The GAC welcomes the publication of the Initial Report of the Temporary Committee on the GAC Advice Status.

As of 06 August 2021, the GAC Advice Status is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Advice Status</th>
<th>Close Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-004787</td>
<td>GAC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Under review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-004790</td>
<td>GAC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Under review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-004792</td>
<td>GAC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Under review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN71 Virtual Forum Communique (June 2021).

The GAC notes that the voluntary nature of the proposed guidance may
- 1) not be protected under the GDPR and
- 2) anonymized registration - or fake names to be records.

This Initial Report contains useful guidance on the proposed methods for the following Recommendations with respect to existing gTLDs, and on preparatory implementation planning for #5 along with other data collection needs.

Concerning the above Recommendations, the GAC notes:
- 1) to maintain the current moratorium on the registration of IGO acronyms pending the conclusion of the IGO curative work track.
- 2) wishes to clarify that the current moratorium on the registration of IGO acronyms should remain in place pending a conclusion to the curative work track.
- 3) the Board's conclusion on the registration of IGO acronyms pending the conclusion of the IGO curative work track.

The GAC previously advised the ICANN Board regarding the need to take action on this recommendation. The Board has continued to follow the community efforts to develop a definition of "abuse" to inform further work related to the ICANN66 Montreal Consensus Advice on CCT Review and Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs.

The GAC observes with continued concern that the Phase 1 Implementation Plan identifying an updated realistic schedule to complete its work. The ICANN71 Virtual Policy Forum Communique was published on 21 June 2021 and is currently being reviewed by the ICANN Board.
Regarding the critical issue of how to centrally handle requests for non-
subsequent rounds of new gTLDs, the GAC prioritized Subsequent Procedures for new gTLDs during the ICANN67 Virtual Community Forum. The GAC discussed Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs, focusing on key issues such as ensuring the accuracy and completeness of the text in their current working document reflects draft final reports expected July 2020. The Sub Pro PDP WG Co-Chairs noted that for potential input to the PDP WG and upcoming public comment period and aim to update previous GAC positions; identify positions/concerns members' participation in ICANN67 Sub Pro PDP WG sessions; review engagement in GAC sessions on this topic. GAC Leadership in Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group (Sub Pro PDP WG), and by scheduling concurrent sessions with meetings of the GNSO New gTLD community related to any such improvements. The ICANN71 Virtual Policy Forum Communique was published on 21 June 2021 and is currently being reviewed by the ICANN Board.

AR-004784 Community Forum ICANN67 Virtual Policy Forum Communique 6/17/2021 The GAC acknowledged the importance of ensuring that registries and registrars comply with ICANN contractual obligations. At the same time, ICANN continues to emphasize the need to develop and implement effective mechanisms to address DNS Abuse, such as the Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group (Sub Pro PDP WG), and duty.

AR-004786 DNS Abuse mitigation remains a priority for the GAC. The GAC recognizes that DNS Abuse is a threat to the multistakeholder community to identify opportunities for advancement and Botnets, and appreciates the efforts from all parties within the collaborative efforts taking place within the ICANN community to develop voluntary mechanisms to address DNS Abuse, such as the SubPro PDP Final Report.

AR-004783● as part of the community consultation process; and ● including:

AR-004784 Outputs to the ICANN Board public comment proceeding. Since 2016, ICANN 50-360 provided an overview on the status and progress of Phase 2 of the Operational Design Phase (ODP). The ODP is an assessment intended to help inform the ICANN Board deliberations on whether the Phase 2 Recommendations on a System for Standardized Access/Disclosure (SSAD) are in the best interest and harm of the Internet users to have their own identifiers is part of ICANN's mission. The ICANN71 Virtual Policy Forum Communique was published on 21 June 2021 and is currently being reviewed by the ICANN Board.
The GAC reaffirms its advice from the Toronto, Beijing, Durban, The NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to AR-001336 AR-001337 Communique 10/15/2014 10/15/2014 and Acronyms Organisation (IGO) Names Governmental Protection of Inter? Concerning preventative protection of IGO names and acronyms; protections remain in place pending the resolution of discussions concerning preventative protection of IGO names and acronyms, and supports continued dialogue between the GAC (excluding TLDs), the GNSO Board (NGPC), and the ICANN to develop concrete solutions to implement long-term GAC action. The GAC published a comprehensive report of GAC recommendations to GAC Advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this report in its scorecard: As noted in the GAC’s advice the NGPC took action to reconcile any remaining differences between the policy recommendations and the NGPC advice or the report. (Note that the NGPC scorecard refers to the ICANN Board to reconcile any remaining differences between the policy recommendations and the NGPC advice or the report. (Note that the NGPC scorecard refers to the ICANN Board. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s report of 7 October 2015.) This item has been considered complete as of the NGPC’s report of 7 October 2015.
The GAC will continue to work with interested parties to reach agreement on appropriate protected provisions for names and terms for Non-Governmental Organisations. This will include the work of the GAC in its capacity as a Board of the GNSO, and in its capacity as an ISSG for BINDINGmechanisms. The GAC will continue to coordinate with the ICANN52 Singapore Communique on the New gTLD Program and the NGPC. To reinforce existing processes for raising and addressing concerns to the ICANN Board, the GAC is providing safeguard advice to apply to broad categories of string and terms for the NGPC. The NGPC published a comprehensive report on NGPC responses and recommendations to safeguard advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 30 October 2015 and provided this advice as a point of reference in the Board's adoption of the NGPC's Framework on Safeguarded Advice. The GAC reiterates its advice to the Board to pursue its consultations in Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider as of the NGPC’s consideration and resolution of 21 June 2015. To address mechanisms which will enable the following aspects in relation to string protection regulations: To provide temporary protections for the names of the International Committee of the Red Cross and International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, and the IFRC Red Cross and Red Crescent Logos. The NGPC published a report on NGPC responses and updates to theServe as the NIOP's official repository of NGPC responses and recommendations from the expedited PDP on 20 November 2014 regarding protections for .wild, .sushi, and .world, which included provisions for certain identifications associated with the Red Cross/Red Crescent (http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/generic-attribution.pdf) When reviewing the NGPC policy recommendations that differ from the NGPC advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 30 October 2015, the Board may only partially accept the NGAC advice concerning a permanent system of safeguards when a registered identifier cannot be ranked in an NGAC registry. As outlined in the Board’s 30 October 2015 resolution, the Board reiterates that it will not protect identifiers (including any creative protection mechanisms) regarding several general protections for .ngo identifiers. This is in the best interest of the GAC Community and ICANN will be for the benefit of the public. The NGPC published a comprehensive report on NGPC responses and recommendations to safeguard advice regarding the New gTLD Program and the NGPC. To reinforce existing processes for raising and addressing concerns to the ICANN Board, the GAC is providing safeguard advice to apply to broad categories of string and terms for the NGPC. The NGPC published a comprehensive report on NGPC responses and recommendations to safeguard advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 30 October 2015 and provided this advice as a point of reference in the Board’s adoption of the NGPC’s Framework on Safeguarded Advice. The GAC reiterates its advice to the Board to pursue its consultations in Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider as of the NGPC’s consideration and resolution of 21 June 2015. To address mechanisms which will enable the following aspects in relation to string protection regulations: To provide temporary protections for the names of the International Committee of the Red Cross and International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, and the IFRC Red Cross and Red Crescent Logos. The NGPC published a report on NGPC responses and updates to the NGPC’s considerations and resolution of 21 June 2015.
On 6 June 2013 the ICANN Board Chair sent a letter to the GAC Chair with a letter to the GAC Chair with a scorecard of the Board's responses to the GAC's non-new gTLD concerns raised in the ICANN49 Singapore Communique as an annex to a letter dated 6 June 2013. The Board provided this response in its scorecard: On 6 June 2013, the NGPC provided a written briefing on the ability of an applicant to change its applied-for string (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-dryden-05jun14-en.pdf) to the GAC to address the questions listed in Annex II.

The Board requested the ICANN Global Stakeholder Engagement team, and within the BGRI and other parts of ICANN, to consider ways in which ICANN could make better use of existing events and fora to track key issues, which could be presented through webinars, written briefings or other methods that may be helpful to the GAC to track key agenda items with key issues, which could be presented through webinars, written briefings or other methods that may be helpful to the GAC to track key issues. The Board also welcomed the GAC Chair's letter of 5 June 2014.

The GAC agreed on a revised charter for continuation of the GAC-AG meetings. The Board welcomes the GAC's agreement to the revised charter for continuation of the GAC-AG meetings.

The GAC received a briefing from Assistant Secretary Larry Corcoran on the ability of an applicant to change its applied-for string (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-dryden-05jun14-en.pdf) to the GAC to address the questions listed in Annex II.

The Board has established a working group to develop guidelines on the ability to change string, on privacy issues, and on transition of certain functions (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-dryden-05jun14-en.pdf) to the GAC to address the questions listed in Annex II. The Board also welcomes the GAC Chair's letter of 5 June 2014.

On 5 June 2014, the NGPC provided a written briefing on the ability of an applicant to change its applied-for string (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-dryden-05jun14-en.pdf) to the GAC to address the questions listed in Annex II. The Board welcomes the GAC Chair's letter of 5 June 2014.
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The GAC agreed to establish a Working Group on Public Safety and Security. The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary. The GAC has made a comprehensive response to the GAC advice from the ICANN51 (Los Angeles). Each meetings page now outlines a guide to visa requirements and preparations. The GAC decided to establish a Working Group on Human Rights and ICANN. The GAC has also made recommendations to the ICANN Board on the implementation of GAC-adopted recommendations as covered by the Board in its recent meeting. ENFORCE has work on some aspects, engaging with ICANN69 Virtual Annual General Meeting Communique. 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.
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The GAC prioritized consideration of policy issues related to the impact of COVID-19 related DNS abuse.

The GAC heard presentations on the impact of COVID-19 related DNS abuse and expressed concerns among some GAC Members. One GAC member stated that the efforts of registries and registrars to address DNS Abuse both proactively and reactively, as well as the initiatives by SSAC and ICANN operations, should continue and be of high priority to the GAC.

Presenters also contributed to the high-interest topics identified by the GAC and noted that the ICANN68 Virtual Policy Forum Communique (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-ismail-07jul20-en.pdf). 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 predicted 40-day public comment period for any new draft reports of the Cross Community Working Party on ICANN Accountability Work Stream 2 (WS2) Recommendations.

The Board acknowledged the ICANN68 Virtual Policy Forum Communique on 30 September 2020 to discuss the ICANN Virtual Policy Forum Communique.
The GAC received an update that the GNSO Council had adopted a revised charter concerning a Sound ranking group to produce policy recommendations which includes content from previous work and the conclusion of the process of selecting a chair prior to moving ahead with such policy efforts.

The Board acknowledged the ICANN68 Virtual Policy Forum Communique on 7 July 2020 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-07jul20-en.pdf), and the Board-IGO-INGO Identifiers in All gTLDs PDP Working Group, and on 30 September 2020 to discuss the ICANN Virtual Policy Forum Communique.

The Board acknowledged the ICANN Virtual Policy Forum Communique on 4 July 2020 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-07jul20-en.pdf), and the Board-IGO-INGO Identifiers in All gTLDs PDP Working Group, and on 30 September 2020 to discuss the ICANN Virtual Policy Forum Communique.
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.

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.

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.
The GAC welcomes the progress made in the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on gTLD Registration Data and in particular for publication of the Phase 1 EPDP Initial Report for public comment. The GAC notes that the EPDP is designed to produce recommendations, including the creation of a model for a standardized system for access to and disclosure of data (SSAD). The GAC will review these recommendations and will provide its input accordingly. Furthermore, the GAC notes the interactions between the Global Data Protection Forum, the SSAD team, and the Board of Directors (Board).

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.

The Board discussed the data and disclosure of technical information was not an issue, follow up to previous advice will be tracked on open advice items related to the same topic.

The Board reviewed the data and disclosure of technical information was not an issue, follow up to previous advice will be tracked on open advice items related to the same topic.
The GAC discussed Subsequent Rounds of new gTLDs, following the publication of the Subsequent Round for New gTLDs PDP WG (SubPro PDP WG) Draft Final Report. The GAC engaged in discussions with the SubPro PDP WG Co-Chairs on recent developments in the PDP WG, their initial reactions to the GAC consensus comment filed on 29 September 2020, and letters submitted by the ICANN Board to the PDP WG. The GAC also discussed the letters to the PDP WG on the process for input from the ICANN Community, specifically the current work of the various SubPro PDP WG sub-groups and the plan for submitting comments to the PDP WG. The GAC thanked the SubPro PDP WG Co-Chairs for their engagement and cooperation with the GAC throughout the course of the PDP WG process, and recognized the tremendous efforts of all the ICANN Community members participating in the PDP Proces. The GAC also highlighted the importance of the PDP WG in advancing the interests of the ICANN Community. The GAC noted that the PDP WG is expected to deliver its Final Report to the GNSO Council by the end of December 2020, with the assumption that the policy recommendations could be delivered to the ICANN Board in Q1 of 2021. The PDP WG is presently in an initial stage of the review process for the 50+ comments received during the public comment period. GAC Topic Leads invited GAC Members and Observers to join in the GAC efforts regarding Subsequent Rounds of new gTLDs in the coming months, and identified the various opportunities for potential GAC input in the forthcoming months, spanning from input to the PDP WG, to the GNSO Council or to the Board as soon as the policy recommendations are submitted to it.
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 (SubPro PDP). GAC Vice-Chairs provided an overview to GAC members on priority topics to the GAC: 

- Clarity and Predictability of Application Process
- Public Interest Commitment (PICs) and Global Public Interest
- Applicant Support and Participation of Underserved Regions
- Closed Generic TLDs
- GAC Early Warnings and GAC Advice
- Community-Based Applications
- Auctions/Mechanisms of Last Resort

On predictability, some 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 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 SPIRT Recommendations, in which the GAC expects to be included as well.

Furthermore, GAC members emphasized the importance of the opportunity for applicants to participate on an equal footing on the SPIRT by all interested communities. On Public Interest Commitment (PICs), GAC members observed that any future PICs need to be enforceable through clear contractual obligations, and consequences for the failure to meet those obligations should be specified in the relevant agreements with Contracted Parties. Additional mandatory and voluntary PICs should be enacted wherever possible. GAC members noted that currently there are no policy recommendations on DNS Abuse Mitigation in the Final Report, which remains a high priority issue. 

On Applicant Support Program, GAC members shared the importance of fostering gTLD applications from a diverse array of applicants from all regions and that every effort be made to increase the number of applications from underrepresented regions. GAC members also reiterated the GAC’s support to proposals to reduce or eliminate ongoing ICANN registry fees to expand financial support. 

On Closed Generic TLDs, GAC members noted support for the proposed suspension of Closed Generic TLD applications until policy recommendations are developed by consensus, as per the At-Large minority statement. GAC members drew the attention of the Board and community to the GAC consensus comments on the At-Large Minority Statement on the GAC’s Comment on the Beijing Consensus on Closed Generic TLDs. GAC members noted that the delegation of closed generic TLDs, which serves a public interest, are developed by consensus, and that the At-Large minority statement on Closed Generic TLDs is the comment on the GAC’s action on Closed Generics. The role of the GAC in this context is to provide advice to the ICANN Board on the Final Report of the GAC Consensus Advice on Closed Generic TLDs. GAC members also reiterated the GAC’s support to proposals to reduce or eliminate ongoing ICANN registry fees to expand financial support. 

On GAC Early Warnings/GAC Advice, in regard to recommendation 30.6, some GAC Members proposed to recall the compromise language presented by the GAC, as it may not always be possible for an applicant to address a specific concern expressed in a GAC Early Warning. 

On Community Based Applications, some GAC Members noted support for the proposed suspension of Community Based Applications, while others noted that further clarification on the delegation of Closed Generic TLDs is needed to ensure that the delegation is equitable and promotes public interest. 

On Community Based Applications, some GAC Members noted support for the proposed suspension of Community Based Applications, while others noted that further clarification on the delegation of Closed Generic TLDs is needed to ensure that the delegation is equitable and promotes public interest.

The Board acknowledged the ICANN70 Communique on 12 May 2021: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2021-05-12-en#2.d

1. The Board acknowledged the ICANN70 Communique on 12 May 2021: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2021-05-12-en#2.d

Phase 2a of the EPDP Phase 2a discusses important issues relevant to the functioning Domain Name System. For example, data suggests that only around 13% of domains registered by end-users are served by gTLDs. Records identified during the checks, triggering the registrar’s obligation to solicit accurate and complete information from the registrant.
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Accuracy of registration data is also an essential tool to mitigate DNS abuse. The GDPR, as well as other data protection regimes and ICANN’s Contract Compliance should ensure enforcement of the security, stability, reliability, and resiliency of the DNS. Accuracy of domain name registration data is fundamental to both the security and stability of the DNS.
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Community and ICANN org prior to the launch of a second round of New gTLDs. The GAC also emphasized the importance of taking action to encourage improved accuracy. DNS Abuse should be addressed in collaboration with the ICANN Community and ICANN org prior to the launch of a second round of New gTLDs. The GAC also emphasized the importance of taking action to encourage improved accuracy.
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of registration data is redacted as compared to what is required by relevant data protection laws. The GAC reiterated, in line with the first GAC Resolution, that the data of legal and natural persons should be distinguished from one another, and that policies and measures to prevent inappropriate disclosure of personal data should be designed in line with the requirements of the GDPR, as well as other data protection regimes and ICANN’s Contract Compliance. The GAC also emphasized the importance of taking action to encourage improved accuracy.
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of registration data is redacted as compared to what is required by relevant data protection laws. The GAC reiterated, in line with the first GAC Resolution, that the data of legal and natural persons should be distinguished from one another, and that policies and measures to prevent inappropriate disclosure of personal data should be designed in line with the requirements of the GDPR, as well as other data protection regimes and ICANN’s Contract Compliance. The GAC also emphasized the importance of taking action to encourage improved accuracy.
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of registration data is redacted as compared to what is required by relevant data protection laws. The GAC reiterated, in line with the first GAC Resolution, that the data of legal and natural persons should be distinguished from one another, and that policies and measures to prevent inappropriate disclosure of personal data should be designed in line with the requirements of the GDPR, as well as other data protection regimes and ICANN’s Contract Compliance. The GAC also emphasized the importance of taking action to encourage improved accuracy.
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of registration data is redacted as compared to what is required by relevant data protection laws. The GAC reiterated, in line with the first GAC Resolution, that the data of legal and natural persons should be distinguished from one another, and that policies and measures to prevent inappropriate disclosure of personal data should be designed in line with the requirements of the GDPR, as well as other data protection regimes and ICANN’s Contract Compliance. The GAC also emphasized the importance of taking action to encourage improved accuracy.
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of registration data is redacted as compared to what is required by relevant data protection laws. The GAC reiterated, in line with the first GAC Resolution, that the data of legal and natural persons should be distinguished from one another, and that policies and measures to prevent inappropriate disclosure of personal data should be designed in line with the requirements of the GDPR, as well as other data protection regimes and ICANN’s Contract Compliance. The GAC also emphasized the importance of taking action to encourage improved accuracy.
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of registration data is redacted as compared to what is required by relevant data protection laws. The GAC reiterated, in line with the first GAC Resolution, that the data of legal and natural persons should be distinguished from one another, and that policies and measures to prevent inappropriate disclosure of personal data should be designed in line with the requirements of the GDPR, as well as other data protection regimes and ICANN’s Contract Compliance. The GAC also emphasized the importance of taking action to encourage improved accuracy.
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of registration data is redacted as compared to what is required by relevant data protection laws. The GAC reiterated, in line with the first GAC Resolution, that the data of legal and natural persons should be distinguished from one another, and that policies and measures to prevent inappropriate disclosure of personal data should be designed in line with the requirements of the GDPR, as well as other data protection regimes and ICANN’s Contract Compliance. The GAC also emphasized the importance of taking action to encourage improved accuracy.
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of registration data is redacted as compared to what is required by relevant data protection laws. The GAC reiterated, in line with the first GAC Resolution, that the data of legal and natural persons should be distinguished from one another, and that policies and measures to prevent inappropriate disclosure of personal data should be designed in line with the requirements of the GDPR, as well as other data protection regimes and ICANN’s Contract Compliance. The GAC also emphasized the importance of taking action to encourage improved accuracy.
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of registration data is redacted as compared to what is required by relevant data protection laws. The GAC reiterated, in line with the first GAC Resolution, that the data of legal and natural persons should be distinguished from one another, and that policies and measures to prevent inappropriate disclosure of personal data should be designed in line with the requirements of the GDPR, as well as other data protection regimes and ICANN’s Contract Compliance. The GAC also emphasized the importance of taking action to encourage improved accuracy.
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of registration data is redacted as compared to what is required by relevant data protection laws. The GAC reiterated, in line with the first GAC Resolution, that the data of legal and natural persons should be distinguished from one another, and that policies and measures to prevent inappropriate disclosure of personal data should be designed in line with the requirements of the GDPR, as well as other data protection regimes and ICANN’s Contract Compliance. The GAC also emphasized the importance of taking action to encourage improved accuracy.
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of registration data is redacted as compared to what is required by relevant data protection laws. The GAC reiterated, in line with the first GAC Resolution, that the data of legal and natural persons should be distinguished from one another, and that policies and measures to prevent inappropriate disclosure of personal data should be designed in line with the requirements of the GDPR, as well as other data protection regimes and ICANN’s Contract Compliance. The GAC also emphasized the importance of taking action to encourage improved accuracy.
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of registration data is redacted as compared to what is required by relevant data protection laws. The GAC reiterated, in line with the first GAC Resolution, that the data of legal and natural persons should be distinguished from one another, and that policies and measures to prevent inappropriate disclosure of personal data should be designed in line with the requirements of the GDPR, as well as other data protection regimes and ICANN’s Contract Compliance. The GAC also emphasized the importance of taking action to encourage improved accuracy.
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of registration data is redacted as compared to what is required by relevant data protection laws. The GAC reiterated, in line with the first GAC Resolution, that the data of legal and natural persons should be distinguished from one another, and that policies and measures to prevent inappropriate disclosure of personal data should be designed in line with the requirements of the GDPR, as well as other data protection regimes and ICANN’s Contract Compliance. The GAC also emphasized the importance of taking action to encourage improved accuracy.
On 25 June 2013 the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of Mitigating abusive Complaints Making and Handling Documentation

ANNEX I. 2.

While respecting privacy and confidentiality, Registry Operators will periodically conduct a technical analysis to assess whether domains in its gTLD currently registered are being used to perpetuate security threats, such as phishing, phishing, malware, and botnets. The provision will also require Registry Operators to 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 provide these to ICANN upon request. The contents of the reports will be publicly available as appropriate. Because there are multiple ways for a Registry Operator to implement the required security checks, ICANN will hold regular community participation including quarterly with the ICANN in such area or region to discuss the security mechanism Registry Operators are using and how effective the mechanism is to prevent illegal conduct in connection with contractual obligations. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s response of 19 June 2013.

On 25 June 2013 the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of Mitigating abusive Complaints Making and Handling Documentation

ANNEX I. 4.

While respecting privacy and confidentiality, Registry Operators will periodically conduct a technical analysis to assess whether domains in its gTLD currently registered are being used to perpetuate security threats, such as phishing, phishing, malware, and botnets. The provision will also require Registry Operators to 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 provide these to ICANN upon request. The contents of the reports will be publicly available as appropriate. Because there are multiple ways for a Registry Operator to implement the required security checks, ICANN will hold regular community participation including quarterly with the ICANN in such area or region to discuss the security mechanism Registry Operators are using and how effective the mechanism is to prevent illegal conduct in connection with contractual obligations. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s response of 19 June 2013.

4-022109 CAR-1301 Enquiry/Comment 05/11/2013

On 25 June 2013 the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of Mitigating abusive Complaints Making and Handling Documentation

ANNEX I. 3.

While respecting privacy and confidentiality, Registry Operators will periodically conduct a technical analysis to assess whether domains in its gTLD currently registered are being used to perpetuate security threats, such as phishing, phishing, malware, and botnets. The provision will also require Registry Operators to 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 provide these to ICANN upon request. The contents of the reports will be publicly available as appropriate. Because there are multiple ways for a Registry Operator to implement the required security checks, ICANN will hold regular community participation including quarterly with the ICANN in such area or region to discuss the security mechanism Registry Operators are using and how effective the mechanism is to prevent illegal conduct in connection with contractual obligations. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s response of 19 June 2013.

4-022117 CAR-1301 Enquiry/Comment 07/11/2013

On 25 June 2013 the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of Mitigating abusive Complaints Making and Handling Documentation

ANNEX II

On 25 June 2013 the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of Mitigating abusive Complaints Making and Handling Documentation

ANNEX I. 3.

While respecting privacy and confidentiality, Registry Operators will periodically conduct a technical analysis to assess whether domains in its gTLD currently registered are being used to perpetuate security threats, such as phishing, phishing, malware, and botnets. The provision will also require Registry Operators to 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 provide these to ICANN upon request. The contents of the reports will be publicly available as appropriate. Because there are multiple ways for a Registry Operator to implement the required security checks, ICANN will hold regular community participation including quarterly with the ICANN in such area or region to discuss the security mechanism Registry Operators are using and how effective the mechanism is to prevent illegal conduct in connection with contractual obligations. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s response of 19 June 2013.

On 25 June 2013 the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of Mitigating abusive Complaints Making and Handling Documentation

ANNEX II

On 25 June 2013 the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of Mitigating abusive Complaints Making and Handling Documentation

ANNEX I. 3.

While respecting privacy and confidentiality, Registry Operators will periodically conduct a technical analysis to assess whether domains in its gTLD currently registered are being used to perpetuate security threats, such as phishing, phishing, malware, and botnets. The provision will also require Registry Operators to 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 provide these to ICANN upon request. The contents of the reports will be publicly available as appropriate. Because there are multiple ways for a Registry Operator to implement the required security checks, ICANN will hold regular community participation including quarterly with the ICANN in such area or region to discuss the security mechanism Registry Operators are using and how effective the mechanism is to prevent illegal conduct in connection with contractual obligations. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s response of 19 June 2013.
On 25 June 2013 the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of consequences for ICANN Board Policy Recommendations on IGO-INGO, 

WHOIS string as a TLD for ICANN Board. 

The GAC notes that there continue to be a range of activities being progressed in relation to WHOIS, including discussions on how to improve the WHOIS domain name directory. In its letter dated 15 October 2014, the Board notes that the discussion on WHOIS-related safeguards has been carried forward. The Board notes that the Deviation Panel has not yet met to consider the recommendations of the Panel, including the proposal for the inclusion of a WHOIS domain name directory in the new .ico domain name.

The Board notes that the question about what constitutes appropriate protections for ICANN Board Policy Recommendations on IGO-INGO, including discussions on how to improve the WHOIS domain name directory. In its letter dated 15 October 2014, the Board notes that the discussion on WHOIS-related safeguards has been carried forward. The Board notes that the Deviation Panel has not yet met to consider the recommendations of the Panel, including the proposal for the inclusion of a WHOIS domain name directory in the new .ico domain name.

The GAC notes that the question about what constitutes appropriate protections for ICANN Board Policy Recommendations on IGO-INGO, including discussions on how to improve the WHOIS domain name directory. In its letter dated 15 October 2014, the Board notes that the discussion on WHOIS-related safeguards has been carried forward. The Board notes that the Deviation Panel has not yet met to consider the recommendations of the Panel, including the proposal for the inclusion of a WHOIS domain name directory in the new .ico domain name.

The GAC notes that the question about what constitutes appropriate protections for ICANN Board Policy Recommendations on IGO-INGO, including discussions on how to improve the WHOIS domain name directory. In its letter dated 15 October 2014, the Board notes that the discussion on WHOIS-related safeguards has been carried forward. The Board notes that the Deviation Panel has not yet met to consider the recommendations of the Panel, including the proposal for the inclusion of a WHOIS domain name directory in the new .ico domain name.

The GAC notes that the question about what constitutes appropriate protections for ICANN Board Policy Recommendations on IGO-INGO, including discussions on how to improve the WHOIS domain name directory. In its letter dated 15 October 2014, the Board notes that the discussion on WHOIS-related safeguards has been carried forward. The Board notes that the Deviation Panel has not yet met to consider the recommendations of the Panel, including the proposal for the inclusion of a WHOIS domain name directory in the new .ico domain name.
The NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to the GAC regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response in its scorecard. The ICANN Board Chair provided written responses, including the requested Safeguard Advice Evaluation Process and the Community Priority Evaluation Process, following the rejection of a number of applications. As part of its rationale, the NGPC recommended that the ICANN Board request the NGPC to take into account the outcome of the Community Priority Evaluation Process, following the rejection of a number of applications. The ICANN Board Chair provided written responses, including the requested implementation of WHOIS-related safeguards; the Public Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Process; and the strings for all new gTLDs and Category 1 (restricted, consumer protection, gTLDs and Category 1 strings). The ICANN Board Chair provided written responses, including the requested Safeguard Advice Evaluation Process and the Community Priority Evaluation Process, following the rejection of a number of applications. The ICANN Board Chair provided written responses, including the requested Safeguard Advice Evaluation Process and the Community Priority Evaluation Process, following the rejection of a number of applications. The ICANN Board Chair provided written responses, including the requested Safeguard Advice Evaluation Process and the Community Priority Evaluation Process, following the rejection of a number of applications. The ICANN Board Chair provided written responses, including the requested Safeguard Advice Evaluation Process and the Community Priority Evaluation Process, following the rejection of a number of applications. The ICANN Board Chair provided written responses, including the requested Safeguard Advice Evaluation Process and the Community Priority Evaluation Process, following the rejection of a number of applications. The ICANN Board Chair provided written responses, including the requested Safeguard Advice Evaluation Process and the Community Priority Evaluation Process, following the rejection of a number of applications. The ICANN Board Chair provided written responses, including the requested Safeguard Advice Evaluation Process and the Community Priority Evaluation Process, following the rejection of a number of applications. The ICANN Board Chair provided written responses, including the requested Safeguard Advice Evaluation Process and the Community Priority Evaluation Process, following the rejection of a number of applications. The ICANN Board Chair provided written responses, including the requested Safeguard Advice Evaluation Process and the Community Priority Evaluation Process, following the rejection of a number of applications. The ICANN Board Chair provided written responses, including the requested Safeguard Advice Evaluation Process and the Community Priority Evaluation Process, following the rejection of a number of applications.
The NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to 2.a.i.1.c.

On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response.
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1.a.I - 1.d.I.

The Board acknowledges the advice in the scorecard. The Board accepts this advice. ICANN will not enter into registry agreements with applicants for the identified string at this time. The NGPC notes that the IPN has already confirmed that it will inform applicants of the decision. The NGPC can provide a timeline for final consideration of the string, and will identify the interested parties noted in the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's report of 7 October 2015.

The Board adopted a scorecard related to the GAC Communique and addressed the advice in the scorecard, including a new appendix attached to the scorecard. The Board includes in the scorecard: The Board accepts this advice. ICANN will not enter into registry agreements with applicants for the identified string at this time. The NGPC notes that the NGPC has already confirmed that it will inform applicants of the decision. The NGPC can provide a timeline for final consideration of the string, and will identify the interested parties noted in the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's report of 7 October 2015.

NGPC F8.12

1.d.I. The Board notes that the IPN has already confirmed that it will inform applicants of the decision. The Board accepts this advice. ICANN will not enter into registry agreements with applicants for the identified string at this time. The NGPC notes that the NGPC has already confirmed that it will inform applicants of the decision. The NGPC can provide a timeline for final consideration of the string, and will identify the interested parties noted in the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's report of 7 October 2015.

Phase 1 | Implementation
The Board notes the actions taken by ICANN in response to the GAC's advice. The Board also notes that the NGPC has already confirmed that it will inform applicants of the decision. The Board accepts this advice. ICANN will not enter into registry agreements with applicants for the identified string at this time. The NGPC notes that the NGPC has already confirmed that it will inform applicants of the decision. The NGPC can provide a timeline for final consideration of the string, and will identify the interested parties noted in the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's report of 7 October 2015.

Phase 2 | Implementation
The Board acknowledges the advice in the scorecard and implemented appropriate safeguards. The Board also notes that the NGPC has already confirmed that it will inform applicants of the decision. The Board accepts this advice. ICANN will not enter into registry agreements with applicants for the identified string at this time. The NGPC notes that the NGPC has already confirmed that it will inform applicants of the decision. The NGPC can provide a timeline for final consideration of the string, and will identify the interested parties noted in the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's report of 7 October 2015.

Phase 3 | Implementation
The Board acknowledges the advice in the scorecard and implemented appropriate safeguards. The Board also notes that the NGPC has already confirmed that it will inform applicants of the decision. The Board accepts this advice. ICANN will not enter into registry agreements with applicants for the identified string at this time. The NGPC notes that the NGPC has already confirmed that it will inform applicants of the decision. The NGPC can provide a timeline for final consideration of the string, and will identify the interested parties noted in the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's report of 7 October 2015.
The GAC convened an open session for the community to inform.
The Board considered the Second Accountability and Transparency Review Team.
The GAC was briefed by the Board-GAC Recommendation Implementation Working Group (BGRI-WG) and agreed to specific ATRT2 recommendations being proposed by the Working Group. The Board also supported the ATRT2 recommendations. The Board recognized that the ATRT2 process continues.

On 30 July 2014 the Board took the following resolutions: Resolved (2014.07.30.14), the Board highly encourages all parties interested in the Internet, including stakeholders. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s resolution of 30 July 2014.

The GAC expressed its thanks for a briefing provided by the Board-GNSO Consultation Group on 23-24 April 2014.

This item is considered complete as of 26 June 2014. The Board consulted the General Assembly and Transparency Review Team (ATRT2) Recommendations on 26 June 2014 and passed the following resolutions: Resolved (2014.06.26.14), the Board accepts all ATRT2 recommendations. The Board also supported the ATRT2 process continues.

The Board considered the Second Accountability and Transparency Review Team (ATRT2) Recommendations on 26 June 2014 and passed the following resolutions: Resolved (2014.06.26.14), the Board accepts all ATRT2 recommendations.

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to the ATRT2 Recommendations relating to GAC activities and are engaged in implementation planning. Given that the Board considered the GAC advice concerning a permanent post-registration notification mechanism that will notify an affected IGO when a third party registers a second level domain matching that organization’s acronym, the Board may only partially accept the GAC advice concerning a permanent post-registration notification mechanism that will notify an affected IGO when a third party registers a second level domain matching that organization’s acronym. (see: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-scorecard-07oct15-en.pdf). This item is considered complete as of 26 June 2014.

The Board considered the Second Accountability and Transparency Review Team (ATRT2) Recommendations on 26 June 2014 and passed the following resolutions: Resolved (2014.06.26.14), the Board accepts all ATRT2 recommendations.

The Board considered the Second Accountability and Transparency Review Team (ATRT2) Recommendations on 26 June 2014 and passed the following resolutions: Resolved (2014.06.26.14), the Board accepts all ATRT2 recommendations.
The Board considered this advice and the general topic of the Adoption of the Framework of Global Policy Options for Two-Level Domain Names at the Second Level on 12 February 2015 and took the following resolution. Resolved (2015.02.12.16), the Board accepts the advice of the Global Core Group to resolve the issue of IGO protections.

The Board notes the advice in paragraph 3.3 of the Global Core Group report and that it is in the best interest of both ICANN and the GAC to fully consider all relevant aspects of this issue. The Board will consider this advice as part of its ongoing work to develop policies that are consistent with international law and practice, including internationally recognized human rights commitments.

The Board recognizes that the advice on IGO protections includes several recommendations that are consistent with the United Nations (UN) and the GAC's advice in previous resolutions and that the Board's actions in this area should be consistent with those of other multistakeholder decision-making processes.

The Board notes that the GAC's advice on IGO protections is consistent with the United Nations (UN) and that the Board's actions in this area should be consistent with those of other multistakeholder decision-making processes.

The Board recognizes that the advice on IGO protections includes several recommendations that are consistent with the UN's universally recognized human rights commitments. The Board will consider this advice as part of its ongoing work to develop policies that are consistent with international law and practice.

The Board notes that the GAC's advice on IGO protections is consistent with the UN's universally recognized human rights commitments. The Board will consider this advice as part of its ongoing work to develop policies that are consistent with international law and practice.

The Board recognizes that the advice on IGO protections includes several recommendations that are consistent with the UN's universally recognized human rights commitments. The Board will consider this advice as part of its ongoing work to develop policies that are consistent with international law and practice.

The Board notes that the GAC's advice on IGO protections is consistent with the UN's universally recognized human rights commitments. The Board will consider this advice as part of its ongoing work to develop policies that are consistent with international law and practice.

The Board recognizes that the advice on IGO protections includes several recommendations that are consistent with the UN's universally recognized human rights commitments. The Board will consider this advice as part of its ongoing work to develop policies that are consistent with international law and practice.

The Board notes that the GAC's advice on IGO protections is consistent with the UN's universally recognized human rights commitments. The Board will consider this advice as part of its ongoing work to develop policies that are consistent with international law and practice.

The Board recognizes that the advice on IGO protections includes several recommendations that are consistent with the UN's universally recognized human rights commitments. The Board will consider this advice as part of its ongoing work to develop policies that are consistent with international law and practice.
The GAC reiterates its advice on this issue and advises the Board that a. on 3 February 2016 the Board considered the Dublin Communique and provided this AR-001345 ICANN54 Dublin Communique 10/21/2015 10/21/2015 Community Priority gTLD Safeguards: Current II. 5.a.I. - 5.c. 4.a.I - 4.a.IV. Affirmation of Commitments. Competition, Trust and Consumer Choice Review (CCT) under the GNSO’s review of issues for improving procedures relating to Ombudsman on this issue when preparing the GAC’s input into the iv. the GAC will take into account the final report of the ICANN applicants in auctions when in competition with commercial applicants; mechanisms; and the specific challenges faced by some community in a manner in which justified community interests are best served; iii. the GAC will take into account the advice given by the GAC on this subject since the aspects of the current round should be undertaken, taking into account the advice given by the GAC on this subject since the 2015 Internet Drafts on Security, Safety and Stability (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/about-art-17-01oct15-en.pdf). The Scorecard lists the various reviews and metrics where this item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 3 February 2016. The GAC advises the Board that before defining the modalities for new gTLD program, the Board acknowledged that the GAC continues to keep under review the community application process for new gTLDs. The Board has also taken into consideration input from the Registry Stakeholder Group expressed in its 9 November 2015 letter to the Board (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/diaz-to-crocker-09nov15-en.pdf). As part of the GNSO’s consideration of submitted comments, staff has performed outreach to governments to seek clarification of comments previously submitted. This further demonstrates ICANN’s ongoing consideration of comments received, regardless of the period for the comments. The Board stands ready to hear from the GAC on this subject and welcomes the GAC’s ongoing advice on this subject. b. on 23 December 2015, ICANN announced the individuals selected to serve on the New gTLD Program Reviews, in particular, as they relate to concerns of governments, and various laws and international agreements or where they may affect public interest, consumer trust and consumer choice (CCT) as called for by ICANN’s Affirmation of Commitments team that will review the New gTLD Program in relation to competition, consumer protection and consumer choice (CCT) as called for by ICANN’s Affirmation of Commitments. The Drafting Team will work with the GAC and the community to ultimately publish a final draft Framework for public comment. The next steps are for the Drafting Team to review and provide feedback. In the spirit of mutual cooperation and transparency, the Board stands ready to hear from the GAC on this subject and welcomes the GAC’s ongoing advice on this subject.
On 28 October 2016 the ICANN Board Chair wrote to the GAC Chair to inform the
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1.a.I.

On 13 December 2016 the Board considered the results of the second-level country/territory codes at the ISO-3166 list as gTLDs
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On 28 October 2016 the ICANN Board Chair wrote to the GAC Chair to inform the
GAC of the Board’s delay in providing a formal response to the Helsinki Communique due to the considerable effort required to complete the IANA transition.

On 13 December 2016 the Board considered the Helsinki Communique and provided this response in its scorecard: The Board understands that the GAC has concerns about the progress of the IANA transition. The Board encourages the implementation of the Transition From IANA Stewardship to ICANN,

On 13 December 2016 the Board considered the Helsinki Communique and provided this response in its scorecard: The Board encourages the implementation of the Transition From IANA Stewardship to ICANN,

On 13 December 2016 the Board considered the Helsinki Communique and provided this response in its scorecard: The Board encourages the implementation of the Transition From IANA Stewardship to ICANN,
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On 13 December 2016 the Board considered the Helsinki Communique and provided this response in its scorecard: The Board encourages the implementation of the Transition From IANA Stewardship to ICANN,

On 13 December 2016 the Board considered the Helsinki Communique and provided this response in its scorecard: The Board encourages the implementation of the Transition From IANA Stewardship to ICANN,
On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and,

1.a.I. protection of IGO Names

Protection of IGO Names

The Board reiterates its advice contained in the Helsinki Communique, and

1.a.II. Protection of Red Cross/Red Crescent

Protection of Red Cross/Red Crescent

The GAC invites the GNSO Working Group on Curative Rights Protection of Red Cross/Red Crescent identifiers and names of Red Cross/Red Crescent organizations which are not registered with ICANN, and due to name

5.a.I. Protection of IGO Names and Acronyms

Protection of IGO Names and Acronyms

The Board reiterates its advice contained in the Helsinki Communique and

4.a.VI. Mitigation of Domain Identifiers and names of IGOs
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The Board reiterates its advice contained in the Helsinki Communique and
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The Board reiterates its advice contained in the Helsinki Communique and
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On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique.

On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique.

The Board considered this advice item on 18 May 2017 and the general topic of Protections under the ICANN57 Hyderabad Communique.
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On 4 February 2018 the Board considered the Abu Dhabi Communique and provided its response in its considered. The Board accepts the GAC advice to ensure that policy recommendations, including those that may arise from consideration of the current draft of the new gTLD application process, are consistent with the GAC advice and to the extent possible, and also acknowledges the GAC’s longstanding advice on the need to protect IIIs and their corresponding policies. The Board also receives the GAC’s advice that the IIIs should be considered in the context of the outcomes of the WHOIS and ICANN’s policy on the protection of IIIs.

The Board notes that the GAC has recommended the Board consider the Abu Dhabi Communique and provides its response to its considered. The Board accepts the GAC advice to ensure that policy recommendations, including those that may arise from consideration of the current draft of the new gTLD application process, are consistent with the GAC advice and to the extent possible, and also acknowledges the GAC’s longstanding advice on the need to protect IIIs and their corresponding policies. The Board also receives the GAC’s advice that the IIIs should be considered in the context of the outcomes of the WHOIS and ICANN’s policy on the protection of IIIs.

The Board also notes that the GAC has recommended the Board consider the Abu Dhabi Communique and provides its response to its considered. The Board accepts the GAC advice to ensure that policy recommendations, including those that may arise from consideration of the current draft of the new gTLD application process, are consistent with the GAC advice and to the extent possible, and also acknowledges the GAC’s longstanding advice on the need to protect IIIs and their corresponding policies. The Board also receives the GAC’s advice that the IIIs should be considered in the context of the outcomes of the WHOIS and ICANN’s policy on the protection of IIIs.

The Board notes that the GAC has recommended the Board consider the Abu Dhabi Communique and provides its response to its considered. The Board accepts the GAC advice to ensure that policy recommendations, including those that may arise from consideration of the current draft of the new gTLD application process, are consistent with the GAC advice and to the extent possible, and also acknowledges the GAC’s longstanding advice on the need to protect IIIs and their corresponding policies. The Board also receives the GAC’s advice that the IIIs should be considered in the context of the outcomes of the WHOIS and ICANN’s policy on the protection of IIIs.

The Board also notes that the GAC has recommended the Board consider the Abu Dhabi Communique and provides its response to its considered. The Board accepts the GAC advice to ensure that policy recommendations, including those that may arise from consideration of the current draft of the new gTLD application process, are consistent with the GAC advice and to the extent possible, and also acknowledges the GAC’s longstanding advice on the need to protect IIIs and their corresponding policies. The Board also receives the GAC’s advice that the IIIs should be considered in the context of the outcomes of the WHOIS and ICANN’s policy on the protection of IIIs.

The Board also notes that the GAC has recommended the Board consider the Abu Dhabi Communique and provides its response to its considered. The Board accepts the GAC advice to ensure that policy recommendations, including those that may arise from consideration of the current draft of the new gTLD application process, are consistent with the GAC advice and to the extent possible, and also acknowledges the GAC’s longstanding advice on the need to protect IIIs and their corresponding policies. The Board also receives the GAC’s advice that the IIIs should be considered in the context of the outcomes of the WHOIS and ICANN’s policy on the protection of IIIs.

The Board also notes that the GAC has recommended the Board consider the Abu Dhabi Communique and provides its response to its considered. The Board accepts the GAC advice to ensure that policy recommendations, including those that may arise from consideration of the current draft of the new gTLD application process, are consistent with the GAC advice and to the extent possible, and also acknowledges the GAC’s longstanding advice on the need to protect IIIs and their corresponding policies. The Board also receives the GAC’s advice that the IIIs should be considered in the context of the outcomes of the WHOIS and ICANN’s policy on the protection of IIIs.

The Board also notes that the GAC has recommended the Board consider the Abu Dhabi Communique and provides its response to its considered. The Board accepts the GAC advice to ensure that policy recommendations, including those that may arise from consideration of the current draft of the new gTLD application process, are consistent with the GAC advice and to the extent possible, and also acknowledges the GAC’s longstanding advice on the need to protect IIIs and their corresponding policies. The Board also receives the GAC’s advice that the IIIs should be considered in the context of the outcomes of the WHOIS and ICANN’s policy on the protection of IIIs.
On 4 February 2018 the Board considered the Abu Dhabi Communique and provided its response in its turn. The Board accepts the advice and direction the GAC provided on the Board’s consideration of the WHOIS Communique, in particular, the Board has made it a high priority to find, to the greatest extent possible, a path forward to find a way for the Board to continue to engage with the EU while maintaining a proportionate access to WHOIS/RDS data for legitimate purposes. This remains a critical path for the Board and is absolutely essential to ensure full compliance with the law at all times. WHOIS/RDS data is critical to public safety, consumer protection, and other organizations’ legitimate purposes, including to combat fraud and deceptive practices.

The Board has been advised by the GAC that it is not the Board’s role to provide legal advice or to determine the lawfulness of a policy proposal, the Board accepts the advice and direction the GAC provided on the Board’s consideration of the WHOIS Communique, in particular, the Board is committed to continuing its work to find, to the greatest extent possible, a path forward to ensure compliance with the law while maintaining a proportionate access to WHOIS/RDS data for legitimate purposes.

At its 4th February meeting the Board, as also evidenced in its 4th February 2018 letter, the Board accepts the advice and direction the GAC provided on the Board’s consideration of the WHOIS Communique, in particular, the Board is committed to continuing its work to find, to the greatest extent possible, a path forward to ensure compliance with the law while maintaining a proportionate access to WHOIS/RDS data for legitimate purposes.

The Board has been advised by the GAC that it is not the Board’s role to provide legal advice or to determine the lawfulness of a policy proposal, the Board accepts the advice and direction the GAC provided on the Board’s consideration of the WHOIS Communique, in particular, the Board is committed to continuing its work to find, to the greatest extent possible, a path forward to ensure compliance with the law while maintaining a proportionate access to WHOIS/RDS data for legitimate purposes.

The Board has been advised by the GAC that it is not the Board’s role to provide legal advice or to determine the lawfulness of a policy proposal, the Board accepts the advice and direction the GAC provided on the Board’s consideration of the WHOIS Communique, in particular, the Board is committed to continuing its work to find, to the greatest extent possible, a path forward to ensure compliance with the law while maintaining a proportionate access to WHOIS/RDS data for legitimate purposes.

The Board has been advised by the GAC that it is not the Board’s role to provide legal advice or to determine the lawfulness of a policy proposal, the Board accepts the advice and direction the GAC provided on the Board’s consideration of the WHOIS Communique, in particular, the Board is committed to continuing its work to find, to the greatest extent possible, a path forward to ensure compliance with the law while maintaining a proportionate access to WHOIS/RDS data for legitimate purposes.

The Board has been advised by the GAC that it is not the Board’s role to provide legal advice or to determine the lawfulness of a policy proposal, the Board accepts the advice and direction the GAC provided on the Board’s consideration of the WHOIS Communique, in particular, the Board is committed to continuing its work to find, to the greatest extent possible, a path forward to ensure compliance with the law while maintaining a proportionate access to WHOIS/RDS data for legitimate purposes.
ICANN61 San Juan Communique

On 30 May 2018 the Board considered the San Juan Communique and provided this message in its scorecard. The Board accepts the advice. As outlined in Section 1.b of the Board's 30 May 2018 resolution and scorecard, ICANN org's Government Affairs team will work with ICANN org's Agreement Services team to address the national governments on this issue and looks forward to further updates on this topic.

As part of their engagement activities, continue to raise awareness about the legitimate purposes identified; provide a detailed rationale for the choices made in the interim model as swiftly as possible, taking into consideration of 30 May 2018.

The GAC considers that in its letter included in the San Juan Communiqué the Board acknowledged that the GAC has in its letter included in the San Juan Communiqué the Amazon.com proposal submitted at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi. The Board acknowledges that the GAC has in its letter included in the San Juan Communiqué the Amazon.com proposal submitted at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi. The Board notes the GAC's concerns regarding this response in its scorecard: The Board accepts this advice. ICANN org's Government Affairs team will work with ICANN org's Agreement Services team to address the national governments on this issue and looks forward to further updates on this topic.

This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 30 May 2018.

Amendments to ICANN's standard Registry and Registrar agreements to incorporate the Temporary Specification every 90 days following adoption. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 30 May 2018.

To comply with the law while ensuring continued availability of Registration Data, as well as consider safeguards for protecting such data in the event that it is not used. Some GAC members considered that these measures are insufficient. The GAC intends to follow up on the implementation of the proposed initiative at ICANN62, bearing in mind the requirements to the fullest extent possible.

GAC members have made themselves available to assist if requested. The GAC considers that in its letter included in the San Juan Communiqué the Board acknowledged that the GAC has in its letter included in the San Juan Communiqué the Amazon.com proposal submitted at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi. The Board acknowledges that the GAC has in its letter included in the San Juan Communiqué the Amazon.com proposal submitted at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi. The Board notes the GAC's concerns regarding this response in its scorecard: The Board accepts this advice. ICANN org's Government Affairs team will work with ICANN org's Agreement Services team to address the national governments on this issue and looks forward to further updates on this topic.

The GAC considers that in its letter included in the San Juan Communiqué the Board acknowledged that the GAC has in its letter included in the San Juan Communiqué the Amazon.com proposal submitted at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi. The Board acknowledges that the GAC has in its letter included in the San Juan Communiqué the Amazon.com proposal submitted at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi. The Board notes the GAC's concerns regarding this response in its scorecard: The Board accepts this advice. ICANN org's Government Affairs team will work with ICANN org's Agreement Services team to address the national governments on this issue and looks forward to further updates on this topic.

The GAC considers that in its letter included in the San Juan Communiqué the Board acknowledged that the GAC has in its letter included in the San Juan Communiqué the Amazon.com proposal submitted at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi. The Board acknowledges that the GAC has in its letter included in the San Juan Communiqué the Amazon.com proposal submitted at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi. The Board notes the GAC's concerns regarding this response in its scorecard: The Board accepts this advice. ICANN org's Government Affairs team will work with ICANN org's Agreement Services team to address the national governments on this issue and looks forward to further updates on this topic.

This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 30 May 2018.

The Board considered the proposed initiative and provided this message in its scorecard. The Board accepts the advice. The Board's 30 May 2018 resolution and scorecard, ICANN org's Government Affairs team and Registrar regarding Registration Data directory services. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 30 May 2018.

The GAC considered the Board's 30 May 2018 resolution and scorecard, ICANN org's Government Affairs team and Registrar regarding Registration Data directory services. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 30 May 2018.

The GAC considered the Board's 30 May 2018 resolution and scorecard, ICANN org's Government Affairs team and Registrar regarding Registration Data directory services. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 30 May 2018.
On 16 September 2018 the Board considered this advice and stated in its scorecard: The Board directed the ICANN org to provide adequate measures to avoid the risk of inaccuracy and completeness of IGO contacts on the list of identifiers. This item is currently in implementation.

The Board initially considered this advice on 30 May 2018. However at the time, the Board’s scorecard and a related discussion on this topic stand as follows.

2.a.I. No. The Board has not made a determination to adopt this advice pending further discussions with the GAC.
On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the Barcelona Communiqué and provided its response in its scorecard. The Board resolution tabled in November 2018 adapting the Measures for Letter/Letter Two-character ASCII Labels to the Barcelona Communiqué was adopted by the Board at its meeting held on 27 January 2019. The Board noted that the Barcelona Communiqué had provided the opportunity to respond to the Barcelona Communiqué. The Board resolution tabled in November 2018 adapting the Measures for Letter/Letter Two-character ASCII Labels to the Barcelona Communiqué was adopted by the Board at its meeting held on 27 January 2019.

On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the Barcelona Communiqué and provided its response in its scorecard. The Board resolution tabled in November 2018 adapting the Measures for Letter/Letter Two-character ASCII Labels to the Barcelona Communiqué was adopted by the Board at its meeting held on 27 January 2019. The Board noted that the Barcelona Communiqué had provided the opportunity to respond to the Barcelona Communiqué. The Board resolution tabled in November 2018 adapting the Measures for Letter/Letter Two-character ASCII Labels to the Barcelona Communiqué was adopted by the Board at its meeting held on 27 January 2019.

The Board noted that the ICANN org is developing a dedicated tool to search and display to GAC members. The ICANN org also describes this service as a way to manage two-character labels at the second-level and that the GAC has issued advice directing members when a risk is identified in order to come to an agreement on how to manage it or to have a third-party assessment of the situation if the name is already registered. The advice was incorporated in the proposed measures to avoid confusion. The tool was subject to further discussion during the Board-GAC Recommendations Implementation (BGRI) meetings at ICANN61, ICANN62 and ICANN63. The Board noted that GAC members have expressed concerns regarding the process for release of two-character labels at the second-level and that the GAC has issued advice directing members when a risk is identified in order to come to an agreement on how to manage it or to have a third-party assessment of the situation if the name is already registered. This advice was incorporated in the proposed measures to avoid confusion. The tool was subject to further discussion during the Board-GAC Recommendations Implementation (BGRI) meetings at ICANN61, ICANN62 and ICANN63. The tool was subject to further discussion during the Board-GAC Recommendations Implementation (BGRI) meetings at ICANN61, ICANN62 and ICANN63.

The Board noted that the ICANN org is developing a dedicated tool to search and display to GAC members. The ICANN org also describes this service as a way to manage two-character labels at the second-level and that the GAC has issued advice directing members when a risk is identified in order to come to an agreement on how to manage it or to have a third-party assessment of the situation if the name is already registered. This advice was incorporated in the proposed measures to avoid confusion. The tool was subject to further discussion during the Board-GAC Recommendations Implementation (BGRI) meetings at ICANN61, ICANN62 and ICANN63. The tool was subject to further discussion during the Board-GAC Recommendations Implementation (BGRI) meetings at ICANN61, ICANN62 and ICANN63. The tool was subject to further discussion during the Board-GAC Recommendations Implementation (BGRI) meetings at ICANN61, ICANN62 and ICANN63.

The Board noted that the ICANN org is developing a dedicated tool to search and display to GAC members. The ICANN org also describes this service as a way to manage two-character labels at the second-level and that the GAC has issued advice directing members when a risk is identified in order to come to an agreement on how to manage it or to have a third-party assessment of the situation if the name is already registered. This advice was incorporated in the proposed measures to avoid confusion. The tool was subject to further discussion during the Board-GAC Recommendations Implementation (BGRI) meetings at ICANN61, ICANN62 and ICANN63. The tool was subject to further discussion during the Board-GAC Recommendations Implementation (BGRI) meetings at ICANN61, ICANN62 and ICANN63. The tool was subject to further discussion during the Board-GAC Recommendations Implementation (BGRI) meetings at ICANN61, ICANN62 and ICANN63.
On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the Barcelona Communique and provided its response in its scorecard. The Board uses the November 2016 resolution as a reference to guide this response. The Board also notes that the GAC advice is scored in its scorecard. The Board considers that the November 2016 resolution provides a clear and comprehensive framework for addressing the issues raised in the GAC advice. The Board also recognizes the importance of maintaining a balance between security, stability, and user experience.

The Board acknowledges that the GAC advice is consistent with the November 2016 resolution. The Board also notes that the GAC advice is consistent with the ICANN’s commitment to the protection of IGTs. The Board also recognizes the importance of maintaining a balance between security, stability, and user experience.

The Board also notes that the GAC advice is consistent with the ICANN’s commitment to the protection of IGTs. The Board also recognizes the importance of maintaining a balance between security, stability, and user experience.

The Board also notes that the GAC advice is consistent with the ICANN’s commitment to the protection of IGTs. The Board also recognizes the importance of maintaining a balance between security, stability, and user experience.

The Board also notes that the GAC advice is consistent with the ICANN’s commitment to the protection of IGTs. The Board also recognizes the importance of maintaining a balance between security, stability, and user experience.

The Board also notes that the GAC advice is consistent with the ICANN’s commitment to the protection of IGTs. The Board also recognizes the importance of maintaining a balance between security, stability, and user experience.

The Board also notes that the GAC advice is consistent with the ICANN’s commitment to the protection of IGTs. The Board also recognizes the importance of maintaining a balance between security, stability, and user experience.

The Board also notes that the GAC advice is consistent with the ICANN’s commitment to the protection of IGTs. The Board also recognizes the importance of maintaining a balance between security, stability, and user experience.
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The Board also notes that the GAC advice is consistent with the ICANN’s commitment to the protection of IGTs. The Board also recognizes the importance of maintaining a balance between security, stability, and user experience.

The Board also notes that the GAC advice is consistent with the ICANN’s commitment to the protection of IGTs. The Board also recognizes the importance of maintaining a balance between security, stability, and user experience.

The Board also notes that the GAC advice is consistent with the ICANN’s commitment to the protection of IGTs. The Board also recognizes the importance of maintaining a balance between security, stability, and user experience.

The Board also notes that the GAC advice is consistent with the ICANN’s commitment to the protection of IGTs. The Board also recognizes the importance of maintaining a balance between security, stability, and user experience.

The Board also notes that the GAC advice is consistent with the ICANN’s commitment to the protection of IGTs. The Board also recognizes the importance of maintaining a balance between security, stability, and user experience.

The Board also notes that the GAC advice is consistent with the ICANN’s commitment to the protection of IGTs. The Board also recognizes the importance of maintaining a balance between security, stability, and user experience.

The Board also notes that the GAC advice is consistent with the ICANN’s commitment to the protection of IGTs. The Board also recognizes the importance of maintaining a balance between security, stability, and user experience.
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The Board also notes that the GAC advice is consistent with the ICANN’s commitment to the protection of IGTs. The Board also recognizes the importance of maintaining a balance between security, stability, and user experience.
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The Board also notes that the GAC advice is consistent with the ICANN’s commitment to the protection of IGTs. The Board also recognizes the importance of maintaining a balance between security, stability, and user experience.

The Board also notes that the GAC advice is consistent with the ICANN’s commitment to the protection of IGTs. The Board also recognizes the importance of maintaining a balance between security, stability, and user experience.

The Board also notes that the GAC advice is consistent with the ICANN’s commitment to the protection of IGTs. The Board also recognizes the importance of maintaining a balance between security, stability, and user experience.

The Board also notes that the GAC advice is consistent with the ICANN’s commitment to the protection of IGTs. The Board also recognizes the importance of maintaining a balance between security, stability, and user experience.

The Board also notes that the GAC advice is consistent with the ICANN’s commitment to the protection of IGTs. The Board also recognizes the importance of maintaining a balance between security, stability, and user experience.
On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the Barcelona Communique and the ICANN61 San Juan Communique.

The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) and the Governmental Advisory Council (GAC) discussed the EPDP Team's recommendations at their Abu Dhabi meeting on 2 November 2017. In its response, the Board referred to the Information Transparency Initiative (ITI), launched in January 2018, which hopefully will lead to the creation of a document management system, in a manner the ALAC agreed. The Board also did not agree to comment on the recent GAC statement, published in December 2018, in response to the Board's December 2018 Communique.

The Board noted that the EPDP Team undertakes to make a recommendation pertaining to this advice.

The ICANN Board is currently considering this advice on 15 May 2019. However, at the time the Board responded, "The Board thanks the GAC for the clarification provided and its position remains unchanged as of the Board's consideration of 15 May 2019. The Board will act on this item in due course and will consider the GAC's additional information in the future, if needed."

The Board agreed that EPDP Recommendation 18 provides a mechanism for third-parties to access non-public registration data. However, the Board also noted that EPDP Recommendation 18 on 15 May 2019 and stated in the scorecard: The Board accepts this advice. The Board determined that EPDP Recommendation 18 should be adopted by the Board pending a response from the GAC.

The Board notes that EPDP Recommendation 18 on 15 May 2019 and stated in the scorecard: The Board accepts this advice. The Board determined that EPDP Recommendation 18 should be adopted by the Board pending a response from the GAC.

The Board noted that EPDP Recommendation 18 provides a mechanism for third-parties to access non-public registration data. However, the Board also noted that EPDP Recommendation 18 on 15 May 2019 and stated in the scorecard: The Board accepts this advice. The Board determined that EPDP Recommendation 18 should be adopted by the Board pending a response from the GAC.

The Board noted that EPDP Recommendation 18 provides a mechanism for third-parties to access non-public registration data. However, the Board also noted that EPDP Recommendation 18 on 15 May 2019 and stated in the scorecard: The Board accepts this advice. The Board determined that EPDP Recommendation 18 should be adopted by the Board pending a response from the GAC.

The Board notes that EPDP Recommendation 18 provides a mechanism for third-parties to access non-public registration data. However, the Board also noted that EPDP Recommendation 18 on 15 May 2019 and stated in the scorecard: The Board accepts this advice. The Board determined that EPDP Recommendation 18 should be adopted by the Board pending a response from the GAC.

The Board noted that EPDP Recommendation 18 provides a mechanism for third-parties to access non-public registration data. However, the Board also noted that EPDP Recommendation 18 on 15 May 2019 and stated in the scorecard: The Board accepts this advice. The Board determined that EPDP Recommendation 18 should be adopted by the Board pending a response from the GAC.

The Board noted that EPDP Recommendation 18 provides a mechanism for third-parties to access non-public registration data. However, the Board also noted that EPDP Recommendation 18 on 15 May 2019 and stated in the scorecard: The Board accepts this advice. The Board determined that EPDP Recommendation 18 should be adopted by the Board pending a response from the GAC.

The Board noted that EPDP Recommendation 18 provides a mechanism for third-parties to access non-public registration data. However, the Board also noted that EPDP Recommendation 18 on 15 May 2019 and stated in the scorecard: The Board accepts this advice. The Board determined that EPDP Recommendation 18 should be adopted by the Board pending a response from the GAC.

The Board noted that EPDP Recommendation 18 provides a mechanism for third-parties to access non-public registration data. However, the Board also noted that EPDP Recommendation 18 on 15 May 2019 and stated in the scorecard: The Board accepts this advice. The Board determined that EPDP Recommendation 18 should be adopted by the Board pending a response from the GAC.

The Board noted that EPDP Recommendation 18 provides a mechanism for third-parties to access non-public registration data. However, the Board also noted that EPDP Recommendation 18 on 15 May 2019 and stated in the scorecard: The Board accepts this advice. The Board determined that EPDP Recommendation 18 should be adopted by the Board pending a response from the GAC.

The Board noted that EPDP Recommendation 18 provides a mechanism for third-parties to access non-public registration data. However, the Board also noted that EPDP Recommendation 18 on 15 May 2019 and stated in the scorecard: The Board accepts this advice. The Board determined that EPDP Recommendation 18 should be adopted by the Board pending a response from the GAC.

The Board noted that EPDP Recommendation 18 provides a mechanism for third-parties to access non-public registration data. However, the Board also noted that EPDP Recommendation 18 on 15 May 2019 and stated in the scorecard: The Board accepts this advice. The Board determined that EPDP Recommendation 18 should be adopted by the Board pending a response from the GAC.

The Board noted that EPDP Recommendation 18 provides a mechanism for third-parties to access non-public registration data. However, the Board also noted that EPDP Recommendation 18 on 15 May 2019 and stated in the scorecard: The Board accepts this advice. The Board determined that EPDP Recommendation 18 should be adopted by the Board pending a response from the GAC.

The Board noted that EPDP Recommendation 18 provides a mechanism for third-parties to access non-public registration data. However, the Board also noted that EPDP Recommendation 18 on 15 May 2019 and stated in the scorecard: The Board accepts this advice. The Board determined that EPDP Recommendation 18 should be adopted by the Board pending a response from the GAC.

The Board noted that EPDP Recommendation 18 provides a mechanism for third-parties to access non-public registration data. However, the Board also noted that EPDP Recommendation 18 on 15 May 2019 and stated in the scorecard: The Board accepts this advice. The Board determined that EPDP Recommendation 18 should be adopted by the Board pending a response from the GAC.
On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled “GAC Advice – Kobe AR-001685 and AR-001686 ICANN61 San Juan Communiqué” on 9/10/2019. The Board also adopted a recommendation in the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019) in response to items of GAC consideration of 15 May 2019. The Board acknowledges the GAC’s concerns regarding the EPDP Phase 2 Report Final Report and the EPDP Phase 2 Work Programme, as well as the need to ensure that limitations in terms of query volume envisaged under Phase 1; the Board responded, “as requested by the GAC in its 17 May 2018 letter to the Board, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting legal issues deferred from Phase 1 ?, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary processes, that time, the Board defers consideration of this advice pending budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting through these legal issues, this item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 15 May 2019.
On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled “GAC Advice – Kobe”.

The Board adopted the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué. The Board notes that the Kobe and San Juan Communiqués will be incorporated into template material, subject to final adjustments. The Board asked the Board to address and consider these results and concerns before proceeding with new rounds.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled “GAC Advice – Kobe”.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled “GAC Advice – Kobe”.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled “GAC Advice – Kobe”.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled “GAC Advice – Kobe”.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled “GAC Advice – Kobe”.

Follow Up: Subsequent WHOIS and Data Protection Legislation

1.a.1. Item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 15 May 2019.

1.a.2. Action and Update: (15 May 2019) In response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué, the Board notes that the Kobe Communiqué includes concrete references and progress reports. The Board asks the Board to address and consider these results and concerns before proceeding with new rounds.

1.a.3. Item is under evaluation and implementation of the new registration data directory services policies, and as a result, some distinct parts to implementation are as indicated and agreed, including the existing distinct parts to implementation as indicated they are agreed, such as the questions deferred from Phase 2.

1.a.4. Item is under evaluation and implementation of the new registration data directory services policies, and as a result, some distinct parts to implementation are as indicated and agreed, including the existing distinct parts to implementation as indicated they are agreed, such as the questions deferred from Phase 2.

1.a.5. Item is under evaluation and implementation of the new registration data directory services policies, and as a result, some distinct parts to implementation are as indicated and agreed, including the existing distinct parts to implementation as indicated they are agreed, such as the questions deferred from Phase 2.

1.a.6. Item is under evaluation and implementation of the new registration data directory services policies, and as a result, some distinct parts to implementation are as indicated and agreed, including the existing distinct parts to implementation as indicated they are agreed, such as the questions deferred from Phase 2.
On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled “GAC Advice – Kobe Communiqué: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)” in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué. The Board directed ICANN org to release this scorecard for public review and to consider the scorecard as an indication of the Board’s resolution and recommendations.

On 15 May 2019 the Board directed ICANN org to release the Kobe Communiqué: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019) in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué. The Board directed ICANN org to consider the Kobe Communiqué: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019) in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué in response to the Final Recommendations of the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team, the Privacy and Data Protection Team, and the Community and Contracted Party Review Team. The Board also directed ICANN org to consider the Kobe Communiqué: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019) in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué as an indication of the Board’s resolution and recommendations.

On 15 May 2019 the Board directed ICANN org to release the Kobe Communiqué: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019) in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué. The Board directed ICANN org to consider the Kobe Communiqué: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019) in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué in response to the Final Recommendations of the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team, the Privacy and Data Protection Team, and the Community and Contracted Party Review Team. The Board also directed ICANN org to consider the Kobe Communiqué: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019) in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué as an indication of the Board’s resolution and recommendations.
On 8 September 2019 the ICANN Board considered the Marrakech Scorecard and provided the following response in its 15 September 2019 resolution. The Board directed the GAC to proceed to the next step in the Applicant Guideline (AGB) and to provide adequate community discussion. The Board also directed the ICANN org President and CEO to continue processing the .AMAZON applications.

Specifically, the Board directed that community discussions around the two-character root for the .AMAZON applications be conducted in accordance with Board resolutions 2019.03.10.01-.07 and in recognition of all relevant material/resolutions-2019-09-08-en#2.c.

On 8 September 2019 the ICANN Board considered the Marrakech Scorecard and provided the following response in its 15 September 2019 resolution. The Board directed the .AMAZON applications to proceed to the next step in the AGB and to provide adequate community discussion. The Board also directed the ICANN org President and CEO to continue processing the .AMAZON applications.

As of the Board’s consideration of 8 September 2019, the Board considered whether it had done its due diligence and had the relevant material to make a decision regarding the proposal, whether the Board’s actions followed the AGB process, and whether the Board understood that some GAC members had concerns regarding this process and the Board’s decision to allow another four weeks of discussions between the two parties. The Board also considered whether it had done its due diligence and had the relevant material to make a decision regarding the proposal, whether the Board’s actions followed the AGB process, and whether the Board understood that some GAC members had concerns regarding this process and the Board’s decision to allow another four weeks of discussions between the two parties.

Specifically, the Board considered whether it had done its due diligence and had the relevant material to make a decision regarding the proposal, whether the Board’s actions followed the AGB process, and whether the Board understood that some GAC members had concerns regarding this process and the Board’s decision to allow another four weeks of discussions between the two parties. The Board also considered whether it had done its due diligence and had the relevant material to make a decision regarding the proposal, whether the Board’s actions followed the AGB process, and whether the Board understood that some GAC members had concerns regarding this process and the Board’s decision to allow another four weeks of discussions between the two parties.

Specifically, the Board considered whether it had done its due diligence and had the relevant material to make a decision regarding the proposal, whether the Board’s actions followed the AGB process, and whether the Board understood that some GAC members had concerns regarding this process and the Board’s decision to allow another four weeks of discussions between the two parties. The Board also considered whether it had done its due diligence and had the relevant material to make a decision regarding the proposal, whether the Board’s actions followed the AGB process, and whether the Board understood that some GAC members had concerns regarding this process and the Board’s decision to allow another four weeks of discussions between the two parties.

Specifically, the Board considered whether it had done its due diligence and had the relevant material to make a decision regarding the proposal, whether the Board’s actions followed the AGB process, and whether the Board understood that some GAC members had concerns regarding this process and the Board’s decision to allow another four weeks of discussions between the two parties. The Board also considered whether it had done its due diligence and had the relevant material to make a decision regarding the proposal, whether the Board’s actions followed the AGB process, and whether the Board understood that some GAC members had concerns regarding this process and the Board’s decision to allow another four weeks of discussions between the two parties.

Specifically, the Board considered whether it had done its due diligence and had the relevant material to make a decision regarding the proposal, whether the Board’s actions followed the AGB process, and whether the Board understood that some GAC members had concerns regarding this process and the Board’s decision to allow another four weeks of discussions between the two parties. The Board also considered whether it had done its due diligence and had the relevant material to make a decision regarding the proposal, whether the Board’s actions followed the AGB process, and whether the Board understood that some GAC members had concerns regarding this process and the Board’s decision to allow another four weeks of discussions between the two parties.
On 8 September 2019, the ICANN Board considered the Marrakech Scorecard and provided the following response. The Board acknowledges the GAC’s follow-up action request and commends the actions being taken as the 3rd phase of the HPP.

On 26 January 2020, the Board considered the Montreal Communiqué and provided the following response. The Board acknowledges the GAC’s follow-up action request and commends the actions being taken as the 4th phase of the HPP.

On 26 January 2020, the Board considered the Montreal Communiqué and provided the following response. The Board acknowledges the GAC’s follow-up action request and commends the actions being taken as the 5th phase of the HPP.

On 11/6/2019, the Board considered the Montreal Communiqué and provided the following response. The Board acknowledges the GAC’s follow-up action request and commends the actions being taken as the 2nd phase of the HPP.

On 11/6/2019, the Board considered the Montreal Communiqué and provided the following response. The Board acknowledges the GAC’s follow-up action request and commends the actions being taken as the 1st phase of the HPP.

On 26 January 2020, the Board considered the Montreal Communiqué and provided the following response. The Board acknowledges the GAC’s follow-up action request and commends the actions being taken as the 3rd phase of the HPP.

On 26 January 2020, the Board considered the Montreal Communiqué and provided the following response. The Board acknowledges the GAC’s follow-up action request and commends the actions being taken as the 4th phase of the HPP.

On 26 January 2020, the Board considered the Montreal Communiqué and provided the following response. The Board acknowledges the GAC’s follow-up action request and commends the actions being taken as the 5th phase of the HPP.

The GAC recalls its Kobe Communiqué and welcomes the follow-up action request as part of their regular implementation review and encourages ICANN to continue addressing this matter as part of the overall implementation work of the EPDP. In this regard, the Board is reviewing four approved policy recommendations related to the protection of certain Red Cross Names in the domain name system, adopting the consensus recommendations of the reconstituted GNSO Policy Development Process, and including GNSO staff to examine the protections to be afforded to the names of the ICRC and the IFRC.

The GAC advises the Board to instruct ICANN Compliance to create a separate Work Track in which IGOs and the GAC have been encouraged to cooperate and collaborate on issues related to the protection of the Red Cross and Red Crescent names in the domain name system, adopting the consensus recommendations of the reconstituted GNSO Policy Development Process and including GNSO staff to examine the protections to be afforded to the names of the ICRC and the IFRC.

The Board notes that any changes to the scope of protections that were provided in the Kobe advice and additional protections that were receiving public policy advice would be subject to budgetary constraints, to facilitate the work of the Board and the EPDP.

The Board recognizes that certain Red Cross Names closed recently on 12 December 2019, and the public domain summary and analysis report has been published. (https://www.icann.org/public-speeches/summary-analysis-implementation-2019-10-28.en.html). The Board understands that ICANN Org has undertaken publishing the Policy advice in NAMEF with an effective date to be no later than 2 August 2020. Regarding the issue of protection for certain names of the international organizations, the Board notes that the transition of certain names currently under protection is scheduled for completion of the current public comment forum, and pursuant to the ICANN Board’s response to the Kobe Communique, the Board continues to understand that “the responsibility for protection of certain Red Cross and Red Crescent names in the domain name system, adopting the consensus recommendations of the reconstituted GNSO Policy Development Process and including GNSO staff to examine the protections to be afforded to the names of the ICRC and the IFRC” continues to be addressed under the same Work Track as the Red Cross Names closed recently on 12 December 2019, and the public domain summary and analysis report has been published. (https://www.icann.org/public-speeches/summary-analysis-implementation-2019-10-28.en.html).

On the implementation and follow-up of the Kobe Communique, the Board continues to understand that “the responsibility for protection of certain Red Cross and Red Crescent names in the domain name system, adopting the consensus recommendations of the reconstituted GNSO Policy Development Process and including GNSO staff to examine the protections to be afforded to the names of the ICRC and the IFRC” continues to be addressed under the same Work Track as the Red Cross Names closed recently on 12 December 2019, and the public domain summary and analysis report has been published. (https://www.icann.org/public-speeches/summary-analysis-implementation-2019-10-28.en.html).

The Board is aware that a fifth recommendation has been referred to the GNSO’s Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms Policy Development Process and a separate Work Track in which IGOs and the GAC have been encouraged to cooperate and collaborate on issues related to the protection of the Red Cross and Red Crescent names in the domain name system, adopting the consensus recommendations of the reconstituted GNSO Policy Development Process and including GNSO staff to examine the protections to be afforded to the names of the ICRC and the IFRC.

The Board is aware that a fifth recommendation has been referred to the GNSO’s Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms Policy Development Process and a separate Work Track in which IGOs and the GAC have been encouraged to cooperate and collaborate on issues related to the protection of the Red Cross and Red Crescent names in the domain name system, adopting the consensus recommendations of the reconstituted GNSO Policy Development Process and including GNSO staff to examine the protections to be afforded to the names of the ICRC and the IFRC.

The Board notes that any changes to the scope of protections that were provided in the Kobe advice and additional protections that were receiving public policy advice would be subject to budgetary constraints, to facilitate the work of the Board and the EPDP.

The Board understands that ICANN Org anticipates publishing the Policy prior to 2020, as per the GAC’s request. The Board notes that any changes to the scope of protections that were provided in the Kobe advice and additional protections that were receiving public policy advice would be subject to budgetary constraints, to facilitate the work of the Board and the EPDP.

The Board notes that the ICANN Board is aware that a fifth recommendation has been referred to the GNSO’s Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms Policy Development Process and a separate Work Track in which IGOs and the GAC have been encouraged to cooperate and collaborate on issues related to the protection of the Red Cross and Red Crescent names in the domain name system, adopting the consensus recommendations of the reconstituted GNSO Policy Development Process and including GNSO staff to examine the protections to be afforded to the names of the ICRC and the IFRC.

The Board notes that any changes to the scope of protections that were provided in the Kobe advice and additional protections that were receiving public policy advice would be subject to budgetary constraints, to facilitate the work of the Board and the EPDP.

The Board notes that the ICANN Board is aware that a fifth recommendation has been referred to the GNSO’s Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms Policy Development Process and a separate Work Track in which IGOs and the GAC have been encouraged to cooperate and collaborate on issues related to the protection of the Red Cross and Red Crescent names in the domain name system, adopting the consensus recommendations of the reconstituted GNSO Policy Development Process and including GNSO staff to examine the protections to be afforded to the names of the ICRC and the IFRC.

The Board notes that any changes to the scope of protections that were provided in the Kobe advice and additional protections that were receiving public policy advice would be subject to budgetary constraints, to facilitate the work of the Board and the EPDP.

The Board notes that any changes to the scope of protections that were provided in the Kobe advice and additional protections that were receiving public policy advice would be subject to budgetary constraints, to facilitate the work of the Board and the EPDP.

The Board notes that any changes to the scope of protections that were provided in the Kobe advice and additional protections that were receiving public policy advice would be subject to budgetary constraints, to facilitate the work of the Board and the EPDP.

The Board notes that any changes to the scope of protections that were provided in the Kobe advice and additional protections that were receiving public policy advice would be subject to budgetary constraints, to facilitate the work of the Board and the EPDP.

The Board notes that any changes to the scope of protections that were provided in the Kobe advice and additional protections that were receiving public policy advice would be subject to budgetary constraints, to facilitate the work of the Board and the EPDP.

The Board notes that any changes to the scope of protections that were provided in the Kobe advice and additional protections that were receiving public policy advice would be subject to budgetary constraints, to facilitate the work of the Board and the EPDP.

The Board notes that any changes to the scope of protections that were provided in the Kobe advice and additional protections that were receiving public policy advice would be subject to budgetary constraints, to facilitate the work of the Board and the EPDP.

The Board notes that any changes to the scope of protections that were provided in the Kobe advice and additional protections that were receiving public policy advice would be subject to budgetary constraints, to facilitate the work of the Board and the EPDP.

The Board notes that any changes to the scope of protections that were provided in the Kobe advice and additional protections that were receiving public policy advice would be subject to budgetary constraints, to facilitate the work of the Board and the EPDP.

The Board notes that any changes to the scope of protections that were provided in the Kobe advice and additional protections that were receiving public policy advice would be subject to budgetary constraints, to facilitate the work of the Board and the EPDP.
The GAC notes that the topic of re-chartering a specific PDP working group is still under discussion with the GAC. Therefore, this item will remain in Phase 3 pending further Board consideration.

The GAC provided additional clarifications to this advice in a letter on 22 June 2020. The Board understands that the GAC provided additional clarifications to this advice in a letter on 22 June 2020. The Board will consider when and if further action is needed on this item. It is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 26 January 2020.

The CEO noted that the Board considered the Federal Register publication and forwarded this recommendation to the Department of State for implementation. The Board considers this item complete.

The Board adopts this advice and notes that the item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 26 January 2020.

If the Board adopts this advice, the implementation will result in the return of the CTLD registries' access to all COVID-19 related content.

The Board adopts this advice and notes that this item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 26 January 2020.

The Board adopts this advice and notes that this item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 26 January 2020.

The Board adopts this advice and notes that this item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 26 January 2020.

The Board adopts this advice and notes that this item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 26 January 2020.
On 12 May 2021, the Board took action on this advice. In the scorecard, the Board stated: “The Board accepts the GAC’s advice to consider the GAC Minority Statement of 24 August 2020 (in Annex). a. The minority statement addressed the public policy concerns expressed therein, and later necessary action, as appropriate.

The GAC clarifies during the Board-GAC meeting on 21 April 2021 that the GAC Minority Statement stands as the GAC’s position on the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report. The Board thanks the GAC for its follow up on previous GAC advice concerning IGO acronyms and gTLD registration data, with a view to seeing a defined list of IGO full names and their corresponding gTLD acronyms ahead of a final resolution of this phase. The Board stated: “The Board thanks the GAC for engaging in this matter with a view to developing a new system of registrations of IGO full names and acronyms. The Board clarifies that the IGO Work Track is an effort to address the public policy concerns expressed therein, and later necessary action, as appropriate.

The GAC expresses concern that the GAC Minority Statement of 24 August 2020, as submitted by the GNSO Council, was not reflected in the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report. The Board notes that the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report is complete and that the GAC Minority Statement will be considered in the Phase 5 deliberations. The Board also notes that the GNSO Work Track on GAC Consultations is ongoing.

The GAC clarifies that the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report is complete and that the GAC Minority Statement will be considered in the Phase 5 deliberations. The Board notes that the GNSO Work Track on GAC Consultations is ongoing.

The GAC expresses concern that the GAC Minority Statement of 24 August 2020, as submitted by the GNSO Council, was not reflected in the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report. The Board notes that the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report is complete and that the GAC Minority Statement will be considered in the Phase 5 deliberations. The Board also notes that the GNSO Work Track on GAC Consultations is ongoing.

The GAC explains that the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report is complete and that the GAC Minority Statement will be considered in the Phase 5 deliberations. The Board notes that the GNSO Work Track on GAC Consultations is ongoing.

The GAC clarifies that the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report is complete and that the GAC Minority Statement will be considered in the Phase 5 deliberations. The Board notes that the GNSO Work Track on GAC Consultations is ongoing.

The GAC expresses concern that the GAC Minority Statement of 24 August 2020, as submitted by the GNSO Council, was not reflected in the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report. The Board notes that the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report is complete and that the GAC Minority Statement will be considered in the Phase 5 deliberations. The Board also notes that the GNSO Work Track on GAC Consultations is ongoing.

The GAC clarifies that the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report is complete and that the GAC Minority Statement will be considered in the Phase 5 deliberations. The Board notes that the GNSO Work Track on GAC Consultations is ongoing.

The GAC expresses concern that the GAC Minority Statement of 24 August 2020, as submitted by the GNSO Council, was not reflected in the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report. The Board notes that the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report is complete and that the GAC Minority Statement will be considered in the Phase 5 deliberations. The Board also notes that the GNSO Work Track on GAC Consultations is ongoing.

The GAC clarifies that the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report is complete and that the GAC Minority Statement will be considered in the Phase 5 deliberations. The Board notes that the GNSO Work Track on GAC Consultations is ongoing.

The GAC expresses concern that the GAC Minority Statement of 24 August 2020, as submitted by the GNSO Council, was not reflected in the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report. The Board notes that the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report is complete and that the GAC Minority Statement will be considered in the Phase 5 deliberations. The Board also notes that the GNSO Work Track on GAC Consultations is ongoing.

The GAC clarifies that the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report is complete and that the GAC Minority Statement will be considered in the Phase 5 deliberations. The Board notes that the GNSO Work Track on GAC Consultations is ongoing.

The GAC expresses concern that the GAC Minority Statement of 24 August 2020, as submitted by the GNSO Council, was not reflected in the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report. The Board notes that the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report is complete and that the GAC Minority Statement will be considered in the Phase 5 deliberations. The Board also notes that the GNSO Work Track on GAC Consultations is ongoing.

The GAC clarifies that the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report is complete and that the GAC Minority Statement will be considered in the Phase 5 deliberations. The Board notes that the GNSO Work Track on GAC Consultations is ongoing.

The GAC expresses concern that the GAC Minority Statement of 24 August 2020, as submitted by the GNSO Council, was not reflected in the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report. The Board notes that the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report is complete and that the GAC Minority Statement will be considered in the Phase 5 deliberations. The Board also notes that the GNSO Work Track on GAC Consultations is ongoing.

The GAC clarifies that the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report is complete and that the GAC Minority Statement will be considered in the Phase 5 deliberations. The Board notes that the GNSO Work Track on GAC Consultations is ongoing.

The GAC expresses concern that the GAC Minority Statement of 24 August 2020, as submitted by the GNSO Council, was not reflected in the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report. The Board notes that the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report is complete and that the GAC Minority Statement will be considered in the Phase 5 deliberations. The Board also notes that the GNSO Work Track on GAC Consultations is ongoing.

The GAC clarifies that the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report is complete and that the GAC Minority Statement will be considered in the Phase 5 deliberations. The Board notes that the GNSO Work Track on GAC Consultations is ongoing.

The GAC expresses concern that the GAC Minority Statement of 24 August 2020, as submitted by the GNSO Council, was not reflected in the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report. The Board notes that the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report is complete and that the GAC Minority Statement will be considered in the Phase 5 deliberations. The Board also notes that the GNSO Work Track on GAC Consultations is ongoing.

The GAC clarifies that the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report is complete and that the GAC Minority Statement will be considered in the Phase 5 deliberations. The Board notes that the GNSO Work Track on GAC Consultations is ongoing.

The GAC expresses concern that the GAC Minority Statement of 24 August 2020, as submitted by the GNSO Council, was not reflected in the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report. The Board notes that the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report is complete and that the GAC Minority Statement will be considered in the Phase 5 deliberations. The Board also notes that the GNSO Work Track on GAC Consultations is ongoing.

The GAC clarifies that the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report is complete and that the GAC Minority Statement will be considered in the Phase 5 deliberations. The Board notes that the GNSO Work Track on GAC Consultations is ongoing.

The GAC expresses concern that the GAC Minority Statement of 24 August 2020, as submitted by the GNSO Council, was not reflected in the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report. The Board notes that the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report is complete and that the GAC Minority Statement will be considered in the Phase 5 deliberations. The Board also notes that the GNSO Work Track on GAC Consultations is ongoing.

The GAC clarifies that the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report is complete and that the GAC Minority Statement will be considered in the Phase 5 deliberations. The Board notes that the GNSO Work Track on GAC Consultations is ongoing.

The GAC expresses concern that the GAC Minority Statement of 24 August 2020, as submitted by the GNSO Council, was not reflected in the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report. The Board notes that the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report is complete and that the GAC Minority Statement will be considered in the Phase 5 deliberations. The Board also notes that the GNSO Work Track on GAC Consultations is ongoing.

The GAC clarifies that the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report is complete and that the GAC Minority Statement will be considered in the Phase 5 deliberations. The Board notes that the GNSO Work Track on GAC Consultations is ongoing.

The GAC expresses concern that the GAC Minority Statement of 24 August 2020, as submitted by the GNSO Council, was not reflected in the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report. The Board notes that the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report is complete and that the GAC Minority Statement will be considered in the Phase 5 deliberations. The Board also notes that the GNSO Work Track on GAC Consultations is ongoing.

The GAC clarifies that the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report is complete and that the GAC Minority Statement will be considered in the Phase 5 deliberations. The Board notes that the GNSO Work Track on GAC Consultations is ongoing.
On 12 May 2021, the Board took action on this advice. In the scorecard, the
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On 4 June 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its consideration.

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its consideration.

On 2 July 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and passed the following resolutions:

- Specific Applications:
  - .wine, .vin
  - .indians and .ram
  - .patagonia, .date, .spa, .yun, .thai, .zulu, etc.

The GAC has reached consensus on GAC Objection Advice for an independent third party to review any such registration.

The GAC advises ICANN that: i. The GAC is interested to work with the IGOs and the NGPC on a complementary cost-sharing basis, in order to implement IGO objections in a cost-effective manner; ii. The GAC is concerned that IGOs are in an objectively different category to other rights holders, warranting special protection by ICANN in the DNS, while also preserving sufficient flexibility for workable implementation. The GAC is mindful of outstanding implementation issues and also preserving sufficient flexibility for workable implementation.

The GAC advises the ICANN Board that: i. The GAC is interested to work with the IGOs and the NGPC on a complementary cost-sharing basis, in order to implement IGO objections in a cost-effective manner; ii. The GAC is concerned that IGOs are in an objectively different category to other rights holders, warranting special protection by ICANN in the DNS, while also preserving sufficient flexibility for workable implementation.

The GAC is mindful of outstanding implementation issues and also preserving sufficient flexibility for workable implementation.

The GAC advises ICANN that it is the consensus of the GAC that a particular application should not proceed. This will create a strong presumption for the ICANN Board to reject any such registration. This is considered complete as of the NGPC's resolution of 4 June 2013.

The NGPC proposes to take action at a future NGPC meeting. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 10 September 2013.
On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard. The NGPC accepts the advice. The AGB provides that the NGPC considers that the applicant must consider the rules for protection of terms with national, cultural, geographic and religious significance, in accordance with the 2007 GAC Principles on New gTLDs. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10 September 2013.

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard. The NGPC accepts the advice. The AGB provides that the NGPC considers that the applicant must also consider the rules for protection of terms with national, cultural, geographic and religious significance, in accordance with the 2007 GAC Principles on New gTLDs. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10 September 2013.

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard. The NGPC accepts the advice. The AGB provides that the NGPC considers that the applicant must also consider the rules for protection of terms with national, cultural, geographic and religious significance, in accordance with the 2007 GAC Principles on New gTLDs. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10 September 2013.

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard. The NGPC accepts the advice. The AGB provides that the NGPC considers that the applicant must also consider the rules for protection of terms with national, cultural, geographic and religious significance, in accordance with the 2007 GAC Principles on New gTLDs. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10 September 2013.

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard. The NGPC accepts the advice. The AGB provides that the NGPC considers that the applicant must also consider the rules for protection of terms with national, cultural, geographic and religious significance, in accordance with the 2007 GAC Principles on New gTLDs. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10 September 2013.

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard. The NGPC accepts the advice. The AGB provides that the NGPC considers that the applicant must also consider the rules for protection of terms with national, cultural, geographic and religious significance, in accordance with the 2007 GAC Principles on New gTLDs. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10 September 2013.

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard. The NGPC accepts the advice. The AGB provides that the NGPC considers that the applicant must also consider the rules for protection of terms with national, cultural, geographic and religious significance, in accordance with the 2007 GAC Principles on New gTLDs. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10 September 2013.

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard. The NGPC accepts the advice. The AGB provides that the NGPC considers that the applicant must also consider the rules for protection of terms with national, cultural, geographic and religious significance, in accordance with the 2007 GAC Principles on New gTLDs. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10 September 2013.

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard. The NGPC accepts the advice. The AGB provides that the NGPC considers that the applicant must also consider the rules for protection of terms with national, cultural, geographic and religious significance, in accordance with the 2007 GAC Principles on New gTLDs. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10 September 2013.

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard. The NGPC accepts the advice. The AGB provides that the NGPC considers that the applicant must also consider the rules for protection of terms with national, cultural, geographic and religious significance, in accordance with the 2007 GAC Principles on New gTLDs. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10 September 2013.

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard. The NGPC accepts the advice. The AGB provides that the NGPC considers that the applicant must also consider the rules for protection of terms with national, cultural, geographic and religious significance, in accordance with the 2007 GAC Principles on New gTLDs. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10 September 2013.

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard. The NGPC accepts the advice. The AGB provides that the NGPC considers that the applicant must also consider the rules for protection of terms with national, cultural, geographic and religious significance, in accordance with the 2007 GAC Principles on New gTLDs. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10 September 2013.

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard. The NGPC accepts the advice. The AGB provides that the NGPC considers that the applicant must also consider the rules for protection of terms with national, cultural, geographic and religious significance, in accordance with the 2007 GAC Principles on New gTLDs. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10 September 2013.

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard. The NGPC accepts the advice. The AGB provides that the NGPC considers that the applicant must also consider the rules for protection of terms with national, cultural, geographic and religious significance, in accordance with the 2007 GAC Principles on New gTLDs. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10 September 2013.

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard. The NGPC accepts the advice. The AGB provides that the NGPC considers that the applicant must also consider the rules for protection of terms with national, cultural, geographic and religious significance, in accordance with the 2007 GAC Principles on New gTLDs. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10 September 2013.

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard. The NGPC accepts the advice. The AGB provides that the NGPC considers that the applicant must also consider the rules for protection of terms with national, cultural, geographic and religious significance, in accordance with the 2007 GAC Principles on New gTLDs. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10 September 2013.

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard. The NGPC accepts the advice. The AGB provides that the NGPC considers that the applicant must also consider the rules for protection of terms with national, cultural, geographic and religious significance, in accordance with the 2007 GAC Principles on New gTLDs. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10 September 2013.

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard. The NGPC accepts the advice. The AGB provides that the NGPC considers that the applicant must also consider the rules for protection of terms with national, cultural, geographic and religious significance, in accordance with the 2007 GAC Principles on New gTLDs. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10 September 2013.

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard. The NGPC accepts the advice. The AGB provides that the NGPC considers that the applicant must also consider the rules for protection of terms with national, cultural, geographic and religious significance, in accordance with the 2007 GAC Principles on New gTLDs. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10 September 2013.
On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response:

**Category 1: Safeguard Advice**

- **Category 1.1: .islam and .halal**
  
  The NGPC noted that the domains lack community involvement and support. It is the view of the NGPC that these domains should not proceed to the ICANN Board.

- **Category 1.2: .org and .net**
  
  The NGPC noted that the domains lack community involvement and support. It is the view of the NGPC that these domains should not proceed to the ICANN Board.

On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response:

- **Category 2: Safeguard Advice**
  
  - **Category 2.1: .shenzen and .guangzhou**
    
    The NGPC noted that the domains lack community involvement and support. It is the view of the NGPC that these domains should not proceed to the ICANN Board.

- **Category 2.2: .hongkong**
  
  The NGPC noted that the domains lack community involvement and support. It is the view of the NGPC that these domains should not proceed to the ICANN Board.

On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response:

- **Category 3: Safeguard Advice**
  
  - **Category 3.1: .ccid**
    
    The NGPC noted that the domains lack community involvement and support. It is the view of the NGPC that these domains should not proceed to the ICANN Board.

On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response:

- **Category 4: Safeguard Advice**
  
  - **Category 4.1: .safeguard-advice**
    
    The NGPC noted that the domains lack community involvement and support. It is the view of the NGPC that these domains should not proceed to the ICANN Board.
On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response. The Board may wish to seek a clear understanding of the legally complex and politically sensitive background on the application for the .YUN string, which may focus on legal norms or treaty conventions relied on by Amazon or governments. The analysis is expected to be completed in time for the ICANN Board meeting to consider the NGPC advice. The item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 5 February 2014.

Since application number 1-1318-12524 has been withdrawn, the remaining application for the .YUN string (application number 1-974-89210) should continue to be completed so that it can be considered by the NGPC when it meets in Singapore. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 5 February 2014.

The NGPC accepts this advice. ICANN published materials in December 2013 to provide clarity on the proposed launch and continued administration of community and geographic TLDs. The NGPC notes that the application for the .YUN string number 1-1318-12524 has been withdrawn, if remaining application for the .YUN string application 1-974-89210 should continue through the stages of the application process. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 5 February 2014.

The NGPC accepts this advice (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-scorecard-07oct15-en.pdf). Additionally, the NGPC has provided a briefing to the GAC on this issue. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 5 February 2014.

The GAC notes that the application for the .YUN string number 1-1318-12524 has been withdrawn. The NGPC accepts this advice. ICANN published materials in December 2013 to provide clarity on the proposed launch and continued administration of community and geographic TLDs. The NGPC accepts this advice. ICANN published materials in December 2013 to provide clarity on the proposed launch and continued administration of community and geographic TLDs.
On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response. The NGPC accepts the advice. The NGPC adopts the implementation framework outlined at Section 3.1.a of the Buenos Aires Communiqué.

On 14 May 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in AR-001220. The NGPC accepts the reiteration of the GAC’s earlier advice. The NGPC adopts the implementation framework outlined at Section 3.1.a of the Buenos Aires Communiqué.

The GAC welcomes the Board’s communication with applicants. Regarding the applications for .spa, the GAC understands that the outcomes for communities, and to work with the applicants in an open and transparent manner in an effort to assist those communities. The GAC further notes that a range of issues relating to the authenticity of licenses or credentials, and to bring registry policies in line with arrangements in place with other high-risk strings.

Sensitive Strings, and Specific Strings - .spa

The registry operators must ensure that registrants continue to operate in a way that is consistent with applicable laws. These requirements should be informed by professional advice, and operate in a way that is consistent with applicable laws. These requirements should be informed by professional advice, and operate in a way that is consistent with applicable laws. These requirements should be informed by professional advice, and operate in a way that is consistent with applicable laws. These requirements should be informed by professional advice, and operate in a way that is consistent with applicable laws. These requirements should be informed by professional advice, and operate in a way that is consistent with applicable laws. These requirements should be informed by professional advice, and operate in a way that is consistent with applicable laws. These requirements should be informed by professional advice, and operate in a way that is consistent with applicable laws.

Terms:
- .town, .city, .capital
- .reise, .reisen
- .weather
- .broker, .brokers, .cpa, .doctor, .dentist, .dds, .engineer, .lawyer, .medical, .medical, .medical, .medicalidentifiers, .view, global, .journal, .lo, lu, lue, luf, luf, luf, the European Geographic Names (en, es, regional name, international) engineering!
On 14 May 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to

The NGPC initially considered this advice on 10 September 2013. However at the

On 14 May 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its
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.indians

Specific Strings - .ram and

Cross/Red Crescent

registration policies)

sensitive strings and

consumer protection,

enforcement and end users; security checks to detect risks of

harm (eg phishing, malware, botnets etc); complaint mechanisms;

Committee (NGPC) on a number of implementation issues. These

Section 1 subsection 6 which states: ?6. Opportunity to Comment.

This item is now closed

letter of 8 June 2020 (https://www.icann.

the same complementary cost neutral mechanisms to be worked

queries are set out in more detail in an Attachment to this

2.a.i

Fundamental concern relates to the implications of changes in WHOIS verification and

Committee (NGPC) on a number of implementation issues. These

The NGPC also noted the

note of the concerns expressed in the GAC?s advice. a) With respect to .RAM, in

2014.

item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September

issues. Refer to NGPC Resolution 2014.05.14.NG03 for additional details. This

This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September

GAC Advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided

Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC/FICR). This item is

International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC/CICR) and the International

acronyms of IGOs will also be used to protect the acronyms of the

agreed to by the GAC and the NGPC for the protection of IGO acronyms in order

acronyms. The NGPC accepts this advice to adopt any mechanism(s) that may be

This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September

GAC Advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided

This is a summary of the action taken. The NGPC notes that this topic may

be of further discussion by the community is it considers future rounds of the New gTLD

material/resolutions-new-gtld-2013-06-25-en#2.d) . The NGPC notes that this topic may

recommendations for the New gTLD Program. The NGAC noted that the Board should

The NGPC considered this advice at its meeting on 10 September 2013 and the

Then, the NGPC adopted a recommendation, in which Chrysler indicated that it ?remains hopeful that an

applicant response to the Board from Chrysler Group LLC (?Chrysler?) concerning

Government of India to discuss the resolution of this matter at any time that is

accommodation can be reached that addresses the Government?s concerns, yet

on this item of GAC advice and encourages the impacted parties to continue the

Government of India to discuss the resolution of this matter at any time that is

.INDIANS, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its

November 2014, the applicant for .INDIANS notified ICANN that it was withdrawing

August 2014, the applicant for .RAM withdrew its

the Board is taking

the matter.

applicants and interested parties should be encouraged to

more fully. In the meantime concerned GAC members believe the

The GAC expresses its concerns with the time the Board is taking

Supporting Organizations and other Advisory Committees, shall

have no impact upon or conflict upon any material advice

provisions to apply any remedy or decision by the Board if the NGPC determines

NGPC Resolution 2014.05.14.NG03 for additional details. This

The same complementary cost neutral mechanisms to be worked

indicates that ICANN has received prior to any decision by the Board.? The GAC therefore

Evaluation and Decision Committee (EDC) and the International Federation of Red Cross and

This is a summary of the action taken. The NGPC notes that this topic may

be of further discussion by the community is it considers future rounds of the New gTLD

material/resolutions-new-gtld-2013-06-25-en#2.d) . The NGPC notes that this topic may

recommendations for the New gTLD Program. The NGAC noted that the Board should

The NGPC considered this advice at its meeting on 10 September 2013 and the

This is a summary of the action taken. The NGPC notes that this topic may

be of further discussion by the community is it considers future rounds of the New gTLD

material/resolutions-new-gtld-2013-06-25-en#2.d) . The NGPC notes that this topic may

recommendations for the New gTLD Program. The NGAC noted that the Board should

The NGPC considered this advice at its meeting on 10 September 2013 and the

This is a summary of the action taken. The NGPC notes that this topic may

be of further discussion by the community is it considers future rounds of the New gTLD

material/resolutions-new-gtld-2013-06-25-en#2.d) . The NGPC notes that this topic may
The GAC recalls its previous public policy advice from the Toronto,
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Names
Organisation (IGO) Names
Governmental
9.I. respective states of origin. b. The full names of the International
clarity, this should also include: a. the 189 National Red Cross and Red
the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement – terms that
permanently protect from unauthorised use the terms associated with
IGOs under the existing procedures. The four recommendations were
posted for public comment on 11 July 2019 and will close on 20 August 2019. After the
public comment period closes, the Board will consider whether to adopt
the four recommendations. The GAC sent a letter to the Board on 29 August 2019
regarding the ICANN’s PDP on INGO Access to Curative RPMs Policy
Recommendations. The Board provided a response on 13 October 2019. In its
scorecard: The GNSO Council approved (https://gnso.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-
advice-scorecard-07oct15-en.pdf) the four recommendations. The GNSO forwarded
recommendations from the expedited PDP on IGO-INGO Access to Curative RPMs Policy
the ICANN Board Chair sent a letter notifying the GAC Chair that the GNSO Council has
resolved to create a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to GAC
advice item remains open for further Board consideration. In the
26 Jan 2021 Letter from Maarten Botterman to Manal Ismail, it was stated that
the Board may only partially accept the GAC advice concerning a permanent
system of notification when a registrant registers a domain name matching an INGO
acronym. As outlined in the Board’s 22 October 2019 resolution, the Board follows the line of the
IGO when a third party registers a second level domain matching that organism’s acronym. (see: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-new-gtld-annex-1-14may14-en.pdf) and
the ICANN Board to ICANN for a report of INGO and IGO names. (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-new-gtld-annex-1-14may14-en.pdf) (including this item of GAC
Advice) the Board requested additional time to consider them, and will
facilitate discussions among the relevant parties to reconcile any remaining
differences between the policy recommendations and the GAC advice on the topic. These policy recommendations and the GAC advice on the topic
will be closed.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit
https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/legalcode or send a letter to Creative Commons, 171 Second Street, Suite 300, San Francisco, California 94105, USA.
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10.
Red Cross and Red Crescent organisations.
not be subjected to, or conditioned upon, a policy development
due to the Red Cross and Red Crescent terms and names should
Accordingly. The GAC now advises, that: I. the Red Cross and Red
Crescent societies, and recalls that the protections
permanently the terms and names associated with the Red Cross
The GAC refers to its previous advice to the Board to protect
work with the GNSO on outcomes that meet the GAC’s concerns.
2020-en). Based on this, this item is considered complete and has been moved to
3.4.3 and noted that a certain number of IGOs have requested that its policy recommendations concerning protection for IGO acronyms be
notified the GAC Chair that the GNSO Council has approved four policy
recommendations that were developed by the GNSO’s PDP Working Group on IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection
mechanisms are needed for INGOs; no specific new dispute resolution procedures should be created for IGOs; and clear policy
guidance is to be developed as to the filing of complaints by IGOs under the
existing procedures. The four recommendations were posted for public comment on 11 July 2019 and will close on 20 August 2019. After the public comment
closed, the NGPC issued a letter to the Board on 20 August 2019 regarding the IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Policy
Recommendations. The Board provided a response on 15 October 2019, to 26 Jun 2021 letter from Martin Schibbye to Martin Smith. It was noted that “IHO
may not, in any event, be subject to the GAC advice concerning permanent terms and names of IGOs as these are reflected in national legislation in force in multiple jurisdictions
and cannot be equated with those of the Red Cross and Red Crescent organisations. The GAC requested the ICANN organization to implement, as an operational matter, an ongoing (i.e.
curative rights mechanisms) regarding second level protections for IGO acronyms
believes at this time that the most appropriate solution (not including any
response on 14 October 2019. In its 27 January 2019 resolution, the Board
approved the NGPC’s letter of 16 September 2018, noted that common protections for PDP recommendations adopted by the Board as they pertain to the
RICS, and International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, and
stated in the GAC Los Angeles Communiqué: “The GAC welcomes the decision of
the 189 National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. The GAC requests the
represented IGOs, those of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent movements.
2014-12-08.pdf) for provide
the ICANN community about its progress to address this matter, and noted that the
NGPC published a comprehensive report of its GAC Recommendations and updates to
GAC Advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided
the response in its scorecard: On 11 July 2019, the Board acknowledged the
NGPC’s letter of 16 September 2018, noted that common protections for PDP recommendations adopted by the Board as they pertain to the
RICS, and International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, and
stated in the GAC Los Angeles Communiqué: “The GAC welcomes the decision of
the 189 National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. The GAC requests the
represented IGOs, those of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent movements.
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the 189 National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. The GAC requests the
represented IGOs, those of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent movements.
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the 189 National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. The GAC requests the
represented IGOs, those of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent movements.
2014-12-08.pdf) for provide
the ICANN community about its progress to address this matter, and noted that the
NGPC published a comprehensive report of its GAC Recommendations and updates to
GAC Advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided
the response in its scorecard: On 11 July 2019, the Board acknowledged the
NGPC’s letter of 16 September 2018, noted that common protections for PDP recommendations adopted by the Board as they pertain to the
RICS, and International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, and
stated in the GAC Los Angeles Communiqué: "The GAC welcomes the decision of
the 189 National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. The GAC requests the
represented IGOs, those of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent movements.
2014-12-08.pdf) for provide
the ICANN community about its progress to address this matter, and noted that the
NGPC published a comprehensive report of its GAC Recommendations and updates to
GAC Advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided
the response in its scorecard: On 11 July 2019, the Board acknowledged the
NGPC’s letter of 16 September 2018, noted that common protections for PDP recommendations adopted by the Board as they pertain to the
RICS, and International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, and
stated in the GAC Los Angeles Communiqué: “The GAC welcomes the decision of
the 189 National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. The GAC requests the
represented IGOs, those of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent movements.
2014-12-08.pdf) for provide
the ICANN community about its progress to address this matter, and noted that the
NGPC published a comprehensive report of its GAC Recommendations and updates to
GAC Advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided
the response in its scorecard: On 11 July 2019, the Board acknowledged the
NGPC’s letter of 16 September 2018, noted that common protections for PDP recommendations adopted by the Board as they pertain to the
RICS, and International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, and
stated in the GAC Los Angeles Communiqué: "The GAC welcomes the decision of
the 189 National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. The GAC requests the
represented IGOs, those of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent movements.
2014-12-08.pdf) for provide
the ICANN community about its progress to address this matter, and noted that the
NGPC published a comprehensive report of its GAC Recommendations and updates to
GAC Advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided
the response in its scorecard: On 11 July 2019, the Board acknowledged the
NGPC’s letter of 16 September 2018, noted that common protections for PDP recommendations adopted by the Board as they pertain to the
RICS, and International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, and
stated in the GAC Los Angeles Communiqué: “The GAC welcomes the decision of
the 189 National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. The GAC requests the
represented IGOs, those of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent movements.
2014-12-08.pdf) for provide
the ICANN community about its progress to address this matter, and noted that the
NGPC published a comprehensive report of its GAC Recommendations and updates to
GAC Advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided
the response in its scorecard: On 11 July 2019, the Board acknowledged the
NGPC’s letter of 16 September 2018, noted that common protections for PDP recommendations adopted by the Board as they pertain to the
RICS, and International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, and
stated in the GAC Los Angeles Communiqué: "The GAC welcome
On 8 September 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this

On 8 September 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this

On 8 September 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this

On 8 September 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this

On 8 September 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this

On 8 September 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this.

The NGPC recommended that the Board consider the following resolution at its meeting on 21 June 2015: Resolved (2015.06.21.NG06) the NGPC directs staff to implement the GAC's Category 2 Safeguard Advice for applicants not seeking to implement the GAC Agreement. The Board will need to consider whether or not to adopt the Proposal and to address a number of important concerns, including: 1) the Board's role in verification of WHOIS information; 2) the protection of trademark owners' rights; and 3) the protection of trademark owners' rights.

The NGPC noted that the Board's role in implementing the Agreement is not well defined, and that the Board needs to consider the following:
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3. The Board's role in protecting trademark owners' rights.
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On 18 October 2015 the NGPC considered the Abu Dhabi Communique and provided this.

On 18 October 2015 the NGPC considered the Abu Dhabi Communique and.

The GAC continues to keep under review the community.
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Evaluation

Community Priority

gTLD Safeguards

4.a.IV

1.b.II.

4.

1.b.II.

2.

4.

1.b.II.

they can rely on the bona fide of the Registrants listed. Relevant

appears to have taken steps to provide confidence to consumers that

practice for other gTLD registry operators. For example the PIC for .bank

validation of credentials for domains in highly regulated sectors to serve

in the GNSO process) which were inconsistent with GAC Advice.

Red Crescent names and identifiers (defined as ?Scope 2? names

Request the GNSO without delay to re-examine its 2013

rationale for the November 2016 resolution, particularly in regard

meeting in Dublin.

seeing the report of the ICANN Ombudsman on this matter

ICANN?s Bylaws.

clarify the milestones intended to be followed in order to seek a

implemented, what remains a work in progress, and what has not

develop a straightforward scorecard on all elements of GAC

The GAC additionally recommends that the NGPC clarifies its

abusive domain names within the current exercise of assessment

consideration of 12 June 2017.

topic, and provide any guidance that it believes appropriate while respecting the

The Board will continue to engage with the GAC and the GNSO on this

Report on Protection of IGO and INGO Identifiers in All gTLDs Policy Development

org's memo and Historical Overview for additional details regarding this topic.

Communiue on 27 January 2019. In its response, the Board pointed to the ICANN
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On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the Copenhagen Communique and provided its response in its summary. The Board has directed the ICANN CEO to respond to the additional questions and engage in a separate dialogue with the GAC concerning the material presented in the four recommendations that were developed by the GNSO PDP Working Group on IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms. The Board noted that the four recommendations were posted for public comment on 11 July 2019 and that responses were received by 20 August 2019. The Board will meet to consider whether to adopt the four recommendations. The GAC sent a letter to the Board on 20 August 2019 regarding the GNSO PDP on INGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms. The Board provided a response on 30 May 2017.

The Board also noted that the ICANN Board Chair and a letter notifying the GAC that the GNSO Council has approved four policy recommendations that were developed by the GNSO PDP Working Group on IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms which will include the following points: no substantive changes to existing rights protection mechanisms are needed for INGOs; no specific new dispute resolution procedures should be created for INGOs; and clarifying policy guidance is to be developed as to the filing of complaints by INGOs under the existing procedures. The four recommendations were posted for public comment on 11 July 2019 and responses were received by 20 August 2019. The Board will meet to consider whether to adopt the four recommendations. The GAC sent a letter to the Board on 20 August 2019 regarding the GNSO PDP on INGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms. The Board provided a response on 30 May 2017.

The Board noted that the ICANN organization’s draft response was sent to the GAC Chair on 30 May 2017 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/board-notice-copenhagen58-2017-06-12-en.pdf). The ICANN organization will discuss the draft response with the GAC Chair and will consider whether to adopt the four recommendations. The GAC sent a letter to the Board on 20 August 2019 regarding the GNSO PDP on INGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms. The Board provided a response on 30 May 2017.

As noted in the 26 Jan 2021 Letter from Maarten Botterman to Manal Ismail, “the Board may only partially accept the GAC advice regarding permanent notification to registrants for a more limited time period, in line with both previous GAC advice and GNSO recommendations.”
On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the Copenhagen Communique and provided its response in its scorecard. The GAC, in its Helsinki Communique, requested the need to constrain the use of codes between country codes and 2-letter registrations at the second level in new gTLDs, and also identified several voluntary measures that Registry/Registry Operators could consider. Finally, it is important to note that the GAC Action 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 processes. Following discussions with the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi, the ICANN org committed to the development of a dedicated webpage for this tool in Montreal. The Board will ensure that support staff from the ICANN org is available to provide any additional assistance as needed. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s discussion with the GAC during the BGIG meeting at ICANN65 in Marrakech.

Additionally, the Board reiterated the need to minimize the risk of confusion between country codes and 2-letter registrations at the second level in new gTLDs, and also identified several voluntary measures that Registry/Registry Operators could consider. Finally, it is important to note that the GAC Action 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 processes. Since then, the Board has received and responded to additional GAC advice related to 2-character domains at the second level. Most recently, the Board responded to consensus advice contained in the Barcelona Communique of 27 January 2019.

ICANN has recently been in the process of reviewing the tool in light of its response to the GAC Advice. The tool is designed to provide a mechanism for Registry/Registry Operators to engage the relevant Registry or the Registrar to engage with the relevant GAC members when a risk is identified in order to come to an agreement on how to manage or to have a third-party assessment of the situation if the name is already registered. Although ICANN has not implemented the GAC Action 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 processes. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s discussion with the GAC during the BGIG meeting at ICANN65 in Marrakech.

On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the Copenhagen Communique and provided its response in its scorecard. The GAC, in its Helsinki Communique, requested the need to constrain the use of codes between country codes and 2-letter registrations at the second level in new gTLDs, and also identified several voluntary measures that Registry/Registry Operators could consider. Finally, it is important to note that the GAC Action 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 processes. Following discussions with the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi, the ICANN org committed to the development of a dedicated webpage for this tool in Montreal. The Board will ensure that support staff from the ICANN org is available to provide any additional assistance as needed. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s discussion with the GAC during the BGIG meeting at ICANN65 in Marrakech.
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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.