contracted Parties have been “undergoing time-consuming negotiations” and are part of discussions, “which may extend an impasse”. Since detailed DPAs remain to be on the critical path to completing the implementation of EPDP Phase 1 policy recommendations, the GAC asks the ICANN Board to support the IRT in getting their sides completed to enhance the timely conclusion of the Phase 1 IRT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-005110</td>
<td>GAC73 Virtual Community Forum GAC Communique</td>
<td>5/24/22</td>
<td>EPDP Phase 3 Final Report</td>
<td>1.a.i</td>
<td>The Board appreciates the intent of the GAC to do the work and has issued updates on multiple areas of the EPDP Phase 1 policy implementation, noted below. Following up on implementation of the Phase 1 recommendations includes completing the draft of the gTLD Registration Data Policy and a proposed implementation timeline to be shared with the ICANN Board, including the anticipated implementation time for contracted parties; ICANN org and a GAC discussion group are also developing implementation specifications pursuant to EPDP Phase 1. Recommendation 19, EPDP Phase 1, Recommendation 18 recommended that ICANN org and the contracted parties negotiate and enter into required data protection agreements, as appropriate. The current thinking is that this Specification will be published for public comment along with the Registration Data Policy. To be clear, these data processing specifications will not change the current paradigm where the Contracted Party must make the decision to disclose the data to a requestor; as this is uncommon and not described in the draft recommendation. The GAC is following the journey as a public policy issue, and the Board has leaned to the conclusion that the ICANN org and Contracted Parties have engaged in the discussions and documented the implementation requirements as part of the Specification. The GAC highlights with “continued concern that the Phase 1 Implementation Review Team (IRT) lacks a current published implementation timeline.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Request Type</th>
<th>GAC Resolution</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Resolution Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) reiterates that this advice still stands and is not in the remit of the GDPR. The GAC observes the need to maintain WHOIS access to ICANN documents. However, its managing system that—where required by the GDPR—has now been published: https://www.icann.org/en/news/blog/creating-content-governance-and-rebuilding-the-infrastructure-of-icann-s-public-sites). The Board acknowledges this follow-up advice item. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 26 January 2020.

On 26 January 2020 the Board considered the Montreal Communiqué and provided this response in its scorecard: “The Board acknowledges this follow-up advice item. The Board notes that the Public Comment Period for the Implementation Plan for the GNSO Consensus Policy relating to the Protection of Certain Red Cross Names closed on 12 December 2019, and the public comment summary and analysis report has now been published: https://www.icann.org/en/news/blog/creating-content-governance-and-rebuilding-the-infrastructure-of-icann-s-public-sites). The Board notes that any changes to the scope of protections that were provided under the 2012 GDRR have now been published: https://www.icann.org/en/news/blog/creating-content-governance-and-rebuilding-the-infrastructure-of-icann-s-public-sites). The Board notes 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 ICANN bylaws). Additionally, the Board acknowledges that the ICANN organization is currently undertaking a review of the transparent interface and format of public comment proceedings. The Board intends to provide the ICANN organization with specific improvements to public comments, including the use of summaries, that can allow the community to quickly identify the questions being asked and how they are proceeding. The Board notes that the provision of timely and comprehensive information on all other relevant topics will improve the Board’s overall understanding of the issues and their implications. In this regard, the Board is reviewing four approved recommendations of the 2018 Implementation Review Team and encourages ICANN, upon completion of the current public comment forum, and pursuant to comments made, to publish and make available the Commsao’s Contracted portion of the new policy and applicable rules. All these initiatives are designed to provide the Board with timely and comprehensible information on all other relevant topics. The Board’s commitment to accountability and transparency and pursuing easily understandable and relevant information on matters of concern to all stakeholders. The Board’s commitment to accountability and transparency and pursuing easily understandable and relevant information on matters of concern to all stakeholders. The Board thanks the GAC for this clarification. The Board affirms its response to the GAC’s request to develop a formal advisory process for recommendations on policies that impact ICANN processes and activities – something that can be implemented without delay. In response, the Board referred to the current efforts of a monthly newsletter, site and panel meetings, and video interviews, as well as to its ICANN scorecard.

The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) thanks the ICANN Board for its response to their joint statement “Endorsing inclusive, informed and meaningful participation in ICANN” issued in ICANN’s Information Transparency Initiative (FTI), launched in January 2018, which hopefully will lead to the creation of a document management system that is not requested 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 websites, its delivery is expected in December 2020. In their joint statement, the ALAC and the GAC also asked ICANN to produce executive summaries, key points and recommendations, provide more transparency, simplify and improve the process of public comments, and improve the accessibility of information on its website. The Board intends to provide the ICANN organization with specific improvements to public comments, including the use of summaries, that can allow the community to quickly identify the questions being asked and how they are proceeding. The Board notes that the provision of timely and comprehensive information on all other relevant topics will improve the Board’s overall understanding of the issues and their implications. In this regard, the Board is reviewing four approved recommendations of the 2018 Implementation Review Team and encourages ICANN, upon completion of the current public comment forum, and pursuant to comments made, to publish and make available the Commsao’s Contracted portion of the new policy and applicable rules. All these initiatives are designed to provide the Board with timely and comprehensible information on all other relevant topics. The Board’s commitment to accountability and transparency and pursuing easily understandable and relevant information on matters of concern to all stakeholders. The Board thanks the GAC for this clarification. The Board affirms its response to the GAC’s request to develop a formal advisory process for recommendations on policies that impact ICANN processes and activities – something that can be implemented without delay. In response, the Board referred to the current efforts of a monthly newsletter, site and panel meetings, and video interviews, as well as to its ICANN scorecard.
ICANN56 Singapore Communique

The GAC advises the Board that before defining the milestones 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 ICANN's obligations to control the timing of the work of the community. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 13 December 2016.

28oct16-en.pdf) On 13 December 2016 the Board considered the Helsinki Communique and provided this response in its scorecard: The Board accepts this advice.

23oct16-en.pdf) 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. The Board considers this advice and continues to monitor the work of the community regarding reviews of the new gTLD Program for subsequent rounds of the New gTLD Program. The Board notes that it does not control the timing of the work of the community. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 13 December 2016.

The GAC advises the Board that before defining the milestones 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 ICANN's obligations to control the timing of the work of the community. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 3 February 2016.

The GAC advises the Board that before defining the milestones 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 ICANN's obligations to control the timing of the work of the community. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 13 December 2016.

28oct16-en.pdf) On 13 December 2016 the Board considered the Helsinki Communique and provided this response in its scorecard: The Board accepts this advice.

23oct16-en.pdf) 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. The Board considers this advice and continues to monitor the work of the community regarding reviews of the new gTLD Program for subsequent rounds of the New gTLD Program. The Board notes that it does not control the timing of the work of the community. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 13 December 2016.

23oct16-en.pdf) 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. The Board considers this advice and continues to monitor the work of the community regarding reviews of the new gTLD Program for subsequent rounds of the New gTLD Program. The Board notes that it does not control the timing of the work of the community. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 13 December 2016.

23oct16-en.pdf) 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. The Board considers this advice and continues to monitor the work of the community regarding reviews of the new gTLD Program for subsequent rounds of the New gTLD Program. The Board notes that it does not control the timing of the work of the community. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 13 December 2016.

23oct16-en.pdf) 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. The Board considers this advice and continues to monitor the work of the community regarding reviews of the new gTLD Program for subsequent rounds of the New gTLD Program. The Board notes that it does not control the timing of the work of the community. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 13 December 2016.

23oct16-en.pdf) 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. The Board considers this advice and continues to monitor the work of the community regarding reviews of the new gTLD Program for subsequent rounds of the New gTLD Program. The Board notes that it does not control the timing of the work of the community. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 13 December 2016.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request/Action Request Number</th>
<th>Continuation</th>
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<th>Subject</th>
<th>Issue Number</th>
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<th>Status</th>
<th>Close Date</th>
<th>Close Update (Public)</th>
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<th>Date Closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001222</td>
<td>ICANN46 Beijing Communique</td>
<td>4/11/13</td>
<td>Future gTLDs Policies and Procedures</td>
<td>1.a.i.i.1</td>
<td>An objective and comprehensive analysis of the costs and benefits should be conducted in parallel, drawing on experience with and outcomes from the recent round. On 30 October 2016 the ICANN Board Chair wrote to the GAC to inform the Board of its delay in providing a formal response to the Helsinki Communique due to the considerable effort required to complete the IANA transition. The GAC advised that the ICANN Board delay in providing a formal response to the Helsinki Communique is not a reason to consider the implementation of the new gTLD program prior to the publication of the second report on the IANA transition. The Board accepts this advice and will follow the procedures established in the GAC's Bylaws concerning policy development processes. As provided in Section 12.2 of the Bylaws, &quot;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 comments, and shall take timely action to account any timely response to that notification prior to taking action.&quot; This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 13 December 2016.</td>
<td>Status Update (Public)</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-12-13-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-12-13-en.pdf</a></td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-12-13-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-12-13-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>12/14/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001310</td>
<td>ICANN46 Beijing Communique</td>
<td>6/30/16</td>
<td>Future gTLDs Policies and Procedures</td>
<td>1.a.I.c.</td>
<td>All measures available to the Board should be used to confirm that a comprehensive and measured approach to further releases of new gTLDs is taken in a logical, sequential and coordinated way that is in the best interest of all stakeholders. On 28 October 2016 the ICANN Board Chair wrote to the GAC to inform the Board of its delay in providing a formal response to the Helsinki Communique due to the considerable effort required to complete the IANA transition. The GAC advised that the ICANN Board delay in providing a formal response to the Helsinki Communique is not a reason to consider the implementation of the new gTLD program prior to the publication of the second report on the IANA transition. The Board accepts this advice and will follow the procedures established in the GAC's Bylaws concerning policy development processes. As provided in Section 12.2 of the Bylaws, &quot;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 comments, and shall take timely action to account any timely response to that notification prior to taking action.&quot; This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 13 December 2016.</td>
<td>Status Update (Public)</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-12-13-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-12-13-en.pdf</a></td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-12-13-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-12-13-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>12/14/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001301</td>
<td>ICANN56 Helsinki Communique</td>
<td>2/3/17</td>
<td>Future gTLDs Policies and Procedures</td>
<td>1.a.i.</td>
<td>The GAC reiterates its advice contained in the Helsinki Communique and provided this response in its communique. The Board accepts this advice and will follow the procedures established in the GAC's Bylaws concerning policy development processes. As provided in Section 12.2 of the Bylaws, &quot;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 comments, and shall take timely action to account any timely response to that notification prior to taking action.&quot; This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 13 December 2016.</td>
<td>Status Update (Public)</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-12-13-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-12-13-en.pdf</a></td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-12-13-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-12-13-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>12/14/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001300</td>
<td>ICANN56 Helsinki Communique</td>
<td>2/3/17</td>
<td>Future gTLDs Policies and Procedures</td>
<td>1.a.</td>
<td>All measures available to the Board should be used to confirm that a comprehensive and measured approach to further releases of new gTLDs is taken in a logical, sequential and coordinated way that is in the best interest of all stakeholders. On 28 October 2016 the ICANN Board Chair wrote to the GAC to inform the Board of its delay in providing a formal response to the Helsinki Communique due to the considerable effort required to complete the IANA transition. The GAC advised that the ICANN Board delay in providing a formal response to the Helsinki Communique is not a reason to consider the implementation of the new gTLD program prior to the publication of the second report on the IANA transition. The Board accepts this advice and will follow the procedures established in the GAC's Bylaws concerning policy development processes. As provided in Section 12.2 of the Bylaws, &quot;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 comments, and shall take timely action to account any timely response to that notification prior to taking action.&quot; This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 13 December 2016.</td>
<td>Status Update (Public)</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-12-13-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-12-13-en.pdf</a></td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-12-13-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-12-13-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>12/14/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001299</td>
<td>ICANN60 Abu Dhabi Communique</td>
<td>11/1/17</td>
<td>Future gTLDs Policies and Procedures</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>The GAC reiterates its advice contained in the Hyderabad Communique concerning process and timing with regard to development of future gTLD policy and procedures. On 24 November 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and provided this response in its communique. The Board accepts this advice and will follow the procedures established in the GAC's Bylaws concerning policy development processes. As provided in Section 12.2 of the Bylaws, &quot;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 comments, and shall take timely action to account any timely response to that notification prior to taking action.&quot; This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 13 December 2016.</td>
<td>Status Update (Public)</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-12-13-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-12-13-en.pdf</a></td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-12-13-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-12-13-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>12/14/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001294</td>
<td>ICANN60 Abu Dhabi Communique</td>
<td>11/1/17</td>
<td>Future gTLDs Policies and Procedures</td>
<td>1.a.i.</td>
<td>The GAC reiterates its advice contained in the Hyderabad Communique and provided this response in its communique. The Board accepts this advice and will follow the procedures established in the GAC's Bylaws concerning policy development processes. As provided in Section 12.2 of the Bylaws, &quot;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 comments, and shall take timely action to account any timely response to that notification prior to taking action.&quot; This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 13 December 2016.</td>
<td>Status Update (Public)</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-12-13-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-12-13-en.pdf</a></td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-12-13-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-12-13-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>12/14/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001293</td>
<td>ICANN60 Abu Dhabi Communique</td>
<td>11/1/17</td>
<td>Future gTLDs Policies and Procedures</td>
<td>1.a.i.</td>
<td>The GAC reiterates its advice contained in the Hyderabad Communique and provided this response in its communique. The Board accepts this advice and will follow the procedures established in the GAC's Bylaws concerning policy development processes. As provided in Section 12.2 of the Bylaws, &quot;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 comments, and shall take timely action to account any timely response to that notification prior to taking action.&quot; This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 13 December 2016.</td>
<td>Status Update (Public)</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-12-13-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-12-13-en.pdf</a></td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-12-13-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-12-13-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>12/14/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001292</td>
<td>ICANN60 Abu Dhabi Communique</td>
<td>11/1/17</td>
<td>Future gTLDs Policies and Procedures</td>
<td>1.a.i.</td>
<td>The GAC reiterates its advice contained in the Hyderabad Communique and provided this response in its communique. The Board accepts this advice and will follow the procedures established in the GAC's Bylaws concerning policy development processes. As provided in Section 12.2 of the Bylaws, &quot;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 comments, and shall take timely action to account any timely response to that notification prior to taking action.&quot; This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 13 December 2016.</td>
<td>Status Update (Public)</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-12-13-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-12-13-en.pdf</a></td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-12-13-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-12-13-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>12/14/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>New gTLDs</td>
<td>Action Request</td>
<td>Action Taken</td>
<td>Date Issued</td>
<td>Date Closed</td>
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<td>Date Scored</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001242</td>
<td>COMBO - Beijing, China</td>
<td>Communique, ICANN47 Durban</td>
<td>The GAC has reached consensus on GAC Objection Advice regarding .1.a.i.i.2 of the Applicant Guidebook.</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-scorecard-07oct15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-scorecard-07oct15-en.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>5/29/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001242</td>
<td>COMBO - Beijing, China</td>
<td>Communique, ICANN47 Durban</td>
<td>The GAC has reached consensus on GAC Objection Advice regarding .1.a.i.i.2 of the Applicant Guidebook.</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-scorecard-07oct15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-scorecard-07oct15-en.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>5/29/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001242</td>
<td>COMBO - Beijing, China</td>
<td>Communique, ICANN47 Durban</td>
<td>The GAC has reached consensus on GAC Objection Advice regarding .1.a.i.i.2 of the Applicant Guidebook.</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-scorecard-07oct15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-scorecard-07oct15-en.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>5/29/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001242</td>
<td>COMBO - Beijing, China</td>
<td>Communique, ICANN47 Durban</td>
<td>The GAC has reached consensus on GAC Objection Advice regarding .1.a.i.i.2 of the Applicant Guidebook.</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-scorecard-07oct15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-scorecard-07oct15-en.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>5/29/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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</tbody>
</table>
ICANN regrets that the Board deferred four items of GAC advice. The GAC urges the Board to take steps to address these issues.

On 27 January 2019 the Board considered this advice and moved to its conclusion. 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 GDPR and the European Data Protection Board. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 9 February 2019.

On 27 January 2019 the Board considered this advice and moved to its conclusion. The Board and the GAC agreed that the Board will proceed with a technical study group to explore breaking the opportunity for individual users to opt-out or opt-in of the access model for legal, operational, and security reasons. The Board also recommended that the Board provide an update on progress related to the development of the unified access model, in addition to allowing a status report four weeks prior to ICANN. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 9 February 2019.
GDPR and WHOIS
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3.d.I.1

Number

Item

Phase 3

Current Phase
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- Implement GDPR activities.
- That ICANN practice transparency vis-à-vis (including interim) solution and requests in the design and implementation of any contracted parties, as quickly as possible; Take all steps necessary to ensure the development and implementation of a unified access model that addresses community interests 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 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 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 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 ongoing dialogues.

Recommendation 3 of the EPDP Final Report states that the EPDP Team undertakes to make a recommendation pertaining to a standardized 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: What are the legitimate purposes for third party access registration data? What are the eligibility criteria for access to non-public registration data? Do these parties/groups consist of different types of third-party requesters? What data elements should each user/party have access to? This advice item remains open for further Board consideration.

The ICANN Board considers this advice on 30 May 2018. However at the time, the Board requested, “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.” The Board most recently considered this item on 15 May 2019 and stated in the scorecard: “The Board continues to defer action on any advice recommendation 3 of the EPDP Final Report states that the EPDP Team undertakes to make a recommendation pertaining to a standardized 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: What are the legitimate purposes for third party access registration data? What are the eligibility criteria for access to non-public registration data? Do these parties/groups consist of different types of third-party requesters? What data elements should each user/party have access to? This advice item remains open for further Board consideration.

The ICANN Board initially considered this advice on 30 May 2018. However at the time, the Board requested, “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.” The Board most recently considered this item on 15 May 2019 and stated in the scorecard: “The Board continues to defer action on any advice recommendation 3 of the EPDP Final Report states that the EPDP Team undertakes to make a recommendation pertaining to a standardized 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: What are the legitimate purposes for third party access registration data? What are the eligibility criteria for access to non-public registration data? Do these parties/groups consist of different types of third-party requesters? What data elements should each user/party have access to? This advice item remains open for further Board consideration.

The ICANN Board initially considered this advice on 30 May 2018. However at the time, the Board requested, “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.” The Board most recently considered this item on 15 May 2019 and stated in the scorecard: “The Board continues to defer action on any advice recommendation 3 of the EPDP Final Report states that the EPDP Team undertakes to make a recommendation pertaining to a standardized 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: What are the legitimate purposes for third party access registration data? What are the eligibility criteria for access to non-public registration data? Do these parties/groups consist of different types of third-party requesters? What data elements should each user/party have access to? This advice item remains open for further Board consideration.

The ICANN Board initially considered this advice on 30 May 2018. However at the time, the Board requested, “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.” The Board most recently considered this item on 15 May 2019 and stated in the scorecard: “The Board continues to defer action on any advice recommendation 3 of the EPDP Final Report states that the EPDP Team undertakes to make a recommendation pertaining to a standardized 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: What are the legitimate purposes for third party access registration data? What are the eligibility criteria for access to non-public registration data? Do these parties/groups consist of different types of third-party requesters? What data elements should each user/party have access to? This advice item remains open for further Board consideration.

The ICANN Board initially considered this advice on 30 May 2018. However at the time, the Board requested, “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.” The Board most recently considered this item on 15 May 2019 and stated in the scorecard: “The Board continues to defer action on any advice recommendation 3 of the EPDP Final Report states that the EPDP Team undertakes to make a recommendation pertaining to a standardized 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: What are the legitimate purposes for third party access registration data? What are the eligibility criteria for access to non-public registration data? Do these parties/groups consist of different types of third-party requesters? What data elements should each user/party have access to? This advice item remains open for further Board consideration.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>Date Issued</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>ISIS/WHOIS</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Last Place</th>
<th>Date Closed</th>
<th>Date Closed</th>
<th>Date Updated</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Issue Close Date</th>
<th>Date Closeup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-00157</td>
<td>OIC/WHOIS</td>
<td>11/1/17</td>
<td>3.b.I.1-2</td>
<td>WHOIS/RDS</td>
<td>The GAC advises the ICANN Board that it is the Board's consideration of 4 February 2018</td>
<td>4 February 2018</td>
<td>On 4 February 2018 the Board considered the GAC's advice and provided this response in its scorecard. The Board accepts this advice and welcomes the GAC's continued engagement with the community on the GDPR-related discussions and is committed to continuing to facilitate this discussion in a transparent way. In 2017 November 2017, the Board and ICANN, as well as other fora, noted that the organization has made a high priority to find to the extremely important data protection agencies in ICANN's dialogue with the community regarding GDPR issues that addresses the following important public interest and tasks carried out for a business and other organizations: 1. Assisting law enforcement activities; 2. Assisting businesses, other organizations, and users in combatting fraud, complying with relevant laws, and safeguarding the interests of the public; 3. Combating 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.</td>
<td>9/10/19</td>
<td>9/10/19</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-2018-02-04-en#2.d">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-2018-02-04-en#2.d</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-00157</td>
<td>OIC/WHOIS</td>
<td>11/1/17</td>
<td>3.b.I.1-2</td>
<td>GDPR/WH</td>
<td>The GAC advises the ICANN Board that it is the Board's consideration of 4 February 2018</td>
<td>4 February 2018</td>
<td>On 4 February 2018 the Board considered the GAC's advice and provided this response in its scorecard. The Board accepts this advice and directs the ICANN Board 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 at the Data Protection and Privacy webpage. The Board appreciates 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.</td>
<td>9/10/19</td>
<td>9/10/19</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-2018-02-04-en#2.d">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-2018-02-04-en#2.d</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-00155</td>
<td>OIC/WHOIS</td>
<td>11/1/17</td>
<td>3.b.I.1-2</td>
<td>GDPR/WH</td>
<td>The GAC advises the ICANN Board that it is the Board's consideration of 4 February 2018</td>
<td>4 February 2018</td>
<td>On 4 February 2018 the Board considered the GAC's advice and provided this response in its scorecard. The Board accepts this advice and directs the ICANN Board 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 at the Data Protection and Privacy webpage. The Board appreciates 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.</td>
<td>9/10/19</td>
<td>9/10/19</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-2018-02-04-en#2.d">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-2018-02-04-en#2.d</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:**

On 4 February 2018 the Board considered the GAC's advice and provided this response in its scorecard. The Board accepts this advice and directs the ICANN Board 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 at the Data Protection and Privacy webpage. The Board appreciates 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 full engagement with the community on the GDPR-related discussions, and is committed to continuing to facilitate this discussion in a transparent way.**
On 10 September 2014, the GAC considered this advice and provided its 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 2014.

On 10 September 2014, the GAC considered this advice and provided its 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 2014.

The GAC recognizes the importance of incorporating Global Public Interest (GPI) considerations into policy development and decision-making at ICANN. The GPIs of particular importance to the GAC, which serves to consider and provide advice on public policy matters within ICANN's remit, the GAC that welcomes the development of a tool that could help ensure the GPI is embedded into policy at ICANN, and the GIP Framework discussions during ICANN91 were a good first step towards that goal. The GIP Framework could be adapted and applied by all AGACs and GLACs in their work, including, for example, through the process of developing and endorsing policy recommendations, decisions and public comments. The requirement of robustness established in the Annexes of incorporation should be explicitly mentioned in the GIP framework. The GAC notes that the initial application of the GPI to the SAID STDR appears to have been limited. It notes that it is possible that the initial application of the GPI is not only considered but effectively addressed. For example, one public interest concern identified during the GIPF...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request/Action Item Number</th>
<th>Community/Attachment</th>
<th>Date Issued</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date Closed</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Document Link</th>
<th>Status Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001295</td>
<td>ICANN53 Buenos Aires</td>
<td>6/24/15</td>
<td>Communique/Communiqué</td>
<td>1-1.a.i.</td>
<td>On 18 October 2015, the NGPC considered the Abu Dhabi Communique and provided this response in its communique. ICANN is in the process of creating a list of Public Interest Commitments (PICs) that includes the Registry Agreements for the Tlds associated with &quot;highly regulated&quot; industries as identified in the NGPC Implementation Framework of the GNSO, Category 3 language and all new gTLDs. The NGPC recommends that the ICANN community creates a harmonised set of PICs that work well for the protection of public interests in new gTLDs related to &quot;highly regulated&quot; sectors.</td>
<td>10/14/15</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/communique/communique-chalaby-to-ismail-14oct19-en.pdf">Link</a></td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2015-10-18-en.pdf">Link</a></td>
<td>10/14/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001296</td>
<td>ICANN53 Buenos Aires</td>
<td>6/24/15</td>
<td>GTLD Safeguards</td>
<td>1-1.b.i.</td>
<td>The NGPC recommends that the NGPC create a list ofcommended/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 (PICs) examples are required to be vetted by impartial, independent third party evaluators. The NGPC recommends that the ICANN community creates a harmonised set of PICs that work well for the protection of public interests in new gTLDs related to &quot;highly regulated&quot; sectors.</td>
<td>10/18/15</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/communique/communique-chalaby-to-ismail-14oct19-en.pdf">Link</a></td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2015-10-18-en.pdf">Link</a></td>
<td>10/18/15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- The NGPC’s recommendations are based on the Abu Dhabi Communique and provide responses in its communique. ICANN is in the process of creating a list of Public Interest Commitments (PICs) that includes the Registry Agreements for the Tlds associated with "highly regulated" industries as identified in the NGPC Implementation Framework of the GNSO, Category 3 language and all new gTLDs.
- The NGPC recommends that the ICANN community creates a harmonised set of PICs that work well for the protection of public interests in new gTLDs related to "highly regulated" sectors.
- The NGPC additionally recommends that the ICANN community creates a list of "highly regulated" domain names within the current exercise of assessment of the new gTLD program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request Number</th>
<th>Date Issued</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Level 1 Item</th>
<th>Level 2 Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score Update Link</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
<th>Date Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the 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 Teams and accepts the advice. The Board has initiated communications with the GAC and the Consumer Trust Review Teams to address the areas related to GIC 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 implementation, 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 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 GIC 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 GAC in Kobe, the “intention was and remains to fully consider and thoughtfully act on each of the recommendations in the Final Report. To clarify, the Board has not rejected any of the recommendations in the Kobe 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 the Board’s decision with respect to the recommendations on an ongoing basis. • We rejected any of the recommendations in the Kobe Final Report. After careful consideration of each 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 the Board’s decision with respect to the recommendations on an ongoing basis. • 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 the Board’s decision with respect to the recommendations on an ongoing basis.

On 12 May 2021, 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 Teams and accepts the advice. The Board has initiated communications with the CCT Review Team implementation subteams (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 implementation, 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 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 teams, the “intention was and remains to fully consider and thoughtfully act on each of the recommendations in the Final Report. To clarify, the Board has not rejected any of the recommendations in the Kobe 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 the Board’s decision with respect to the recommendations on an ongoing basis. • We rejected any of the recommendations in the Kobe Final Report. After careful consideration of each 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 the Board’s decision with respect to the recommendations on an ongoing basis.

On 12 May 2021, 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 Teams and accepts the advice. The Board has initiated communications with the CCT Review Team implementation subteams (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 implementation, 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 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 teams, the “intention was and remains to fully consider and thoughtfully act on each of the recommendations in the Final Report. To clarify, the Board has not rejected any of the recommendations in the Kobe 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 the Board’s decision with respect to the recommendations on an ongoing basis. • We rejected any of the recommendations in the Kobe Final Report. After careful consideration of each 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 the Board’s decision with respect to the recommendations on an ongoing basis.

On 12 May 2021, 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 Teams and accepts the advice. The Board has initiated communications with the CCT Review Team implementation subteams (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 implementation, 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 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 teams, the “intention was and remains to fully consider and thoughtfully act on each of the recommendations in the Final Report. To clarify, the Board has not rejected any of the recommendations in the Kobe 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 the Board’s decision with respect to the recommendations on an ongoing basis. • We rejected any of the recommendations in the Kobe Final Report. After careful consideration of each 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 the Board’s decision with respect to the recommendations on an ongoing basis.
20-05639 ICANN Brussels Communique 2/14/18 IGO Protections 2.a.I.2 Consider in the context of the Board's 14 September 2017 resolution on the GAC's ICANN58 Communique, the Board emphasizes that the final scope of interim protections for IGO acronyms is a matter to be determined through ICANN's policy processes, including the outcomes of the ongoing IGO Work Track (now an EPDP team). Registry Operators are currently required to withhold the acronyms of the IGOS on the GAC's 2013 list from registration in new gTLDs launched under the 2012 new gTLD Program. This measure was intended to be temporary while the Board, ICANN org and the community continue to actively work through implementation issues concerning IGO acronyms. The Board confirmed that these interim protections will remain in place until the post-registration notification system for acronyms is in place. The EPDP team that the Board mentioned in the scorecard completed its work in April 2022 and forwarded its recommendations, all of which preserved Fall Communique, to the GNSO Council. The GNSO Council approved all the EPDP recommendations in June 2022 and forwarded its Recommendations Report to the ICANN Board in July 2022. In addition to the EPDP recommendations, the Board will also consider the remaining GNSO policy recommendations concerning protections for IGO acronyms, including the four GNSO Council-approved recommendations from the Policy Development Process on IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Mechanisms.

20-05640 ICANN Brussels Communique 2/14/18 IGO Protections 2.a.I.2 Consider in the context of the Board's 14 September 2017 resolution on the GAC's ICANN58 Communique, the Board emphasizes that the final scope of interim protections for IGO acronyms is a matter to be determined through ICANN's policy processes, including the outcomes of the ongoing IGO Work Track (now an EPDP team). Registry Operators are currently required to withhold the acronyms of the IGOS on the GAC's 2013 list from registration in new gTLDs launched under the 2012 new gTLD Program. This measure was intended to be temporary while the Board, ICANN org and the community continue to actively work through implementation issues concerning IGO acronyms. The Board confirmed that these interim protections will remain in place until the post-registration notification system for acronyms is in place. The EPDP team that the Board mentioned in the scorecard completed its work in April 2022 and forwarded its recommendations, all of which preserved Fall Communique, to the GNSO Council. The GNSO Council approved all the EPDP recommendations in June 2022 and forwarded its Recommendations Report to the ICANN Board in July 2022. In addition to the EPDP recommendations, the Board will also consider the remaining GNSO policy recommendations concerning protections for IGO acronyms, including the four GNSO Council-approved recommendations from the Policy Development Process on IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Mechanisms.

20-05641 ICANN Brussels Communique 2/14/18 IGO Protections 2.a.I.2 Consider in the context of the Board's 12 September 2017 resolution on the GAC's ICANN58 Communique, the Board emphasizes that the final scope of interim protections for IGO acronyms is a matter to be determined through ICANN's policy processes, including the outcomes of the ongoing IGO Work Track (now an EPDP team). Registry Operators are currently required to withhold the acronyms of the IGOS on the GAC's 2013 list from registration in new gTLDs launched under the 2012 new gTLD Program. This measure was intended to be temporary while the Board, ICANN org and the community continue to actively work through implementation issues concerning IGO acronyms. The Board confirmed that these interim protections will remain in place until the post-registration notification system for acronyms is in place. The EPDP team that the Board mentioned in the scorecard completed its work in April 2022 and forwarded its recommendations, all of which preserved Fall Communique, to the GNSO Council. The GNSO Council approved all the EPDP recommendations in June 2022 and forwarded its Recommendations Report to the ICANN Board in July 2022. In addition to the EPDP recommendations, the Board will also consider the remaining GNSO policy recommendations concerning protections for IGO acronyms, including the four GNSO Council-approved recommendations from the Policy Development Process on IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Mechanisms.
The GAC is continuing to discuss a proposed mechanism and process for updating the IGO list that the GAC submitted to ICANN in 2013, to ensure that it is as complete as possible, and is maintained in the future, consistent with Advice in the GAC San Juan Communique. The Board had directed that ICANN conduct a feasibility study in response to the San Juan Communique.

As noted in the scorecard accompanying the Board’s 12 September 2021 resolution on Curative Rights Mechanisms, the Board “emphasizes that the full scope of protections for IGO acronyms is a matter to be determined through ICANN’s policy processes, including the outcomes of the ongoing IGO Work Track (now as EPDP team).” Registry Operators are currently required to withhold the acronyms of the IGOs on the GAC’s 2013 list from registration in new gTLDs launched under the 2012 new gTLD Program. This measure was intended to be temporary while the Board, ICANN, and the community continue to actively work through implementation issues concerning IGO acronyms. The Board has confirmed that these interim reservations will remain in place until the post-registration notification system for GIs is in place. The EPDP team that the Board mentioned in the scorecard completed its work in April 2022 and finalized its recommendations, all of which attained Full Consensus, to the ICANN Board. The GNSO Council approved the EPDP Team’s Recommendations Report to the ICANN Board in July 2022. In addition to the EPDP recommendations, the Board will also consider the remaining GNSO policy recommendations concerning protections for GIs acronyms, including the four GNSO Council-approved recommendations from the Policy Development Process on IGO-INGO Access to Jurisdictional Rights Mechanisms.

As noted in the scorecard accompanying the Board’s 14 September 2019 resolution on the GAC’s KAMWGI Communique, the Board “emphasizes that the final scope of protections for GIs acronyms is a matter to be determined through ICANN’s policy processes, including the outcomes of the ongoing IGO Work Track (now an EPDP team).” Registry Operators are currently required to withhold the acronyms of the GIs on the GAC’s 2013 list from registration in new gTLDs launched under the 2012 new gTLD Program. This measure was intended to be temporary while the Board, ICANN, and the community continue to actively work through implementation issues concerning GIs acronyms. The Board has confirmed that these interim reservations will remain in place until the post-registration notification system for GIs is in place. The EPDP team that the Board mentioned in the scorecard completed its work in April 2022 and finalized its recommendations, all of which attained Full Consensus, to the ICANN Board. Should the GNSO Council approve the EPDP Team’s Recommendations Report to the ICANN Board in July 2022, in addition to the EPDP recommendations, the Board will also consider the remaining GNSO policy recommendations concerning protections for GIs acronyms, including the four GNSO Council-approved recommendations from the Policy Development Process on IGO-INGO Access to Jurisdictional Rights Mechanisms.

As noted in the scorecard accompanying the Board’s 14 September 2019 resolution on the GAC’s KAMWGI Communique, the Board “emphasizes that the final scope of protections for GIs acronyms is a matter to be determined through ICANN’s policy processes, including the outcomes of the ongoing IGO Work Track (now an EPDP team).” Registry Operators are currently required to withhold the acronyms of the GIs on the GAC’s 2013 list from registration in new gTLDs launched under the 2012 new gTLD Program. This measure was intended to be temporary while the Board, ICANN, and the community continue to actively work through implementation issues concerning GIs acronyms. The Board has confirmed that these interim reservations will remain in place until the post-registration notification system for GIs is in place. The EPDP team that the Board mentioned in the scorecard completed its work in April 2022 and finalized its recommendations, all of which attained Full Consensus, to the ICANN Board. Should the GNSO Council approve the EPDP Team’s Recommendations Report to the ICANN Board in July 2022, in addition to the EPDP recommendations, the Board will also consider the remaining GNSO policy recommendations concerning protections for GIs acronyms, including the four GNSO Council-approved recommendations from the Policy Development Process on IGO-INGO Access to Jurisdictional Rights Mechanisms.
On 23 October 2021, the ICANN Board discussed the ICANN's role in ensuring the security, protection regimes and ICANN's Registrar DNS. The GDPR, as well as other data protection regimes, require registration data to be protected for an indefinite duration for ICANN's purposes. Specification 5 of this version of the Registry Agreement defines a list of names protected by the IC and ICANN Agreement that "shall be withheld from registration or allocated to Registry Operators until the second level within the TLD." This protection was added pursuant to a GAC resolution to maintain these protections "until such time as a policy is adopted that may require further action" (2014-06-05.NG03). The resolution recognized the GDPR's innovator of an expanded RFP, until such time as the GDPR approach recommendations, in the RFP and the Board Resolution is to maintain resolutions protecting ICANN's names will remain in place. Should the GDPR submit any recommendations on this topic, the NGPC will confer with the GAC prior to taking action on any such recommendations. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 4 June 2021.

The ICANN Board also discussed the ICANN’s role with respect to the ICANN’s engagement in maintaining the security, protection regimes and ICANN’s Registrar DNS. The GDPR, as well as other data protection regimes, require registration data to be protected for an indefinite duration for ICANN’s purposes. Specification 5 of this version of the Registry Agreement defines a list of names protected by the IC and ICANN Agreement that “shall be withheld from registration or allocated to Registry Operators until the second level within the TLD.” This protection was added pursuant to a GAC resolution to maintain these protections “until such time as a policy is adopted that may require further action” (2014-06-05.NG03). The resolution recognized the GDPR’s innovator of an expanded RFP, until such time as the GDPR approach recommendations, in the RFP and the Board Resolution is to maintain resolutions protecting ICANN’s names will remain in place. Should the GDPR submit any recommendations on this topic, the NGPC will confer with the GAC prior to taking action on any such recommendations. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 4 June 2021.

The ICANN Board also discussed the ICANN’s role with respect to the ICANN’s engagement in maintaining the security, protection regimes and ICANN’s Registrar DNS. The GDPR, as well as other data protection regimes, require registration data to be protected for an indefinite duration for ICANN’s purposes. Specification 5 of this version of the Registry Agreement defines a list of names protected by the IC and ICANN Agreement that “shall be withheld from registration or allocated to Registry Operators until the second level within the TLD.” This protection was added pursuant to a GAC resolution to maintain these protections “until such time as a policy is adopted that may require further action” (2014-06-05.NG03). The resolution recognized the GDPR’s innovator of an expanded RFP, until such time as the GDPR approach recommendations, in the RFP and the Board Resolution is to maintain resolutions protecting ICANN’s names will remain in place. Should the GDPR submit any recommendations on this topic, the NGPC will confer with the GAC prior to taking action on any such recommendations. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 4 June 2021.

The ICANN Board also discussed the ICANN’s role with respect to the ICANN’s engagement in maintaining the security, protection regimes and ICANN’s Registrar DNS. The GDPR, as well as other data protection regimes, require registration data to be protected for an indefinite duration for ICANN’s purposes. Specification 5 of this version of the Registry Agreement defines a list of names protected by the IC and ICANN Agreement that “shall be withheld from registration or allocated to Registry Operators until the second level within the TLD.” This protection was added pursuant to a GAC resolution to maintain these protections “until such time as a policy is adopted that may require further action” (2014-06-05.NG03). The resolution recognized the GDPR’s innovator of an expanded RFP, until such time as the GDPR approach recommendations, in the RFP and the Board Resolution is to maintain resolutions protecting ICANN’s names will remain in place. Should the GDPR submit any recommendations on this topic, the NGPC will confer with the GAC prior to taking action on any such recommendations. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 4 June 2021.

The ICANN Board also discussed the ICANN’s role with respect to the ICANN’s engagement in maintaining the security, protection regimes and ICANN’s Registrar DNS. The GDPR, as well as other data protection regimes, require registration data to be protected for an indefinite duration for ICANN’s purposes. Specification 5 of this version of the Registry Agreement defines a list of names protected by the IC and ICANN Agreement that “shall be withheld from registration or allocated to Registry Operators until the second level within the TLD.” This protection was added pursuant to a GAC resolution to maintain these protections “until such time as a policy is adopted that may require further action” (2014-06-05.NG03). The resolution recognized the GDPR’s innovator of an expanded RFP, until such time as the GDPR approach recommendations, in the RFP and the Board Resolution is to maintain resolutions protecting ICANN’s names will remain in place. Should the GDPR submit any recommendations on this topic, the NGPC will confer with the GAC prior to taking action on any such recommendations. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 4 June 2021.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Date Issued</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Date Closed</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-004500</td>
<td>6/27/20</td>
<td>Issue of Importance: Accountability Work Stream 2 Implementation</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>11/3/20</td>
<td>GAC highly appreciated the ICANN Virtual Communique from ICANN67 on 16 March 2020. The ICANN68 GAC Communique did not contain Consensus GAC Advice. The Board-GAC Interactions Group met with GAC leadership on 8 June 2020 to discuss the &quot;Issues of Importance&quot; noted in the ICANN67 GAC Communique, which included reports such as the transaction and implementation of Transparency, Registration Data Protection, and Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs. The Board also appreciated the letter from Botterman to Ismail (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-ismail-08apr20-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-ismail-08apr20-en.pdf</a>).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Board acknowledged the ICANN Virtual Policy Forum Communique on 7 July 2020 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-ismail-08apr20-en.pdf), and the Board-GAC Interactions Group (BGIG) met on 30 September 2020 to discuss the ICANN Virtual Policy Forum Communique.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request</th>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link Status Update (Public)</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link Date Closed</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link Date Closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>202006132</td>
<td>AR-004502</td>
<td>6/27/20</td>
<td>3/16/20</td>
<td>Status Update (Public)</td>
<td>3/16/20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ICANN68 Virtual Policy Forum Communique**

The Board discussed the ICANN68 Virtual Community Forum Communique on 7 July 2020. In particular, the Board discussed the ICANN68 Virtual Policy Forum Communique, including the Issues of Importance, at the 1 November 2020 Board-GAC Interactions Group (BGIG) meeting.

**ICANN67 Virtual Community Forum Communique**

The Board discussed the ICANN67 Virtual Community Forum Communique on 16 March 2020. The Board and the GAC noted the ICANN67 Virtual Community Forum Communique, which included issues such as: Acquisition of PIR (.org), Domain Name Registration Directory Service and Data Protection, and Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs.

**ICANN69 Communique**

The Board discussed the ICANN69 Communique, including the Issues of Importance, at the 11 March 2021 Board-GAC Interactions Group (BGIG) meeting.

**GAC67 Final Report**

The GAC small group highlighted the need for more transparency regarding the implementation of the “Issues of Importance” noted in the GAC67 Final Report: Community on DNS Abuse. The GAC small group noted the ICANN66 Virtual Policy Forum Communique, which included issues such as: Acquisition of PIR (.org), Domain Name Registration Directory Service and Data Protection, and Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs.

**GAC67 Final Report**

The GAC small group highlighted the need for more transparency regarding the implementation of the “Issues of Importance” noted in the GAC67 Final Report: Community on DNS Abuse. The GAC small group noted the ICANN66 Virtual Policy Forum Communique, which included issues such as: Acquisition of PIR (.org), Domain Name Registration Directory Service and Data Protection, and Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request/Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Date Issued</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status Update (Public)</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
<th>Date Closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-004534</td>
<td>ICANN Virtual Policy Forum Communique</td>
<td>6/27/20</td>
<td>Issue of Importance: IGO Protections</td>
<td>6/27/20</td>
<td>The GAC received an update that the GNSO Council had adapted a revised charter concerning a focused working group to produce policy recommendations which addresses concerns raised over IGO access to a curative dispute resolution mechanism and in the process of selecting a Chair prior to moving ahead with such policy effort.</td>
<td>The Board acknowledged the ICANN Virtual Policy Forum Communique on 7 July 2020 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-ismail-07jul20-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-ismail-07jul20-en.pdf</a>), and the Board-GAC Interactions Group (BGIG) met on 30 September 2020 to discuss the ICANN Virtual Policy Forum Communique.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/3/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-004501</td>
<td>ICANN Virtual Community Forum Communique</td>
<td>3/16/20</td>
<td>Issue of Importance: Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs</td>
<td>3/16/20</td>
<td>The GAC prioritized consideration of policy issues related to successive rounds of new gTLDs during ICANN67, notably by devoting several GAC sessions to this topic, by not scheduling concurrent sessions with meetings of the GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Proponents (Sub-Pro) PDP Working Group (Sub-Pro PDP WG), and by actively participating in each Sub-Pro PDP WG meeting. The GAC wishes to thank the Sub-Pro PDP WG Co-Chairs for their participation and engagement in GAC sessions on this topic. The GAC recognizes that the Sub-Pro PDP WG is building an intersessional track in order to prepare discussions on key topics of high interest to the GAC. The GAC wishes to warmly thank the Sub-Pro PDP WG Co-Chairs for their participation and engagement in this regard.</td>
<td>The Board-GAC Interactions Group met with GAC leadership on 8 June 2020 to discuss the “Issues of Importance” noted in the ICANN67 GAC Communique, which included topics such as: Acquisition of PIR (.org), Domain Name Registration Directory Service and Data Protection, and Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6/8/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-004531</td>
<td>ICANN Virtual Policy Forum Communique</td>
<td>6/27/20</td>
<td>Issue of Importance: Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs</td>
<td>6/27/20</td>
<td>The GAC prioritized consideration of policy issues related to successive rounds of new gTLDs during ICANN68, notably by devoting three GAC sessions to this topic, reviewing the GAC Scorecard, and engaging in the GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Proponents (Sub-Pro) PDP Working Group (Sub-Pro PDP WG) meeting. The GAC wishes to thank the Sub-Pro PDP WG Co-Chairs for their participation in GAC sessions on this topic, and recognize the extensive and diligent work of the Sub-Pro PDP WG to deliver the Final Report. The GAC concluded an update on the Sub-Pro PDP WG Co-Chair visit conducted since ICANN67, in particular consideration of the draft final report and review of the compilation of individual GAC Members and the development of the Sub-Pro PDP WG timeline. The GAC notes that the draft final report is expected to be posted for public comment in July 2020 for 40 days. Some GAC Members expressed concerns with the use of a standard 60-day public comment proceeding for a topic of high priority to the GAC and the ICANN Community. The Sub-Pro PDP WG Co-Chair noted such concerns.</td>
<td>The Board acknowledged the ICANN Virtual Policy Forum Communique on 7 July 2020 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-ismail-07jul20-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-ismail-07jul20-en.pdf</a>), and the Board-GAC Interactions Group (BGIG) met on 30 September 2020 to discuss the ICANN Virtual Policy Forum Communique.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/3/20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20160518 ICANN57 Hyderabad Communique 01/26/16 Mitigating Abuse activity Notice 1.2

Registries operators will remove bad terms of use for registrants that are against the distribution of malware, operation of botnets, phishing, viruses, trademarks or copyright infringement, fraudulent or deceptive practices, counterfeiting or otherwise engaging in activity contrary to applicable law.

On 19 June 2013 the NGPC considered this advice and the general topics of safeguard application 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 requests to the advice item as follows: 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 6.1 of Specification 11 of the proposed new gTLD Registry Agreement provides that the 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 complaints respecting malicious conduct in the TLD, and will provide ICANN with prompt notice of any changes to such contact details. (See, Section 6.1 of the proposal.)

The NGPC Registry Agreement provides that, "Registry Operator shall take reasonable steps to investigate and respond to reports of illegal conduct and government or 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/inaccurate-whois.pdf) , which is a mechanism for making complaints that WHOIS information is inaccurate. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's response of 19 June 2013.
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Registries operators will remove bad terms of use for registrants that are against the distribution of malware, operation of botnets, phishing, viruses, trademarks or copyright infringement, fraudulent or deceptive practices, counterfeiting or otherwise engaging in activity contrary to applicable law.

On 19 June 2013 the NGPC considered this advice and the general topics of safeguard application 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 requests to the advice item as follows: 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 6.1 of Specification 11 of the proposed new gTLD Registry Agreement provides that the 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 complaints respecting malicious conduct in the TLD, and will provide ICANN with prompt notice of any changes to such contact details. (See, Section 6.1 of the proposal.)

The NGPC Registry Agreement provides that, "Registry Operator shall take reasonable steps to investigate and respond to reports of illegal conduct and government or 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/inaccurate-whois.pdf) , which is a mechanism for making complaints that WHOIS information is inaccurate. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's response of 19 June 2013.
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On 19 June 2013 the NGPC considered this advice and the general topics of safeguard application 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 requests to the advice item as follows: 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 6.1 of Specification 11 of the proposed new gTLD Registry Agreement provides that the 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 complaints respecting malicious conduct in the TLD, and will provide ICANN with prompt notice of any changes to such contact details. (See, Section 6.1 of the proposal.)

The NGPC Registry Agreement provides that, "Registry Operator shall take reasonable steps to investigate and respond to reports of illegal conduct and government or 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/inaccurate-whois.pdf) , which is a mechanism for making complaints that WHOIS information is inaccurate. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's response of 19 June 2013.
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On 19 June 2013 the NGPC considered this advice and the general topics of safeguard application 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 requests to the advice item as follows: 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 6.1 of Specification 11 of the proposed new gTLD Registry Agreement provides that the 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 complaints respecting malicious conduct in the TLD, and will provide ICANN with prompt notice of any changes to such contact details. (See, Section 6.1 of the proposal.)

The NGPC Registry Agreement provides that, "Registry Operator shall take reasonable steps to investigate and respond to reports of illegal conduct and government or 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/inaccurate-whois.pdf) , which is a mechanism for making complaints that WHOIS information is inaccurate. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's response of 19 June 2013.
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On 19 June 2013 the NGPC considered this advice and the general topics of safeguard application 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 requests to the advice item as follows: 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 6.1 of Specification 11 of the proposed new gTLD Registry Agreement provides that the 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 complaints respecting malicious conduct in the TLD, and will provide ICANN with prompt notice of any changes to such contact details. (See, Section 6.1 of the proposal.)

The NGPC Registry Agreement provides that, "Registry Operator shall take reasonable steps to investigate and respond to reports of illegal conduct and government or 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/inaccurate-whois.pdf) , which is a mechanism for making complaints that WHOIS information is inaccurate. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's response of 19 June 2013.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request Number</th>
<th>Action Request: Action (Public)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Action Request: Action (Public)</th>
<th>Approval/Action Date</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
<th>Date Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
On 20 October 2014 the ICANN Board first wrote to the ICANN Chair to inform the Board of its delay in providing a formal response to the Helsinki Communiqué due to the considerable amount of work required to complete the IANA Transition (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-schneider-20141020-en.pdf). On 11 December 2014 the Board considered the Helsinki Communiqué and provided this response in its report. 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 GAC’s recent Communiqué 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. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 12 December 2014.

On 3 February 2016 the Board considered the Dublin Communique and provided this response in its scorecard. On 16 July 2015, the “small group” of representatives of GICs, the GAC and the NGPC met and submitted a draft proposal for dealing with the protection of GIC 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 2016 the Board took action requesting additional time to consider certain GNSO advisory committee recommendations that differ from advice from the GAC to the Board with respect to protections for GIC 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. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 3 February 2016.

On 12 September 2021 the ICANN Board considered the GAC ICANN71 Virtual Policy Development Process (V-PDP) Phase 1 Implementation. The GAC notes the ongoing work between ICANN and the GNSO on privacy and proxy service accreditation. The GAC advises the Board to facilitate the implementation of privacy/proxy service providers. The Board notes that ICANN’s recent Consultation 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. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 12 December 2014.

On 8 September 2014 the ICANN Board requested the staff to provide the ICANN Chair with a draft recommendation to the ICANN Board regarding the topic of protection of geographic names in TLDs. The staff provided a briefing, and the Board requested that the working group on future TLD issues, in consultation with the community, provide a proposal on the topic for future consideration. The Board expects to receive further work on this matter and future updates will be provided at the next GAC meeting.

On 8 September 2014, the ICANN Board considered the advice and provided the response in its scorecard. The NGPC accepted the advice. In the 3 February 2016 iteration of the scorecard, the NGPC acknowledged the GAC’s view, and directed ICANN to contact 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. The NGPC requested ICANN to submit a “small group” of representatives of GICs, the GAC and the NGPC meet and submitted a draft proposal for dealing with the protection of GIC 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 2016 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 GIC 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. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 3 February 2016.

On 8 September 2014 the ICANN Board requested the staff to provide the ICANN Chair with a draft recommendation to the ICANN Board regarding the topic of protection of geographic names in TLDs. The staff provided a briefing, and the Board requested that the working group on future TLD issues, in consultation with the community, provide a proposal on the topic for future consideration. The Board expects to receive further work on this matter and future updates will be provided at the next GAC meeting.

On 8 September 2014, the ICANN Board considered the advice and provided the response in its scorecard. The NGPC accepted the advice. In the 3 February 2016 iteration of the scorecard, the NGPC acknowledged the GAC’s view, and directed ICANN to contact 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. The NGPC requested ICANN to submit a “small group” of representatives of GICs, the GAC and the NGPC meet and submitted a draft proposal for dealing with the protection of GIC 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 2016 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 GIC 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. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 3 February 2016.

On 8 September 2014, the ICANN Board requested the staff to provide the ICANN Chair with a draft recommendation to the ICANN Board regarding the topic of protection of geographic names in TLDs. The staff provided a briefing, and the Board requested that the working group on future TLD issues, in consultation with the community, provide a proposal on the topic for future consideration. The Board expects to receive further work on this matter and future updates will be provided at the next GAC meeting.

On 8 September 2014, the ICANN Board considered the advice and provided the response in its scorecard. The NGPC accepted the advice. In the 3 February 2016 iteration of the scorecard, the NGPC acknowledged the GAC’s view, and directed ICANN to contact 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. The NGPC requested ICANN to submit a “small group” of representatives of GICs, the GAC and the NGPC meet and submitted a draft proposal for dealing with the protection of GIC 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 2016 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 GIC 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. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 3 February 2016.

On 8 September 2014, the ICANN Board requested the staff to provide the ICANN Chair with a draft recommendation to the ICANN Board regarding the topic of protection of geographic names in TLDs. The staff provided a briefing, and the Board requested that the working group on future TLD issues, in consultation with the community, provide a proposal on the topic for future consideration. The Board expects to receive further work on this matter and future updates will be provided at the next GAC meeting.

On 8 September 2014, the ICANN Board considered the advice and provided the response in its scorecard. The NGPC accepted the advice. In the 3 February 2016 iteration of the scorecard, the NGPC acknowledged the GAC’s view, and directed ICANN to contact 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. The NGPC requested ICANN to submit a “small group” of representatives of GICs, the GAC and the NGPC meet and submitted a draft proposal for dealing with the protection of GIC 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 2016 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 GIC 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. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 3 February 2016.

On 8 September 2014, the ICANN Board requested the staff to provide the ICANN Chair with a draft recommendation to the ICANN Board regarding the topic of protection of geographic names in TLDs. The staff provided a briefing, and the Board requested that the working group on future TLD issues, in consultation with the community, provide a proposal on the topic for future consideration. The Board expects to receive further work on this matter and future updates will be provided at the next GAC meeting.

On 8 September 2014, the ICANN Board considered the advice and provided the response in its scorecard. The NGPC accepted the advice. In the 3 February 2016 iteration of the scorecard, the NGPC acknowledged the GAC’s view, and directed ICANN to contact 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. The NGPC requested ICANN to submit a “small group” of representatives of GICs, the GAC and the NGPC meet and submitted a draft proposal for dealing with the protection of GIC 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 2016 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 GIC 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. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 3 February 2016.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request Number</th>
<th>Action Request: Action</th>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status Update [Public]</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Resolution Text</th>
<th>Date Closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001327</td>
<td>Action Request: Action</td>
<td>2.a.II.</td>
<td>The GAC advises the NGPC that it: The GAC is interested to work with the IGOs and the NGPC on a complementary set of mechanisms that would: 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 allow for an independent third party to review any such registration requests, in the event of a disagreement between an IGO and potential registrant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/15/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001327</td>
<td>Action Request: Action</td>
<td>2.a.II.</td>
<td>The GAC advises the NGPC that it: The GAC is interested to work with the IGOs and the NGPC on a complementary set of mechanisms that would: 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 allow for an independent third party to review any such registration requests, in the event of a disagreement between an IGO and potential registrant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/15/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001327</td>
<td>Action Request: Action</td>
<td>2.a.III.</td>
<td>The GAC advises the NGPC that it: The GAC is interested to work with the IGOs and the NGPC on a complementary set of mechanisms that would: 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 allow for an independent third party to review any such registration requests, in the event of a disagreement between an IGO and potential registrant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/15/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001327</td>
<td>Action Request: Action</td>
<td>2.a.III.</td>
<td>The GAC advises the NGPC that it: The GAC is interested to work with the IGOs and the NGPC on a complementary set of mechanisms that would: 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 allow for an independent third party to review any such registration requests, in the event of a disagreement between an IGO and potential registrant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/15/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001327</td>
<td>Action Request: Action</td>
<td>2.a.III.</td>
<td>The GAC advises the NGPC that it: The GAC is interested to work with the IGOs and the NGPC on a complementary set of mechanisms that would: 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 allow for an independent third party to review any such registration requests, in the event of a disagreement between an IGO and potential registrant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/15/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001327</td>
<td>Action Request: Action</td>
<td>2.a.III.</td>
<td>The GAC advises the NGPC that it: The GAC is interested to work with the IGOs and the NGPC on a complementary set of mechanisms that would: 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 allow for an independent third party to review any such registration requests, in the event of a disagreement between an IGO and potential registrant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/15/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001327</td>
<td>Action Request: Action</td>
<td>2.a.III.</td>
<td>The GAC advises the NGPC that it: The GAC is interested to work with the IGOs and the NGPC on a complementary set of mechanisms that would: 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 allow for an independent third party to review any such registration requests, in the event of a disagreement between an IGO and potential registrant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/15/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001327</td>
<td>Action Request: Action</td>
<td>2.a.III.</td>
<td>The GAC advises the NGPC that it: The GAC is interested to work with the IGOs and the NGPC on a complementary set of mechanisms that would: 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 allow for an independent third party to review any such registration requests, in the event of a disagreement between an IGO and potential registrant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/15/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001327</td>
<td>Action Request: Action</td>
<td>2.a.III.</td>
<td>The GAC advises the NGPC that it: The GAC is interested to work with the IGOs and the NGPC on a complementary set of mechanisms that would: 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 allow for an independent third party to review any such registration requests, in the event of a disagreement between an IGO and potential registrant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/15/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001327</td>
<td>Action Request: Action</td>
<td>2.a.III.</td>
<td>The GAC advises the NGPC that it: The GAC is interested to work with the IGOs and the NGPC on a complementary set of mechanisms that would: 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 allow for an independent third party to review any such registration requests, in the event of a disagreement between an IGO and potential registrant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/15/14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and provided this response in its scorecard. Based on the Board’s understanding, the Board accepts this advice. The Board sent a letter to the GNSO Council regarding the next steps in 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. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 3 February 2017.

On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and provided this response in its scorecard. The Board accepts this advice. The Board notes that the IGO acronyms are a starting basis for resolution of the differences between GAC advice and GNSO recommendations with respect to the protection of GAC acronyms in the DNS and to report on progress at ICANN 98.

On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and provided this response in its scorecard. The Board accepts this advice. The Board notes that the IGO acronyms are a starting basis for resolution of the differences between GAC advice and GNSO recommendations with respect to the protection of GAC acronyms in the DNS and to report on progress at ICANN 98.

On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and provided this response in its scorecard. The Board accepts this advice. The Board notes that the IGO acronyms are a starting basis for resolution of the differences between GAC advice and GNSO recommendations with respect to the protection of GAC acronyms in the DNS and to report on progress at ICANN 98.

On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and provided this response in its scorecard. The Board accepts this advice. The Board notes that the IGO acronyms are a starting basis for resolution of the differences between GAC advice and GNSO recommendations with respect to the protection of GAC acronyms in the DNS and to report on progress at ICANN 98.
The GAC continues to advise the Board of the Toronto, Beijing, Dubai, Buenos Aires and Singapore Communique 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, especially differ from other rights holder classes (the NGPC's letter of 1 June 2014 to the GAC) concerning further steps under the ICANN Policy Development Process while expressing concern that the processes for protection of IGO names and acronyms at the top and second levels are so protected while the NGPC’s concern that interim protections remain in place pending any such process and confirms its willingness to work with the GAC as outcomes that meet the GAC’s concerns.

The GAC Advises the ICANN Board that the GAC, together with ICANN, remains committed to continuing the dialogue with NGPC on finalizing the modalities for permanent protection of IGO names and acronyms at the second level, by putting in place a mechanism which would: i. provide for a permanent system of notifications to both the potential registrant and the relevant IGO if a possible conflict arises if a potential registrant seeks to register a domain name matching the acronym of that IGO; ii. be at no cost or of a nominal cost to the potential party in order to resolve any disagreement in a timely manner by governments under international law, especially different rights holder classes (the NGPC’s letter of 1 June 2014 to the GAC) concerning further steps under the ICANN Policy Development Process while expressing concern that the processes for protection of IGO names and acronyms at the top and second levels are so protected while the NGPC’s concern that interim protections remain in place pending any such process and confirms its willingness to work with the GAC as outcomes that meet the GAC’s concerns.

The GAC, noting the ICANN71 Communique, the Board ‘acknowledges the GAC advice to maintain the current restrictions on second-level registrations of domain names matching the acronyms of IGOS currently on the GAC List (dated March 2013), pending the conclusion of the GIC Work Track’ and ‘emphasizes that the final scope of protection for IGO acronyms is a matter to be determined through ICANN’s policy processes, including the outcomes of the ongoing IGO Work Track (now an ICANN team)’. Registry Operations are currently required to withhold the acronyms of IGOS on the GAC’s 2013 list from registration in new gTLDs launched under the 2012 New gTLD Program. This measure was intended to be temporary while the Board, ICANN and the community continue to actively work through implementation issues concerning IGO acronyms. The Board has confirmed that these interim measures will remain in place until the post-registration notification process is finalized. The GAC, noting the ICANN71 Communique, the Board acknowledged the GAC advice to maintain the current restrictions on second-level registrations of domain names matching the acronyms of IGOS currently on the GAC List (dated March 2013), pending the conclusion of the GIC Work Track’ and ‘emphasizes that the final scope of protection for IGO acronyms is a matter to be determined through ICANN’s policy processes, including the outcomes of the ongoing IGO Work Track (now an ICANN team)’.

Registry Operations are currently required to withhold the acronyms of IGOS on the GAC’s 2013 list from registration in new gTLDs launched under the 2012 New gTLD Program. This measure was intended to be temporary while the Board, ICANN and the community continue to actively work through implementation issues concerning IGO acronyms. The Board has confirmed that these interim measures will remain in place until the post-registration notification process is finalized.

The GAC, noting the ICANN71 Communique, the Board ‘acknowledges the GAC advice to maintain the current restrictions on second-level registrations of domain names matching the acronyms of IGOS currently on the GAC List (dated March 2013), pending the conclusion of the GIC Work Track’ and ‘emphasizes that the final scope of protection for IGO acronyms is a matter to be determined through ICANN’s policy processes, including the outcomes of the ongoing IGO Work Track (now an ICANN team)’. Registry Operations are currently required to withhold the acronyms of IGOS on the GAC’s 2013 list from registration in new gTLDs launched under the 2012 New gTLD Program. This measure was intended to be temporary while the Board, ICANN and the community continue to actively work through implementation issues concerning IGO acronyms. The Board has confirmed that these interim measures will remain in place until the post-registration notification process is finalized.

Recommendation from the Policy Development Process on IGO-INGO Access to Domain Names

The GAC, noting the ICANN71 Communique, the Board ‘acknowledges the GAC advice to maintain the current restrictions on second-level registrations of domain names matching the acronyms of IGOS currently on the GAC List (dated March 2013), pending the conclusion of the GIC Work Track’ and ‘emphasizes that the final scope of protection for IGO acronyms is a matter to be determined through ICANN’s policy processes, including the outcomes of the ongoing IGO Work Track (now an ICANN team)’. Registry Operations are currently required to withhold the acronyms of IGOS on the GAC’s 2013 list from registration in new gTLDs launched under the 2012 New gTLD Program. This measure was intended to be temporary while the Board, ICANN and the community continue to actively work through implementation issues concerning IGO acronyms. The Board has confirmed that these interim measures will remain in place until the post-registration notification process is finalized.

The GAC, noting the ICANN71 Communique, the Board ‘acknowledges the GAC advice to maintain the current restrictions on second-level registrations of domain names matching the acronyms of IGOS currently on the GAC List (dated March 2013), pending the conclusion of the GIC Work Track’ and ‘emphasizes that the final scope of protection for IGO acronyms is a matter to be determined through ICANN’s policy processes, including the outcomes of the ongoing IGO Work Track (now an ICANN team)’. Registry Operations are currently required to withhold the acronyms of IGOS on the GAC’s 2013 list from registration in new gTLDs launched under the 2012 New gTLD Program. This measure was intended to be temporary while the Board, ICANN and the community continue to actively work through implementation issues concerning IGO acronyms. The Board has confirmed that these interim measures will remain in place until the post-registration notification process is finalized.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request Number</th>
<th>Action Request</th>
<th>Request Number</th>
<th>Action Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001340</td>
<td>CAX002 Los Angeles Communique</td>
<td>AR-001339</td>
<td>CAX002 Singapore Communique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/14</td>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>02/11/15</td>
<td>Item 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l.b.i.</td>
<td>l.b.i.</td>
<td>l.b.i.</td>
<td>l.b.i.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GAC Action

**Title:** The GAC advises from the Toronto, Beijing, Buenos Aires, Singapore and London Communiques regarding protection of IGO names and acronyms at the top and second levels. As implementation of such protection is in the public interest and given that IGOs, as created by governments under international law, enjoy extra-legal rights (including immunity), C. Concerning protection at the second level, the GAC requests the ICANN Board that a notice of a match to an IGO name or acronym to be placed in two languages, and at no cost to the concerned IGO, should apply until the concerned IGO adopts a Curative Rights Protection Mechanism; the GAC requests the ICANN Board that any such mechanism should be at no or nominal cost to IGOs; and further, implementing any such curative protection at the second level, and noting the ongoing GNSO Policy Development Process on access to curative Rights Protection Mechanisms; the GAC requests the ICANN Board that any such mechanism should be at no or nominal cost to IGOs; and, further, implementing any such curative protection at the second level, and noting the ongoing GNSO Policy Development Process on access to...
On 11/8/16, the ICANN57 Hyderabad Communique was published.

The ICANN57 Hyderabad Communique reiterates the action that the Board decided to take in its response to the GAC advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 20 August 2019, which is to state the GAC's view that a solution should not be further delayed pending the outcomes of a GAGD PDF. The GAC further recognized that the GAC's advice that the protections afforded to the Red Cross and Red Crescent, including those relating to the ICRC, are not consistent with GAC advice; the protection of terms and names should not be subject to any form of prior public policy development process; 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 Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC/FICR).

The same complementary cost neutral mechanisms to be worked out above in tandem with the implementation of the protections for acronyms of the Red Cross and Red Crescent organizations which are not consistent with GAC advice, and are due course in 2020.

On 3 February 2017 the Board provided the Hyderabad Communique and a response to the GAC advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 20 August 2019. The Board notes that the ICRC has provided 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. The four recommendations were adopted by the Board on 20 August 2019. The Board requires New gTLD registry operators to implement temporary protections for acronyms of the Red Cross and Red Crescent organizations which are not consistent with GAC advice, and are due course in 2020.

On 3 February 2017 the Board provided the Hyderabad Communique and a response to the GAC advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 20 August 2019. The Board notes that the ICRC has provided 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. The four recommendations were adopted by the Board on 20 August 2019. The Board requires New gTLD registry operators to implement temporary protections for acronyms of the Red Cross and Red Crescent organizations which are not consistent with GAC advice, and are due course in 2020.
In a previous version of ICANN’s GAC Advice, the GAC gave the Board to permanently protect terms associated with the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement’s marks that are protected in international law and treaty, in legislation in countries throughout the world. The GAC advised the Board, for clarity, to adopt in the policies that are currently being adopted, a full list of Red Cross/Red Crescent identifiers in the English language and the official languages of the respective states of origin. The full names of the International Committee of the Red Cross and International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies in the six UN United Nations Languages.

On 9 November 2014, the GNSO published its comprehensive report of the Board’s recommendations to update GAC Advice regarding the new gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response to its scorecard: The GNSO Council approved the expedited PDP on 30 November 2013 for registering protections for IGOs and INGOs, which included protections for certain identifiers associated with the Red Cross and Red Crescent. The GNSO forwarded its policy recommendations to the ICANN Board for further consideration. On 30 August 2016, the Board took action (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-materia/resolutions/new-gtld-2016-08-30-en#2.4) to protect against the inclusion of Red Cross/Red Crescent identifiers in the new gTLDs. The Board requested that the GNSO Council continue to facilitate discussions among the relevant parties to reconcile any remaining differences between the policies that the GAC advises. The GNSO forwarded its policy recommendations that differ from the GAC Advice (https://gnso.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#20160830-7), including this item of GAC Advice, to the Board in its response to this item of GAC Advice.

The GAC advice was re-issued on 12 June 2017 and provided this response to its scorecard: As noted in the GAC 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 IRR National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. The matter of permanent protections is an open item of advice. The GNSO Council approved recommendations that were developed by the GNSO’s PDP Working Group on GDO-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.

On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard: The NGPC accepts this advice. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 5 February 2014.

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of the Board’s recommendations to update GAC Advice regarding the new gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response to its scorecard: The GNSO Council approved the expedited PDP on 30 November 2013 for registering protections for IGOs and INGOs, which included protections for certain identifiers associated with the Red Cross and Red Crescent. The GNSO forwarded its policy recommendations to the ICANN Board for further consideration. On 30 August 2016, the Board took action (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-materia/resolutions/new-gtld-2016-08-30-en#2.4) to protect against the inclusion of Red Cross/Red Crescent identifiers in the new gTLDs. The Board requested that the GNSO Council continue to facilitate discussions among the relevant parties to reconcile any remaining differences between the policies that the GAC advises. The GNSO forwarded its policy recommendations that differ from the GAC Advice (https://gnso.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#20160830-7), including this item of GAC Advice, to the Board in its response to 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 this topic. (To note, the GNSO policy recommendations that instead of reserving the RCRC national society names as advised by the GAC, the names should be bulk added to the Trademark Clearinghouse.) This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s report of 7 October 2015.

On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard: The NGPC accepts this advice. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 5 February 2014.

On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard: The NGPC accepts this advice. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 5 February 2014.

On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard: The NGPC accepts this advice. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 5 February 2014.
On 27 January 2019, the Board considered the Brussels Communique and approved this response in its sorrow. The Board acknowledges and appreciates this follow-up of 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 GAC’s advice 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 its parts, and (2) request the GAC’s opinion where public policy concerns may be affected. Accordingly, the Board intends to take public comments and GAC advice that may be timely reviewed when it considers the GAC’s policy recommendations. Please also see the Board’s response to item §2.a.I regarding IGO Protections. This item is considered completed as of the Board’s consideration of 27 January 2019.

On 4 July 2019, the NGPC concluded the labour and passed the following resolution: Resolved (2019.07.02 NGOs), the NGPC confirms that appropriate 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.html>) and while the GAC, NGPC, ICANN Staff and community continue to actively work through outstanding implementation issues. Resolved (2013.07.02 NGOs), the NGPC reiterates its advice to the ICANN Board that temporary protections presently accorded to these acronyms remain in place until such time an appropriate process and review is conducted by the GAC. This item is considered completed as of 2 July 2013.

On 29 April 2013, the NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to GAC advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 29 April 2013 (<http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment/base-agreement-29apr13-en.htm>) and the Board acknowledges the ICANN70 Communique, including the Board’s response to item §2.a.I above regarding IGO Protections. This item is considered completed as of 7 October 2015.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request/Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>Date Issued</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Scorecard</th>
<th>Follow up</th>
<th>Follow-up to previous advice will be tracked on open advice items related to the same topic.</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Date Closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001241</td>
<td>ICANN47 Durban Communique</td>
<td>7/18/13</td>
<td>Cross-Community Conflicts with Privacy Law, including seeking input from the GAC on modifications.</td>
<td>1.9.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>follow up</td>
<td>The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-resolutions-new-gtld-2013-09-09-en.pdf">Board Material</a></td>
<td>9/10/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001242</td>
<td>ICANN59 Johannesburg Communique</td>
<td>6/29/17</td>
<td>Cross-Community Conflicts with Privacy Law, including seeking input from the GAC on modifications.</td>
<td>1.9.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>follow up</td>
<td>The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-resolutions-new-gtld-2013-09-10-en.pdf">Board Material</a></td>
<td>7/10/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001243</td>
<td>ICANN46 Beijing Communique</td>
<td>4/11/13</td>
<td>Cross-Community Conflicts with Privacy Law, including seeking input from the GAC on modifications.</td>
<td>1.9.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>follow up</td>
<td>The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-resolutions-new-gtld-2013-09-10-en.pdf">Board Material</a></td>
<td>7/10/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001244</td>
<td>ICANN59 Johannesburg Communique</td>
<td>6/29/17</td>
<td>Cross-Community Conflicts with Privacy Law, including seeking input from the GAC on modifications.</td>
<td>1.9.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>follow up</td>
<td>The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-resolutions-new-gtld-2013-09-09-en.pdf">Board Material</a></td>
<td>9/10/13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The GAC notes that new gTLDs registries have submitted IRSEP (Registry Services Evaluation Process) requests to 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 second level domain names in new gTLD registries. This is because in most cases, there are combinations of letters that are also in the GAC Table 3 (e.g. .tv), in considering these IRSEP requests, and consistent with the Applicant Guidelines, the GAC considers that the public comment periods is an important transparency mechanism, and in addition, that relevant governments are 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 GAC Board in due course.

**Category 2**

- **Release of Second Level Names at the Second Level**
  - **Resolution of 10 June 2013**: Resolved (2013.06.25.K05), the Board considers the advice of the GAC from the Los Angeles Communiqué regarding the release of two-character codes at the second level in gTLDs. The Board directs the President and CEO, or his designee(s), to design an efficient process to permit the release of two-character domain names in the gTLD namespace, taking into account the GAC’s advice in the Los Angeles Communiqué. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s resolution of 10 June 2013.

  - **Resolution of 12 February 2015**: Resolved (2015.02.12.K05), the Board accepts the advice of the GAC from the Los Angeles 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 design an efficient process to permit the release of two-character domain names in the gTLD namespace, taking into account the GAC’s advice in the Los Angeles Communiqué. In its rationale for this resolution, the Board states that the efficient procedure for the release of two-character domains currently required to be reviewed in the new gTLD Registry Agreement, taking into account the GAC’s advice in the Los Angeles Communiqué. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s resolution of 10 June 2013.

- **Resolution of 11 February 2015**: Resolved (2015.02.12.K05), the Board considered the advice in the Los Angeles Communiqué regarding the release of two-character codes at the second level in gTLDs. The Board directs the President and CEO, or his designee(s), to develop and implement an efficient procedure for the release of two-character domain names in new gTLDs, taking into account the GAC’s advice in the Los Angeles Communiqué. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s resolution of 10 June 2013.

- **Resolution of 16 October 2014**: Resolved (2014.10.16.K05), the proposed registry service for the release of two-character codes in the gTLD namespace does not create a reasonable risk of a negative impact 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 codes in new gTLDs. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s resolution of 10 June 2013.

- **Resolution of 16 October 2014**: Resolved (2014.10.16.K05), the proposed registry service for the release of two-character codes in the gTLD namespace does not create a reasonable risk of a negative impact 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 codes in new gTLDs. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s resolution of 10 June 2013.

- **Resolution of 16 October 2014**: Resolved (2014.10.16.K05), the proposed registry service for the release of two-character codes in the gTLD namespace does not create a reasonable risk of a negative impact 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 codes in new gTLDs. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s resolution of 10 June 2013.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request/Issue Number</th>
<th>Creation/Issue Date</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Action Impact/Issue Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Action/Issue Status</th>
<th>Action/Issue Resolution Link</th>
<th>Date Closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001272</td>
<td>6/25/14</td>
<td>strings registration (restricted, regulated sensitive protection, consumer Category 1 to all new Applicable)</td>
<td>Advice to provide public notice to all new gTLDs and Category 1/2 names in regulated and highly regulated spaces, including: a) the process for verification of WHOIS information, b) the proactive verification of registrations of domain names in regulated and highly regulated categories (GAC Guidance #185), c) the country security checks by registrars, d) the Rights Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Process (RIPDP), which is not defined as to length, e) the proactive security checks by registrars, f) the Rights Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Process (RIPDP), g) the Rights Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Process (RIPDP), h) the Rights Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Process (RIPDP), i) the Rights Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Process (RIPDP), j) the Rights Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Process (RIPDP), k) the Rights Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Process (RIPDP), l) the Rights Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Process (RIPDP), m) the Rights Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Process (RIPDP), n) the Rights Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Process (RIPDP), o) the Rights Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Process (RIPDP), p) the Rights Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Process (RIPDP), q) the Rights Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Process (RIPDP), r) the Rights Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Process (RIPDP), s) the Rights Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Process (RIPDP), t) the Rights Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Process (RIPDP), u) the Rights Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Process (RIPDP), v) the Rights Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Process (RIPDP), w) the Rights Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Process (RIPDP), x) the Rights Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Process (RIPDP), y) the Rights Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Process (RIPDP), z) the Rights Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Process (RIPDP), {null}</td>
<td>The Board considered planning for future gTLD Application Round on 14 November 2014 and passed the following resolution: Resolved (2014.11.17.1), the Board notes the effort it progresses within the GNSO to identify areas where the GNSO believes that policy advice can be clarified in order to provide additional policy advice applicable to gTLDs and Name Space (the policy advice that the Board provides to the GAC prior to at least five weeks prior to ICANN meetings is 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. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 9 September 2014.</td>
<td>11/14/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AR-001289  ICANN52 Los Angeles

Communique  10/15/14

Item Number 7.1c

The GAC urges the ICANN Board to focus its attention on the following.

1. Implementation of WHOIS-Related Safeguards. a. Provide the GAC with a comprehensive scoping including steps and timelines regarding all streams of work related to the WHOIS accuracy safeguards. b. Complete the analysis of WHOIS accuracy, including assessment of identity validation, and share the findings in a timely manner for review on the ICANN 52 meeting. c. Initiate steps towards Phase 2 (identity verification) of both WHOIS and ICANN 52 meeting. 2. Benefit analysis of implementation options, which can be summarized the process to address and resolve inaccurate WHOIS records and requested to promote compliance reports. 3. Security Risk. a. Inform the GAC and provide GAC members with an opportunity to contribute to the ongoing consultation framework for the Registrar to report suspicious activity regarding WHOIS records. b. Inform the GAC on 6-7 weeks before the ICANN 52 meeting. c. Ensure an interim mechanism is in place to address security risks.

AR-001284  ICANN52 Singapore

Communique  10/7/15

Item Number 6.6.1.2

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of its responses and updates to GAC advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response in its scored. The NGPC are pleased that its advice was the subject of an exchange between some members of the GAC and the NGPC. Following the exchange on 13 January 2016, the NGPC provided the GAC with responses in a 23 January 2016 letter (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/compliance/responses/letter-to-nepc-23jan16-en.pdf) to some of the GAC advice items raised in its Los Angeles Communique and discussed at the conference call regarding implementation of the WHOIS-related safeguards, security risk safeguards, the Public Internet Committee Dispute Resolution Process, and the WHOIS roadmap. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's report of 7 October 2015.

AR-001284  ICANN46 Beijing

Communique  10/15/14

Item Number 4.1b

This NGPC published a comprehensive report of its responses and updating to GAC advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response in its scored. The NGPC are pleased that its advice was the subject of an exchange between some members of the GAC and the NGPC. Following the exchange on 13 January 2016, the NGPC provided the GAC with responses in a 23 January 2016 letter (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/compliance/responses/letter-to-nepc-23jan16-en.pdf) to some of the GAC advice items raised in its Los Angeles Communique and discussed at the conference call regarding implementation of the WHOIS-related safeguards, security risk safeguards, the Public Internet Committee Dispute Resolution Process, and the WHOIS roadmap. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's report of 7 October 2015.

AR-001284  ICANN51 Los Angeles

Communique  10/7/15

Item Number 6.6.1.2

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of its responses and updates to GAC advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response in its scored. The NGPC are pleased that its advice was the subject of an exchange between some members of the GAC and the NGPC. Following the exchange on 13 January 2016, the NGPC provided the GAC with responses in a 23 January 2016 letter (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/compliance/responses/letter-to-nepc-23jan16-en.pdf) to some of the GAC advice items raised in its Los Angeles Communique and discussed at the conference call regarding implementation of the WHOIS-related safeguards, security risk safeguards, the Public Internet Committee Dispute Resolution Process, and the WHOIS roadmap. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's report of 7 October 2015.

AR-001284  ICANN46 Beijing

Communique  10/15/14

Item Number 4.1b

This NGPC published a comprehensive report of its responses and updating to GAC advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response in its scored. The NGPC are pleased that its advice was the subject of an exchange between some members of the GAC and the NGPC. Following the exchange on 13 January 2016, the NGPC provided the GAC with responses in a 23 January 2016 letter (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/compliance/responses/letter-to-nepc-23jan16-en.pdf) to some of the GAC advice items raised in its Los Angeles Communique and discussed at the conference call regarding implementation of the WHOIS-related safeguards, security risk safeguards, the Public Internet Committee Dispute Resolution Process, and the WHOIS roadmap. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's report of 7 October 2015.

AR-001284  ICANN51 Los Angeles

Communique  10/7/15

Item Number 6.6.1.2

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of its responses and updates to GAC advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response in its scored. The NGPC are pleased that its advice was the subject of an exchange between some members of the GAC and the NGPC. Following the exchange on 13 January 2016, the NGPC provided the GAC with responses in a 23 January 2016 letter (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/compliance/responses/letter-to-nepc-23jan16-en.pdf) to some of the GAC advice items raised in its Los Angeles Communique and discussed at the conference call regarding implementation of the WHOIS-related safeguards, security risk safeguards, the Public Internet Committee Dispute Resolution Process, and the WHOIS roadmap. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's report of 7 October 2015.

AR-001284  ICANN46 Beijing

Communique  10/15/14

Item Number 4.1b

This NGPC published a comprehensive report of its responses and updating to GAC advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response in its scored. The NGPC are pleased that its advice was the subject of an exchange between some members of the GAC and the NGPC. Following the exchange on 13 January 2016, the NGPC provided the GAC with responses in a 23 January 2016 letter (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/compliance/responses/letter-to-nepc-23jan16-en.pdf) to some of the GAC advice items raised in its Los Angeles Communique and discussed at the conference call regarding implementation of the WHOIS-related safeguards, security risk safeguards, the Public Internet Committee Dispute Resolution Process, and the WHOIS roadmap. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's report of 7 October 2015.

AR-001284  ICANN51 Los Angeles

Communique  10/7/15

Item Number 6.6.1.2

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of its responses and updates to GAC advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response in its scored. The NGPC are pleased that its advice was the subject of an exchange between some members of the GAC and the NGPC. Following the exchange on 13 January 2016, the NGPC provided the GAC with responses in a 23 January 2016 letter (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/compliance/responses/letter-to-nepc-23jan16-en.pdf) to some of the GAC advice items raised in its Los Angeles Communique and discussed at the conference call regarding implementation of the WHOIS-related safeguards, security risk safeguards, the Public Internet Committee Dispute Resolution Process, and the WHOIS roadmap. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's report of 7 October 2015.

AR-001284  ICANN46 Beijing

Communique  10/15/14

Item Number 4.1b

This NGPC published a comprehensive report of its responses and updating to GAC advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response in its scored. The NGPC are pleased that its advice was the subject of an exchange between some members of the GAC and the NGPC. Following the exchange on 13 January 2016, the NGPC provided the GAC with responses in a 23 January 2016 letter (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/compliance/responses/letter-to-nepc-23jan16-en.pdf) to some of the GAC advice items raised in its Los Angeles Communique and discussed at the conference call regarding implementation of the WHOIS-related safeguards, security risk safeguards, the Public Internet Committee Dispute Resolution Process, and the WHOIS roadmap. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's report of 7 October 2015.

AR-001284  ICANN51 Los Angeles

Communique  10/7/15

Item Number 6.6.1.2

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of its responses and updates to GAC advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response in its scored. The NGPC are pleased that its advice was the subject of an exchange between some members of the GAC and the NGPC. Following the exchange on 13 January 2016, the NGPC provided the GAC with responses in a 23 January 2016 letter (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/compliance/responses/letter-to-nepc-23jan16-en.pdf) to some of the GAC advice items raised in its Los Angeles Communique and discussed at the conference call regarding implementation of the WHOIS-related safeguards, security risk safeguards, the Public Internet Committee Dispute Resolution Process, and the WHOIS roadmap. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's report of 7 October 2015.

AR-001284  ICANN46 Beijing

Communique  10/15/14

Item Number 4.1b

This NGPC published a comprehensive report of its responses and updating to GAC advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response in its scored. The NGPC are pleased that its advice was the subject of an exchange between some members of the GAC and the NGPC. Following the exchange on 13 January 2016, the NGPC provided the GAC with responses in a 23 January 2016 letter (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/compliance/responses/letter-to-nepc-23jan16-en.pdf) to some of the GAC advice items raised in its Los Angeles Communique and discussed at the conference call regarding implementation of the WHOIS-related safeguards, security risk safeguards, the Public Internet Committee Dispute Resolution Process, and the WHOIS roadmap. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's report of 7 October 2015.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request Number</th>
<th>Action Request</th>
<th>Scorecard: Date Closed</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Regarding the application for .spa, the GAC understands that the relevant parties, including the City of Spa and other applicants, have reached an agreement. The GAC has followed this agreement and welcomes the report that an agreement has been reached between the City of Spa and one of the applicants.

On 14 May 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard. On 13 May 2014, the NGPC accepted the GAC advice identified in the GAC Section of Action to its scorecard: In response to the GAC’s advice in the Durban Communiqué (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 Durban Communiqué, on 10 September 2013, the NGPC adopted an iteration of the Scorecard (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-new-gtld-annex-1-08jun20-en.pdf) taking note of the concerns expressed in the GAC’s Durban Communiqué: “The application for .ram is a matter of extreme sensitivity for the Government of India and no political and religious considerations. The NGPC notes that the Government of India has requested that the application not be proceeded with, and is of the opinion that the application has not been processed in accordance with the Applicant Guidebook.” On 10 September 2013, the NGPC adopted an iteration of the Scorecard (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-new-gtld-annex-1-08jun20-en.pdf) taking note of the concerns expressed in the GAC’s Durban Communiqué: “The application for .ram is a matter of extreme sensitivity for the Government of India and no political and religious considerations. The NGPC notes that the Government of India has requested that the application not be proceeded with, and is of the opinion that the application has not been processed in accordance with the Applicant Guidebook.”

On 14 May 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard. On 13 May 2014, the NGPC accepted the GAC advice identified in the GAC Section of Action to its scorecard: In response to the GAC’s advice in the Durban Communiqué (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 Durban Communiqué, on 10 September 2013, the NGPC adopted an iteration of the Scorecard (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-new-gtld-annex-1-08jun20-en.pdf) taking note of the concerns expressed in the GAC’s Durban Communiqué: “The application for .ram is a matter of extreme sensitivity for the Government of India and no political and religious considerations. The NGPC notes that the Government of India has requested that the application not be proceeded with, and is of the opinion that the application has not been processed in accordance with the Applicant Guidebook.”
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request Number</th>
<th>Action Request</th>
<th>Issue Number</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Issue Number</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Date Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-004733</td>
<td>Action Request: Action</td>
<td>11/1/21</td>
<td>Subsequent Rounds of new gTLDs</td>
<td>Issue of Importance</td>
<td>The GAC discussed Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs, following the GNSO Council’s adoption of the Final Report of the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process (SubPro PDP). The GAC Vice-Chairs provided an overview to GAC members on priority topics to the GAC: ● GAC’s Charter and Predictability of Application Process ● Public Interest Commitments (PICs) and Global Public Interest ● Applicant Support and Participation of Underrepresented Regions. Based on the above, the GAC intends to consider collective GAC comment to the Subsequent Rounds of new gTLDs. The GAC discussed the role of SubPro as part of the Operational Design Phase (ODP), and the ODP scope for SubPro which is in light of Implementation Guidance 2.3 suggesting direct dialogue between the SPIRT, GAC and the ICANN Board on the implementation of the ODP. The Operational Design Phase (ODP) relative to policy recommendations in the Final Report of the GNSO Policy Development Process Working Group (PDP WGs) on Subsequent Procedures for New gTLDs (SubPro PDP) relates to policy recommendations in the Final Report of the GNSO Policy Development Process Working Group (PDP WGs) on Subsequent Procedures for New gTLDs. The GAC intends to maintain open communication channels with ICANN org throughout the ODP. The GAC encourages continued Public Interest Engagement in the ODP, providing input at appropriate stages during the ODP. During the ODP, the GAC recommends maintaining communication with ICANN org and the ICANN Board on priority topics to the GAC. The GAC discussed the issues of importance related to the GAC’s role in the implementation of the ODP. The GAC discussed the potential need for the GAC to consider, including: ● SPIRT should be encouraged, wherever possible; ● GAC members discussed potential next steps for the GAC to consider, including: ● Call for volunteers to serve on the Operational Design Phase (ODP) subgroups which is in the process of being finalized by the ICANN Board. GAC members discussed potential next steps for the GAC to consider, including: ● SPIRT should be encouraged to continue as part of the GAC’s efforts to continue to support and promote the GAC’s role and influence in the ODP.</td>
<td>20/2/22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request Number</td>
<td>Action Request: Action</td>
<td>Event Name</td>
<td>Event Date</td>
<td>Event Location</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Resolution Link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-005038</td>
<td>Communique</td>
<td>ICANN 74 Policy Forum Communique</td>
<td>6/20/22</td>
<td></td>
<td>The GAC discussed Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs, and received an update from ICANN org about the current state of work of the Operational Design Phase (ODP) relative to policy recommendations in the Final Report of the SSAD Policy Development Process Working Group (PPWG) on Subsequent Procedures for New gTLDs. The GAC will continue to maintain open communication channels with ICANN org throughout the ODP, providing input as appropriate during community consultation phases. Following the ICANN Board of Directors’ consideration of the ICANN org presented draft resolution, the Board agreed to explore a mutually agreeable way forward on closed generics, the GAC intends to respond favorably, noting its willingness to contribute to this effort. The GAC will continue to engage in creating a comprehensive solution relative to closed generic applications in the next round of new gTLDs, in keeping with the GAC Beijing Communique whereby “exclusive registry access should serve a public interest goal”.</td>
<td>Final Report</td>
<td>5/24/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Request (Action Request Number)</td>
<td>Communique</td>
<td>Date Issued</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Item Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Draft/Place</td>
<td>Action Request/Link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001280</td>
<td>ICANN Los Angeles Communique</td>
<td>10/15/16</td>
<td>Action 1 of 24</td>
<td>A.1.4.3.4</td>
<td>The Board requests that the Board chair commit to working closely with the ICANN Board Chair and ICANN staff to ensure that key issues are tracked in a more concise and structured way, so that the Board is able to provide timely and comprehensive advice. For example, the multiple streams of activity being dealt with regard to IANA Accountability/Agreement, data protection, and data retention issues, WHOIS (e.g., Expert Working Group, privacy and proxy services, etc). The GAC would benefit from some form of comprehensive exercise by ICANN of such related issues prior to the meeting.</td>
<td>The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary. The item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 1 November 2017.</td>
<td>10/16/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description

The ICANN Board Chair provided the ICANN Chair with a summary of the Board's responses to the GAC's new IANA-ccTLD concerns raised at the ICANN59 Singapore Communique as an addendum dated 5 June 2014. The Board provided this response in its summary. The Board will coordinate with the ICANN 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. The Board is committed to providing some form of comprehensive exercise by ICANN of such related issues prior to the meeting.

**Board Resolution Link**


**Date Scored**

10/16/16

---

The ICANN Board Chair provided the ICANN Chair with a summary of the Board's responses to the GAC's new IANA-ccTLD concerns raised at the ICANN59 Singapore Communique as an addendum dated 5 June 2014. The Board provided this response in its summary. The Board will coordinate with the ICANN 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. The Board is committed to providing some form of comprehensive exercise by ICANN of such related issues prior to the meeting.
On 27 January 2019 the Board considered this advice on 27 January 2019. 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.” The Board most recently considered this item on 30 May 2019 and stated in its scorecard: “See response on item §3.a.III above in the Board’s scorecard.” This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 30 May 2019.

On 30 May 2019 the Board considered this advice on 30 May 2019. Moreover, 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.” The Board most recently considered this item on 30 May 2019 and stated in its scorecard: “See response on item §3.a.III above in the Board’s scorecard.” This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 30 May 2019.

On 8 September 2019 the ICANN Board considered the Marrakech Communiqué and provided the following response: “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 2018 as well as a historical overview of the process. The Board also notes that during the BUD meeting at ICANN65 in Montreal it was discussed that the BUD 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 raise any concerns, where appropriate. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 8 September 2019.


On 8 September 2019 the ICANN Board considered the Marrakech Communiqué and provided the following response: “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 2018 as well as a historical overview of the process. The Board also notes that during the BUD meeting at ICANN65 in Montreal it was discussed that the BUD 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 raise any concerns, where appropriate. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 8 September 2019.
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On 27 January 2016 the Board considered the Barcelona Communique and provided this response in its scorecard. The Board acknowledges that some GAC members have expressed concerns regarding the process for release of two-character labels at the second level and that the GAC has issued advice directing the GNSO to engage with concerned governments. The Board notes that the GNSO engaged in extensive conversations with concerned governments in May 2017 exploring the process and development of the framework adopted by the 8 November 2016 Board resolution. Additionally, the GNSO Board and GAC engaged in discussions with the GAC at the Board-GAC Recommendation Implementation (BARI) meetings at GNSO61, GNSO62 and GNSO63. 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 same is already registered.

On 27 January 2016 the Board considered the Barcelona Communique and provided this response in its scorecard. The Board acknowledges that some GAC members have expressed concerns regarding the process for release of two-character labels at the second level and that the GAC has issued advice directing the GNSO to engage with concerned governments. The Board notes that the GNSO engaged in extensive conversations with concerned governments in May 2017 exploring the process and development of the framework adopted by the 8 November 2016 Board resolution. Additionally, the GNSO Board and GAC engaged in discussions with the GAC at the Board-GAC Recommendation Implementation (BARI) meetings at GNSO61, GNSO62 and GNSO63. 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 same is already registered.
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<tr>
<td>AR-001303</td>
<td>ICANN57 Dublin Community Forum Communique</td>
<td>10/21/15</td>
<td>1.c.i.e)</td>
<td></td>
<td>The GAC advises the Board to task ICANN to work with the GAC Secretariat to address the technical issues with country letter codes and the ISO-3166 list as TLDs in future rounds of the New gTLD Program. The GAC also welcomes the offer made by Dr Ajay Data (Chair of UASG) to discuss the work of the UASG with the GAC at ICANN57. The Board discussed the ICANN57 Virtual Annual Community Forum Communique, including the issues of importance, at the 24 May 2023 Board GAC Interactions Group (BAG) meeting.</td>
<td>5/26/22</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/resolutions/ons-annex-1-03feb16-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/resolutions/ons-annex-1-03feb16-en.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001347</td>
<td>ICANN54 Dublin Community Forum Communique</td>
<td>11/1/17</td>
<td>2.c.i.e)</td>
<td></td>
<td>The GAC advises the Board to task ICANN to work with the GAC to: (i) request the Board to facilitate simplification of the process for providing comments to address their concerns; (ii) with respect to new requests for release, the GAC advises the Board to: (2) task ICANN to work with the GAC Secretariat to address the technical issues with country letter codes and the ISO-3166 list as TLDs in future rounds; and (3) with respect to ongoing requests for release, the GAC advises the Board to: (a) advise the Board that it should continue to encourage the community to continue in-depth analysis and discussions on all aspects related to a potential use of 3-letter codes in the ISO-3166 list as TLDs in future rounds, in particular with regard to whether such a potential use is considered to be in the public interest or the public interest or respect to the provision of services. The Board discussed the ICANN73 Virtual Annual Community Forum Communique, including the issues of importance, at the 24 May 2023 Board GAC Interactions Group (BAG) meeting.</td>
<td>12/17/20</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/resolutions/ons-annex-1-03feb16-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/resolutions/ons-annex-1-03feb16-en.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001348</td>
<td>ICANN54 Dublin Community Forum Communique</td>
<td>10/21/22</td>
<td>3.a.i.e)</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Board discussed the ICANN57 Virtual Annual Community Forum Communique, including the issues of importance, at the 24 May 2023 Board GAC Interactions Group (BAG) meeting. The Board discussed the ICANN73 Virtual Annual Community Forum Communique, including the issues of importance, at the 24 May 2023 Board GAC Interactions Group (BAG) meeting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001349</td>
<td>ICANN54 Virtual Community Forum Communique</td>
<td>2016-12-13</td>
<td>1.b.i.e)</td>
<td></td>
<td>The GAC reiterates its advise on both issue and item, advises the Board that it should investigate options for optimizing and approval procedures, including appropriate liaison with the national government of the country hosting the meeting, and that the GAC is available to assist in this regard. The Board discussed the ICANN57 Virtual Annual Community Forum Communique, including the issues of importance, at the 24 May 2023 Board GAC Interactions Group (BAG) meeting.</td>
<td>5/26/22</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/resolutions/ons-annex-1-03feb16-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/resolutions/ons-annex-1-03feb16-en.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subject:** Use of 3-letter codes in the ISO-3166 list as TLDs in future rounds.

**Description:** The GAC advises the Board to task ICANN to work with the GAC to: (i) request the Board to facilitate simplification of the process for providing comments to address their concerns; (ii) with respect to new requests for release, the GAC advises the Board to: (2) task ICANN to work with the GAC Secretariat to address the technical issues with country letter codes and the ISO-3166 list as TLDs in future rounds; and (3) with respect to ongoing requests for release, the GAC advises the Board to: (a) advise the Board that it should continue to encourage the community to continue in-depth analysis and discussions on all aspects related to a potential use of 3-letter codes in the ISO-3166 list as TLDs in future rounds, in particular with regard to whether such a potential use is considered to be in the public interest or the public interest or respect to the provision of services.

**Remarks:** The Board discussed the ICANN73 Virtual Annual Community Forum Communique, including the issues of importance, at the 24 May 2023 Board GAC Interactions Group (BAG) meeting.


**Board Resolution Link:** https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/resolutions/ons-annex-1-03feb16-en.pdf
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001293</td>
<td>ICANN54 Being Committed</td>
<td>3/27/13</td>
<td>NH05 S aging</td>
<td>The GAC notes the ICANN Board on the 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 PAWG Report • Conflict with National Privacy Laws • Implications of gTLD WHOIS Services, approved in 2007, see Andy's letter dated 22 January 2015: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-schneider-22jan15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-schneider-22jan15-en.pdf</a> This item is considered complete as of the Board's response of 22 January 2015.</td>
<td>6/25/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001287</td>
<td>ICANN54 Singapore Committed</td>
<td>3/27/13</td>
<td>NH05 S aging</td>
<td>The GAC notes the work being accomplished by the Expert Working Group (EWG) on WHOIS. The GAC will work inter-sessionally on a roadmap prior to the ICANN 54 London meeting in order to enable the GAC to collaborate on a next step roadmap.</td>
<td>6/25/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001277</td>
<td>ICANN55 London Committed</td>
<td>3/27/13</td>
<td>NH05 S aging</td>
<td>The GAC notes that there continue to be a wide range of initiatives being proposed relevant to WHOIS, including outcomes from the WHOIS Review Team and the recently finalised report of the Expert Working Group on ELD Directory Services. Many of the issues under discussion and analysis have public policy dimensions, including privacy, law enforcement, consumer protection and public safety. The GAC requests that 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 is adequately reflected in ICANN's earlier Roadmap and other relevant discussions. The GAC also considers the implications of short, executive committees for community workload. The GAC suggests that ICANN produce a version for the community on these issues in Los Angeles.</td>
<td>6/25/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001287</td>
<td>ICANN56 Los Angeles Committed</td>
<td>3/27/13</td>
<td>NH05 S aging</td>
<td>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 PAWG Report • Conflict with National Privacy Laws • Implications of gTLD WHOIS Services, approved in 2007, see Andy's letter dated 22 January 2015: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-schneider-22jan15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-schneider-22jan15-en.pdf</a> This item is considered complete as of the Board's response of 22 January 2015.</td>
<td>6/25/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001283</td>
<td>ICANN57 Singapore Committed</td>
<td>3/27/13</td>
<td>NH05 S aging</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>6/25/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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The GAC advises the Board to facilitate an exchange at IWWW Fall 2016 of the SDs and ACs regarding new work requiring community input to be scheduled and managed by the respective SD and AC communities, particularly for issues of broad interest across the community as a whole. The GAC considers that a joint GAC/AC review meeting will permit the Board to better assess the level of consent with which the community can manage. This exchange should include consideration of: 1) how different community priorities are balanced; and 2) how this process can maximize community participation in policy development processes.

The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary. This item was presented as complete to the GAC at IWWW in Abu Dhabi on 1 November 2017.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the connected titled “GAC Advice - Kobe Communique: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)” in response to items of GAC Advice in the Kobe Communique and the IWWW Kobe Communique. The Board accepts this advice. The Board believes there is work to proceed with implementation of ICANN55 Marrakech Action Request: Action Communique and ICANN64 Kobe Communique on Data Protection, Legislation, and Verification. Work verification and scheduling for issues of broader interest across the community as a whole is managed by the respective SD and AC communities. The Board continues to value the input of the SDs and ACs regarding how work requiring community input is scheduled and managed by the respective SD and AC communities.

On 25 June 2013 the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of Safeguards Implementation of GAC Safeguards Applicable to all New gTLDs and the GAC reaffirms its request for a joint ICANN and GAC Action: ICANN and the community to identify the appropriate course of action. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 15 May 2019.

On 25 June 2013 the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of Safeguards Implementation of GAC Safeguards Applicable to all New gTLDs and the GAC reaffirms its request for a joint ICANN and GAC Action: ICANN and the community to identify the appropriate course of action. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 15 May 2019.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the connected titled “GAC Advice Kobe Communique: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)” in response to items of GAC Advice in the Kobe Communique and the IWWW Kobe Communique. The Board accepts this advice. The Board believes there is work to proceed with implementation of ICANN55 Marrakech Action Request: Action Communique and ICANN64 Kobe Communique on Data Protection, Legislation, and Verification. Work verification and scheduling for issues of broader interest across the community as a whole is managed by the respective SD and AC communities. The Board continues to value the input of the SDs and ACs regarding how work requiring community input is scheduled and managed by the respective SD and AC communities.

On 25 June 2013 the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of Safeguards Implementation of GAC Safeguards Applicable to all New gTLDs and the GAC reaffirms its request for a joint ICANN and GAC Action: ICANN and the community to identify the appropriate course of action. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 15 May 2019.

On 25 June 2013 the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of Safeguards Implementation of GAC Safeguards Applicable to all New gTLDs and the GAC reaffirms its request for a joint ICANN and GAC Action: ICANN and the community to identify the appropriate course of action. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 15 May 2019.

On 25 June 2013 the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of Safeguards Implementation of GAC Safeguards Applicable to all New gTLDs and the GAC reaffirms its request for a joint ICANN and GAC Action: ICANN and the community to identify the appropriate course of action. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 15 May 2019.

On 25 June 2013 the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of Safeguards Implementation of GAC Safeguards Applicable to all New gTLDs and the GAC reaffirms its request for a joint ICANN and GAC Action: ICANN and the community to identify the appropriate course of action. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 15 May 2019.

On 25 June 2013 the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of Safeguards Implementation of GAC Safeguards Applicable to all New gTLDs and the GAC reaffirms its request for a joint ICANN and GAC Action: ICANN and the community to identify the appropriate course of action. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 15 May 2019.
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