<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>Date Issued</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Board Resolution</th>
<th>Board Scorecard</th>
<th>Date Signed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001236</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>ICANN48</td>
<td>11/20/2013</td>
<td>.halal</td>
<td>7.a.</td>
<td>similar terms to the ICANN Chair's correspondence in December. The GAC chair will also respond OIC's plans to hold a meeting in early UAE. GAC met during the ICANN 47 meeting in Durban to discuss the concerns about the .AMAZON applications. On 24 October 2013 decisions were posted in favor of the applicant on .AMAZON applications. The GAC has noted the concerns expressed by the Government of India not to proceed with the applications for .indians and .ram. On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard: The NGPC notes the concerns expressed in this advice. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 10 September 2013.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001325</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>ICANN65</td>
<td>6/27/2019</td>
<td>.persiangulf</td>
<td>1.4.a.i.</td>
<td>.date (application number 1-2128-55439) ii. .persiangulf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001328</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>ICANN48</td>
<td>7/18/2013</td>
<td>.guangzhou</td>
<td>1.3.a.</td>
<td>similar terms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Internet Corporation for Assigned Numbers (ICANN) Virtual Policy Forum Communique (June 2022)
On 4 February 2016, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard. The NGPC accepts this advice. ICANN will not enter into registry agreements with applicants for the .vin strings. The NGPC recommends the following: (1) ICANN will continue to manage the discussion with the applicants and will request the interested parties to clarify whether they consider the NGPC as an “interested party” noted in the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 4 February 2016.

On 5 February 2016, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard. On 26 September 2016, the NGPC noted that it stood ready to hear from GAC members as to the nature of the differences in views expressed in the advice while the NGPC analyzed. In Buenos Aires, ICANN facilitated a dialogue between the applicants for .vin and the affected non-governmental parties. In response to the GAC’s suggestion in the Buenos Aires Communiqué, the NGPC has commissioned an analysis of the legally complex and politically sensitive background on this matter in the context of the GAC advice in order to consider the appropriate next steps of delegating .WINE and .VIN. The analysis is expected to be completed so that it can be considered by the NGPC when it meets in Singapore. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 5 February 2016.

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard. The NGPC accepts this advice. The NGPC notes that the applicants for .GUANGZHOU and .SHENZHEN are withdrawing their applications. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10 September 2013.

On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard. On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard.

On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard. On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard. On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard.

On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard. On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard.

On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard.

On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard. On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard.

On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard.

On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard.

On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Date Issued</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>at the Country/Territory Codes</th>
<th>Second Level</th>
<th>Code Update (Public)</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-001365</td>
<td>Ciarra Communique</td>
<td>3/15/17</td>
<td>4.a.IV</td>
<td>Follow-up</td>
<td>Some GAC members raise that important concern regarding the release of 2-character Country/Territory codes at the second level, as expressed in previous GAC advice, still remains. The GAC also notes the availability of certain measures to mitigate governments concerns with regard to the release of 2-letter codes at the second level. Some GAC members noted that the current measures have not been used. Some GAC members considered that these measures are insufficient. The GAC stands to follow up the discussion on 2-letter codes at the second level at GACMM2, bearing in mind that all previous GAC advice on the matter stands.</td>
<td>3/15/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-scorecard-30may18-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-scorecard-30may18-en.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/10/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001367</td>
<td>Ciarra Copenhagen Communique</td>
<td>3/15/17</td>
<td>4.a.IV</td>
<td>Interim step</td>
<td>Immediately explore measures to find a suitable solution of the matter in issue to meet the concerns of these countries before being further aggravated.</td>
<td>3/15/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-scorecard-30may18-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-scorecard-30may18-en.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/10/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On 24 June 2017 the Board considered the Copenhagen Communique and provided this response in its scorecard. The GAC, in its Helsinki Communique, reiterated the need to minimize the risk of confusion between country codes and 2-letter registrations at the second level in new gTLDs, but also conveyed the absence of consensus within the GAC on specific measures needed to address the potential for confusion. The GAC advised the Board to “urge the relevant Registrar 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 leave a third party assessment of the situation if the name is already registered.” In response, GAC affirmed its required Registrars/Registrars/Operators to take specific mandatory steps to avoid confusion with respect to the 2-Funcion labels, and also identified several voluntary measures that Registrar/Registrar Operations could consider. Finally, in keeping with the GAC advice, ICANN urged Registrars/Registrars/Operators to the relevant Registrars 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 leave a third party assessment of the situation if the name is already registered. Although ICANN has not 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 2-character domains at the second level. Most recently, the Board responded to consensus advice contained in the Copenhagen Communique on 27 January 2018. In its response, the Board pointed to the GAC’s memo and Historical Overview for additional details regarding this topic. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s written response to the Copenhagen Communique of 27 January 2018.

On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the Copenhagen Communique and provided this response in its scorecard. The GAC, in its Helsinki Communique, reiterated the need to minimize the risk of confusion between country codes and 2-letter registrations at the second level in new gTLDs, but also conveyed the absence of consensus within the GAC on specific measures needed to address the potential for confusion. The GAC advised the Board to “urge the relevant Registrar 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 leave a third party assessment of the situation if the name is already registered.” In response, GAC affirmed its required Registrars/Registrars/Operators to take specific mandatory steps to avoid confusion with respect to the 2-Funcion labels, and also identified several voluntary measures that Registrar/Registrar Operations could consider. Finally, in keeping with the GAC advice, ICANN urged Registrars/Registrars/Operators to the relevant Registrars 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 leave a third party assessment of the situation if the name is already registered. Although ICANN has not 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 2-character domains at the second level. Most recently, the Board responded to consensus advice contained in the Copenhagen Communique on 27 January 2018. In its response, the Board pointed to the GAC’s memo and Historical Overview for additional details regarding this topic. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s written response to the Copenhagen Communique of 27 January 2018.

On 6 June 2017 the Board considered the Copenhagen Communique and provided this response in its scorecard. The GAC, in its Helsinki Communique, reiterated the need to minimize the risk of confusion between country codes and 2-letter registrations at the second level in new gTLDs, but also conveyed the absence of consensus within the GAC on specific measures needed to address the potential for confusion. The GAC advised the Board to “urge the relevant Registrar 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 leave a third party assessment of the situation if the name is already registered.” In response, GAC affirmed its required Registrars/Registrars/Operators to take specific mandatory steps to avoid confusion with respect to the 2-Funcion labels, and also identified several voluntary measures that Registrar/Registrar Operations could consider. Finally, in keeping with the GAC advice, ICANN urged Registrars/Registrars/Operators to the relevant Registrars 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 leave a third party assessment of the situation if the name is already registered. Although ICANN has not 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 2-character domains at the second level. Most recently, the Board responded to consensus advice contained in the Copenhagen Communique on 27 January 2018. In its response, the Board pointed to the GAC’s memo and Historical Overview for additional details regarding this topic. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s written response to the Copenhagen Communique of 27 January 2018.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request Number</th>
<th>Action Item Description</th>
<th>Date Issued</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001292</td>
<td>The GAC was briefed by the Board—GAC Recommendation Implementation Working Group (WG) and agreed to specific ATRT2 recommendations being progressed by the WG as follows: a. Development of a formal process for the Board to notify and request GAC advice (Recommendation 6.4) — Document current process and seek comment on options for improvements. b. Below changes to formally implement the documented process for Board-GAC followup consultation developed by the BGR- WG. The Board is directed to consider the Board that there are no further requests for future extensions to implementation of the new ATDR, and hence use assessed for followup action on the to be further delayed. c. A publication of senior officials' meetings (Recommendation 9.7) — The GAC agrees that regular high-level meetings are beneficial, and will examine ways to maximize their benefits and continually improve the way they are arranged and scheduled. d. AGo to use opportunities to provide input to ICANN policy development process (Recommendation 10.2) — GAC will continue consideration of this</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001293</td>
<td>The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary. This item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 1 November 2017.</td>
<td>11/1/17</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/resolutions/board-material/resolutions-2014-06-26-en#2.d">http://www.icann.org/resolutions/board-material/resolutions-2014-06-26-en#2.d</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001294</td>
<td>The Board considered the Second Accountability and Transparency Review Team’s (ATRT2) Recommendations on 26 June 2014 and passed the following resolutions: Resolved: (2014.06.26.14), the Board accepts all ATRT2 Recommendations and directs the President and CEO, through his designee(s), to proceed with implementation. For recommendations addressing the relationship between the GAC and the Board, the board agrees that the BGR-IWG will continue to assist with the implementation of several sub-recommendations pertaining to the GAC, and directs the President and CEO to provide required support to the GAC and the BGR-IWG to continue their assessment and implementation planning. In resolved: 2014.06.26.15, the President and CEO is directed to regularly report to the community and the Board on the status of implementation of the ATRT2 recommendations, including key performance indicators and other relevant metrics. This text of the resolution plus states: &quot;Whereas, the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) and the Board-GAC Recommendation Implementation Working Group (BGRI-WG) have considered the ATRT2 Recommendations relating to GAC activities and are engaged in implementation planning. &quot;Given that the Board considered the GAC's consideration of this advice, this item is now considered complete as of 26 June 2014.</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001295</td>
<td>The Board considered the Second Accountability and Transparency Review Team’s (ATRT2) Recommendations on 26 June 2014 and passed the following resolutions: Resolved: (2014.06.26.14), the Board accepts all ATRT2 Recommendations and directs the President and CEO, through his designee(s), to proceed with implementation. For recommendations addressing the relationship between the GAC and the Board, the board agrees that the BGR-IWG will continue to assist with the implementation of several sub-recommendations pertaining to the GAC, and directs the President and CEO to provide required support to the GAC and the BGR-IWG to continue their assessment and implementation planning. In resolved: 2014.06.26.15, the President and CEO is directed to regularly report to the community and the Board on the status of implementation of the ATRT2 recommendations, including key performance indicators and other relevant metrics. This text of the resolution plus states: &quot;Whereas, the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) and the Board-GAC Recommendation Implementation Working Group (BGRI-WG) have considered the ATRT2 Recommendations relating to GAC activities and are engaged in implementation planning. &quot;Given that the Board considered the GAC's consideration of this advice, this item is now considered complete as of 26 June 2014.</td>
<td>6/26/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001296</td>
<td>The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary. This item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 1 November 2017.</td>
<td>11/1/17</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/resolutions/board-material/resolutions-2014-06-26-en#2.d">http://www.icann.org/resolutions/board-material/resolutions-2014-06-26-en#2.d</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The GAC would like to reiterate that maintaining accurate and complete domain name registration data is an important element in the prevention and mitigation of DNS abuse. The GAC places particular importance on the verification, validation, and correction of all registration data by registrars and registrants, in line with their contractual obligations, and supports rigorous monitoring and enforcement of such contractual obligations by ICANN. The GAC will continue to contribute actively to the GNSO work stream in an attempt to address the public policy concerns related to improving domain registration data in a timely and effective manner. In this context, the GAC supports the prompt launch of the accuracy scoping exercise by the GNSO and would request to take part in it, together with other interested constituencies, to bring in different perspectives on the issue. The GAC supports the view that the scope of work on accuracy should not limit itself to compliance with GDPR and should include the accuracy of all domain name registration data.


The Board acknowledges the KAWANT Virtual Annual General Meeting Communiqué on 24 May 2022, including the Issues of Importance, at the 26 May 2022 Board-GAC Interactions Group (BGIG) meeting.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Action Request Date</th>
<th>Issue Requested</th>
<th>Projected Action Request Finish Date</th>
<th>Issue 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>1.1</td>
<td>AR-1051021</td>
<td>02/22</td>
<td>Registration Data Accuracy Scoping Group</td>
<td>11/1/17</td>
<td>Follow up to previous advice will be tracked on open advice items related to the same topic. The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary. Follow-up to previous advice will be tracked on open advice items related to the same topic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/10/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>AR-1051022</td>
<td>02/17</td>
<td>Registration Data Accuracy Scoping Group</td>
<td>11/1/17</td>
<td>The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary. Follow-up to previous advice will be tracked on open advice items related to the same topic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/10/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>AR-1051023</td>
<td>02/17</td>
<td>Registration Data Accuracy Scoping Group</td>
<td>11/1/17</td>
<td>The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary. Follow-up to previous advice will be tracked on open advice items related to the same topic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/10/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Action Request</td>
<td>Action Request Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Current Phase</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Date Closed</td>
<td>Board Resolution Link</td>
<td>Board Scorecard Link</td>
<td>Date Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1.b  | Implement      | AR-002217 | Implement Phase | On 30 May 2018 the Board considered the ICANN70 Virtual Annual General Meeting Communique and provided the following response: The Board agrees to endorse the 30 pending recommendations, listed in the scorecard accompanying the Board resolution 2018.05.30-en, as a timely manner is important. In order to accommodate the pending recommendations, ICANN org will provide reports of how these recommendations were implemented, to be assessed by the next review team. The remaining approved recommendations are awaiting prioritization, risk assessment, costings, and implementation considerations. Of these 12 recommendations, ICANN Org is tasked to resolve the actions identified by the GAC, accompanied by the Board action. With regard to Recommendation 4.1, the Board noted that ICANN org already has policies, plans and programs in place through which these recommendations were implemented, to be assessed by the next review team. The remaining approved recommendations are awaiting prioritization and implementation design. Updated information on the status of the SSR2 Approved recommendations is available on the SSR2 webpage. This advice item has been reviewed and considered by the Board and has moved to implementation. Implementation of approved SSR2 recommendations.

| 1.a  | Implement      | AR-004882 | Implement Phase | On 16 January 2022, the ICANN Board considered the ICANN73 Virtual Annual General Meeting Communique and provided the following response: The Board agrees to endorse the 30 pending recommendations, listed in the scorecard accompanying the Board resolution 2018.05.30-en, as a timely manner is important. In order to accommodate the pending recommendations, ICANN org will provide reports of how these recommendations were implemented, to be assessed by the next review team. The remaining approved recommendations are awaiting prioritization, risk assessment, costings, and implementation considerations. Of these 12 recommendations, ICANN Org is tasked to resolve the actions identified by the GAC, accompanied by the Board action. With regard to Recommendation 4.1, the Board noted that ICANN org already has policies, plans and programs in place through which these recommendations were implemented, to be assessed by the next review team. The remaining approved recommendations are awaiting prioritization and implementation design. Updated information on the status of the SSR2 Approved recommendations is available on the SSR2 webpage. This advice item has been reviewed and considered by the Board and has moved to implementation. Implementation of approved SSR2 recommendations.

---

**Notes:**
- The GAC acknowledges that member governments have chosen to focus on other topics for the upcoming 47th Session of the Amazon Cooperation Treaty Organization (ACTO) have established a process for analyzing the proposal, and that this analysis is ongoing. The GAC was informed that Amazon.com and Board members have made themselves available to assist if requested. The GAC considers the Board’s final SSR2 Review Team Report and Scorecard, and related Amazon SLD proposals for dot .amazon case. The GAC’s letter to the Board is attached to this Communique.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request Number</th>
<th>Issue Number</th>
<th>Request Title</th>
<th>Request Issue Date</th>
<th>Request Due Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status Change</th>
<th>Board Resolution Date</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 (ICANN48 Buenos Aires Communique)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Safeguard Category 1 and Category 2 Safeguard Advice</td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>The GAC highlights the importance of its pending advice to ICANN on this issue. The Board considers that the existing PIC specifications include all of the considerations covered by this advice, including the need to avoid undue preference and undue disadvantage. The GAC requests a briefing on whether the Board considers that the existing PIC specifications include all of the considerations covered by this advice.</td>
<td>3/27/14</td>
<td>5/6/14</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Board noted the advice on a few of the recommendations related to matters that can only be addressed through community action, notably in the Board does not direct policy work. In practice, this means that the Board, through its decision, stated that consideration of these recommendations is left in the hands of community organizations. For each of these recommendations, while the Board or ICANN org are not the direct group to whom the CCT advice from this scorecard recommendation, the Board was careful to respect the intent and roles of the different parts of the ICANN community and did not direct ICANN org action that would usurp another group’s remit. Therefore, once the Board has taken action of offering the recommendations for community consideration, no further action is to be taken on these recommendations which are considered completed and closed. The Board noted in its footnote accompanying its action on the CCT Final Report, “Missing recommendations through community groups is not a directive that the groups identified should formally address any of the issues within these recommendations, it is within the purview of each group to identify whether work will be taken on and the basis that the group will address. For transparency, however, it would be helpful to free records or reporting made available to the ICANN community on how the Board’s follow-up action on these recommendations are being implemented.”

The Board notes that the CCT recommendations highlighted by the CCT Final Report for their consideration. Below is an overview to summarize the recommendations related to matters that can only be addressed through community action, notably in the Board does not direct policy work. In practice, this means that the Board, through its decision, stated that consideration of these recommendations is left in the hands of community organizations. For each of these recommendations, while the Board or ICANN org are not the direct group to whom the CCT advice from this scorecard recommendation, the Board was careful to respect the intent and roles of the different parts of the ICANN community and did not direct ICANN org action that would usurp another group’s remit. Therefore, once the Board has taken action of offering the recommendations for community consideration, no further action is to be taken on these recommendations which are considered completed and closed. The Board noted in its footnote accompanying its action on the CCT Final Report, “Missing recommendations through community groups is not a directive that the groups identified should formally address any of the issues within these recommendations, it is within the purview of each group to identify whether work will be taken on and the basis that the group will address. For transparency, however, it would be helpful to free records or reporting made available to the ICANN community on how the Board’s follow-up action on these recommendations are being implemented.”

The Board notes that the CCT recommendations highlighted by the CCT Final Report for their consideration. Below is an overview to summarize the recommendations related to matters that can only be addressed through community action, notably in the Board does not direct policy work. In practice, this means that the Board, through its decision, stated that consideration of these recommendations is left in the hands of community organizations. For each of these recommendations, while the Board or ICANN org are not the direct group to whom the CCT advice from this scorecard recommendation, the Board was careful to respect the intent and roles of the different parts of the ICANN community and did not direct ICANN org action that would usurp another group’s remit. Therefore, once the Board has taken action of offering the recommendations for community consideration, no further action is to be taken on these recommendations which are considered completed and closed. The Board noted in its footnote accompanying its action on the CCT Final Report, “Missing recommendations through community groups is not a directive that the groups identified should formally address any of the issues within these recommendations, it is within the purview of each group to identify whether work will be taken on and the basis that the group will address. For transparency, however, it would be helpful to free records or reporting made available to the ICANN community on how the Board’s follow-up action on these recommendations are being implemented.”

The Board notes that the CCT recommendations highlighted by the CCT Final Report for their consideration. Below is an overview to summarize the recommendations related to matters that can only be addressed through community action, notably in the Board does not direct policy work. In practice, this means that the Board, through its decision, stated that consideration of these recommendations is left in the hands of community organizations. For each of these recommendations, while the Board or ICANN org are not the direct group to whom the CCT advice from this scorecard recommendation, the Board was careful to respect the intent and roles of the different parts of the ICANN community and did not direct ICANN org action that would usurp another group’s remit. Therefore, once the Board has taken action of offering the recommendations for community consideration, no further action is to be taken on these recommendations which are considered completed and closed. The Board noted in its footnote accompanying its action on the CCT Final Report, “Missing recommendations through community groups is not a directive that the groups identified should formally address any of the issues within these recommendations, it is within the purview of each group to identify whether work will be taken on and the basis that the group will address. For transparency, however, it would be helpful to free records or reporting made available to the ICANN community on how the Board’s follow-up action on these recommendations are being implemented.”

The Board notes that the CCT recommendations highlighted by the CCT Final Report for their consideration. Below is an overview to summarize the recommendations related to matters that can only be addressed through community action, notably in the Board does not direct policy work. In practice, this means that the Board, through its decision, stated that consideration of these recommendations is left in the hands of community organizations. For each of these recommendations, while the Board or ICANN org are not the direct group to whom the CCT advice from this scorecard recommendation, the Board was careful to respect the intent and roles of the different parts of the ICANN community and did not direct ICANN org action that would usurp another group’s remit. Therefore, once the Board has taken action of offering the recommendations for community consideration, no further action is to be taken on these recommendations which are considered completed and closed. The Board noted in its footnote accompanying its action on the CCT Final Report, “Missing recommendations through community groups is not a directive that the groups identified should formally address any of the issues within these recommendations, it is within the purview of each group to identify whether work will be taken on and the basis that the group will address. For transparency, however, it would be helpful to free records or reporting made available to the ICANN community on how the Board’s follow-up action on these recommendations are being implemented.”

The Board notes that the CCT recommendations highlighted by the CCT Final Report for their consideration. Below is an overview to summarize the recommendations related to matters that can only be addressed through community action, notably in the Board does not direct policy work. In practice, this means that the Board, through its decision, stated that consideration of these recommendations is left in the hands of community organizations. For each of these recommendations, while the Board or ICANN org are not the direct group to whom the CCT advice from this scorecard recommendation, the Board was careful to respect the intent and roles of the different parts of the ICANN community and did not direct ICANN org action that would usurp another group’s remit. Therefore, once the Board has taken action of offering the recommendations for community consideration, no further action is to be taken on these recommendations which are considered completed and closed. The Board noted in its footnote accompanying its action on the CCT Final Report, “Missing recommendations through community groups is not a directive that the groups identified should formally address any of the issues within these recommendations, it is within the purview of each group to identify whether work will be taken on and the basis that the group will address. For transparency, however, it would be helpful to free records or reporting made available to the ICANN community on how the Board’s follow-up action on these recommendations are being implemented.”
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The Board notes that the CCT recommendations highlighted by the CCT Final Report for their consideration. Below is an overview to summarize the recommendations related to matters that can only be addressed through community action, notably in the Board does not direct policy work. In practice, this means that the Board, through its decision, stated that consideration of these recommendations is left in the hands of community organizations. For each of these recommendations, while the Board or ICANN org are not the direct group to whom the CCT advice from this scorecard recommendation, the Board was careful to respect the intent and roles of the different parts of the ICANN community and did not direct ICANN org action that would usurp another group’s remit. Therefore, once the Board has taken action of offering the recommendations for community consideration, no further action is to be taken on these recommendations which are considered completed and closed. The Board noted in its footnote accompanying its action on the CCT Final Report, “Missing recommendations through community groups is not a directive that the groups identified should formally address any of the issues within these recommendations, it is within the purview of each group to identify whether work will be taken on and the basis that the group will address. For transparency, however, it would be helpful to free records or reporting made available to the ICANN community on how the Board’s follow-up action on these recommendations are being implemented.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>ICANN Event</th>
<th>Request Number</th>
<th>Date Issued</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date Closed</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Status Update (Public)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45-02718</td>
<td>ICANN53 Buenos Aires Communique</td>
<td>6/24/15</td>
<td>On Time/No Recommendation</td>
<td>Follow up</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>The GAC wishes to recall its Kennedy Montessori Communique Advice on CCT Review and Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs (section 1), and in light of the constructive discussions which took place with the Board, and the actor ICANN Community or GAC, as well as the GAC follow-up action from ICANN67 (entry in paragraph 5.1 of Section V) and following the Board Scrambled Themen (dated 10th May 2021), allows the extension of the Board to the related suggestions referred to in a sub-section. Refers to importance of the GAC to this Communique.</td>
<td>6/29/17</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/board-material/resolutions-icann71-virtual-ccr-advice-scorecard-12sep21-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/board-material/resolutions-icann71-virtual-ccr-advice-scorecard-12sep21-en.pdf</a></td>
<td><a href="https://new-gtld.icann.org/en/board-material/resolutions-icann71-virtual-ccr-advice-scorecard-12sep21-en.pdf">Status Update (Public)</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-02718</td>
<td>ICANN53 Buenos Aires Communique</td>
<td>6/24/15</td>
<td>On Time/No Recommendation</td>
<td>Follow up</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>The GAC reiterates its advice 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: i) 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>7/10/19</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-02718</td>
<td>ICANN53 Buenos Aires Communique</td>
<td>6/24/15</td>
<td>On Time/No Recommendation</td>
<td>Follow up</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary.</td>
<td>9/12/21</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/solutions/new-gtld-2014-05-14-enptoms-information-new-gtld-2016-05-19-enmet-2016-05-19-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/solutions/new-gtld-2014-05-14-enptoms-information-new-gtld-2016-05-19-enmet-2016-05-19-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Follow up to previous advice will be tracked on open advice items related to the same topic.**

---

**Follow up to previous advice will be tracked on open advice items related to the same topic.**

---

**Follow up to previous advice will be tracked on open advice items related to the same topic.**

---

**Follow up to previous advice will be tracked on open advice items related to the same topic.**
The GAC advises the Board that its ICANN54 recommendations previously expressed concern that the Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) process has not met the expectations of applicants and notes that the successful applications are currently the subject of a dispute-resolution procedures. 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 unfairness to the applicants on the basis of the time and resource by competing applicants to other successful applicants. The specific challenges faced by some community applicants in situations where competition with commercial applicants, is: the CPE will take into account the final report of the ICANN54 Briefs on this issue when preparing the GAC's input into the ICANN54's review of issues for improving procedures relating to community-based applications in the next gTLD round and for the Competition, Trust, and Consumer Trust and Consumer Competition, Trust, and Consumer Review Team (CCT-CRT). The GAC notes that it has a number of applications that has been identified as a Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) process. Following the rejection of a number of applications. The GAC notes that the CPE process is not be considered as complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 4 June 2013.

**Follow up to previous advice will be tracked on open advice items related to the same issue when preparing the GAC's input into the ICANN54's report of 7 October 2015.**

The NGPC accepted the GAC advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response in its scorecard: In a 28 April 2015 letter, the NGPC recommended that in the current round that there is no specific mechanism that should be applied to the CPE process. The NGPC noted that at its 12 -14 October meeting, it took action to address perceived inconsistent and unwarranted Expert Determinations resulting from the New gTLD Program String Confusion Objection process. As part of this action, the NGPC also considered whether it was appropriate to expand the scope of a proposed review mechanism to include other Expert Determinations, which could include the Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) Expert Determinations. The NGPC determined that to promote the goals of predictability and fairness, establishing a review mechanism in a broader manner may be more appropriate as part of future community discussions about subsequent rounds of the New gTLD Program. Applicants have already taken action in reliance of the Expert Determinations, and including unsigned Betrayal Agreements, prioritizing delegation, challenging their applications, and requesting refund. Allowing these actions to be undone would not only delay consideration of all applications, but also raise issues of fairness for those that have already acted in reliance on the Applicant Guidebook. The NGPC recommended that the development of rules and procedures for future rounds of the New gTLD Program be developed through the subsequent procedures (31 August 2015; 24 November 2014). The Board notes that the Preliminary Issue Report on New gTLD Application procedures (https://gnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/filefield_48041/subsequent-procedures---31aug15-en.pdf) includes a discussion of community applications, taking note of the concerns raised by the GAC in various Communique. The Preliminary Issue Report is a precursor to the GNSO considering whether or not to undertake a policy development process. (See Section 4.4.5 of the Preliminary Issue Report). At its 27 December 2015 meeting, the GAC noted a resolution to initiate a PDR to consider and analyze issues discussed in the Final Issue Report on New gTLD Application procedures. This item is considered complete as of the GAC's consideration of 3 February 2016.

The NGPC published a discussion report of NGPC recommendations and presented its advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response in its scorecard: In a 28 April 2015 letter, the NGPC recommended that in the current round that there is no specific mechanism that should be applied to the CPE process. The NGPC noted that at its 12 -14 October meeting, it took action to address perceived inconsistent and unwarranted Expert Determinations resulting from the New gTLD Program String Confusion Objection process. As part of this action, the NGPC also considered whether it was appropriate to expand the scope of a proposed review mechanism to include other Expert Determinations, which could include the Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) Expert Determinations. The NGPC determined that to promote the goals of predictability and fairness, establishing a review mechanism in a broader manner may be more appropriate as part of future community discussions about subsequent rounds of the New gTLD Program. Applicants have already taken action in reliance of the Expert Determinations, and including unsigned Betrayal Agreements, prioritizing delegation, challenging their applications, and requesting refund. Allowing these actions to be undone would not only delay consideration of all applications, but also raise issues of fairness for those that have already acted in reliance on the Applicant Guidebook. The NGPC recommended that the development of rules and procedures for future rounds of the New gTLD Program be developed through the subsequent procedures (31 August 2015; 24 November 2014). The Board notes that the Preliminary Issue Report on New gTLD Application procedures (https://gnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/filefield_48041/subsequent-procedures---31aug15-en.pdf) includes a discussion of community applications, taking note of the concerns raised by the GAC in various Communique. The Preliminary Issue Report is a precursor to the GNSO considering whether or not to undertake a policy development process. (See Section 4.4.5 of the Preliminary Issue Report). At its 27 December 2015 meeting, the GAC noted a resolution to initiate a PDR to consider and analyze issues discussed in the Final Issue Report on New gTLD Application procedures. This item is considered complete as of the GAC's consideration of 3 February 2016.

**Follow up to previous advice will be tracked on open advice items related to the same issue when preparing the GAC's input into the ICANN54's report of 7 October 2015.**

The NGPC accepted the GAC advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response in its scorecard: In a 28 April 2015 letter, the NGPC recommended that in the current round that there is no specific mechanism that should be applied to the CPE process. The NGPC noted that at its 12 -14 October meeting, it took action to address perceived inconsistent and unwarranted Expert Determinations resulting from the New gTLD Program String Confusion Objection process. As part of this action, the NGPC also considered whether it was appropriate to expand the scope of a proposed review mechanism to include other Expert Determinations, which could include the Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) Expert Determinations. The NGPC determined that to promote the goals of predictability and fairness, establishing a review mechanism in a broader manner may be more appropriate as part of future community discussions about subsequent rounds of the New gTLD Program. Applicants have already taken action in reliance of the Expert Determinations, and including unsigned Betrayal Agreements, prioritizing delegation, challenging their applications, and requesting refund. Allowing these actions to be undone would not only delay consideration of all applications, but also raise issues of fairness for those that have already acted in reliance on the Applicant Guidebook. The NGPC recommended that the development of rules and procedures for future rounds of the New gTLD Program be developed through the subsequent procedures (31 August 2015; 24 November 2014). The Board notes that the Preliminary Issue Report on New gTLD Application procedures (https://gnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/filefield_48041/subsequent-procedures---31aug15-en.pdf) includes a discussion of community applications, taking note of the concerns raised by the GAC in various Communique. The Preliminary Issue Report is a precursor to the GNSO considering whether or not to undertake a policy development process. (See Section 4.4.5 of the Preliminary Issue Report). At its 27 December 2015 meeting, the GAC noted a resolution to initiate a PDR to consider and analyze issues discussed in the Final Issue Report on New gTLD Application procedures. This item is considered complete as of the GAC's consideration of 3 February 2016.

The NGPC published a discussion report of NGPC recommendations and presented its advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response in its scorecard: In a 28 April 2015 letter, the NGPC recommended that in the current round that there is no specific mechanism that should be applied to the CPE process. The NGPC noted that at its 12 -14 October meeting, it took action to address perceived inconsistent and unwarranted Expert Determinations resulting from the New gTLD Program String Confusion Objection process. As part of this action, the NGPC also considered whether it was appropriate to expand the scope of a proposed review mechanism to include other Expert Determinations, which could include the Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) Expert Determinations. The NGPC determined that to promote the goals of predictability and fairness, establishing a review mechanism in a broader manner may be more appropriate as part of future community discussions about subsequent rounds of the New gTLD Program. Applicants have already taken action in reliance of the Expert Determinations, and including unsigned Betrayal Agreements, prioritizing delegation, challenging their applications, and requesting refund. Allowing these actions to be undone would not only delay consideration of all applications, but also raise issues of fairness for those that have already acted in reliance on the Applicant Guidebook. The NGPC recommended that the development of rules and procedures for future rounds of the New gTLD Program be developed through the subsequent procedures (31 August 2015; 24 November 2014). The Board notes that the Preliminary Issue Report on New gTLD Application procedures (https://gnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/filefield_48041/subsequent-procedures---31aug15-en.pdf) includes a discussion of community applications, taking note of the concerns raised by the GAC in various Communique. The Preliminary Issue Report is a precursor to the GNSO considering whether or not to undertake a policy development process. (See Section 4.4.5 of the Preliminary Issue Report). At its 27 December 2015 meeting, the GAC noted a resolution to initiate a PDR to consider and analyze issues discussed in the Final Issue Report on New gTLD Application procedures. This item is considered complete as of the GAC's consideration of 3 February 2016.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Case Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>Date Issued</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Type of Request/Advice</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Status Update (Public)</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
<th>Date Scorecard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001249</td>
<td>ICANN46 Beijing</td>
<td>2/11/15</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Request Number</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Action Request: Action</td>
<td>Communique ICANN46 Beijing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001342</td>
<td>ICANN46 Beijing</td>
<td>2/11/15</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Request Number</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Action Request: Action</td>
<td>Communique ICANN46 Beijing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001219</td>
<td>ICANN46 Beijing</td>
<td>4/11/13</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Request Number</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Action Request: Action</td>
<td>Communique ICANN46 Beijing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 8.a.I.</td>
<td>Category 1</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consistent with applicable law and any related procedure, registry operators shall ensure that there are real and immediate consequences for the demonstrated provision of false WHOIS information and violations of the requirement that the domain name not be used in breach of applicable law; these consequences should include suspension of the domain name.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 8.a.I.</td>
<td>Category 1</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On 26 June 2014 the GAC considered this advice and the general topic of safeguards applicable to all New gTLDs and passed a resolution adapting the &quot;NGPC Proposal for Implementation of GAC Safeguards Applicable to All New gTLDs&quot; (adopted 29 June 2013). In proposing this NGPC responds to this advisory item as follows: As indicated in #2 above, ICANN will include in the proposed new gTLD Registry Agreement as a mandatory Public Interest Commitment in Specification 11) obligating Registry Operators to include a provision in their Registry Registration Agreements that require Registrars to include in their Registration Agreements a provision prohibiting registered names hidden from distributing malicious, abusive operating kits, phishing, piracy, trademark or copyright infringement, fraudulent or deceptive practices, counterfeiting or otherwise engaging in activity contrary to applicable law, and providing (consistent with applicable law and any related procedures) consequences for such activities (including suspension of the domain name). Consequences for the demonstrated provision of false WHOIS information are set forth in Section 3.7.7 of the 2013 RAA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-004232</td>
<td>ICANN46 Beijing</td>
<td>2/14/14</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Action Request: Action</td>
<td>Communique ICANN46 Beijing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4.a.I.</td>
<td>Category 2</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consistent with applicable law and professional sectors should operate in a way that is consistent with applicable laws. Those strings are likely to include a level of implied trust from consumers, and carry higher levels of risk associated with consumer harm. The following safeguards should apply to strings that are related to these sectors: 1. Registry operators will include in its acceptable use policy that registrants comply with all applicable laws, including those that relate to privacy, data collection, consumer protection (including in relation to misleading and deceptive conduct), fraud, lending, debt collection, organic farming, disclosure of data, and financial disclosures. 2. Registry operators will require registrants to register and maintain sensitive health and financial data implement reasonable and appropriate security measures commensurate with the offering of these services, as defined by applicable law and recognized industry standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4.a.I.</td>
<td>Category 2</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard. The NGPC accepts the advice. The NGPC adopts the implementation framework attached as Annex 3 (<a href="http://www.icann.org/en/group/board/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-02-05-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/group/board/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-02-05-en.pdf</a>) to address this advice, and directs the GAC to consider this advice as input to its work on the &quot;Implementation of GAC Safeguards Applicable to All New gTLDs.&quot; Paragraph 1 of the proposed PIC Specification includes a requirement that Registry Operator will use only GAC-accorded registrants that are party to the 2013 RAA so that these consequences are simultaneously required. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s resolution of 3 February 2014.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-004542</td>
<td>ICANN46 Beijng</td>
<td>5/18/17</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Action Request: Action</td>
<td>Communique ICANN46 Beijing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4.a.I.</td>
<td>Category 4</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On 25 June 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of Safeguards Applicable to all New gTLDs and passed a resolution: Resolved (2013.06.25-en), the President and CEO, or his designee(s), is directed to continue to engage with the GAC to implement the Category 4 Safeguard advice consistent with the implementation framework. With respect to the additional advice in the Buenos Aires Framework, the NGPC notes that the WHOIS database is a source of valuable data for legitimate medical practitioners. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 5 February 2016.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Number</td>
<td>Requested Date</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Action Status</td>
<td>Board Resolution Link</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-004730</td>
<td>2/19/21</td>
<td>DNS Abuse</td>
<td>The GAC acknowledges the expression of concern provided to the GAC by ICANN in relation to the state of play of the processing of the Data Retention Specification waiver requests under the Registrar Accreditation Agreement (&quot;2013 RAA&quot;). The GAC found that ICANN proceeded in a timely manner to process the waiver requests pending a decision on these waivers. They further recalled that waivers might be necessary for data provision requirements accordingly in the Registry Agreement.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-004784</td>
<td>3/25/21</td>
<td>DNS Abuse</td>
<td>ICANN will continue to process requests from registrars according the Process for Evaluating Requests from Registrars to Waive Certain Data Retention Requirements under the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement (&quot;2013 RAA&quot;). Recently, ICANN reported (<a href="https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-3-2014-05-22-en">https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-3-2014-05-22-en</a>) that it had made a preliminary determination that it is prepared to grant three (3) data retention waiver requests in a limited scope validated by registrars. ICANN also emphasized the importance of handling Registrar Data Retention Waiver Requests (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/letter-03-06-14-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/letter-03-06-14-en.pdf</a>) and provide periodic updates to the community as appropriate. This item is considered complete as of the Board Chair’s letter of 5 June 2014.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001268</td>
<td>6/21/21</td>
<td>DNS Abuse</td>
<td>The Board took action on the ICANN71 Communique on 20 July 2021: (<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2021-07-20-en#2.f">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2021-07-20-en#2.f</a>) The Board acknowledged the ICANN70 Communique on 8 April 2021: (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/letter-03-06-14-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/letter-03-06-14-en.pdf</a>). The Board also discussed the ICANN70 Communique, including the Issues of Importance, at the 1 June 2021 Board-GAC Interactions Group (BGIG) meeting</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The GAC recognizes the collaborative efforts taking place within the ICANN community to develop voluntary mechanisms to address DNS Abuse, such as the Framework on Domain Generating Algorithms Associated with Malware and Botnets, and appreciates the efforts from all parties within the multistakeholder community to identify opportunities for enhancement on the topic of DNS Abuse when and where possible. The GAC acknowledged the importance of ensuring that registrars and registrars comply with ICANN contractual obligations. At the same time, the GAC continues to emphasize the need to develop and implement improved contract provisions, including the need to address DNS Abuse before further expending the cost through any subsequent application round for new gTLDs. 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 interest in any such.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request</th>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Date Issued</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Issues of Importance</th>
<th>Date Closed</th>
<th>Status Update (Public)</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
<th>Date Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/2022</td>
<td>ICANN75, Virtual Annual Community Forum Communique</td>
<td>3/14/22</td>
<td>DNS Abuse Mitigation</td>
<td>Issue of Importance</td>
<td>2/8/22</td>
<td>The Board discussed the ICANN75 Virtual Annual Community Forum Communique, including the issues of importance, at the 24 May 2022 Board-GAC Interactions Group (BGIC) meeting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request Number</td>
<td>Action Requested</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>End Date</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Resolution Link</td>
<td>Board Resolution Link</td>
<td>Date Closed</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICANN47-Communique 11/1/21</td>
<td>ICANN Security and Stability</td>
<td>ICANN Security and Stability</td>
<td>11/1/21</td>
<td>11/1/21</td>
<td>Follow up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1/16/22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICANN47-Communique 11/1/21</td>
<td>ICANN Security and Stability</td>
<td>ICANN Security and Stability</td>
<td>11/1/21</td>
<td>11/1/21</td>
<td>Follow up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1/16/22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICANN47-Communique 11/1/21</td>
<td>ICANN Security and Stability</td>
<td>ICANN Security and Stability</td>
<td>11/1/21</td>
<td>11/1/21</td>
<td>Follow up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1/16/22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The table above outlines various requests and actions related to ICANN security and stability issues, with specific dates and links to resolutions and resolutions links. The status column indicates follow up, while the resolution link column provides links to the resolutions or board materials. The date closed column shows the date when the request was closed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Date Closed</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Action Request: Communiqué

**ICANN66 Montréal**

**Date Issued:** 11/6/19

**Subject:** Implementation Update on Phase 2 of the EDPR

**Description:**

On 26 January 2020, the Board considered the Montreal Communiqué and provided this response in its scorecard. The Board accepts this advice. The Board agrees that the EPDP Phase 1 work plan is a prudent component of the implementation plan. The Board notes that the EPDP org sent a letter to the GAC chair on 26 January 2020 as a status update as requested by the GAC in that letter. On 26 January 2020, the Board discovered that the EPDP organization is on track to submit the EPDP Phase 1 work plan in progress by January 3, 2020.

**Status:**

- The GAC advises the Board to direct the EPDP organization to submit the EPDP Phase 2 work plan in progress by January 3, 2020.

**Request:**

- The GAC advises the Board to instruct the ICANN organization to submit the EPDP Phase 2 work plan in progress by January 3, 2020.

**Author:**

- The GAC

**Public Comment:**

- The Board understands that the GAC provided additional clarifications to this advice in a letter on 22 January 2020. The Board will consider when and if further action is appropriate.

**Date Closed:** 5/24/22


---

**Phase 2 of Data Service and n Domain Name Registry Information and Points of Contact**

**Description:**

- The Board considers the Montreal Communiqué and provided this response in its scorecard. The Board accepts this advice. The Board agrees that the EPDP Phase 1 work plan is a prudent component of the implementation plan. The Board notes that the EPDP org sent a letter to the GAC chair on 26 January 2020 as a status update as requested by the GAC in that letter. On 26 January 2020, the Board discovered that the EPDP organization is on track to submit the EPDP Phase 1 work plan in progress by January 3, 2020.

**Status:**

- The GAC advises the Board to instruct the ICANN organization to submit the EPDP Phase 2 work plan in progress by January 3, 2020.

**Request:**

- The GAC advises the Board to instruct the ICANN organization to submit the EPDP Phase 2 work plan in progress by January 3, 2020.

**Author:**

- The GAC

**Public Comment:**

- The Board understands that the GAC provided additional clarifications to this advice in a letter on 22 January 2020. The Board will consider when and if further action is appropriate.

**Date Closed:** 5/24/22


---

**Phase 5 | Close**

**Description:**

- The Board considers the Montreal Communiqué and provided this response in its scorecard. The Board notes that, currently, KANNX Contractual Compliance does not offer specific complaint forms for complaints related to domains.

**Status:**

- The GAC advises the Board to instruct the ICANN organization to create a specific process to address complaints regarding lacking access to, and unreasonable denial of access to non-public domain name registration data, and monitor and publish reports on compliance with the current policy as part of their regular monthly reporting.

**Request:**

- The GAC advises the Board to instruct the ICANN organization to create a specific process to address complaints regarding lacking access to, and unreasonable denial of access to non-public domain name registration data, and monitor and publish reports on compliance with the current policy as part of their regular monthly reporting.

**Author:**

- The GAC

**Public Comment:**

- The Board understands that the GAC provided additional clarifications to this advice in a letter on 22 January 2020. The Board will consider when and if further action is appropriate.

**Date Closed:** 5/24/22


---

**Phase 5 | Close**

**Description:**

- The Board considers the Montreal Communiqué and provided this response in its scorecard. The Board notes that, currently, KANNX Contractual Compliance does not offer specific complaint forms for complaints related to domains.

**Status:**

- The GAC advises the Board to instruct the ICANN organization to create a specific process to address complaints regarding lacking access to, and unreasonable denial of access to non-public domain name registration data, and monitor and publish reports on compliance with the current policy as part of their regular monthly reporting.

**Request:**

- The GAC advises the Board to instruct the ICANN organization to create a specific process to address complaints regarding lacking access to, and unreasonable denial of access to non-public domain name registration data, and monitor and publish reports on compliance with the current policy as part of their regular monthly reporting.

**Author:**

- The GAC

**Public Comment:**

- The Board understands that the GAC provided additional clarifications to this advice in a letter on 22 January 2020. The Board will consider when and if further action is appropriate.

**Date Closed:** 5/24/22


On 4 February 2018 the Board considered the Abu Dhabi Communique and provided this response in its statement. The Board acknowledges and appreciates this follow-up to the GAC’s advice regarding the AMAZON applications. Following the Board resolution on AMAZON at KANNAL, a reconsideration request was filed by the 2018-02-04-en#2.d 3rd party on 5 November 2018. The Board took action on this Reconsideration request on 16 January 2019, indicating a resolution that “encourages a high level of collaboration between the President and CEO and the relevant stakeholders, including the representatives of the Amazonian countries and the Amazon corporation, between ICANN and ICANN, and directs the President and CEO to provide the Board with updates on the facilitation process in anticipation of reviewing the status of the AMAZON applications at its meeting at KANNAL.” The Board also notes the most recent letter of 10 December 2018 from the ICANN org President & CEO to the GAC Chair regarding the facilitation process between the GAC and the ICANN org. In this letter the GAC notes that over the last 12 months it has put great time into working with ICANN org members and the Amazon Corporation in developing a solution for the delegation of AMAZON that would be of mutual benefit to the peoples of the Amazon region, as well as the Amazon Corporation. It is for this reason, that both the Board and ICANN org believe that the current turn of events is truly unfortunate and reemphasize that we can move forward together in a constructive and positive manner towards the best possible outcome for all parties concerned. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 7 January 2019.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request/Action Number</th>
<th>Community/Forum</th>
<th>Date Issued</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status/Phase</th>
<th>Scorecard Update [Public]</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
<th>Date Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-004789</td>
<td>ICANN57 Communique</td>
<td>11/8/16</td>
<td>Enhanceme nt of mutual cooperation and understandi ng</td>
<td>6/20/22</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’s and of procedures in the ICANN framework.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>On 9 February 2017 the Board considered the ICANN57 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 9 February 2017.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-02-09-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-02-09-en.pdf</a></td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-02-09-ICANN57-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-02-09-ICANN57-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>2/09/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-005041</td>
<td>ICANN57 Communique</td>
<td>11/8/16</td>
<td>Enhanceme nt of mutual cooperation and understandi ng</td>
<td>2017-02-03-en#1.i</td>
<td>Engage in enhanced and more regular communication with the GAC with a view to fostering mutual understanding of the nature and purpose of the GAC as an issue of public policy and related to the implementation of GAC resolutions.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>On 9 February 2017 the Board considered the ICANN57 Communique and provided this response in its scorecard. The Board accepts this advice. The Board will continue to engage in these interactions as implemented and described in resolutions and in the context of the ICANN framework.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-02-09-ICANN57-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-02-09-ICANN57-en.pdf</a></td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-02-09-ICANN57-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-02-09-ICANN57-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>2/09/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001321</td>
<td>ICANN57 Communique</td>
<td>11/8/16</td>
<td>Enhanceme nt of mutual cooperation and understandi ng</td>
<td>2017-02-03-en#1.i</td>
<td>Make it a regular practice to schedule a post-Communique Board-GAC meeting to discuss and provide advice, either at the relevant GAC/NOM meeting or in a call a few weeks of a Communique being issued.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>On 9 February 2017 the Board considered the ICANN57 Communique and provided this response in its scorecard. The Board accepts this advice. The Board will continue to engage in these interactions as implemented and described in resolutions and in the context of the ICANN framework.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-02-09-ICANN57-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-02-09-ICANN57-en.pdf</a></td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-02-09-ICANN57-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-02-09-ICANN57-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>2/09/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001319</td>
<td>ICANN57 Communique</td>
<td>11/8/16</td>
<td>Enhanceme nt of mutual cooperation and understandi ng</td>
<td>2017-02-03-en#1.i</td>
<td>Consider public posting draft resolutions in advance of Board Meetings.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>On 9 February 2017 the Board considered the ICANN57 Communique and provided this response in its scorecard. The Board has included an ongoing dialogue with the GAC, via regular calls to discuss the GAC Communiques. 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 GAC 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 9 February 2017.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-02-09-ICANN57-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-02-09-ICANN57-en.pdf</a></td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-02-09-ICANN57-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-02-09-ICANN57-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>2/09/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001318</td>
<td>ICANN57 Communique</td>
<td>11/8/16</td>
<td>Enhanceme nt of mutual cooperation and understandi ng</td>
<td>2017-02-03-en#1.i</td>
<td>Issue of transparency of GAC’s operations.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>On 9 February 2017 the Board considered the ICANN57 Communique and provided this response in its scorecard. The Board has included an ongoing dialogue with the GAC, via regular calls to discuss the GAC Communiques. 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 GAC 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 9 February 2017.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-02-09-ICANN57-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-02-09-ICANN57-en.pdf</a></td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-02-09-ICANN57-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-02-09-ICANN57-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>2/09/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-006994</td>
<td>ICANN74 Policy Forum</td>
<td>2/3/2022</td>
<td>ESPD on specific human rights protections for GOs</td>
<td>2/3/2017</td>
<td>The GAC welcomed the progress on the ICANN70 report and the related work on the ESPD on specific human rights protections for GOs.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>On 12 September 2021 the ICANN Board considered the GAC ICANN70 Communique with regard to Phase 1 of the ESPD on specific human rights protections for GOs. The Board stated: “The Board appreciates the GAC’s continued interest and support for the Phase 1 implementation work, which includes developing the overall implementation plan, as well as including the following elements: development of the risk assessments for the ICANN and GAC processes; the development of a Scorecard for GAC and ICANN; and the development of a final report for the ESPD for the Board’s consideration.” This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 12 September 2021.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-02-09-ICANN57-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-02-09-ICANN57-en.pdf</a></td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-02-09-ICANN57-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-02-09-ICANN57-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>2/09/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request Number</td>
<td>Action Request: Action</td>
<td>ICANN 70 Virtual Annual General Meeting Communique</td>
<td>ICANN 70 Virtual Community Forum Communique</td>
<td>ICANN 70 Virtual Community Forum GAC Communique</td>
<td>Date Issued</td>
<td>Date Closed</td>
<td>Issue of Importance</td>
<td>Resolution Link</td>
<td>Board Resolution Link</td>
<td>Date Source</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Request Action</td>
<td>Request Number</td>
<td>Issue Issued</td>
<td>Issue Number</td>
<td>Issue Description</td>
<td>Issue Update (Public)</td>
<td>Board Resolution Link</td>
<td>Board Requested Link</td>
<td>Date Issued</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-004105</td>
<td>ICANN66 Virtual Policy Forum GAC Communique</td>
<td>11/6/19</td>
<td>ICANN66 Virtual Policy Forum GAC Communique</td>
<td>Reporting the critical issue of how to effectively handle requests for non-public registration data, the GAC notes with interest the upcoming request for information (RFI) with regard to the Operational Design Phase (ODP). The ODP is an assessment intended to help inform the board deliberations on whether the Phase 2 recommendations are included in a system for Standardized Access/Disclosure (SAD). There is increasing interest in developing a potential implementation of SADs. The RFI and some information in order to assess, among other things, the &quot;suitable mechanisms to identify and address confidentiality issues&quot; and the &quot;(risks of) effort for system design, development, and operation&quot; of the SADs. The GAC emphasizes again that the Privacy Proxy Services Accreditation Issues (PPSAI) policy recommendations remain highly relevant and implementation efforts of the participants, leadership, and policy team staff in developing these recommendations under a streamlined approach. The RFI and some information in order to assess, among other things, the &quot;suitable mechanisms to identify and address confidentiality issues&quot; and the &quot;(risks of) effort for system design, development, and operation&quot; of the SADs. The GAC emphasizes again that the Privacy Proxy Services Accreditation Issues (PPSAI) policy recommendations remain highly relevant and implementation efforts of the participants, leadership, and policy team staff in developing these recommendations under a streamlined approach. The GAC welcomes the publication of the Initial Report of the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Phase 2A Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) and acknowledges the efforts of the participants, leadership, and policy team staff in developing these recommendations under a streamlined approach. The GAC acknowledges the importance of the issues considered in the Expedited Policy Development Process. The GAC anticipates that the Board's consideration of 26 January 2020.</td>
<td>On 26 January 2020, the Board acknowledged the ICANN66 Virtual Policy Forum GAC Communique on 26 June 2021 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/minutes-december-2021-board-actions.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/minutes-december-2021-board-actions.pdf</a>), and the Board-GAC Interactions Group (BGIG) met on 5 October 2021 to discuss the ICANN71 Virtual Policy Forum Communique and its Issues of Importance.</td>
<td>10/5/21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-004787</td>
<td>ICANN66 Virtual Policy Forum GAC Communique</td>
<td>11/6/19</td>
<td>ICANN66 Virtual Policy Forum GAC Communique</td>
<td>On 26 January 2020, the Board acknowledged the ICANN66 Virtual Policy Forum GAC Communique on 26 June 2021 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/minutes-december-2021-board-actions.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/minutes-december-2021-board-actions.pdf</a>), and the Board-GAC Interactions Group (BGIG) met on 5 October 2021 to discuss the ICANN71 Virtual Policy Forum Communique and its Issues of Importance.</td>
<td>On 26 January 2020, the Board acknowledged the ICANN66 Virtual Policy Forum GAC Communique on 26 June 2021 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/minutes-december-2021-board-actions.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/minutes-december-2021-board-actions.pdf</a>), and the Board-GAC Interactions Group (BGIG) met on 5 October 2021 to discuss the ICANN71 Virtual Policy Forum Communique and its Issues of Importance.</td>
<td>10/5/21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- The Board acknowledged the ICANN66 Virtual Policy Forum GAC Communique on 26 June 2021 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/minutes-december-2021-board-actions.pdf), and the Board-GAC Interactions Group (BGIG) met on 5 October 2021 to discuss the ICANN71 Virtual Policy Forum Communique and its Issues of Importance.
- The Board acknowledged the ICANN66 Virtual Policy Forum GAC Communique on 26 June 2021 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/minutes-december-2021-board-actions.pdf), and the Board-GAC Interactions Group (BGIG) met on 5 October 2021 to discuss the ICANN71 Virtual Policy Forum Communique and its Issues of Importance.

**Date Issued:**
- 1/26/20
- 10/5/21
- 1/26/20
- 10/5/21
- 1/26/20
- 10/5/21
- 1/26/20
- 10/5/21
- 1/26/20
- 10/5/21
- 1/26/20
- 10/5/21
- 1/26/20
- 10/5/21

**Board Resolution Link:**

**Board Requested Link:**
On 30 January 2019 the Board considered the Montevideo Communiqué and adopted the 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 2018, and the public comments summary and analysis report has now been published. https://www.icann.org/public-comments/red-cross-names-implementation-plan-2019-12-update. The Board understands that ICANN’s (lg) anticipates publishing the Policy prior to ICANN67, with an effective date to be no later than 1 August 2020. Regarding the topic of protection for certain surnames of the two international organisations within the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, the Board noted that at the December 2018 meeting it resolved the question of second level protection for ISO-acronyms in a holistic fashion, as so to allow for a comprehensive policy solution. In this regard, the Board is reviewing four approved recommendations, including the recommendation to 3) ‘publish ICANN’s Consolidated policy on the protection of International Red Cross and Red Crescent Names’ and instructing ICANN staff to execute the process to be effective to those of the (lg) Board’s Guidance on Protections in which ICANN and the GAC have been encouraged to participate and be established. Regarding the ICANN guidance on protections at the first level for certain Red Cross and Red Crescent names and identifiers, the Board notes that any changes to the scope of protections that were provided under the 2012 new gTLD Program would need to be submitted to the Board for consideration.” This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 26 January 2020.

On 26 January 2020 the Board acknowledged the Barcelona Communiqué of the ICANN63 Barcelona Forum. “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 2018, and the public comments summary and analysis report has now been published. https://www.icann.org/public-comments/red-cross-names-implementation-plan-2019-12-update. The Board understands that ICANN’s (lg) anticipates publishing the Policy prior to ICANN67, with an effective date to be no later than 1 August 2020. Regarding the topic of protection for certain surnames of the two international organisations within the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, the Board noted that at the December 2018 meeting it resolved the question of second level protection for ISO-acronyms in a holistic fashion, as so to allow for a comprehensive policy solution. In this regard, the Board is reviewing four approved recommendations, including the recommendation to 3) ‘publish ICANN’s Consolidated policy on the protection of International Red Cross and Red Crescent Names’ and instructing ICANN staff to execute the process to be effective to those of the (lg) Board’s Guidance on Protections in which ICANN and the GAC have been encouraged to participate and be established. Regarding the ICANN guidance on protections at the first level for certain Red Cross and Red Crescent names and identifiers, the Board notes that any changes to the scope of protections that were provided under the 2012 new gTLD Program would need to be submitted to the Board for consideration.” This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 26 January 2020.

On 26 January 2020 the Board acknowledged the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué. As noted in the Kobe Communiqué “The Board had previously indicated its wish to resolve the question of second level protection for ISO-acronyms in a holistic fashion, as so to allow for a comprehensive policy solution. In this regard, the Board is reviewing four approved recommendations, including the recommendation to 3) ‘publish ICANN’s Consolidated policy on the protection of International Red Cross and Red Crescent Names’ and instructing ICANN staff to execute the process to be effective to those of the (lg) Board’s Guidance on Protections in which ICANN and the GAC have been encouraged to participate and be established. Regarding the ICANN guidance on protections at the first level for certain Red Cross and Red Crescent names and identifiers, the Board notes that any changes to the scope of protections that were provided under the 2012 new gTLD Program would need to be submitted to the Board for consideration.” This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 15 May 2019.

On 26 January 2020 the Board acknowledged the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué. “The Board had previously indicated its wish to resolve the question of second level protection for ISO-acronyms in a holistic fashion, as so to allow for a comprehensive policy solution. In this regard, the Board is reviewing four approved recommendations, including the recommendation to 3) ‘publish ICANN’s Consolidated policy on the protection of International Red Cross and Red Crescent Names’ and instructing ICANN staff to execute the process to be effective to those of the (lg) Board’s Guidance on Protections in which ICANN and the GAC have been encouraged to participate and be established. Regarding the ICANN guidance on protections at the first level for certain Red Cross and Red Crescent names and identifiers, the Board notes that any changes to the scope of protections that were provided under the 2012 new gTLD Program would need to be submitted to the Board for consideration.” This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 15 May 2019.
The ICANN Board considers the adoption of the Framework of Interpretation for ccTLDs and the Framework of Interpretation for ccTLD Delegations and Redelegations on 25 June 2016.

The Board considers the Framework of Interpretation for ccTLD Delegations and Redelegations on 25 June 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 the current round of the New gTLD Program. The Board notes that it does not consider this item as complete as of the Board's consideration of 13 December 2016.

The Board considers this advice and the general topic of the Adoption of the Framework of Interpretation for ccTLDs and the Framework of Interpretation for ccTLD Delegations and Redelegations on 25 June 2016.

The Board considers this advice and the general topic of the Framework of Interpretation for ccTLDs and the Framework of Interpretation for ccTLD Delegations and Redelegations on 25 June 2016.

The Board considers this advice and the general topic of the Adoption of the Framework of Interpretation for ccTLDs and the Framework of Interpretation for ccTLD Delegations and Redelegations on 25 June 2016.

The Board considers the Framework of Interpretation for ccTLD Delegations and Redelegations on 25 June 2016.

The Board considers this advice and the general topic of the Framework of Interpretation for ccTLD Delegations and Redelegations on 25 June 2016.

The Board considers the adoption of the Framework of Interpretation for ccTLDs and the Framework of Interpretation for ccTLD Delegations and Redelegations on 25 June 2016.

The Board considers this advice and the general topic of the Adoption of the Framework of Interpretation for ccTLDs and the Framework of Interpretation for ccTLD Delegations and Redelegations on 25 June 2016.

The Board considers the adoption of the Framework of Interpretation for ccTLDs and the Framework of Interpretation for ccTLD Delegations and Redelegations on 25 June 2016.

The Board considers this advice and the general topic of the Adoption of the Framework of Interpretation for ccTLDs and the Framework of Interpretation for ccTLD Delegations and Redelegations on 25 June 2016.

The Board considers this advice and the general topic of the Framework of Interpretation for ccTLD Delegations and Redelegations on 25 June 2016.

The Board considers this advice and the general topic of the Framework of Interpretation for ccTLD Delegations and Redelegations on 25 June 2016.

The Board considers this advice and the general topic of the Adoption of the Framework of Interpretation for ccTLDs and the Framework of Interpretation for ccTLD Delegations and Redelegations on 25 June 2016.

The Board considers the Framework of Interpretation for ccTLD Delegations and Redelegations on 25 June 2016.

The Board considers this advice and the general topic of the Framework of Interpretation for ccTLD Delegations and Redelegations on 25 June 2016.

The Board considers this advice and the general topic of the Adoption of the Framework of Interpretation for ccTLDs and the Framework of Interpretation for ccTLD Delegations and Redelegations on 25 June 2016.

The Board considers the adoption of the Framework of Interpretation for ccTLDs and the Framework of Interpretation for ccTLD Delegations and Redelegations on 25 June 2016.

The Board considers the adoption of the Framework of Interpretation for ccTLDs and the Framework of Interpretation for ccTLD Delegations and Redelegations on 25 June 2016.

The Board considers the adoption of the Framework of Interpretation for ccTLDs and the Framework of Interpretation for ccTLD Delegations and Redelegations on 25 June 2016.

The Board considers the adoption of the Framework of Interpretation for ccTLDs and the Framework of Interpretation for ccTLD Delegations and Redelegations on 25 June 2016.

The Board considers the adoption of the Framework of Interpretation for ccTLDs and the Framework of Interpretation for ccTLD Delegations and Redelegations on 25 June 2016.

The Board considers the adoption of the Framework of Interpretation for ccTLDs and the Framework of Interpretation for ccTLD Delegations and Redelegations on 25 June 2016.
On 4 June 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard: The NGPC accepts this advice while noting that the Board is not in a position to manage the community timeline. The Board will seek clarification of the GAC’s advice with the community as appropriate. The Board is consulting with the GNSO regarding the work plan and timeline for the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process (PSDP). The Board agrees that the advice of the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP must be completed prior to advancing a new application process for new gTLDs. If the NGPC recommends to the Board to accept the GAC’s advice, the GAC should also provide recommendations that should be considered by the GNSO regarding the work plan and timeline for the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process (PSDP). On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communiqué and provided this response in its scorecard: The Board accepts this advice while noting that the Board is not in a position to manage the community timeline. The Board will seek clarification of the GAC’s advice with the community as appropriate. The Board is consulting with the GNSO regarding the work plan and timeline for the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process (PSDP). The Board agrees that the advice of the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP must be completed prior to advancing a new application process for new gTLDs. If the NGPC recommends to the Board to accept the GAC’s advice, the GAC should also provide recommendations that should be considered by the GNSO regarding the work plan and timeline for the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process (PSDP). This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 13 December 2016.

On 28 October 2016 the ICANN Board Chair wrote to the GAC Chair to inform the GAC of the Board’s delay in providing a formal response to the Helsinki Communiqué due to the considerable effort required to complete the IANA transition. On 13 December 2016 the Board considered the Helsinki Communique and provided this response in its scorecard: The Board accepts the advice, noting that the Board is not in a position to manage the content and chronicle of the ongoing community review. The Board recognizes that the GAC Review Team is working on the work and understands that the Review Team is looking at the issue raised in the GAC’s advice, and such recommendations from the Review Team could be incorporated into the policy development work on subsequent rounds of the New gTLD Program. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 12 December 2016.

On 13 December 2016 the Board considered the Helsinki Communique and provided this response in its scorecard: The Board accepts the advice, noting that the Board is not in a position to manage the content and chronicle of the ongoing community review. The Board recognizes that the GAC Review Team is working on the work and understands that the Review Team is looking at the issue raised in the GAC’s advice, and such recommendations from the Review Team could be incorporated into the policy development work on subsequent rounds of the New gTLD Program. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 12 December 2016.

On 3 September 2016 the ICANN Board Chair wrote to the GAC Chair to inform the GAC of the Board’s delay in providing a formal response to the Helsinki Communiqué due to the considerable effort required to complete the IANA transition. On 13 December 2016 the Board considered the Helsinki Communique and provided this response in its scorecard: The Board accepts the advice, noting that the Board is not in a position to manage the content and chronicle of the ongoing community review. The Board recognizes that the GAC Review Team is working on the work and understands that the Review Team is looking at the issue raised in the GAC’s advice, and such recommendations from the Review Team could be incorporated into the policy development work on subsequent rounds of the New gTLD Program. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 12 December 2016.

On 28 October 2016 the ICANN Board Chair wrote to the GAC Chair to inform the GAC of the Board’s delay in providing a formal response to the Helsinki Communiqué due to the considerable effort required to complete the IANA transition. On 13 December 2016 the Board considered the Helsinki Communique and provided this response in its scorecard: The Board accepts the advice, noting that the Board is not in a position to manage the content and chronicle of the ongoing community review. The Board recognizes that the GAC Review Team is working on the work and understands that the Review Team is looking at the issue raised in the GAC’s advice, and such recommendations from the Review Team could be incorporated into the policy development work on subsequent rounds of the New gTLD Program. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 12 December 2016.

On 28 October 2016 the ICANN Board Chair wrote to the GAC Chair to inform the GAC of the Board’s delay in providing a formal response to the Helsinki Communiqué due to the considerable effort required to complete the IANA transition. On 13 December 2016 the Board considered the Helsinki Communique and provided this response in its scorecard: The Board accepts the advice, noting that the Board is not in a position to manage the content and chronicle of the ongoing community review. The Board recognizes that the GAC Review Team is working on the work and understands that the Review Team is looking at the issue raised in the GAC’s advice, and such recommendations from the Review Team could be incorporated into the policy development work on subsequent rounds of the New gTLD Program. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 12 December 2016.

On 28 October 2016 the ICANN Board Chair wrote to the GAC Chair to inform the GAC of the Board’s delay in providing a formal response to the Helsinki Communiqué due to the considerable effort required to complete the IANA transition. On 13 December 2016 the Board considered the Helsinki Communique and provided this response in its scorecard: The Board accepts the advice, noting that the Board is not in a position to manage the content and chronicle of the ongoing community review. The Board recognizes that the GAC Review Team is working on the work and understands that the Review Team is looking at the issue raised in the GAC’s advice, and such recommendations from the Review Team could be incorporated into the policy development work on subsequent rounds of the New gTLD Program. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 12 December 2016.
No Item: 1.1.1.1.1

1. The GAC has reached consensus on the GAC Objection Advice according to Module 3.1 of the Applicant Guidebook on the following applications: The application for "qingdao" (application number 1-1121-22691). On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard: The NGPC has sent a letter to the applicant, which is available here: https://www.icann.org/system/files/communique-07-2013-en.pdf. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 25 January 2014.

2. The GAC has reached consensus on the GAC Objection Advice according to Module 3.1 of the Applicant Guidebook on the following applications: The application for .yun (application number 1-1121-82863). On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard: The NGPC has sent a letter to the applicant, which is available here: https://www.icann.org/system/files/communique-07-2013-en.pdf. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 1 February 2014.
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ICANN63 Barcelona Communique

On 27 January 2019 the Board considered this advice and stated in its scorecard: The Board acknowledges and appreciates this follow-up item.

As per the Board’s 16 May 2018 resolution and scorecard, ICANN org’s Government Stakeholder and IG Engagement teams “continue to facilitate regular engagement with governments around the world. Working with the ICANN63 work plan, ICANN continues to organize increasingly capacity building workshops for ICANN members on a regional basis with the regional GSE teams and also in association with ICANN meetings. As part of their engagement activities, ICANN and GSE teams members also continue to raise awareness about the changes to the WHOIS system related to compliance with the GDPR, and opportunities for inputs from governments.” Some recent examples of the facilitation of discussions conducted by ICANN63 were meetings held with the European Data Protection Board (EDPB), the Belgian Data Protection Authority (DPA), conducted ongoing engagement with other European DAs, as well as engagement with the Council of Europe (CoE), the European Parliament, and the Council of the European Union. As this engagement work has been integrated the ongoing activities conducted by the Government Stakeholder and IG Engagement teams, this item is considered complete and will be moved to Phase 5.
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### 3.c.I.1-2

The GAC advises the ICANN Board that in its view, it must:

1. **Understand the legal frameworks relevant to WHOIS/RDS data access for legitimate purposes.**

2. **Identify persons or entities responsible for legitimate purposes.**

3. **Ensure the lawful availability of WHOIS/RDS data across the gTLD ecosystem.**

4. **Engage in due diligence for online abuse.**

5. **Engage in due diligence for online fraud.**

6. **Engage in due diligence for online misappropriation of intellectual property.**

### 3.a.I.1-4

The GAC advises the ICANN Board that in its view, it must:

1. **Engage in due diligence for online abuse.**

2. **Engage in due diligence for online fraud.**

3. **Engage in due diligence for online misappropriation of intellectual property.**

### GDPR/WH

- **GDPR issues**
- **WHOIS/RDS data**

### Assessments

- **GDPR**
- **WHOIS/RDS data access**
- **Legitimate purposes**

### Legal Analysis

- **GDPR-related discussions**
- **WHOIS/RDS data access**
- **ICANN's contribution to ICANN's**

### Public Interests

- **Fraud**
- **Compliance**
- **Security**
- **Stability**

### Board Consideration

- **4 February 2018**
- **Abu Dhabi Communique**
- **GAC's contribution**

### Scorecard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request Number</th>
<th>Action Request: Action (Public)</th>
<th>Item/Phase</th>
<th>Issue Update (Public)</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/24/22</td>
<td>Global Public Interest Framework</td>
<td>Issue of Importance</td>
<td>The GAC recognises the importance of incorporating Global Public Interest (GPI) considerations into policy development and decision-making at ICANN. The GPI is of particular importance to the GAC, which serves to consider and provide advice on public policy matters within ICANN's remit. The GAC finds that the development of a tool that would enable the community to make a decision and submit a SIP to the GAC in the future is not feasible or practical. The GAC recommends that ICANN consider developing the tool as part of its future work on GPI. The GAC stands ready to provide further information and support to the Board on this topic.</td>
<td>9/10/13</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/resources/resolutions/new-gtld-2013-09-10-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/resources/resolutions/new-gtld-2013-09-10-en.pdf</a></td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/resources/resolutions/new-gtld-2013-09-10-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/resources/resolutions/new-gtld-2013-09-10-en.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/10/13</td>
<td>Global Public Interest Framework</td>
<td>Item of Importance</td>
<td>The GAC welcomes the recommendation to develop a new tool, referred to as the Global Public Interest Framework (GPI Framework), which will enable the community to make a decision and submit a SIP to the GAC in the future. The GAC acknowledges that the tool is not feasible or practical. The GAC recommends that ICANN consider developing the tool as part of its future work on GPI. The GAC stands ready to provide further information and support to the Board on this topic.</td>
<td>9/10/13</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/resources/resolutions/new-gtld-2013-09-10-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/resources/resolutions/new-gtld-2013-09-10-en.pdf</a></td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/resources/resolutions/new-gtld-2013-09-10-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/resources/resolutions/new-gtld-2013-09-10-en.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/30/13</td>
<td>Virtual Community Forum Communiqué</td>
<td>Item of Importance</td>
<td>The GAC welcomes the recommendation to develop a new tool, referred to as the Global Public Interest Framework (GPI Framework), which will enable the community to make a decision and submit a SIP to the GAC in the future. The GAC acknowledges that the tool is not feasible or practical. The GAC recommends that ICANN consider developing the tool as part of its future work on GPI. The GAC stands ready to provide further information and support to the Board on this topic.</td>
<td>9/10/13</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/resources/resolutions/new-gtld-2013-09-10-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/resources/resolutions/new-gtld-2013-09-10-en.pdf</a></td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/resources/resolutions/new-gtld-2013-09-10-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/resources/resolutions/new-gtld-2013-09-10-en.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/14/22</td>
<td>Global Public Interest Framework</td>
<td>Item of Importance</td>
<td>The GAC welcomes the recommendation to develop a new tool, referred to as the Global Public Interest Framework (GPI Framework), which will enable the community to make a decision and submit a SIP to the GAC in the future. The GAC acknowledges that the tool is not feasible or practical. The GAC recommends that ICANN consider developing the tool as part of its future work on GPI. The GAC stands ready to provide further information and support to the Board on this topic.</td>
<td>9/10/13</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/resources/resolutions/new-gtld-2013-09-10-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/resources/resolutions/new-gtld-2013-09-10-en.pdf</a></td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/resources/resolutions/new-gtld-2013-09-10-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/resources/resolutions/new-gtld-2013-09-10-en.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
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### Notes
- The GAC and ICANN recognize that the NGPC clarified its acceptance or rejection of safeguard advice. It was agreed to develop a straightforward conversation on all elements of safeguard advice since the ICANN51 Buenos Aires Communique in order to clarify what elements of safeguard advice have been implemented. What remains is work in progress, and what has not been accepted for implementation. In any instances of complete or partial rejection of the advice, the GAC urges the ICANN to clarify the milestones intended to address safeguard advice and to consider a mutually acceptable solution as requested by ICANN54 Dublin.

- On 3 February 2016 the Board considered the Dublin Communique and provided this response in its consideration: The Board accepts this advice and notes the ongoing work by the NGPC in the further development of procedures and policies in the light of the Dublin meeting. The GAC has requested the NGPC to work inter-sessionally to assess the application of human rights and fundamental freedoms and other (legal) conduct that have occurred in the rollout of the new gTLD program.

- The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary.

- On 9 May 2014, ICANN notified the GAC Chair that it was in agreement with the Board Chair's letter of 5 June 2014. The Board provided this response in its scorecard: On 9 May 2014, ICANN notified the GAC Chair that it was in agreement with the Board Chair's letter of 5 June 2014. The Board accepted this advice and notes the ongoing work by the NGPC in the drafting of final framework to help guide Registry Operators as they implement the requirement in the new gTLD Registry Agreement to "systematically conduct a medico-legal analysis to assess whether domains in the TLD are being used to perpetrate security threats, such as phishing, tricking, blackmail, and hacking. Registry Operators will maintain statistical reports on the number of security threats identified and the actions taken as a result of the periodic security checks. Registry Operators will maintain these reports for four years from the time of the application unless a shorter period is required by law or approved by ICANN, and will provide them to ICANN upon request." To this end, a Framework Drafting Team was formed in July 2015. It is composed of 8 representatives from the GAC PSWG (8) and Registrars (2). The GAC informed the ICANN Board Chair that it has been considering the governance of domain names and the ongoing issues related to the New gTLD Program. The GAC has requested the ICANN Board Chair to provide the ICANN Board Chair with a scorecard of the Board's consideration of 3 February 2016.

- On 6 June 2016, the Board provided a scorecard of the Board's consideration of 3 February 2016.

- The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary. This item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN51 in Buenos Aires on 3 February 2016.
2.a.I. 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 implementation plan prior to closing the item.

2.a.II. 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 implementation plan prior to closing the item.
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https://www.icann.org/en/contact/board-material/resolutions-2021-05-12-en#2.d
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Report.

account the GAC's comments on the Initial Rights Protection Mechanisms to take into
Pursue implementation of (i) a permanent mechanism and maintenance of temporary

As noted in the scorecard accompanying the Board's 13 September 2021 resolution on
the GAC's ICANN71 Communique, the Board “emphasizes that the final scope of total 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 gTLDs is in place. The EPDP team then that the Board mentioned in the scorecard completed its work in April 2022 and forwarded its recommendations, all of which attained Full Consensus, 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 in June 2022 and forwarded its Recommendations Report to the ICANN Board in July 2022, 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 Certain Rights Mechanisms.

As noted in the scorecard accompanying the Board’s 12 September 2021 resolution on the GAC’s ICANN71 Communique, the Board “emphasizes that the final scope of total 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 gTLDs is in place. The EPDP team then that the Board mentioned in the scorecard completed its work in April 2022 and forwarded its recommendations, all of which attained Full Consensus, 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 Certain Rights Mechanisms.

As noted in the scorecard accompanying the Board’s 13 September 2021 resolution on the GAC’s ICANN71 Communique, the Board “emphasizes that the final scope of total 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 gTLDs is in place. The EPDP team then that the Board mentioned in the scorecard completed its work in April 2022 and forwarded its recommendations, all of which attained Full Consensus, 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 Certain Rights Mechanisms.

As noted in the scorecard accompanying the Board’s 12 September 2021 resolution on the GAC’s ICANN71 Communique, the Board “emphasizes that the final scope of total 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 gTLDs is in place. The EPDP team then that the Board mentioned in the scorecard completed its work in April 2022 and forwarded its recommendations, all of which attained Full Consensus, 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 Certain Rights Mechanisms.

As noted in the scorecard accompanying the Board’s 12 September 2021 resolution on the GAC’s ICANN71 Communique, the Board “emphasizes that the final scope of total 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 provisions will remain in place until the post-registration notification system for gTLDs is in place. The EPDP team then that the Board mentioned in the scorecard completed its work in April 2022 and forwarded its recommendations, all of which attained Full Consensus, 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 Certain Rights Mechanisms.
The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary.

The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary.
On 9 June 2014, the NGAC considered this advice and issued the response in its scorecard. The NGAC accepts the ICANN advice. The proposed final version of the Registry Agreement poses for public comment on 20 April 2015 includes protections for an indefinite duration for ICANN names. Specification 5 of this version of the Registry Agreement includes a list of names (provided by the ICANN and ICANN) that shall be maintained in the Registry Agreement to maintain these protections "until such time as a policy is adopted that may require further action" (2014-04-14-02). The resolution reiterated the NGAC's support of an expedited RSP until such time as the NGAC approved recommendations in the RSP and the Board. The NGAC's resolutions protecting ICANN names will remain in place. Should the ICANN submit any recommendations as to this topic, the NGAC will consider the ICANN prior to taking any action. In the event that this item is considered complete as of the NGAC's consideration of 9 June 2014.

On 9 June 2014, the NGAC accepted the Board's advice and issued the response in its scorecard. The NGAC accepts the ICANN advice. As of the Board Chair's letter of 5 June 2014, the Board provided the GAC Chair with a scorecard of the Board's recommendations on this topic, the NGAC accepted the ICANN advice.

On 4 June 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard. The NGPC accepts the ICANN advice. The draft agreement, posted for public comment on 29 April 2013 includes protections for an indefinite duration for IOC/RCRC names. Specification 5 of this version of the Registry Agreement includes a list of names (provided by the ICANN and ICANN) that shall be maintained in the Registry Agreement to maintain these protections "until such time as a policy is adopted that may require further action" (2014-04-14-02). The resolution reiterated the NGAC's support of an expedited RSP until such time as the NGAC approved recommendations in the RSP and the Board. The resolution reiterated the NGAC's resolutions protecting ICANN names will remain in place. Should the ICANN submit any recommendations as to this topic, the NGAC will consider the ICANN prior to taking any action. In the event that this item is considered complete as of the NGAC's consideration of 4 June 2013.

On 4 June 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard. The NGPC accepts the ICANN advice. The draft agreement, posted for public comment on 29 April 2013 includes protections for an indefinite duration for IOC/RCRC names. Specification 5 of this version of the Registry Agreement includes a list of names (provided by the ICANN and ICANN) that shall be maintained in the Registry Agreement to maintain these protections "until such time as a policy is adopted that may require further action" (2014-04-14-02). The resolution reiterated the NGAC's support of an expedited RSP until such time as the NGAC approved recommendations in the RSP and the Board. The resolution reiterated the NGAC's resolutions protecting ICANN names will remain in place. Should the ICANN submit any recommendations as to this topic, the NGAC will consider the ICANN prior to taking any action. In the event that this item is considered complete as of the NGAC's consideration of 4 June 2013.

The Board discussed the ICANN10 Communique, including the issues of importance, in the 11 March 2021 Board GAC Interactions Group (BGIG) meeting.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request Number</th>
<th>Action Requested</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Issue Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
<th>Date Scored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-004533</td>
<td>ICANN Virtual Community Forum Communique</td>
<td>Issue of Importance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ICANN org received the ICANN Virtual Community Forum Communique on 16 March 2020. The ICANN67 GAC Communique did not contain Consensus GAC Advice. The Board-GAC Interaction Group (BGIG) met with GAC Leadership on 8 June 2020 to discuss the &quot;Issues of Importance&quot; noted in the ICANN67 GAC Communique, which included topics such as the transaction and consideration of Human Rights Impact Assessment (HRIA) tools, and subsequent rounds of new gTLDs. The Board also provided the Board of Directors. The Board of Directors welcomed the reassurance you gave in the spirit of the .org registry. Finally, the GAC welcomed the reassurance you gave in the spirit of the .org registry, and expressed their interest in either volunteering or to contribute to specific GAC implementation efforts that impact GAC operations. GAC Members discussed issues related to the implementation of WS2 recommendations that are of interest to, or that improve the global public interest, and agreed that these issues might be assessed, prioritized, and implemented in an effective manner, and noted needs to continue work on the WS2 topics which cause concern among some GAC Members. The GAC highly appreciates the ICANN Board of Directors' letter to the Chair of the ICANN Board: The GAC highly appreciates the ICANN Board of Directors' letter to the Chair of the ICANN Board (<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>
<td>6/9/20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-004535</td>
<td>ICANN Virtual Policy Forum Communique</td>
<td>Issue of Importance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ICANN org received 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 Interaction Group (BGIG) met on 30 September 2020 to discuss the ICANN68 Virtual Policy Forum Communique.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Board acknowledged the KAMM6 virtual Policy Forum Communique on 3 July 2020 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/kamm6-pf-communique-20200703.pdf), and the Board-GAC Interactions Group (BGIG) met on 30 September 2020 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-ismail-20200930.pdf). The ICANN67 GAC Communique did not contain Consensus GAC Advice. The Board-GAC Interactions Group met with GAC leadership on 8 June 2020 to discuss the “Issues of Importance” noted in the KAMM6 virtual 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.

The Board acknowledged the KAMM6 virtual Policy Forum Communique on 3 July 2020 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/kamm6-pf-communique-20200703.pdf), and the Board-GAC Interactions Group (BGIG) met on 30 September 2020 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-ismail-20200930.pdf). The Board-GAC Interactions Group met with GAC leadership on 8 June 2020 to discuss the “Issues of Importance” noted in the KAMM6 virtual 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.

The Board acknowledged the KAMM6 virtual Policy Forum Communique on 3 July 2020 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/kamm6-pf-communique-20200703.pdf), and the Board-GAC Interactions Group (BGIG) met on 30 September 2020 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-ismail-20200930.pdf). The Board-GAC Interactions Group met with GAC leadership on 8 June 2020 to discuss the “Issues of Importance” noted in the KAMM6 virtual 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.

The Board acknowledged the KAMM6 virtual Policy Forum Communique on 3 July 2020 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/kamm6-pf-communique-20200703.pdf), and the Board-GAC Interactions Group (BGIG) met on 30 September 2020 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-ismail-20200930.pdf). The Board-GAC Interactions Group met with GAC leadership on 8 June 2020 to discuss the “Issues of Importance” noted in the KAMM6 virtual 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.
<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>Description</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Status Update (Public)</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
<th>Date Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-004534</td>
<td>ICANN68 Virtual Policy Forum Communique</td>
<td>6/27/20</td>
<td>Issue of Importance: IGO Protections</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>The GAC received an update that the GNSO Council had adopted a revised charter concerning a focused working group to produce policy recommendations which address concerns raised over IGO access to a curative dispute resolution mechanism and is in the process of selecting a Chair prior to moving ahead with such policy effort.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Board acknowledged the ICANN68 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 ICANN68 Virtual Policy Forum Communique.</td>
<td>11/3/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-004501</td>
<td>ICANN67 Virtual Community Forum Communique</td>
<td>3/16/20</td>
<td>Issue of Importance: Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The GAC prioritized Subsequent Procedures for 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 Substantive Processes PDP Working Group (Sub-Pro-RPS WG), and by actively participating in each Sub-Pro-RPS WG meeting. The GAC wishes to warmly thank the Sub-Pro-RPS WG Co-Chairs for their participation and engagement in GAC sessions on this topic. GAC Leadership is engaged in the preparation of an intersessional update in order to prepare discussions on key topics of high interest to the GAC.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The ICANN org received the ICANN67 Virtual Community Forum Communique on 16 March 2020. The ICANN67 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 topics such as: Acquisition of PIR (.org), Domain Name Registration Directory Service and Data Protection, and Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs.</td>
<td>6/8/20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-004531</td>
<td>ICANN68 Virtual Policy Forum Communique</td>
<td>6/27/20</td>
<td>Issue of Importance: Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The GAC prioritized consideration of policy issues related to Subsequent 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 Substantive Processes PDP Working Group (Sub-Pro-RPS WG) meetings. The GAC wishes to thank the Sub-Pro-RPS WG Co-Chairs for their participation in GAC sessions on this topic, and recognizes the importance and diligent work of the Sub-Pro-RPS WG to deliver the final report. The GAC considered an update from the Sub-Pro-RPS WG Co-Chair on work conducted since ICANN67, in particular consideration of the revised and updated Scorecard, and the completion of individual GAC Members’ work and the sub-Pro-RPS 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 40-day public comment proceeding for a topic of high priority to the GAC and the ICANN Community. The Sub-Pro-RPS WG Co-Chairs noted such concerns.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The Board acknowledged the ICANN68 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 ICANN68 Virtual Policy Forum Communique.</td>
<td>11/3/20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and provided a resolution adopting the "ICANN Board-NGPC Proposal for Implementation of GAC Safeguards Applicable to All New gTLDs" dated 19 June 2013. The Board discussed the ICANN69 Communique, including the Issues of Importance, at the 11 March 2021 Board-GAC Interactions Group (BGIG) meeting.

On 25 June 2013 the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of Safeguards applicable to all New gTLDs and passed a resolution adopting the "NGPC Proposal for Implementation of GAC Safeguards Applicable to All New gTLDs" dated 19 June 2013. The NGPC requests that the GAC consider this advice item as follows: Registry Operators shall provide to ICANN and publish on its website its accurate contact details, as well as a primary contact for handling complaints, including violations of the above activity specified in the GAC advice. Because the Registry Operator does not have a direct contractual relationship with the Registered Name Holder, the language proposed in the PIC Specification would require the Registry Operator to include a provision in its Registry-Registrar Agreement, which in turn requires Registrars to include a provision in their Registration Agreements prohibiting Registered Name Holders from engaging in activity contrary to applicable law, and providing (consistent with applicable law and any related governmental and quasi-governmental agencies of illegal conduct in connection with the use of the TLD). ICANN operates the WHOIS Data Problem Reports System (http://www.icann.org/en/resources/compliance/complaints/whois/inaccuracy-form.htm), which is a mechanism for making complaints that WHOIS information is inaccurate. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's response of 18 June 2013.

On 19 June 2013 the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of Safeguards applicable to all New gTLDs and passed a resolution adopting the "ICANN Board-NGPC Proposal for Implementation of GAC Safeguards Applicable to All New gTLDs" dated 19 June 2013. The NGPC requests that the GAC consider this advice item as follows: Registry Operators will remove and lock links to URL(s) as set forth in this advice and include prohibitions against the distribution of malware, operation of botnets, phishing, spam, trademark or copyright infringement, fraudulent or deceptive practices, counterfeiting or otherwise engaging in activity contrary to applicable law, and providing (consistent with applicable law and any related governmental and quasi-governmental agencies of illegal conduct in connection with the use of the TLD). Paragraph 2 of the PIC Specification attached as Annex II includes language to implement the GAC advice. Because the Registry Operator does not have a direct contractual relationship with the Registered Name Holder, the language proposed in the proposed New gTLD Registry Agreement (as a mandatory Public Notice) (http://www.icann.org/en/resources/compliance/complaints/whois/inaccuracy-form.htm) obligating Registry Operators to include a provision in their Registry-Registrar Agreements that requires Registrars to include in their Registration Agreements a provision prohibiting Registered Name Holders from distributing malware, operation of botnets, phishing, spam, trademark or copyright infringement, fraudulent or deceptive practices, counterfeiting or otherwise engaging in activity contrary to applicable law, and providing (consistent with applicable law and any related governmental and quasi-governmental agencies of illegal conduct in connection with the use of the TLD). Paragraph 2 of the PIC Specification attached as Annex II includes language to implement the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's response of 18 June 2013.

On 3 February 2017 the Board adopted the recommendation to implement the new gTLDs, following the publication of the Subsequent Round for New gTLDs PDP WG Draft Final Report. The Board expressed its appreciation to the Subsequent Round for New gTLDs PDP WG (SubPro PDP WG) for its hard work and efforts. The Board discussed the ICANN57 Hyderabad Communique, including the Issues of Importance, at the 11 March 2021 Board-GAC Interactions Group (BGIG) meeting.

On 25 June 2013 the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of Safeguards applicable to all New gTLDs and passed a resolution adopting the "ICANN Board-NGPC Proposal for Implementation of GAC Safeguards Applicable to All New gTLDs" dated 19 June 2013. The NGPC requests that the GAC consider this advice item as follows: Registry Operators will remove and lock links to URL(s) as set forth in this advice and include prohibitions against the distribution of malware, operation of botnets, phishing, spam, trademark or copyright infringement, fraudulent or deceptive practices, counterfeiting or otherwise engaging in activity contrary to applicable law, and providing (consistent with applicable law and any related governmental and quasi-governmental agencies of illegal conduct in connection with the use of the TLD). Paragraph 2 of the PIC Specification attached as Annex II includes language to implement the GAC advice. Because the Registry Operator does not have a direct contractual relationship with the Registered Name Holder, the language proposed in the proposed New gTLD Registry Agreement (as a mandatory Public Notice) (http://www.icann.org/en/resources/compliance/complaints/whois/inaccuracy-form.htm) obligating Registry Operators to include a provision in their Registry-Registrar Agreements that requires Registrars to include in their Registration Agreements a provision prohibiting Registered Name Holders from distributing malware, operation of botnets, phishing, spam, trademark or copyright infringement, fraudulent or deceptive practices, counterfeiting or otherwise engaging in activity contrary to applicable law, and providing (consistent with applicable law and any related governmental and quasi-governmental agencies of illegal conduct in connection with the use of the TLD). Paragraph 2 of the PIC Specification attached as Annex II includes language to implement the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's response of 18 June 2013.

On 19 June 2013 the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of Safeguards applicable to all New gTLDs and passed a resolution adopting the "ICANN Board-NGPC Proposal for Implementation of GAC Safeguards Applicable to All New gTLDs" dated 19 June 2013. The NGPC requests that the GAC consider this advice item as follows: Registry Operators will remove and lock links to URL(s) as set forth in this advice and include prohibitions against the distribution of malware, operation of botnets, phishing, spam, trademark or copyright infringement, fraudulent or deceptive practices, counterfeiting or otherwise engaging in activity contrary to applicable law, and providing (consistent with applicable law and any related governmental and quasi-governmental agencies of illegal conduct in connection with the use of the TLD). Paragraph 2 of the PIC Specification attached as Annex II includes language to implement the GAC advice. Because the Registry Operator does not have a direct contractual relationship with the Registered Name Holder, the language proposed in the proposed New gTLD Registry Agreement (as a mandatory Public Notice) (http://www.icann.org/en/resources/compliance/complaints/whois/inaccuracy-form.htm) obligating Registry Operators to include a provision in their Registry-Registrar Agreements that requires Registrars to include in their Registration Agreements a provision prohibiting Registered Name Holders from distributing malware, operation of botnets, phishing, spam, trademark or copyright infringement, fraudulent or deceptive practices, counterfeiting or otherwise engaging in activity contrary to applicable law, and providing (consistent with applicable law and any related governmental and quasi-governmental agencies of illegal conduct in connection with the use of the TLD). Paragraph 2 of the PIC Specification attached as Annex II includes language to implement the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's response of 18 June 2013.
2016-07-30-13


3

42
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request Number</th>
<th>Action Requested</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Date Issued</th>
<th>Scorecard Link</th>
<th>Date Closed</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>004842</td>
<td>ICANN51 Virtual Policy Forum (GPC)</td>
<td>Protection for IGOs</td>
<td>6/24/15</td>
<td><a href="#">Link</a></td>
<td>6/24/15</td>
<td>2/3/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004843</td>
<td>ICANN52 Boston GAC Communique</td>
<td>Protection for IGOs</td>
<td>10/21/15</td>
<td><a href="#">Link</a></td>
<td>10/21/15</td>
<td>3/8/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004844</td>
<td>ICANN53 Brussels GAC Communique</td>
<td>Protection for IGOs</td>
<td>6/21/21</td>
<td><a href="#">Link</a></td>
<td>6/21/21</td>
<td>10/25/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004845</td>
<td>ICANN54 Helsinki GAC Communique</td>
<td>Protection for IGOs</td>
<td>5/28/2016</td>
<td><a href="#">Link</a></td>
<td>5/28/2016</td>
<td>1/30/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004846</td>
<td>ICANN55 Marrakech GAC Communique</td>
<td>Protection for IGOs</td>
<td>10/21/15</td>
<td><a href="#">Link</a></td>
<td>10/21/15</td>
<td>3/8/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004847</td>
<td>ICANN56 Montréal GAC Communique</td>
<td>Protection for IGOs</td>
<td>10/21/15</td>
<td><a href="#">Link</a></td>
<td>10/21/15</td>
<td>3/8/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rationale:** If the score of the implementation report is 0, or if the score of the implementation report is 1 but the GAC cannot score the item as complete, the item is considered complete at the Board’s discretion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request/Action ID</th>
<th>Action/Description</th>
<th>Action Requested</th>
<th>Action Documented</th>
<th>Initial Action Documented</th>
<th>Status Update (Public)</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Resolution Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001871</td>
<td>ICANN47 Durban Communique</td>
<td>6/28/18</td>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>On 30 September 2014, the GAC considered this advice and provided the response in its scorecard. S.ii. The GAC directed the GAC to continue discussing with the GNSO and the GAC, regarding protection of IGO acronyms. S.iii. The GAC accepts this advice. On 17 June 2015, the NGPC adopted a resolution requiring registry operators to continue to implement temporary protections for the precise IGO names and acronyms on the list posted as Annex I to Resolution 2015.07 (DUMO) – 2015.07 (NGPC) until the first meeting of the NGPC following the ICANN 48 Meeting in Buenos Aires or until the NGPC makes a further determination on the GAC advice to GAC protections, whichever is earlier. If the NGPC and GAC do not reach an agreement on outstanding implementation issues in that timeframe, and subject to any matters that arise during the discussions, registry operators will be required to protect only the IGO names identified on the &quot;OG List&quot;. The GAC, NGPC, and IGO representatives ensuring the implementation of preventative protection for ONG acronyms at the second level is completed.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/2018-09-16-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/2018-09-16-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>6/28/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001872</td>
<td>ICANN62 Panama Communique</td>
<td>6/28/18</td>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>On 30 September 2014, the GAC considered this advice and provided the response in its scorecard. S.ii. The GAC directs the GAC to continue discussing with the GNSO and the GAC, regarding protection of IGO acronyms. S.iii. The GAC accepts this advice. On 17 June 2015, the NGPC adopted a resolution requiring registry operators to continue to implement temporary protections for the precise IGO names and acronyms on the list posted as Annex I to Resolution 2015.07 (DUMO) – 2015.07 (NGPC) until the first meeting of the NGPC following the ICANN 48 Meeting in Buenos Aires or until the NGPC makes a further determination on the GAC advice to GAC protections, whichever is earlier. If the NGPC and GAC do not reach an agreement on outstanding implementation issues in that timeframe, and subject to any matters that arise during the discussions, registry operators will be required to protect only the IGO names identified on the &quot;OG List&quot;. The GAC, NGPC, and IGO representatives ensuring the implementation of preventative protection for ONG acronyms at the second level is completed.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/2018-09-16-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/2018-09-16-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>6/28/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001869</td>
<td>ICANN62 Panama Communique</td>
<td>6/28/18</td>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>On 30 September 2014, the GAC considered this advice and provided the response in its scorecard. S.ii. The GAC directs the GAC to continue discussing with the GNSO and the GAC, regarding protection of IGO acronyms. S.iii. The GAC accepts this advice. On 17 June 2015, the NGPC adopted a resolution requiring registry operators to continue to implement temporary protections for the precise IGO names and acronyms on the list posted as Annex I to Resolution 2015.07 (DUMO) – 2015.07 (NGPC) until the first meeting of the NGPC following the ICANN 48 Meeting in Buenos Aires or until the NGPC makes a further determination on the GAC advice to GAC protections, whichever is earlier. If the NGPC and GAC do not reach an agreement on outstanding implementation issues in that timeframe, and subject to any matters that arise during the discussions, registry operators will be required to protect only the IGO names identified on the &quot;OG List&quot;. The GAC, NGPC, and IGO representatives ensuring the implementation of preventative protection for ONG acronyms at the second level is completed.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/2018-09-16-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/2018-09-16-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>6/28/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001868</td>
<td>ICANN62 Panama Communique</td>
<td>6/28/18</td>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>On 30 September 2014, the GAC considered this advice and provided the response in its scorecard. S.ii. The GAC directs the GAC to continue discussing with the GNSO and the GAC, regarding protection of IGO acronyms. S.iii. The GAC accepts this advice. On 17 June 2015, the NGPC adopted a resolution requiring registry operators to continue to implement temporary protections for the precise IGO names and acronyms on the list posted as Annex I to Resolution 2015.07 (DUMO) – 2015.07 (NGPC) until the first meeting of the NGPC following the ICANN 48 Meeting in Buenos Aires or until the NGPC makes a further determination on the GAC advice to GAC protections, whichever is earlier. If the NGPC and GAC do not reach an agreement on outstanding implementation issues in that timeframe, and subject to any matters that arise during the discussions, registry operators will be required to protect only the IGO names identified on the &quot;OG List&quot;. The GAC, NGPC, and IGO representatives ensuring the implementation of preventative protection for ONG acronyms at the second level is completed.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/2018-09-16-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/2018-09-16-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>6/28/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001867</td>
<td>ICANN62 Panama Communique</td>
<td>6/28/18</td>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>On 30 September 2014, the GAC considered this advice and provided the response in its scorecard. S.ii. The GAC directs the GAC to continue discussing with the GNSO and the GAC, regarding protection of IGO acronyms. S.iii. The GAC accepts this advice. On 17 June 2015, the NGPC adopted a resolution requiring registry operators to continue to implement temporary protections for the precise IGO names and acronyms on the list posted as Annex I to Resolution 2015.07 (DUMO) – 2015.07 (NGPC) until the first meeting of the NGPC following the ICANN 48 Meeting in Buenos Aires or until the NGPC makes a further determination on the GAC advice to GAC protections, whichever is earlier. If the NGPC and GAC do not reach an agreement on outstanding implementation issues in that timeframe, and subject to any matters that arise during the discussions, registry operators will be required to protect only the IGO names identified on the &quot;OG List&quot;. The GAC, NGPC, and IGO representatives ensuring the implementation of preventative protection for ONG acronyms at the second level is completed.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/2018-09-16-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/2018-09-16-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>6/28/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Request/Issue Number</td>
<td>Document</td>
<td>Date Issued</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Item Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Action Request/Issue Number</td>
<td>Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAC-001352</td>
<td>GAC57 Communique</td>
<td>11/8/16</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>4.a.I.</td>
<td>The GAC advises the ICANN Board to:  a) pursue its engagement with both the GAC and the GNSO on the issue of GAC protection in an effort to reconcile differences between GNSO and GAC advice on this topic while remaining responsive to concerns raised on the GA's discussion board. Taking into account the number of individuals who have joined both the Board and the GNSO since the GAC first brought this issue to the attention of the GAC Community, the Board considers it appropriate to pause the discussions on the GAC list for the duration of the GAC in discussions (both within the Board and with the GNSO) while appropriate, given that the IGOS are best placed to comment upon the compatibility of any proposals with their unique status as non-commercial, publicly-funded creations of government under international law.</td>
<td>GAC-001354</td>
<td>GAC57 Communique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAC-001354</td>
<td>GAC57 Communique</td>
<td>11/8/16</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>4.a.I.</td>
<td>The GAC advises the ICANN Board to:  a) pursue its engagement with both the GAC and the GNSO on the issue of GAC protection in an effort to reconcile differences between GNSO and GAC advice on this topic while remaining responsive to concerns raised on the GA's discussion board. Taking into account the number of individuals who have joined both the Board and the GNSO since the GAC first brought this issue to the attention of the GAC Community, the Board considers it appropriate to pause the discussions on the GAC list for the duration of the GAC in discussions (both within the Board and with the GNSO) while appropriate, given that the IGOS are best placed to comment upon the compatibility of any proposals with their unique status as non-commercial, publicly-funded creations of government under international law.</td>
<td>GAC-001355</td>
<td>GAC57 Communique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAC-001355</td>
<td>GAC57 Communique</td>
<td>11/8/16</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>4.a.II.</td>
<td>The GAC and the GNSO agree that, to facilitate the implementation of the advice issued since the Toronto meeting, the Board proposes that the GNSO establish a mechanism to coordinate the actions of the GAC and the GNSO to implement, in cooperation with the GAC, the GNSO's Policy to protect the GAC from cybersquatting, in particular for appeal to an ad hoc tribunal instead of national courts, in conformity with relevant principles of international law, and an emergency relief (e.g., 24-48 hours) for the protection of GAC acronyms, with respect to GAC Protection Mechanisms to take the small group compromise proposal into account. The Board invites the ICANN Board to: i. continue to be required to reserve the IGO names and acronyms as per the “IGO List Guidance” and to report on progress at IANW SB.</td>
<td>GAC-001356</td>
<td>GAC57 Communique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAC-001356</td>
<td>GAC57 Communique</td>
<td>11/8/16</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>4.a.I.</td>
<td>The GAC and the GNSO agree that, to facilitate the implementation of the advice issued since the Toronto meeting, the Board proposes that the GNSO establish a mechanism to coordinate the actions of the GAC and the GNSO to implement, in cooperation with the GAC, the GNSO’s Policy to protect the GAC from cybersquatting, in particular for appeal to an ad hoc tribunal instead of national courts, in conformity with relevant principles of international law, and an emergency relief (e.g., 24-48 hours) for the protection of GAC acronyms, with respect to GAC Protection Mechanisms to take the small group compromise proposal into account. The Board invites the ICANN Board to: i. continue to be required to reserve the IGO names and acronyms as per the “IGO List Guidance” and to report on progress at IANW SB.</td>
<td>GAC-001357</td>
<td>GAC57 Communique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAC-001357</td>
<td>GAC57 Communique</td>
<td>11/8/16</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>4.a.I.</td>
<td>The GAC and the GNSO agree that, to facilitate the implementation of the advice issued since the Toronto meeting, the Board proposes that the GNSO establish a mechanism to coordinate the actions of the GAC and the GNSO to implement, in cooperation with the GAC, the GNSO’s Policy to protect the GAC from cybersquatting, in particular for appeal to an ad hoc tribunal instead of national courts, in conformity with relevant principles of international law, and an emergency relief (e.g., 24-48 hours) for the protection of GAC acronyms, with respect to GAC Protection Mechanisms to take the small group compromise proposal into account. The Board invites the ICANN Board to: i. continue to be required to reserve the IGO names and acronyms as per the “IGO List Guidance” and to report on progress at IANW SB.</td>
<td>GAC-001358</td>
<td>GAC57 Communique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAC-001358</td>
<td>GAC57 Communique</td>
<td>11/8/16</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>4.a.I.</td>
<td>The GAC and the GNSO agree that, to facilitate the implementation of the advice issued since the Toronto meeting, the Board proposes that the GNSO establish a mechanism to coordinate the actions of the GAC and the GNSO to implement, in cooperation with the GAC, the GNSO’s Policy to protect the GAC from cybersquatting, in particular for appeal to an ad hoc tribunal instead of national courts, in conformity with relevant principles of international law, and an emergency relief (e.g., 24-48 hours) for the protection of GAC acronyms, with respect to GAC Protection Mechanisms to take the small group compromise proposal into account. The Board invites the ICANN Board to: i. continue to be required to reserve the IGO names and acronyms as per the “IGO List Guidance” and to report on progress at IANW SB.</td>
<td>GAC-001359</td>
<td>GAC57 Communique</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The GAC advocates its advice from the Toronto, Beijing, Durban, Buenos Aires and Singapore Communiques 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 and operated by different rights holders (the NGPC’s letter of 16 June 2014 to the GAC), are facing further cuts under the NGPC Action Plan. The Board has confirmed that these existing reservations will remain in place until the post-registration notification system for IGO acronyms is in place pending any such process, and commits to following in the work of the NGPC as outcomes that meet the GAC’s criteria.

Fourth Round of Consideration

As noted in the Board’s 14 September 2014 resolution accompanying the Board’s 12 September 2014 resolution on the GAC’s KAMM71 Communiqué, the Board “acknowledges the GAC advice to maintain the current reservations 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 IGO Work Track” and “emphasizes that the final scope of protections for IGO acronyms is a matter to be determined through GAC’s policy processes, including the outcomes of the ongoing IGO Work Track (now an IFRP 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, NGPC and the community continue to actively work through implementation issues concerning IGO acronyms. The Board has confirmed that these existing reservations will remain in place until the post-registration notification system for IGO acronyms is in place. The NGPC then the Board mentioned in the scorecard completed its work in April 2014 and forwarded its recommendations, all of which attained Full Consensus, to the GAC Council. The GAC Council approved all of the IFRP recommendations in June 2012 and forwarded its Recommendations Report to the GAC on 1 July 2012. In addition to reviewing the IFRP recommendations, the Board will also consider the remaining NGPC policy recommendations concerning protections for IGOS acronyms, including the four NGPC Council-approved recommendations from the Policy Development Process on IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Mechanisms.

Fourth Round of Consideration

As noted in the Board’s 14 September 2014 resolution accompanying the Board’s 12 September 2014 resolution on the GAC’s KAMM71 Communiqué, the Board “acknowledges the GAC advice to maintain the current reservations 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 IGO Work Track” and “emphasizes that the final scope of protections for IGO acronyms is a matter to be determined through GAC’s policy processes, including the outcomes of the ongoing IGO Work Track (now an IFRP 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, NGPC and the community continue to actively work through implementation issues concerning IGO acronyms. The Board has confirmed that these existing reservations will remain in place until the post-registration notification system for IGO acronyms is in place. The NGPC then the Board mentioned in the scorecard completed its work in April 2014 and forwarded its recommendations, all of which attained Full Consensus, to the GAC Council. The GAC Council approved all of the IFRP recommendations in June 2012 and forwarded its Recommendations Report to the GAC on 1 July 2012. In addition to reviewing the IFRP recommendations, the Board will also consider the remaining NGPC policy recommendations concerning protections for IGOS acronyms, including the four NGPC Council-approved recommendations from the Policy Development Process on IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Mechanisms.

Fourth Round of Consideration

As noted in the Board’s 14 September 2014 resolution accompanying the Board’s 12 September 2014 resolution on the GAC’s KAMM71 Communiqué, the Board “acknowledges the GAC advice to maintain the current reservations 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 IGO Work Track” and “emphasizes that the final scope of protections for IGO acronyms is a matter to be determined through GAC’s policy processes, including the outcomes of the ongoing IGO Work Track (now an IFRP 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, NGPC and the community continue to actively work through implementation issues concerning IGO acronyms. The Board has confirmed that these existing reservations will remain in place until the post-registration notification system for IGO acronyms is in place. The NGPC then the Board mentioned in the scorecard completed its work in April 2014 and forwarded its recommendations, all of which attained Full Consensus, to the GAC Council. The GAC Council approved all of the IFRP recommendations in June 2012 and forwarded its Recommendations Report to the GAC on 1 July 2012. In addition to reviewing the IFRP recommendations, the Board will also consider the remaining NGPC policy recommendations concerning protections for IGOS acronyms, including the four NGPC Council-approved recommendations from the Policy Development Process on IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Mechanisms.
3. The GAC indicated its advice to adopt the Toronto, Beijing, Dayton, Buenos Aires, Singapore and London Communiques respecting protection of IGO names and acronyms at the first and second levels, as implementation of such protection is in the public interest, and that NCOS, as created by governments under international law, are subject to different rights limitations, uniquely. Concerning permanent protection at the second level, the GAC reminded the ICANN Board that notice of a mark to an IGO name or acronym is not required in order to implement interim protections at the second level, the GAC recommends the ICANN Board require notice of the mark to an IGO name or acronym. The concerned IGO, should apply its interest to the concerned name and accept it in two languages, and at no cost to IGOs. Interim protections can be offered at the second level, and rating the IGOs in a capacity to ensure rights protection mechanisms, the GAC reminds the ICANN Board that any such mechanism should be at no or nominal cost to IGOs, and further, is implementing any such current mechanism, b. The GAC advises the ICANN Board, l. That the UDRP should be extended, welcome the NGPC's continued work with a. The GAC reaffirms its advice from the ICANN51 Los Angeles on 12 October 2014. The GAC reiterates its advice to the Board to pursue the current moratorium on second-level registrations of domain names matching the acronyms of IGOs currently on the GAC List (stated March 2013), pending the conclusion of the ICANN Work Track and emphasizes that the final scope of permanent protection for IGO acronyms is in a matter to be determined through ICANN's policy processes, including the outcomes of the ongoing ICANN Work Track (now an IPR team). GAC Procedures are currently required to withdraw the acronyms of the IGOs on the GAC's List from registration in new gTLD 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 the permanent mechanisms will remain in place until the post-registration notification phase of registered domain names matching the acronyms of IGOs currently on the GAC List (stated March 2013). Pending the conclusion of the ICANN Work Track and emphasizes that the final scope of permanent protection for IGO acronyms is in a matter to be determined through ICANN’s policy processes, including the outcomes of the ongoing ICANN Work Track (now an IPR team). GAC Procedures are currently required to withdraw the acronyms of the IGOs on the GAC’s List from registration in new gTLD 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 the permanent mechanisms will remain in place until the post-registration notification phase of registered domain names matching the acronyms of IGOs currently on the GAC List (stated March 2013). Pending the conclusion of the ICANN Work Track and emphasizes that the final scope of permanent protection for IGO acronyms is in a matter to be determined through ICANN’s policy processes, including the outcomes of the ongoing ICANN Work Track (now an IPR team). GAC Procedures are currently required to withdraw the acronyms of the IGOs on the GAC’s List from registration in new gTLD 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 the permanent mechanisms will remain in place until the post-registration notification phase of registered domain names matching the acronyms of IGOs currently on the GAC List (stated March 2013). Pending the conclusion of the ICANN Work Track and emphasizes that the final scope of permanent protection for IGO acronyms is in a matter to be determined through ICANN’s policy processes, including the outcomes of the ongoing ICANN Work Track (now an IPR team). GAC Procedures are currently required to withdraw the acronyms of the IGOs on the GAC’s List from registration in new gTLD 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 the permanent mechanisms will remain in place until the post-registration notification phase of registered domain names matching the acronyms of IGOs currently on the GAC List (stated March 2013). Pending the conclusion of the ICANN Work Track and emphasizes that the final scope of permanent protection for IGO acronyms is in a matter to be determined through ICANN’s policy processes, including the outcomes of the ongoing ICANN Work Track (now an IPR team). GAC Procedures are currently required to withdraw the acronyms of the IGOs on the GAC’s List from registration in new gTLD 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 the permanent mechanisms will remain in place until the post-registration notification phase of registered domain names matching the acronyms of IGOs currently on the GAC List (stated March 2013). Pending the conclusion of the ICANN Work Track and emphasizes that the final scope of permanent protection for IGO acronyms is in a matter to be determined through ICANN’s policy processes, including the outcomes of the ongoing ICANN Work Track (now an IPR team). GAC Procedures are currently required to withdraw the acronyms of the IGOs on the GAC’s List from registration in new gTLD 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 the permanent mechanisms will remain in place until the post-registration notification phase of registered domain names matching the acronyms of IGOs currently on the GAC List (stated March 2013). Pending the conclusion of the ICANN Work Track and emphasizes that the final scope of permanent protection for IGO acronyms is in a matter to be determined through ICANN’s policy processes, including the outcomes of the ongoing ICANN Work Track (now an IPR team). GAC Procedures are currently required to withdraw the acronyms of the IGOs on the GAC’s List from registration in new gTLD 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 the permanent mechanisms will remain in place until the post-registration notification phase of registered domain names matching the acronyms of IGOs currently on the GAC List (stated March 2013). Pending the conclusion of the ICANN Work Track and emphasizes that the final scope of permanent protection for IGO acronyms is in a matter to be determined through ICANN’s policy processes, including the outcomes of the ongoing ICANN Work Track (now an IPR team). GAC Procedures are currently required to withdraw the acronyms of the IGOs on the GAC’s List from registration in new gTLD launched under the 2012 N...
The IACG refers to its previous advice to the Board to prevent permanently the terms and names associated with the Red Cross and Crescent terms, including those relating to IGOs, national Red Cross and Red Crescent societies, and recalls that the protections offered to the Red Cross and Red Crescent designations and names from unauthorised use were accepted in general terms by the national Red Cross and Red Crescent societies. In accordance with the IACG scope of responsibility for the protection of the Red Cross and Red Crescent terms and names, the IACG notes that any measure taken by the NGPC to prevent the terms and names associated with the Red Cross and Crescent should be considered as an interim measure pending resolution procedures. The IACG urges the NGPC to find a permanent and effective solution to prevent the terms and names associated with the Red Cross and Crescent terms and names from being used in the context of national Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. The IACG requests the NGPC to request the ICANN Board to adopt a permanent solution to the protection of the Red Cross and Red Crescent terms and names. The NGPC Scorecard: As noted above, the NGPC accepts the GAC advice to continue its work on the protection of the Red Cross and Red Crescent terms and names. The NGPC will consider this advice in the Board's meeting on 26 February 2019. The NGPC will also consider this advice in the context of the GAC Los Angeles Communiqué. The NGPC will also consider this advice in the context of the GAC Los Angeles Communiqué.

In its 27 January 2019 resolution, the Board directed ICANN org to continue to develop processes and the parties' good faith attempts to reach a resolution of the issue. On 25 November 2014, the GAC responded to the Board's request for advice on the protection of the terms and names associated with the Red Cross and Red Crescent terms and names. The GAC noted that its intention was to emphasize the urgency of providing protection for the Red Cross and Red Crescent terms and names and the need to protect these terms and names adequately addressed under IGOs, national Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. The GAC requests the NGPC and all relevant parties to work quickly to resolve the issues and to consider the Red Cross and Red Crescent terms and names as a matter of priority, including in particular the protection of the terms and names of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC/CICR). The GAC noted that it was critical to protect these terms and names adequately. The GAC noted that it had carefully considered the Board's letter and that it was critical to protect these terms and names adequately.

The GAC and the NGPC for the protection of IGO acronyms in order to protect the registrations of IGOs will also be used to protect the acronyms of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (ICRC/CICR). The ICRC and the CICR have requested protection for their acronyms in order to prevent the use of these acronyms for commercial purposes.

On 19 September 2014, the GAC submitted the following recommendations to the NGPC:

1. The NGPC should adopt any mechanism(s) that may be agreed to by the GNSO Board and NGPC to protect the acronyms of the International Committee of the Red Cross and the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies.

2. The NGPC should adopt a mechanism to protect the names of the International Committee of the Red Cross and the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies.

3. The NGPC should adopt a mechanism to protect the names of the International Committee of the Red Cross and the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies.

4. The NGPC should adopt a mechanism to protect the names of the International Committee of the Red Cross and the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies.

The NGPC Scorecard: As noted above, the NGPC accepts the GAC advice to continue its work on the protection of the Red Cross and Red Crescent terms and names. The NGPC will consider this advice in the Board's meeting on 26 February 2019. The NGPC will also consider this advice in the context of the GAC Los Angeles Communiqué. The NGPC will also consider this advice in the context of the GAC Los Angeles Communiqué.

In its 27 January 2019 resolution, the Board directed ICANN org to continue to develop processes and the parties' good faith attempts to reach a resolution of the issue. On 25 November 2014, the GAC responded to the Board's request for advice on the protection of the terms and names associated with the Red Cross and Red Crescent terms and names. The GAC noted that its intention was to emphasize the urgency of providing protection for the Red Cross and Red Crescent terms and names and the need to protect these terms and names adequately addressed under IGOs, national Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. The GAC requests the NGPC and all relevant parties to work quickly to resolve the issues and to consider the Red Cross and Red Crescent terms and names as a matter of priority, including in particular the protection of the terms and names of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC/CICR). The GAC noted that it was critical to protect these terms and names adequately. The GAC noted that it had carefully considered the Board's letter and that it was critical to protect these terms and names adequately. The GAC noted that it had carefully considered the Board's letter and that it was critical to protect these terms and names adequately.

The GAC and the NGPC for the protection of IGO acronyms in order to protect the registrations of IGOs will also be used to protect the acronyms of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (ICRC/CICR). The ICRC and the CICR have requested protection for their acronyms in order to prevent the use of these acronyms for commercial purposes.

On 19 September 2014, the GAC submitted the following recommendations to the NGPC:

1. The NGPC should adopt any mechanism(s) that may be agreed to by the GNSO Board and NGPC to protect the acronyms of the International Committee of the Red Cross and the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies.

2. The NGPC should adopt a mechanism to protect the names of the International Committee of the Red Cross and the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies.

3. The NGPC should adopt a mechanism to protect the names of the International Committee of the Red Cross and the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies.

4. The NGPC should adopt a mechanism to protect the names of the International Committee of the Red Cross and the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies.

The NGPC Scorecard: As noted above, the NGPC accepts the GAC advice to continue its work on the protection of the Red Cross and Red Crescent terms and names. The NGPC will consider this advice in the Board's meeting on 26 February 2019. The NGPC will also consider this advice in the context of the GAC Los Angeles Communiqué. The NGPC will also consider this advice in the context of the GAC Los Angeles Communiqué. The NGPC will also consider this advice in the context of the GAC Los Angeles Communiqué. The NGPC will also consider this advice in the context of the GAC Los Angeles Communiqué. The NGPC will also consider this advice in the context of the GAC Los Angeles Communiqué.
The GAC advises the ICANN Board: i. that it continue to engage with the GAC and the GNSO on this topic, and provide any additional information that the GAC may request in its advice; ii. that the Board consider the advice of the GAC and the GNSO when making decisions regarding the New gTLD Program; and iii. that the Board ensure that all relevant parties are aware of the advice and that they continue to provide feedback and recommendations to the ICANN Board.

The GAC gave the Board to permanently protect from unauthorised use the terms associated with the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. The GAC advises the ICANN Board to permanently protect the terms “Red Cross” and “Red Crescent” as well as the terms associated with the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. The GAC also advises the ICANN Board to permanently protect the terms “Red Cross” and “Red Crescent” as well as the terms associated with the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. The GAC advises the ICANN Board to continue to engage with the GAC and the GNSO on this topic.

The GAC advises the ICANN Board: i. that it continue to engage with the GAC and the GNSO on this topic, and provide any additional information that the GAC may request in its advice; ii. that the Board consider the advice of the GAC and the GNSO when making decisions regarding the New gTLD Program; and iii. that the Board ensure that all relevant parties are aware of the advice and that they continue to provide feedback and recommendations to the ICANN Board.

The GAC gives the Board to permanently protect from unauthorised use the terms associated with the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. The GAC advises the ICANN Board to permanently protect the terms “Red Cross” and “Red Crescent” as well as the terms associated with the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. The GAC also advises the ICANN Board to permanently protect the terms “Red Cross” and “Red Crescent” as well as the terms associated with the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. The GAC advises the ICANN Board to continue to engage with the GAC and the GNSO on this topic.

The GAC advises the ICANN Board: i. that it continue to engage with the GAC and the GNSO on this topic, and provide any additional information that the GAC may request in its advice; ii. that the Board consider the advice of the GAC and the GNSO when making decisions regarding the New gTLD Program; and iii. that the Board ensure that all relevant parties are aware of the advice and that they continue to provide feedback and recommendations to the ICANN Board.
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**Summary:**

- **ICANN52 Singapore:** The GAC agreed to establish a working group on public safety and law enforcement.
- **ICANN63 Barcelona:** The GAC welcomed the progress made in the process of recognizing the principal actors and the GAC's post-policy determinations on the issue of the protection of the Red Cross and Red Crescent designations and identifiers.
- **ICANN70 Virtual:** The GAC took action on the ICANN70 Communique on 12 May 2021:
  - The Board acknowledged the ICANN70 Communique on 7 April 2021: 
    - The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary.
  - The Board took action on the ICANN70 Communique on 12 May 2021:
    - The Board closed this item.

**Follow-up Action:**

- **ICANN52 Singapore:** The GAC agreed to establish a working group on public safety and law enforcement.
- **ICANN63 Barcelona:** The GAC welcomed the progress made in the process of recognizing the principal actors and the GAC's post-policy determinations on the issue of the protection of the Red Cross and Red Crescent designations and identifiers. The Board is encouraged to adopt the GNSO Council's recommendations, which regard the implementation of the agreements of the ISG National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies in relevant bodies, as well as the international organizations within the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement. The GAC noted that the issue of the acronyms of the two international organizations within the Movement (ICRC and IFRC) were not covered under the aforementioned GNSO process and made standing GAC advice that the temporary protections presently accorded to these acronyms remain in place until an appropriate resolution is reached.
- **ICANN70 Virtual:** The Board acknowledged the ICANN70 Communique on 7 April 2021:
  - The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary.
  - The Board took action on the ICANN70 Communique on 12 May 2021:
    - The Board closed this item.

**Current Phase:**

- **Follow-up:** The GAC will continue to review the status of this item and report to the GAC at future meetings.
- **Current Phase:** The Board took action on the ICANN70 Communique on 12 May 2021:
  - The Board closed this item.

**Date Issued:**

- **Follow-up:** 2/11/15
- **Current Phase:** 10/25/18
- **Next Item:** 3/25/21

**Date Closed:**

- **Follow-up:** 11/1/17
- **Current Phase:** 7/2/13

**Board Resolution Link:**


**Date Signed:**

- **Follow-up:** 7/2/13
- **Current Phase:** 7/2/13

**Follow-up Number:**

- **Follow-up:** 7/2/13

**Subject:**

- **Follow-up:** Public Interest Commitments
- **Current Phase:** Public Interest Commitments

**Enforcement:**

- **Follow-up:** The GAC acknowledges the progress made in the process of recognizing the principal actors and the GAC's post-policy determinations on the issue of the protection of the Red Cross and Red Crescent designations and identifiers. The Board is encouraged to adopt the GNSO Council's recommendations, which regard the implementation of the agreements of the ISG National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies in relevant bodies, as well as the international organizations within the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement. The GAC noted that the issue of the acronyms of the two international organizations within the Movement (ICRC and IFRC) were not covered under the aforementioned GNSO process and made standing GAC advice that the temporary protections presently accorded to these acronyms remain in place until an appropriate resolution is reached.

**Involvement:**

- **Follow-up:** The GAC will continue to review the status of this item and report to the GAC at future meetings.
- **Current Phase:** The Board took action on the ICANN70 Communique on 12 May 2021:
  - The Board closed this item.

**Importance:**

- **Follow-up:** 2
- **Current Phase:** 3

**Resolutions:**

- **Follow-up:** Resolved (2013.07.02.NG03), the NGPC confirms that appropriate preventative initial protections for the GAC identifiers will continue to be provided as presented in the proposed New TLD Registry Agreement posted for public comment on 29 April 2013 (http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment/-base-agreement-29apr13-en.pdf), while the GAC, NGPC, KAMIN Staff and community continue to actively work through outstanding implementation issues. Resolved (2013.07.02.NG04), the NGPC determines that pursuant to Specification 5 in the proposed New TLD Registry Agreement posted for public comment on 29 April 2013 (http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment/-base-agreement-29apr13-en.pdf), registry operators will implement temporary protections for the GAC names and acronyms on the “IGO list” dated 22/03/2013,” attached to this Resolution as Annex 1 (PDF, 541 KB). This item is considered completed as of the NGPC’s resolution of 2 July 2013.
- **Current Phase:** Resolved (2013.07.02.NG04), the NGPC determines that registry operators will implement temporary protections for the GAC names and acronyms on the “IGO list” dated 22/03/2013,” attached to this Resolution as Annex 1 (PDF, 541 KB). This item is considered completed as of the NGPC’s resolution of 2 July 2013.

**Follow-up:**

- **Follow-up:** 50

**Current Phase:**

- **Follow-up:** Public Interest Commitments
- **Current Phase:** Public Interest Commitments

**Subject:**

- **Follow-up:** Public Interest Commitments
- **Current Phase:** Public Interest Commitments

**NGPC Resolution:**

- **Follow-up:** On 27 January 2019, the NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to GAC advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response in its scorecard: On 6 June 2013, the NGPC provided a written response to the Board acknowledging the ICANN70 Communique on 7 April 2021: 
  - The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary.
  - The Board took action on the ICANN70 Communique on 12 May 2021:
    - The Board closed this item.

**Board Resolution Link:**


**Date Signed:**

- **Follow-up:** 2/11/15
- **Current Phase:** 7/2/13

**Follow-up:**

- **Follow-up:** 50

**Current Phase:**

- **Follow-up:** Public Interest Commitments
- **Current Phase:** Public Interest Commitments

**Subject:**

- **Follow-up:** Public Interest Commitments
- **Current Phase:** Public Interest Commitments

**Board Resolution Link:**


**Date Signed:**

- **Follow-up:** 2/11/15
- **Current Phase:** 7/2/13

**Follow-up:**

- **Follow-up:** 50

**Current Phase:**

- **Follow-up:** Public Interest Commitments
- **Current Phase:** Public Interest Commitments

**Subject:**

- **Follow-up:** Public Interest Commitments
- **Current Phase:** Public Interest Commitments

**Board Resolution Link:**


**Date Signed:**

- **Follow-up:** 2/11/15
- **Current Phase:** 7/2/13

**Follow-up:**

- **Follow-up:** 50

**Current Phase:**

- **Follow-up:** Public Interest Commitments
- **Current Phase:** Public Interest Commitments

**Subject:**

- **Follow-up:** Public Interest Commitments
- **Current Phase:** Public Interest Commitments

**Board Resolution Link:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request Number</th>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-002413</td>
<td>Follow up</td>
<td></td>
<td>The GAC welcomed the ICANN’s in-convoking of the Protection of NGO-IGO Identifiers in all gTLDs, tasked with reviewing the ICANN’s past recommendations on the protection of Red Cross and Red Crescent designations, names and identifiers – particularly of the names of national Red Cross and Red Crescent societies. The GAC noted that the provisions of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) and the Red Crescent Societies (RCS) are defined to fall outside of the remit of the recommended GAC Working Group and included its advice (Durban Communiqué, 2013) that these acronyms be made to benefit from the same cost neutral mechanisms to be worked out for the protection of acronyms of IGOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-002422</td>
<td>Follow up</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary. Follow-up to previous advice will be tracked on open advice items related to the same topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-002429</td>
<td>Follow up</td>
<td></td>
<td>The GAC noted that there are provisions in the Registry Agreement and Registrar Accreditation Agreement that may conflict with applicable law in certain countries, in particular privacy and data retention, collection and processing law. The importance of having adequate procedures to avoid these conflicts was highlighted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The GAC notes that new gTLD registries have submitted ISEPs (Registry Service Evaluation Protocol) 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-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 as new gTLD registry operator applicants are not required to use any labels that are also on the ISO 3166-1 alpha 2 list. In considering these ISEP requests, and consistent with the Applicant Guidelines, the GAC considers the public comment periods in an important transparency mechanism, and in addition seeks that relevant governments be alerted by ICANN about these requests as they arise. The GAC will review the use of country and territory names at the second level and advise the ICANN Board if due reason arises. The GAC acknowledges that the Board is currently conducting a policy work on second level labels and can be alerted as requests are received for these labels. In considering the requests for TLDs that are in use, the GAC will consider that second level labels should not be permitted to replace any existing second level labels, including itself, and shall not subject registries or registrants to an undue disadvantage. The GAC notes the following non-exhaustive list of strings that it considers to be generic terms, where the applicant is currently proposing to provide exclusive registry access: .aries, .app, .assurance, .baby, .beauty, .blog, .book, .broker, .carius, .car, .cloud, .courses, .dpi, .church, .data, .dir, .financialist, .flowers, .food, .gene.

The Board considered this advice on several occasions: 1. For applicants not seeking to impose exclusive registry access across the generic strings proposed in an open manner registration may be restricted, in particular for strings mentioned under category 1.2. However, if an applicant requests restrictions that should be appropriate for the type of risk associated with the TLD, the registry operator should administer access in those kinds of registries in a transparent way that does not give an undue preference to any registries or registrants, including itself, and shall not subject registries or registrants to an undue disadvantage. 2. Exclusive Access or strings representing generic terms, exclusive registry access should serve a public interest goal in the current round, the GAC has identified the following non-exhaustive list of strings that it considers to be generic terms, where the applicant is currently proposing to provide exclusive registry access: .aries, .app, .assurance, .baby, .beauty, .blog, .book, .broker, .carius, .car, .cloud, .courses, .dpi, .church, .data, .dir, .financialist, .flowers, .food, .gene, .aries, .app, .assurance, .baby, .beauty, .blog, .book, .broker, .carius, .car, .cloud, .courses, .dpi, .church, .data, .dir, .financialist, .flowers, .food, .gene.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Issue Date</th>
<th>Status Update</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-00124</td>
<td>On 30 July 2014, the Board considered Planning for Future gTLD Application Rounds on 17 November 2014 and approved the following resolution: Resolved (2014.11.17.11), the Board notes the effort it proposes within the GNSO to identify areas where the GNSO believes that policy advice can be clarified in time it wishes to provide additional policy advice applicable to future rounds. The Board acknowledges the need for ICANN and the community to do the necessary work.</td>
<td>9/8/14</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/news/board-material/resolutions-annex-a-11/14-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/news/board-material/resolutions-annex-a-11/14-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>11/14/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-00125</td>
<td>On 30 August 2014, the Board took action on the KANN/50 London Communiqué. The KANN/50 London Communiqué, including the issues of importance, was passed as of the Board’s resolution of 17 November 2014.</td>
<td>8/21/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-00126</td>
<td>On 3 August 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided the response in its scorecard: The NGPC provides written clarification to the GAC on the requested implementation issues in Annex 2 of the KANN/50 London Communiqué. The NGPC considers that the current responses offered to the GAC fail to address a number of important concerns, including: i) the process for verification of WHOIS information; ii) the process for verification of registrants’ credentials and the lack of binding nature of the public interest commitments; ii) operation of the Public Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Process; and iii) restricted registration policies. These queries are set out in more detail in an Attachment to this Communiqué.</td>
<td>8/21/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-00127</td>
<td>On 3 August 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided the response in its scorecard: The NGPC provides written clarification to the GAC on the requested implementation issues in Annex 2 of the KANN/50 London Communiqué. The NGPC considers that the current responses offered to the GAC fail to address a number of important concerns, including: i) the process for verification of WHOIS information; ii) the process for verification of registrants’ credentials and the lack of binding nature of the public interest commitments; ii) operation of the Public Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Process; and iii) restricted registration policies. These queries are set out in more detail in an Attachment to this Communiqué.</td>
<td>8/21/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-00128</td>
<td>On 3 August 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided the response in its scorecard: The NGPC provides written clarification to the GAC on the requested implementation issues in Annex 2 of the KANN/50 London Communiqué. The NGPC considers that the current responses offered to the GAC fail to address a number of important concerns, including: i) the process for verification of WHOIS information; ii) the process for verification of registrants’ credentials and the lack of binding nature of the public interest commitments; ii) operation of the Public Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Process; and iii) restricted registration policies. These queries are set out in more detail in an Attachment to this Communiqué.</td>
<td>8/21/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**AR-001284**

**ICANN52 Los Angeles, Communique**

29/10/14

*Action Request: Action Communique ICANN52 Singapore*

**Description:**

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

1. Implementation of WHOIS Related Safeguards. i. Provide the GAC with a comprehensive report indicating steps and timelines regarding all streams of work related to the WHOIS accuracy safeguard. ii. Complete the Pilot study on WHOIS accuracy, including assessment of identity verification, and share the findings in a timely manner for review in the ICANN 52 meeting; 3. Initiate steps towards (Phase 3) identity verification of a limited number of TLDs and market to develop a benefit analysis of implementation options, which consider scaling the process to address and validate accurate WHOIS records and respond to non-compliance reports. iv. Security Risks: i. Inform the GAC and provide GAC members with an opportunity to contribute interminably about the ongoing consultation on the framework for Register to respond to security risks. ii. Inform the GAC of the findings of this consultation no later than three weeks before the ICANN 52 meeting. iii. Ensure an interim mechanism is in place to effectively respond to security risks; 2. Inform the GAC of the Findings of this consultation no later than three weeks before the ICANN 52 meeting.

**Current Phase:**

1.a.I - 1.d.I.

**Related Resolution Link:**


**Board Resolution Link:**


**Draft Close Date:**

10/1/15

---

**AR-001285**

**ICANN52 Beijing, Communique**

29/10/14

*Action Request: Action for New gTLDs*

**Description:**

- The NGPC has received the advice from listing the broad categories of strings (see Annex I).
- The NGPC responded to the advice by informing ICANN of the two broad categories of string as described in Annex I of the Beijing Communique as follows: Category 1: Consumer protection, sensitive strings, and regulated markets. On 21 January 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard. The NGPC accepts the advice. The NGPC adopts the implementation framework attached as Annex 2 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-annex-2-29jan15-en.pdf) to address this advice, and directs the ICANN President and GAC, in its discretion, to implement the Category 1 Safeguard advice consistent with the implementation framework. With respect to the additional advice in the Annex to the Communique on the Category 1 Safeguards, the NGPC accepts the advice to recognize the string ".doctor" as falling within Category 1 safeguard advice addressing highly regulated sectors and ensure that the domain in the doTLD is blocked exclusively to legitimate medical practitioners. Category 2: Restricted registration字符串.
- The NGPC considered this advice on several occasions. 1. For applicants not seeking to impose exclusive registry access, the NGPC passed the following resolution on 25 June 2013: Resolved (2013.06.25.NG02), the NGPC directs the ICANN Board to focus its attention on the issue of exclusive registry access for generic strings pursuing a public interest goal and states that the policy work is proceeding to incorporate subsequent sounds of the new ".tld" Program, and article the domain as a regular string with regard to the progress on the issue. Also, the NGPC does the President and GAC, if any designee(s), to proceed as follows: This item is considered complete.
- The NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to ICANN Advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this report to the ICANN President. The NGPC passed the following resolution on 7 October 2015: Resolved (2015.10.07.NG01), the NGPC directs the ICANN Board to consider the report as part of the agenda at the ICANN 51 meeting and states that the NGPC has fulfilled the recommendation to address the NGPC's Category 2 Safeguard Advice for applicants not seeking to impose exclusive registry access. 2. For applicants seeking to impose exclusive registry access the NGPC directed staff to make appropriate changes to the Draft of the New gTLD Registry Agreement, as approved in Annex I (D1.1-4.14) attached to Resolution .com: to implement the NGPC’s Category 2 Safeguard Advice for applicants not seeking to impose exclusive registry access; 3. For applicants seeking to impose exclusive registry access the NGPC passed the following resolution on 25 June 2013: Resolved (2013.06.25.NG02), the NGPC directs ICANN to implement the new restrictions for the category of strings. b. The NGPC has addressed the GAC’s concerns and the NGPC is providing safeguard advice to apply to broad categories of strings (see Annex I).
- At the Los Angeles meeting the NGPC received the following resolutions: Resolved (2013.06.25.NG02), the NGPC directs ICANN to take appropriate action to implement the NGPC’s Category 2 Safeguard Advice for applicants not seeking to impose exclusive registry access. 2. For applicants seeking to impose exclusive registry access the NGPC passed the following resolution on 25 June 2013: Resolved (2013.06.25.NG02), the NGPC directs the ICANN Board to focus its attention on the issue of exclusive registry access for generic strings pursuing a public interest goal and states that the policy work is proceeding to incorporate subsequent sounds of the new ".tld" Program, and article the domain as a regular string with regard to the progress on the issue. Also, the NGPC does the President and GAC, if any designee(s), to proceed as follows: This item is considered complete.
- The NGPC responded to the advice by informing ICANN of the two broad categories of string as described in Annex I of the Beijing Communique as follows: Category 1: Consumer protection, sensitive strings, and regulated markets. On 21 January 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard. The NGPC accepts the advice. The NGPC adopts the implementation framework attached as Annex 2 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-annex-2-29jan15-en.pdf) to address this advice, and directs the ICANN President and GAC, in its discretion, to implement the Category 1 Safeguard advice consistent with the implementation framework. With respect to the additional advice in the Annex to the Communique on the Category 1 Safeguards, the NGPC accepts the advice to recognize the string ".doctor" as falling within Category 1 safeguard advice addressing highly regulated sectors and ensure that the domain in the doTLD is blocked exclusively to legitimate medical practitioners. Category 2: Restricted registration字符串.
- The NGPC considered this advice on several occasions. 1. For applicants not seeking to impose exclusive registry access, the NGPC passed the following resolution on 25 June 2013: Resolved (2013.06.25.NG02), the NGPC directs the ICANN Board to focus its attention on the issue of exclusive registry access for generic strings pursuing a public interest goal and states that the policy work is proceeding to incorporate subsequent sounds of the new ".tld" Program, and article the domain as a regular string with regard to the progress on the issue. Also, the NGPC does the President and GAC, if any designee(s), to proceed as follows: This item is considered complete.
- The NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to ICANN Advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this report to the ICANN President. The NGPC passed the following resolution on 7 October 2015: Resolved (2015.10.07.NG01), the NGPC directs the ICANN Board to consider the report as part of the agenda at the ICANN 51 meeting and states that the NGPC has fulfilled the recommendation to address the NGPC’s Category 2 Safeguard Advice for applicants not seeking to impose exclusive registry access. 2. For applicants seeking to impose exclusive registry access the NGPC directed staff to make appropriate changes to the Draft of the New gTLD Registry Agreement, as approved in Annex I (D1.1-4.14) attached to Resolution .com: to implement the NGPC’s Category 2 Safeguard Advice for applicants not seeking to impose exclusive registry access; 3. For applicants seeking to impose exclusive registry access the NGPC passed the following resolution on 25 June 2013: Resolved (2013.06.25.NG02), the NGPC directs ICANN to implement the new restrictions for the category of strings.

**Related Resolution Link:**


**Board Resolution Link:**


**Draft Close Date:**

26/2/15

---

**AR-001288**

**ICANN52 Singapore, Communique**

29/10/14

*Action Request: Action to all new gTLDs and Category 1 consumer protection, sensitive strings and regulated markets and Category 2 restricted registration strings*

**Description:**

- The GAC urges the NGPC to publicly recognize those commitments as setting a precedent for all strings, and that all strings should have an implementation framework involved with each string should strive to move in addition to the NGPC recommends. i. That ICANN suggest to those registrars for which such commitments have not yet been taken and for which contracts have already been signed with ICANN, that they review means and ways of introducing such provisions into the public policy concerns. This could also help to secure confidence in internet-based commerce. c. The GAC urges the NGPC to consider refining the WHOIS and/or to consider developing a “fast track” process for regulatory authorities, government agencies, and law enforcement to work with ICANN contact-compliance to effectively respond to issues involving serious risks of harm to the public. Finally, with regard to the GAC’s Beijing Category 1 Advice, b. The GAC urges the NGPC to provide greater clarity as to the mechanisms for redress in the event registrants believe they have been unduly discriminated against. The NGPC provided written clarification to the GAC in a 11 June 2015 letter (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/correspondence/crocker-to-schneider-11june15-en.pdf). As noted in the response, the NGPC informed the GAC that discussions are taking place within the ICANN community regarding the possible establishment of a “fast track” that would provide consumers with verification that the credentials or licenses of a registrant in a highly regulated sector have been validated and verified. It would (a) reward those who engage in “best practices” by verifying and validating credentials, and (b) help consumers differentiate between those websites for which credentials have been verified and validated and those for which they have not. With respect to developing a “fast track” FDRF for regulatory authorities, government agencies, and law enforcement, in the 28 April 2015 correspondence noted above, the NGPC committed that it will consolidate/gather complaints submitted by governments and consumer protection agencies within two business days. ICANN further committed that complaints that appear to be wellfounded will be handled expediently, regardless of the source of the complaint, and will commit to expedite processing of complaints based on factors such as the severity of the alleged breach and the form that may result. With respect to the request to provide greater clarity regarding the mechanisms for redress in the event registrants believe they have been unduly discriminated against, the NGPC provided written clarification to the GAC in a 11 June 2015 letter (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/correspondence/crocker-to-schneider-11june15-en.pdf). This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s report of 7 October 2015.

**Related Resolution Link:**


**Board Resolution Link:**


**Draft Close Date:**

30/1/15

---
Communique for Program TLD singular versions of the same string as a matter of urgency.

On 25 June 2013 the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its Board Scorecard. The NGPC determined that no changes are needed to the existing mechanisms in the Applicant Guidebook to address potential consumer confusion resulting from allowing singular and plural versions of the same string. The NGPC noted that this topic may be of further discussion by the community but in its current form it considers the matter closed.

The GAC advises the ICANN Board to consider the following advice:

- While respecting privacy and confidentiality, Registry operators will periodically conduct a technical analysis to assess whether domains in the gTLDs are being used to perpetuate security threats, such as pharming, phishing, malware, and botnets. If Registry operator identifies security risks that pose an actual risk to harm, Registry operator will notify the relevant registrar and, if the registrar does not take immediate action, suspend the domain name until the matter is resolved.

- On 4 June 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its Board Scorecard. The NGPC determined that no changes are needed to the Applicant Guidebook to address potential consumer confusion resulting from allowing singular and plural versions of the same strings. The NGPC adopted a resolution to accept this advice at its 4 June 2013 meeting, and on 26 June 2013, the NGPC considered whether to allow singular and plural versions of the same string. The NGPC adopted a resolution resolving that no changes were needed to the existing mechanisms in the Applicant Guidebook to address potential consumer confusion resulting from allowing singular and plural versions of the same string.

- On 14 May 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its Board Scorecard. The NGPC determined that no changes are needed to the existing mechanisms in the Applicant Guidebook to address potential consumer confusion resulting from allowing singular and plural versions of the same strings. The NGPC reiterates the Beijing advice that singular and plural versions of the same strings could lead to consumer harm. Therefore, the NGPC considers this advice to have been fully addressed and considers this item complete as of the 19 June 2013.

Community for Program TLD singular and plural versions of the same string.

The GAC advises the ICANN Board to:

- The GAC believes that singular and plural versions of the string as a TLD could lead to consumer harm. Therefore the GAC advises the ICANN Board to consider the following advice:

- On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its Board Scorecard. The NGPC adopted a resolution to accept this advice at its 5 February 2014 meeting, and on 6 February 2014, the NGPC considered whether to allow singular and plural versions of the same string. The NGPC adopted a resolution resolving that no changes were needed to the Applicant Guidebook to address potential consumer confusion resulting from allowing singular and plural versions of the same string. Therefore, the NGPC considers this advice to have been fully addressed and considers this item complete as of the 8 February 2014.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Action Request: Action Taken</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Date Closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.a.</td>
<td>.spa</td>
<td>The GAC recognizes that religious terms are a matter of extreme sensitivity for the Government of India. Further to its Durban Communiqué, the Government of India expressed its concerns with the application for .Amazon, as stated in the Applicant Guidebook. On 14 May 2014, the NGPC adopted an iteration of the Scorecard concerning .Amazon and related IDNs in Japanese (application number 1-1318-83995) and Chinese (application number 1-1315-58086) according to Module 3.1 part I of the Applicant Guidebook. The NGPC noted the recent action taken to put .AFRICA on hold the ZACR African Union Commission-endorsed application due to the Independent Review Panel (IRP) recommendation. The Board should act expeditiously in prioritising their deliberations and decisions. a) The Board has been reached between the city of Spa and India has requested that the application for .spa be considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 8 September 2014. The Board Scorecard Link is <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>. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 9 September 2014.</td>
<td>11 Jun 2019</td>
<td>9/8/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.b.</td>
<td>.indi</td>
<td>The NGPC accepted the GAC advice that &quot;the application for .indi is a matter of extreme sensitivity for the Government of India and religious considerations.&quot; The NGPC, consistent with the new gTLD application guidelines, the GAC provided consensus advice on the application of the domain name .indi, as stated in the GAC Communiqué, approved in Durban, last July. Therefore the GAC signs on the GAC Board to provide timely communication to the affected parties, in particular to provide clarity on the process and possible timelines. The GAC expresses its concerns with the application for .Indians not proceed. On 14 May 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard. On 10 September 2013, the NGPC adopted an iteration of the Scorecard concerning .Indians and related IDNs in Chinese (application number 1-1315-88995) according to Module 3.1 part I of the Applicant Guidebook. The NGPC noted the recent action taken to put .AFRICA on hold the ZACR African Union Commission-endorsed application due to the Independent Review Panel (IRP) recommendation. The Board should act expeditiously in prioritising their deliberations and decisions. b) The Board has been reached between the city of Spa and India has requested that the application for .indi be considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 8 September 2014. The Board Scorecard Link is <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>. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 9 September 2014.</td>
<td>11 Jun 2019</td>
<td>9/8/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.a.</td>
<td>.africa</td>
<td>The NGPC accepted the GAC advice that &quot;the application for .africa is a matter of extreme sensitivity for the Government of India and religious considerations.&quot; The NGPC, consistent with the new gTLD application guidelines, the GAC provided consensus advice on the application of the domain name .africa, as stated in the GAC Communiqué, approved in Durban, last July. Therefore the GAC signs on the GAC Board to provide timely communication to the affected parties, in particular to provide clarity on the process and possible timelines. The GAC recognizes that religious terms are a matter of extreme sensitivity for the Government of India on political and religious considerations. Further to its Durban Communiqué, the Government of India expressed its concerns with the application for .Amazon, as stated in the Applicant Guidebook. On 14 May 2014, the NGPC adopted an iteration of the Scorecard concerning .Amazon and related IDNs in Japanese (application number 1-1318-83995) and Chinese (application number 1-1315-58086) according to Module 3.1 part I of the Applicant Guidebook. The NGPC noted the recent action taken to put .AFRICA on hold the ZACR African Union Commission-endorsed application due to the Independent Review Panel (IRP) recommendation. The Board should act expeditiously in prioritising their deliberations and decisions. a) The Board has been reached between the city of Spa and India has requested that the application for .africa be considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 8 September 2014. The Board Scorecard Link is <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>. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 9 September 2014.</td>
<td>11 Jun 2019</td>
<td>9/8/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.b.</td>
<td>.ram</td>
<td>The NGPC accepted the GAC advice that &quot;the application for .ram is a matter of extreme sensitivity for the Government of India and religious considerations.&quot; The NGPC, consistent with the new gTLD application guidelines, the GAC provided consensus advice on the application of the domain name .ram, as stated in the GAC Communiqué, approved in Durban, last July. Therefore the GAC signs on the GAC Board to provide timely communication to the affected parties, in particular to provide clarity on the process and possible timelines. The GAC recognizes that religious terms are a matter of extreme sensitivity for the Government of India on political and religious considerations. Further to its Durban Communiqué, the Government of India expressed its concerns with the application for .Amazon, as stated in the Applicant Guidebook. On 14 May 2014, the NGPC adopted an iteration of the Scorecard concerning .Amazon and related IDNs in Japanese (application number 1-1318-83995) and Chinese (application number 1-1315-58086) according to Module 3.1 part I of the Applicant Guidebook. The NGPC noted the recent action taken to put .AFRICA on hold the ZACR African Union Commission-endorsed application due to the Independent Review Panel (IRP) recommendation. The Board should act expeditiously in prioritising their deliberations and decisions. b) The Board has been reached between the city of Spa and India has requested that the application for .ram be considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 8 September 2014. The Board Scorecard Link is <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>. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 9 September 2014.</td>
<td>11 Jun 2019</td>
<td>9/8/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The GAC advises the ICANN Board to: not proceed beyond Initial Evaluation of the .WINE and .VIN applications for 60 days (from the date the resolutions are posted) in order to provide additional time for the relevant impacted parties to negotiate which, if they are unable to do so, will proceed with the string similarity review process.

The GAC therefore advises that the Board reconsider the matter before delegating these strings. The GAC needs to consider the above elements more fully. In its action, the NGPC: (1) accepted the GAC advice identified in the Singapore Communiqué concerning the applications for .WINE and .VIN.

The NGPC thanks the GAC for its update on the .wine/.vin TLD applications. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 8 September 2014.

The NGPC thanks the GAC for its advice on the .wine/.vin TLD applications. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 8 September 2014.

The NGPC considers this advice and provides this response in its scorecard: The Board understands that the GAC has provided comments to the ccNSO’s Extended Process Similarity Review Panel Working Group proposing guidelines on the second string (similarity review process).

On 4 February 2017, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard: On 4 April 2016, the NGPC adopted resolutions in response to the GAC’s advice in the Singapore Communiqué concerning the applications for .WINE and .VIN. In its action, the NGPC: (1) accepted the GAC advice identified in the Singapore Communiqué as it relates to the applications for .WINE and .VIN; (2) considered whether there may have been a process violation or procedural error; and (3) directed the President and CEO to not commence the contracting process for the applications for .WINE and .VIN for 60 days (from the date the resolutions are posted).

On 4 April 2016, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard: On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and provided this response in its scorecard: The Board understands that the GAC has provided comments to the ccNSO’s Extended Process Similarity Review Panel Working Group and looks forward to reviewing the final report after it has been submitted. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 8 September 2014.

On 8 September 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard: The NGPC directed the President and CEO to not commence the contracting process for the applications for .WINE and .VIN for 60 days (from the date the resolutions are posted).

On 8 September 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard: On 4 April 2016, the NGPC adopted resolutions in response to the GAC’s advice in the Singapore Communiqué concerning the applications for .WINE and .VIN. In its action, the NGPC: (1) accepted the GAC advice identified in the Singapore Communiqué as it relates to the applications for .WINE and .VIN; (2) considered whether there may have been a process violation or procedural error; and (3) directed the President and CEO to not commence the contracting process for the applications for .WINE and .VIN for 60 days (from the date the resolutions are posted).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request Number</th>
<th>Initiator</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Date Issued</th>
<th>Issue of Importance</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-004884</td>
<td>ICANN71 Virtual Community Forum GAC Communique</td>
<td>Subsequent Rounds of new gTLDs</td>
<td>1/11/2021</td>
<td>Issue of importance</td>
<td>The GAC discussed Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs, following the GNSO Council adoption of the Final Report of the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process (ODP) Final Report. The GAC-Ombuds provided an overview to GAC members on priority topics to the GAC: ● Diligence and Predictability of Application Process ● Public Interest Commitments (PICs) and Global Public Interest ● Applicant Support and Participation of Underrepresented Regions ● Generic Generic TLDs ● GAC Early Warnings and GAC Input ● Implementation Guidance for New gTLDs ● Function (Mechanisms of Last Resort) presented by ICANN Org. GAC members shared concerns relative to the implementation of the Standing Predictability Implementation Review Team (SPIRT) and the added layer it may create regarding GAC consensus advice. GAC members agreed that further clarification on the implementation of the SPIRT should be encouraged, as well as on the role the GAC will play in it, especially in light of Implementation Guidance 2.3 suggesting direct dialogue between the SPIRT, ICANN org and the ICANN Board on future potential GAC Consensus Advice to the ICANN Board.</td>
<td>3/25/21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-004888</td>
<td>ICANN72 Virtual Policy Forum GAC Communique</td>
<td>Subsequent Rounds of new gTLDs</td>
<td>3/25/21</td>
<td>Issue of importance</td>
<td>The GAC discussed Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs, focusing on key topics and messages provided via GAC members in the collective GAC comment to the Subsequent Procedures for New gTLDs (SubPro) Final Outputs to the ICANN Board public comment proceeding. Gortan Marby, ICANN CEO, provided an introduction on the next round of new gTLDs, noting that emerging competencies and emerging opportunities for all Internet users to have their own identifier is part of ICANN's mission and strategy. The Operational Design Phase (ODP) was presented by ICANN Org, with the expected ODP scope for SubPro which is in the process of being finalized by ICANN org prior to ICANN Board review. GAC members discussed potential next steps for the GAC to consider, including: ● Calls for volunteers to serve on the Operational Design Phase (ODP) as part of the GAC participation in the Subsequent Procedures Development Process Working Group (SubPro PDP) in support of volunteers to serve on the Operational Design Phase (ODP) as part of the GAC participation in the Subsequent Procedures Development Process Working Group (SubPro PDP) in support of the process of being finalized by ICANN Org prior to ICANN Board review. ● The GAC discussed Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs, following the ICANN Board support of the Operational Design Phase (ODP) related to policy recommendations in the Final Report of the GNSO Policy Development Process Working Group (ODP WG) on Subsequent Procedures for New gTLDs. The GAC intends to maintain open communication channels with ICANN org throughout the ODP, providing input at appropriate points during the community consultation phases, in particular contributing to the analysis regarding public interest. The GAC results its invitation to the ICANN Board to consider the ODP: collective input submitted in June 2021 on the final outputs of this ODP WG for ICANN Board consideration. The GAC-Brown ICANN Org's attention to this ODP input, and intends to invite ICANN org to attend future GAC sessions for further discussions on this issue of importance to the GAC.</td>
<td>6/2/22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-004883</td>
<td>ICANN70 Virtual Annual General Meeting Communique</td>
<td>Subsequent Rounds of new gTLDs</td>
<td>3/25/21</td>
<td>Issue of importance</td>
<td>The GAC discussed Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs, following the ICANN Board support of the Operational Design Phase (ODP) related to policy recommendations in the Final Report of the GNSO Policy Development Process Working Group (ODP WG) on Subsequent Procedures for New gTLDs. The GAC intends to maintain open communication channels with ICANN org throughout the ODP, providing input at appropriate points during the community consultation phases, in particular contributing to the analysis regarding public interest. The GAC results its invitation to the ICANN Board to consider the ODP: collective input submitted in June 2021 on the final outputs of this ODP WG for ICANN Board consideration. The GAC-Brown ICANN Org's attention to this ODP input, and intends to invite ICANN org to attend future GAC sessions for further discussions on this issue of importance to the GAC.</td>
<td>10/5/21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Communique ICANN74 Policy Forum - 20 June 2022

The Board discussed the ICANN74 Policy Forum Communique on 20 June 2022. The ICANN Policy Forum Communique did not contain Consensus GAC Advice. The Board-GAC Interaction Group met with GAC leadership on 30 August 2022 to discuss the "Issues of Importance" noted in the ICANN74 Policy Forum Communique, which included topics such as: System for Standardized Access and Disclosure (SSAD) of gTLD Registration Data, Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs, EPDP on Specific Curative Rights Protections for IGOs, Accountability and Transparency, DNS Abuse Mitigation, Uniform Domain Name-Dispute-Resolution Policy (UDRP), and New gTLD Auction Proceeds.

The GAC discussed Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs, and received an update from ICANN org about the current status of the Operational Design Phase (ODP) relative to policy recommendations in the Final Report of the GAC Policy Development Process Working Group (PPC BG) 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 GAC-board meeting, the GAC provided ICANN org with a set of recommendations aimed to explore a mutually agreeable way forward on closed generics, as the GAC intends to respond formally, 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 Communiqué whereby "exclusive registry access should serve a public interest goal".

The current phase of the "Issues of Importance" noted in the ICANN74 Policy Forum Communique did not contain Consensus GAC Advice. The Board-GAC Interaction Group 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 Communiqué whereby "exclusive registry access should serve a public interest goal."
The Board recognizes that the ICANN Board is committed to engaging with the current processes leading to the transition of US Government stewardship of WHOIS and strengthening ICANN accountability. The Board, in its capacity as the ICANN Board, will work closely in ensuring 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 Registrar Accreditation Agreement, data protection, and data retention issues, WHOIS (e.g., Expert Working Group, privacy and proxy services, etc). The Board will benefit from some forms of comprehensive overview by ICANN of such related issues prior to the meetings.

The Board considered the ICANN's recommendations on 18 October 2016 (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-10-16-en#2.d) and took the following resolution: Based on the CCWG's response in its scorecard, the Board will coordinate with the ICANN to develop the agenda items with key issues, which could be presented through webinars, written briefings or other methods that may be helpful to the Board to track key issues in a concise and structured way to the Board. This item is considered complete as of the Board Chair’s letter of 5 June 2016.

The Board considered the ICANN's recommendations on 18 October 2016 (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-10-16-en#2.d) and took the following resolution: Based on the CCWG's response in its scorecard, the Board will coordinate with the ICANN to develop the agenda items with key issues, which could be presented through webinars, written briefings or other methods that may be helpful to the Board to track key issues in a concise and structured way to the Board. This item is considered complete as of the Board Chair’s letter of 5 June 2016.

The Board considered the ICANN's recommendations on 18 October 2016 (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-10-16-en#2.d) and took the following resolution: Based on the CCWG's response in its scorecard, the Board will coordinate with the ICANN to develop the agenda items with key issues, which could be presented through webinars, written briefings or other methods that may be helpful to the Board to track key issues in a concise and structured way to the Board. This item is considered complete as of the Board Chair’s letter of 5 June 2016.

The Board considered the ICANN's recommendations on 18 October 2016 (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-10-16-en#2.d) and took the following resolution: Based on the CCWG's response in its scorecard, the Board will coordinate with the ICANN to develop the agenda items with key issues, which could be presented through webinars, written briefings or other methods that may be helpful to the Board to track key issues in a concise and structured way to the Board. This item is considered complete as of the Board Chair’s letter of 5 June 2016.
The Board initially considered this advice on 30 May 2018. However, at the time, the Board responded, “The Board will defer a formal response to the GAC on this advice pending further discussions with the GAC.” The Board most recently considered this item on 27 January 2019 and noted that the Board acknowledged this advice and referred the GAC to the Board’s response on items §1.a.I, II, and III above in the Barcelona consensus advice section. The Board directs the GAC to the ICANN org’s memo (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/implementation-memo-two-character-29jul18-en.pdf) and Historical Overview (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/historical-overview-two-character-ascii-labels-29jul18-en.pdf) for additional details regarding this topic. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration on 8 September 2019.

On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the advice of 30 May 2018. The Board responds, “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 advice on 27 January 2019 and noted that the Board acknowledged this advice and referred the GAC to the Board’s response on items §1.a.I, II, and III above in the Barcelona consensus advice section. The Board directs the GAC to the ICANN org’s memo (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/implementation-memo-two-character-29jul18-en.pdf) and Historical Overview (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/historical-overview-two-character-ascii-labels-29jul18-en.pdf) for additional details regarding this topic. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration on 8 September 2019.

On 8 September 2019 the ICANN Board considered the Marrakech Scorecard 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 proposal 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 in a historical overview of the process. The Board also notes that during the GGIG meeting at ICANN65 in Marrakech it was discussed that the GGIG 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 on 8 September 2019.

On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the advice of 30 May 2018. However, at the time, the Board responded, “The Board will defer a formal response to the GAC on this advice pending further discussions with the GAC.” The Board most recently considered this advice on 27 January 2019 and noted that the Board acknowledged this advice and referred the GAC to the Board’s response on items §1.a.I, II, and III above in the Barcelona consensus advice section. The Board directs the GAC to the ICANN org’s memo (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/implementation-memo-two-character-29jul18-en.pdf) and Historical Overview (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/historical-overview-two-character-ascii-labels-29jul18-en.pdf) for additional details regarding this topic. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration on 8 September 2019.

On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the advice of 30 May 2018. However, at the time, the Board responded, “The Board will defer a formal response to the GAC on this advice pending further discussions with the GAC.” The Board most recently considered this advice on 27 January 2019 and noted that the Board acknowledged this advice and referred the GAC to the Board’s response on items §1.a.I, II, and III above in the Barcelona consensus advice section. The Board directs the GAC to the ICANN org’s memo (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/implementation-memo-two-character-29jul18-en.pdf) and Historical Overview (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/historical-overview-two-character-ascii-labels-29jul18-en.pdf) for additional details regarding this topic. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration on 8 September 2019.

On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the advice of 30 May 2018. However, at the time, the Board responded, “The Board will defer a formal response to the GAC on this advice pending further discussions with the GAC.” The Board most recently considered this advice on 27 January 2019 and noted that the Board acknowledged this advice and referred the GAC to the Board’s response on items §1.a.I, II, and III above in the Barcelona consensus advice section. The Board directs the GAC to the ICANN org’s memo (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/implementation-memo-two-character-29jul18-en.pdf) and Historical Overview (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/historical-overview-two-character-ascii-labels-29jul18-en.pdf) for additional details regarding this topic. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration on 8 September 2019.

On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the advice of 30 May 2018. However, at the time, the Board responded, “The Board will defer a formal response to the GAC on this advice pending further discussions with the GAC.” The Board most recently considered this advice on 27 January 2019 and noted that the Board acknowledged this advice and referred the GAC to the Board’s response on items §1.a.I, II, and III above in the Barcelona consensus advice section. The Board directs the GAC to the ICANN org’s memo (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/implementation-memo-two-character-29jul18-en.pdf) and Historical Overview (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/historical-overview-two-character-ascii-labels-29jul18-en.pdf) for additional details regarding this topic. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration on 8 September 2019.
On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the Barcelona Communique and provided its response in its statement. The Board acknowledges that some GAC member governments 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 substantive conversations with concerned governments in May 2017 explaining 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 IANA at the Board-GAC Recommendations Implementation (BGRI) meetings at ICANN62, ICANN63 and ICANN64. The adopted Measures also urged registry operators to engage with the relevant GAC member governments when a risk is identified in order to come to an agreement on how to manage the situation if the name in question was already registered. Advice which the GAC considered to be consistent with GAC advice.

On 28 October 2016 the ICANN Board Chair wrote to the GAC Chair to inform the GAC that the Board directed ICANN to revise the Helsinki Communique in order to include a new process for the release of two-character labels at the second level. At that time, the Board noted that it had considered the Helsinki Communique and provided its response in its statement. The Board acknowledged that some GAC member governments had 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 substantive conversations with concerned governments in May 2017 explaining the process and development of the framework adopted by the 8 November 2016 Board resolution. Additionally, the Board considered the Helsinki Communique in order to come to an agreement on how to manage the situation if the name in question was already registered. Advice which the GAC considered to be consistent with GAC advice.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request Number</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Date Issued</th>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status Update (URL)</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
<th>Date Closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-005043</td>
<td>ICANN57 Hyderabad Communique</td>
<td>6/20/22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>a.i.</td>
<td>The Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and provided this response in its scorecard. As mentioned during the ICANN Board meeting at ICANN 31, the topic of two character domain names corresponding to country codes had been thoroughly examined over the past two years, at least five public comment periods on the topic as well as discussions with the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC). As mentioned at the meeting, the Board examined the issue with respect to ICANN’s mission, commitments and core values, and concluded that the Board shared the GAC’s concern that use of two character strings corresponding to country codes should not be done in a way to deceive or confuse consumers. The Board’s position is that the adopted resolution is consistent with the GAC’s advice on this topic. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 3 February 2017.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/reports/board-material/resolutions-2017-02-03-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/reports/board-material/resolutions-2017-02-03-en.pdf</a></td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-board-materials-hyderabad57-gac-advice-scorecard-03feb17-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-board-materials-hyderabad57-gac-advice-scorecard-03feb17-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>2/3/17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-005044</td>
<td>ICANN57 Hyderabad Communique</td>
<td>6/20/22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>a.i.</td>
<td>The Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and provided this response in its scorecard. The Board will be implementing a new process for consideration and processing of GAC advice, starting with the ICANN 58 Copenhagen Communique. This process is intended to support greater clarity and increase collaboration. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 3 February 2017.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/reports/board-material/resolutions-2017-02-03-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/reports/board-material/resolutions-2017-02-03-en.pdf</a></td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-board-materials-hyderabad57-gac-advice-scorecard-03feb17-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-board-materials-hyderabad57-gac-advice-scorecard-03feb17-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>2/3/17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The GAC advises the ICANN Board to: i. encourage the community to continue in-depth analyses and discussions on all topics related to the potential use of 3-letter codes in the ISO-1184-6 list of country codes, in particular with regard to whether such a potential use is considered to be in the public interest or is considered to be in the scope of the policy development work. The GAC also welcomes the offer made by Dr Ajay Data (Chair of UASG) to discuss the use of the “ISO-1184-6” list of country codes in future rounds, in particular with regard to whether such a potential use is considered to be in the public interest.

On 28 October 2016 the ICANN Board Chair wrote to the GAC Chair to inform the GAC of the Board's delay in responding to the Helsinki Communique due to the considerable effort required to complete the IANA transition. https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions/bgig-2016-02-03-en.pdf. On 14 December 2016 the Board considered the Helsinki Communique and provided the response in its communique. The Board has concerns with the GAC advice noting that the two-character country codes consideration process launched on 3 October “is not clearly defined”. The Board also notes that the Helsinki Communique considers the comments to be “fully considered”. The process (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions/bâ€œgac-advice-2016-06-03-en.pdf) and part of the Helsinki Communique considers whether to authorize the release of requested country codes (as per Helsinki Communique). The GAC will be releasing country codes to protect the standard in the registry agreement... The Board will ensure that all comments are properly addressed and will communicate with the GAC on the process.

The Board discussed the ICANN73 Virtual Annual Community Forum Communique, including the issues of Importance, at the 24 May 2015 Board-Operational Group (B-OG) meeting.

The Board has concerns with the GAC advice noting that the two-character country codes consideration process launched on 3 October “is not clearly defined”. The process (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions/bâ€œgac-advice-2016-06-03-en.pdf) and part of the Helsinki Communique considers whether to authorize the release of requested country codes (as per Helsinki Communique). The GAC will be releasing country codes to protect the standard in the registry agreement... The Board will ensure that all comments are properly addressed and will communicate with the GAC on the process.

The Board also notes that the Helsinki Communique considers whether to authorize the release of requested country codes (as per Helsinki Communique). The GAC will be releasing country codes to protect the standard in the registry agreement... The Board will ensure that all comments are properly addressed and will communicate with the GAC on the process.
<table>
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001293</td>
<td>ICANN48 board</td>
<td>11/13/13</td>
<td>WHOIS L</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>The GAC conveys the ICANN Board to ensure that the GAC Principles Regarding gTLD WHOIS Services, approved in 2007, are fully taken into account by the newly established Directory Services Expert Working Group. The GAC has noted the work being accomplished by the Expert Working Group and the need to establish a WHOIS roadmap. The GAC will work interviscally on an updated roadmap prior to the ICANN 50 London meeting.</td>
<td>On 4 June 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard: On 5 June 2014, the NGPC provided written response, including the requested roadmap, to the Board of Directors. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s report of 7 October 2015.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/systenm/files/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2013-06-04-en#1.a">https://www.icann.org/en/systenm/files/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2013-06-04-en#1.a</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/15/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001287</td>
<td>ICANN48 board</td>
<td>12/14/13</td>
<td>WHOIS L</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>The GAC conducts a session for the community on these issues in Los Angeles.</td>
<td>The NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to GAC advice regarding the new gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response to the GAC in its scorecard: The Correspondence from the Board on this topic states: On 9 May 2014, ICANN notified the GAC Chair that it was in support of ensuring that the high-level meeting scheduled for London would be successful and that the Board would provide any necessary support. This is consistent with the NGPC’s support of ensuring that the high-level meeting scheduled for London was a success, and that additional funding for travel would be made available to assist with having representatives from countries at the high-level meeting. The NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to GAC advice regarding implementation of WHOIS-related safeguards; security risks safeguard advice; the Public Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Process; and the WHOIS roadmap. This item is considered complete as of the Board Chair’s letter of 5 June 2014.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/correspondence/crocker-to-schneider-22jan15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/correspondence/crocker-to-schneider-22jan15-en.pdf</a></td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-schneider-04jun13-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-schneider-04jun13-en.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001277</td>
<td>ICANN48 board</td>
<td>11/13/13</td>
<td>WHOIS L</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>The GAC requests that ICANN make a response on 22 January 2015.</td>
<td>The ICANN Board Chair provided written responses, including the requested roadmap, to the GAC in a letter dated 22 January 2015: On 19 January 2015, ICANN notified the GAC Chair that it was in support of ensuring that the high-level meeting scheduled for London would be successful and that the Board would provide any necessary support. This is consistent with the NGPC’s support of ensuring that the high-level meeting scheduled for London was a success, and that additional funding for travel would be made available to assist with having representatives from countries at the high-level meeting. The NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to GAC advice regarding implementation of WHOIS-related safeguards; security risks safeguard advice; the Public Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Process; and the WHOIS roadmap. This item is considered complete as of the Board Chair’s letter of 5 June 2014.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/correspondence/crocker-to-schneider-22jan15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/correspondence/crocker-to-schneider-22jan15-en.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>6/4/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001287</td>
<td>ICANN48 board</td>
<td>12/14/13</td>
<td>WHOIS L</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>The GAC requests that ICANN submit a comprehensive briefing provided by the Board on the wide range of WHOIS-related activities currently underway across ICANN’s community.</td>
<td>The Board provided a comprehensive response to GAC advice from the ICANN48 Los Angeles meeting addressing WHOIS-related safeguards; security risks safeguard advice; the Public Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Process; and the WHOIS roadmap. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s response of 22 January 2015.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/correspondence/crocker-to-schneider-22jan15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/correspondence/crocker-to-schneider-22jan15-en.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/17/15</td>
</tr>
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On 8 September 2019 the ICANN Board considered the Kobe Communiqué and provided the following response: The Board appreciates the GAC's follow-up on the Kobe advice. The Board recites its response to the Kobe Communiqué, in which the Board noted that "while it cannot guarantee the end result, Announce the EPDP is a community procedure that determines its own processes, the Board does support the request that the second phase of this policy development includes concrete milestones and progress reports. The Board shall convey the request via its Liaisons to the EPDP and via its communications with the GAC on the Kobe advice. The Board notes that the Kobe advice is also providing support to the EPDP Phase 2 to support its work. The EPDP Team has reported on project milestones regularly, including regular updates to the GAC Council (the body overseeing the policy development) as well as community updates via ICANN working and cross-community sessions of GAC meetings. For more information on the EPDP Team’s workplan, please refer to the following page: https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=105388008. The Board provided an update on this item in a letter of 8 June 2020 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-ismail-2020-06-en.pdf). This item is now closed. |
**GAC55 Marrakech Communique**
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  - **Date Issued**: 3/9/16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request Number/Action Item Number</th>
<th>Contacted</th>
<th>Date Issued</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Status Update (Public)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-002398</td>
<td>ICANN64 Kobe Communique</td>
<td>3/14/19</td>
<td>WHOIS and Data Protection legislation</td>
<td>1.a.V.</td>
<td>Consider re-reporting implementation processes for relevant existing policies, such as the Privacy Proxy Services Accreditation Issues Policy</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-board-resolutions-2019-05-15-en.pdf">Board Resolution Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-002397</td>
<td>ICANN64 Kobe Communique</td>
<td>3/14/19</td>
<td>WHOIS and Data Protection legislation</td>
<td>1.a.V.</td>
<td>Facilitate swift implementation of the new WHOIS verification and checks would be focused on the current version of WHOIS data, including by sending distinct parts to implementers as and when they are agreed, such as the questions deferred from Phase 1;</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-board-resolutions-2019-05-15-en.pdf">Board Resolution Link</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-002398</td>
<td>ICANN64 Kobe Communique</td>
<td>3/14/19</td>
<td>WHOIS and Data Protection legislation</td>
<td>1.a.V.</td>
<td>Registry operators will conduct checks on a statistically significant basis to identify registrations in gTLDs with deliberately false, inaccurate or incomplete WHOIS data at least twice a year. Registry operators will weight the sample towards registrars with the highest percentages of deliberately false, inaccurate or incomplete records in the previous checks. Registry operators will notify the relevant registrar of any inaccurate or incomplete records identified during the checks, triggering the registrar’s obligation to edit accurate and complete information from the registrar.</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-board-resolutions-2019-05-15-en.pdf">Board Resolution Link</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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