As of 8 June 2020

GAC Advice Status

AR-004106
Communiqué
11/6/19
Directory Service and Data RegistrationFollow Up: Domain Name Designations and Identifiers for ICANN Board Category 2.b.II
unreasonable denial of requests for non-public domain name registration specific process to address complaints regarding failure to respond to, and completion of the EPDP.

Data. The implementation of the PPSAI should not be deferred until the different Red Cross and Red Crescent organizations.
The Guidebook, with the full and agreed list of names and identifiers of the implemented for the acronyms of IGOs. The GAC lastly encourages the IFRC) be addressed under the same protection regime to be agreed and implemented for the acronyms of the two international organizations within the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, the International Committee of the Red Cross and the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. The GAC acknowledges the cooperation of the ICANN66 Montréal: 11/6/19

Current Phase

This item is currently in implementation.
item after review of the GAC clarifications and after continued discussion with the GAC.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>Date of Communique</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>About Item Number</th>
<th>Advice Text</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Board Action(s)</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-004102</td>
<td>Communiqué</td>
<td>3/13/18</td>
<td>2.a.i</td>
<td>GAC Advice Status</td>
<td>In Phase 4 - Implement, to: 1. Instruct the ICANN org to ensure high-level support that requires &quot;reasonable access&quot;; to: 2. Instruct the ICANN org to provide the public with a means of submitting comments on the VSRRP and to: 3. Instruct the ICANN org to ensure high-level support that requires &quot;reasonable access&quot;.</td>
<td>Phase 4 - Implement</td>
<td>Improve matters relating to the VSRRP that have been identified in previous ICANN66 Montreal Communique</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resolutions/2020-01-26-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resolutions/2020-01-26-en.pdf</a></td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resolutions/2020-01-26-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resolutions/2020-01-26-en.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-004103</td>
<td>Communiqué</td>
<td>3/13/18</td>
<td>2.a.i</td>
<td>GAC Advice Status</td>
<td>In Phase 4 - Implement, to: 1. Instruct the ICANN org to ensure high-level support that requires &quot;reasonable access&quot;; to: 2. Instruct the ICANN org to provide the public with a means of submitting comments on the VSRRP and to: 3. Instruct the ICANN org to ensure high-level support that requires &quot;reasonable access&quot;.</td>
<td>Phase 4 - Implement</td>
<td>Improve matters relating to the VSRRP that have been identified in previous ICANN66 Montreal Communique</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resolutions/2020-01-26-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resolutions/2020-01-26-en.pdf</a></td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resolutions/2020-01-26-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resolutions/2020-01-26-en.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-004104</td>
<td>Communiqué</td>
<td>3/13/18</td>
<td>2.a.i</td>
<td>GAC Advice Status</td>
<td>In Phase 4 - Implement, to: 1. Instruct the ICANN org to ensure high-level support that requires &quot;reasonable access&quot;; to: 2. Instruct the ICANN org to provide the public with a means of submitting comments on the VSRRP and to: 3. Instruct the ICANN org to ensure high-level support that requires &quot;reasonable access&quot;.</td>
<td>Phase 4 - Implement</td>
<td>Improve matters relating to the VSRRP that have been identified in previous ICANN66 Montreal Communique</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resolutions/2020-01-26-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resolutions/2020-01-26-en.pdf</a></td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resolutions/2020-01-26-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resolutions/2020-01-26-en.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN67 Virtual Communique (March 2020). (Note: the ICANN67 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus or Follow-up to Previous GAC Advice)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>Board Resolution Close</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Advice Text</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-002295</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/10/19</td>
<td>Follow-up</td>
<td>The GAC advises board members to ensure that conclusions of the board are consistent with the GAC advice and welcomes the actions being taken to address their concerns, in compliance with GAC Advice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/syste...8008-06-wd2c">http://www.icann.org/en/syste...8008-06-wd2c</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-002300</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/10/19</td>
<td>Follow-up</td>
<td>On 8 September 2019 the ICANN Board considered the Kobe Communique and provided the following response: The Board adopted the Kobe Communique and resolved to address the concerns raised by the GAC in the Kobe Communique.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/syste...8008-06-wd2c">http://www.icann.org/en/syste...8008-06-wd2c</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-002301</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/8/19</td>
<td>Follow-up</td>
<td>The GAC asks the Board to explain in writing whether and why it considers this phase of the EPDP proposal that the eight Amazon countries considered did not address their concerns, in compliance with GAC Advice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/syste...8008-06-wd2c">http://www.icann.org/en/syste...8008-06-wd2c</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-002302</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/8/19</td>
<td>Follow-up</td>
<td>The GAC recalls its Kobe Communique advice and welcomes the actions being taken to ensure that conclusions of the Board are consistent with the GAC advice and welcomes the actions being taken to address their concerns, in compliance with GAC Advice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/syste...8008-06-wd2c">http://www.icann.org/en/syste...8008-06-wd2c</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-002303</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/8/19</td>
<td>Follow-up</td>
<td>The GAC asks the Board to explain in writing whether and why it considers this phase of the EPDP proposal that the eight Amazon countries considered did not address their concerns, in compliance with GAC Advice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/syste...8008-06-wd2c">http://www.icann.org/en/syste...8008-06-wd2c</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-002304</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/8/19</td>
<td>Follow-up</td>
<td>The GAC asks the Board to explain in writing whether and why it considers this phase of the EPDP proposal that the eight Amazon countries considered did not address their concerns, in compliance with GAC Advice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/syste...8008-06-wd2c">http://www.icann.org/en/syste...8008-06-wd2c</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-002305</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/8/19</td>
<td>Follow-up</td>
<td>The GAC asks the Board to explain in writing whether and why it considers this phase of the EPDP proposal that the eight Amazon countries considered did not address their concerns, in compliance with GAC Advice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/syste...8008-06-wd2c">http://www.icann.org/en/syste...8008-06-wd2c</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-002306</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/8/19</td>
<td>Follow-up</td>
<td>The GAC asks the Board to explain in writing whether and why it considers this phase of the EPDP proposal that the eight Amazon countries considered did not address their concerns, in compliance with GAC Advice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/syste...8008-06-wd2c">http://www.icann.org/en/syste...8008-06-wd2c</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-002307</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/8/19</td>
<td>Follow-up</td>
<td>The GAC asks the Board to explain in writing whether and why it considers this phase of the EPDP proposal that the eight Amazon countries considered did not address their concerns, in compliance with GAC Advice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/syste...8008-06-wd2c">http://www.icann.org/en/syste...8008-06-wd2c</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-002308</td>
<td></td>
<td>9/8/19</td>
<td>Follow-up</td>
<td>The GAC asks the Board to explain in writing whether and why it considers this phase of the EPDP proposal that the eight Amazon countries considered did not address their concerns, in compliance with GAC Advice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/syste...8008-06-wd2c">http://www.icann.org/en/syste...8008-06-wd2c</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Request Number</td>
<td>Communique/Sources</td>
<td>Code of Recommendation</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>About This Advice</td>
<td>Action Text</td>
<td>Current Phase</td>
<td>Board Action(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-002293</td>
<td>GAC Advice Status</td>
<td>[51x553]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-002294</td>
<td>GAC Advice Status</td>
<td>[69x346]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-002295</td>
<td>GAC Advice Status</td>
<td>[69x382]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-002296</td>
<td>GAC Advice Status</td>
<td>[69x461]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-002297</td>
<td>GAC Advice Status</td>
<td>[69x520]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN67 Virtual Communique (March 2020). (Note: the ICANN67 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus or Follow-up to Previous GAC Advice)

Notes:
- [9/10/19] [5/15/19]
- [5/15/19]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

As of 8 June 2020

GAC Advice Status

AR-002128

AR-002299

The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communiqué (April 2013) through the ICANN67 Virtual Communique (March 2020). (Note: the ICANN67 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus or Follow-up to Previous GAC Advice)

Notes:

ICANN63 Barcelona

ICANN64 Kobe Communique

ICANN65 Tokyo Communique

ICANN65 Tokyo Communique

Codes at the Second Level

Two-Character Country

Legislation

WHOIS and Data Protection

ICANN Board Consideration

Category

1.a.VI.

2.a.I.

Advice Item

Explain in writing how and why it considers it is implementing GAC advice, such as the Privacy Proxy Services Accreditation Issues Policy.

Consider re-starting implementation processes for relevant existing Board's resolution and advice Text

Current Phase

Page 5

Least four weeks prior to the subsequent ICANN meeting. This procedure is implemented by starting with the Copenhagen Communiqué, the ICANN Board and GAC have agreed upon a assessment of the situation if the name is already registered.’ The advice was incorporated identified in order to come to an agreement on how to manage it or to have a third-party concern among GAC members that the Board did not consider the advice regarding two-

ICANN org to make changes to the process based on GAC advice, including advice from the Akram Atallah in August 2015. In each phase of development, the Board directed the of Registry Service Evaluation Process (RSEP) requests in 2014. Over the subsequent two develop an efficient procedure for the release of two-character labels following the receipt individual government input. The Board took its initial action directing the ICANN org to include consideration of requests from registry operators, relevant GAC advice and Corresponding Country Codes followed a multi-year effort of community consultation,

On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the Barcelona Communique and provided this Board's consideration of 15 May 2019.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the second of the “GAC Advice - Kobe Communiqué” actions: (see 15 May 2019). A response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué and the Barca Communique. The Board accepts this advice. The Board believes that waiting to proceed with implementation of Privacy, Privacy, implementation issues (PPMI) Policy until the completion of the RSEP RSEP is a prudent course of action. This is another of the issues that need to be resolved to have the PPMI implementation are under active discussion, such as the conflict of juridical control and independent control, and the success of the process by the community, to focus resources on ensuring that GAC compliant requirements and best practices are maintained as the implementation process is ongoing. The Board also directed the ICANN org at the implementation phase of the RSEP. ICANN will be removing all CAPM includes and other mechanisms which may be requested by the new General Consensus and will work with the ICANN to find a community-led process to handle the appropriate level of course. The transition is announced as complete by the adoption of this resolution on 15 May 2019.

The Board has publicly committed to meet with the leaders of other specific review teams to avoid surprises in the future. The Board stands by its decisions and to hold a public session at ICANN65 with the ICANN community, to address the broader issues around reviews and recommendations. The Board determined to address, in general, the ways in which the GAC advice is handled and when the implementation phase, to be shared with the community within six months from the Board action. We acknowledge that some members of the community believe that this timeline is unnecessarily extended; and we will review their recommendation with ICANN org to determine whether this timeline can be accelerated. In response of the previous communications, to be included on the next GAC Advice Scorecard.

The Board determined to address each, in one of three ways: • The recommendations in the Final Report. To be clear, the Board has not rejected any of the recommendations in the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué. The Board acknowledges the GAC’s

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the second of the “GAC Advice - Kobe Communiqué” actions: (see 15 May 2019). A response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué and the Barca Communique. The Board accepts this advice. The Board believes that waiting to proceed with implementation of Privacy, Privacy, implementation issues (PPMI) Policy until the completion of the RSEP RSEP is a prudent course of action. This is another of the issues that need to be resolved to have the PPMI implementation are under active discussion, such as the conflict of juridical control and independent control, and the success of the process by the community, to focus resources on ensuring that GAC compliant requirements and best practices are maintained as the implementation process is ongoing. The Board also directed the ICANN org at the implementation phase of the RSEP. ICANN will be removing all CAPM includes and other mechanisms which may be requested by the new General Consensus and will work with the ICANN to find a community-led process to handle the appropriate level of course. The transition is announced as complete by the adoption of this resolution on 15 May 2019.

The Board has publicly committed to meet with the leaders of other specific review teams to avoid surprises in the future. The Board stands by its decisions and to hold a public session at ICANN65 with the ICANN community, to address the broader issues around reviews and recommendations. The Board determined to address, in general, the ways in which the GAC advice is handled and when the implementation phase, to be shared with the community within six months from the Board action. We acknowledge that some members of the community believe that this timeline is unnecessarily extended; and we will review their recommendation with ICANN org to determine whether this timeline can be accelerated. In response of the previous communications, to be included on the next GAC Advice Scorecard.

The Board determined to address each, in one of three ways: • The recommendations in the Final Report. To be clear, the Board has not rejected any of the recommendations in the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué. The Board acknowledges the GAC’s
Notes:
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN67 Virtual Communique (March 2020). (Note: the ICANN67 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus or Follow-up to Previous GAC Advice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>Start of Period</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Close Request</th>
<th>Close Phase</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Phase 5 | Close Request**

AR-002130: 

On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the Barcelona Communique and provided its response in its scorecard. The Board asked that the ICANN org share its explanation in writing by 31 December 2018. Previous GAC advice on this matter stands.

AR-002131: 

On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the Barcelona Communique and provided its response in its scorecard. The Board asked that the ICANN org share its explanation in writing by 31 December 2018. Previous GAC advice on this matter stands.

**Close Phase**

AR-002130: 

On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the Barcelona Communique and provided its response in its scorecard. The Board asked that the ICANN org share its explanation in writing by 31 December 2018. Previous GAC advice on this matter stands.

AR-002131: 

On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the Barcelona Communique and provided its response in its scorecard. The Board asked that the ICANN org share its explanation in writing by 31 December 2018. Previous GAC advice on this matter stands.

**Board Resolution Link**


**Board Scorecard Link**

The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN67 Virtual Communique (March 2020). (Note: the ICANN67 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus or Follow-up to Previous GAC Advice)

Protection of IGO Identifiers

2.a.III. joint statement by ALAC and GAC

Joint

2.a.I. National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies in relevant languages, and an online consultative process conducted under the auspices of the ICANN Fast-Track Working Group on Red Cross and Red Crescent issues. The Board endorses the joint statement by the ICANN and the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, which, in response to the resolution of the 108th National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies of the IFRC, calls for the implementation of a consultative process and multi-stakeholder dialogues on the matter, particularly in relation to the protection of IGO identifiers. This joint statement, the ALAC and the GAC also asked ICANN to produce a joint report. On 27 January 2019 the Board referred to the Information Transparency Initiative, the ICANN disclosure policy, and the request for transparency and access and accountability, and applies to all contracted parties, as quickly as possible.

2.a. Protection of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Identifiers

On 27 January 2019 the Board referred to the ICANN Learn online platform. All these initiatives are commendable and important and contribute to the development of a solution that would allow the community to quickly identify the questions being asked in each proceeding.

2.a. Phase 5 | Close Request

The Board directs the ICANN President and CEO “to support the development of a solution that would allow the .AMAZON applications directing the ICANN President and CEO "to support the .AMAZON applications and to include a resolution that "encourages a high level of communication between the President and the GAC regarding proposed technical issues" and a resolution that "encourages the ICANN to produce a joint report on the .AMAZON applications".

On 27 January 2019 the Board directed the ICANN President and CEO to "support the development of a solution that would allow the community to quickly identify the questions being asked in each proceeding." This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 21 January 2019.

2.c. Phase 5 | Close Request

The Board directed the ICANN President and CEO "to support the development of a solution that would allow the community to quickly identify the questions being asked in each proceeding." This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 21 January 2019.

2.c. Phase 5 | Close Request

The Board directs the ICANN President and CEO "to support the development of a solution that would allow the community to quickly identify the questions being asked in each proceeding." This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 21 January 2019.

2.a. Follow-up to the Board resolution of 22 March 2018 on access to WHOIS

The Board’s consideration of 27 January 2019.

The Board directs the ICANN President and CEO “to support the development of a solution that would allow the community to quickly identify the questions being asked in each proceeding." This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 21 January 2019.

2.a. Follow-up to the Board resolution of 22 March 2018 on access to WHOIS

The Board directs the ICANN President and CEO “to support the development of a solution that would allow the community to quickly identify the questions being asked in each proceeding." This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 21 January 2019.

2.a. Follow-up to the Board resolution of 22 March 2018 on access to WHOIS

The Board directs the ICANN President and CEO “to support the development of a solution that would allow the community to quickly identify the questions being asked in each proceeding." This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 21 January 2019.

2.a. Follow-up to the Board resolution of 22 March 2018 on access to WHOIS

The Board directs the ICANN President and CEO “to support the development of a solution that would allow the community to quickly identify the questions being asked in each proceeding." This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 21 January 2019.

2.a. Follow-up to the Board resolution of 22 March 2018 on access to WHOIS

The Board directs the ICANN President and CEO “to support the development of a solution that would allow the community to quickly identify the questions being asked in each proceeding." This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 21 January 2019.

2.a. Follow-up to the Board resolution of 22 March 2018 on access to WHOIS

The Board directs the ICANN President and CEO “to support the development of a solution that would allow the community to quickly identify the questions being asked in each proceeding." This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 21 January 2019.

2.a. Follow-up to the Board resolution of 22 March 2018 on access to WHOIS

The Board directs the ICANN President and CEO “to support the development of a solution that would allow the community to quickly identify the questions being asked in each proceeding." This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 21 January 2019.

2.a. Follow-up to the Board resolution of 22 March 2018 on access to WHOIS

The Board directs the ICANN President and CEO “to support the development of a solution that would allow the community to quickly identify the questions being asked in each proceeding." This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 21 January 2019.

2.a. Follow-up to the Board resolution of 22 March 2018 on access to WHOIS

The Board directs the ICANN President and CEO “to support the development of a solution that would allow the community to quickly identify the questions being asked in each proceeding." This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 21 January 2019.

2.a. Follow-up to the Board resolution of 22 March 2018 on access to WHOIS

The Board directs the ICANN President and CEO “to support the development of a solution that would allow the community to quickly identify the questions being asked in each proceeding." This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 21 January 2019.

2.a. Follow-up to the Board resolution of 22 March 2018 on access to WHOIS

The Board directs the ICANN President and CEO “to support the development of a solution that would allow the community to quickly identify the questions being asked in each proceeding." This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 21 January 2019.

2.a. Follow-up to the Board resolution of 22 March 2018 on access to WHOIS

The Board directs the ICANN President and CEO “to support the development of a solution that would allow the community to quickly identify the questions being asked in each proceeding," This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 21 January 2019.

2.a. Follow-up to the Board resolution of 22 March 2018 on access to WHOIS

The Board directs the ICANN President and CEO “to support the development of a solution that would allow the community to quickly identify the questions being asked in each proceeding," This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 21 January 2019.

2.a. Follow-up to the Board resolution of 22 March 2018 on access to WHOIS

The Board directs the ICANN President and CEO “to support the development of a solution that would allow the community to quickly identify the questions being asked in each proceeding," This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 21 January 2019.

2.a. Follow-up to the Board resolution of 22 March 2018 on access to WHOIS

The Board directs the ICANN President and CEO “to support the development of a solution that would allow the community to quickly identify the questions being asked in each proceeding," This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 21 January 2019.
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN67 Virtual Communique (March 2020). (Note: the ICANN67 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus or Follow-up to Previous GAC Advice)

- ICANN61 San Juan
- ICANN62 Panama
- 3/15/18
- 6/28/18
- GDPR and WHOIS Codes at the Second Level
- Two-character Country Code

The GAC Advice Status includes Action Request Numbers (AR-001671, AR-001873, AR-001874) and provides an overview of the advice, including:

1. The advice was reviewed by the Board of Trustees on 30 May 2018 and the Board noted the advice was complete as of the Board's consideration of 30 May 2018. The advice was included in the Temporary Specification that was ultimately adopted by the Board on 17 May 2018. The Temporary Specification also takes into account the available “small group” proposal, is adequately taken into account in any Board decisions. The Board also welcomes the GAC’s desire to work with the ICANN org and the community to refine the WHOIS system, the Temporary specification will provide a single, uniform framework forWHOIS access to generic top-level domain registration data, as well as consider safeguards for organizations and Advisory Committees to explore structural changes to improve accuracy and access to generic top-level domain registration data, and shall work with Supporting Stakeholders to establish an effective mechanism to resolve conflicts in a satisfactory manner, taking into account also in any related Board decision; and

2. The Board notes that on 9 July 2018 the Final Report from the IGO-INGO access to curative and remedial health services report was published. The Board notes the recommendation of the IGO-INGO report. This advice was considered complete as of the CEO’s blog of 20 August 2018.

3. The Board initially considered this advice on 30 May 2018. However at the time, the Board was required to reaffirm the Temporary Specification every 90 days following publication of the Draft Framework for a Possible Unified Approach. This advice was considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 30 May 2018.

4. The Board notes that on 27 January 2018 the Final Report from the IGO-INGO access to curative and remedial health services report was published. The Board notes the recommendation of the IGO-INGO report. This advice was considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 27 January 2018 and stated in its scorecard: The Board acknowledges this advice and refers further discussions with the GAC. This item remains open for further Board consideration.

5. The Board notes that on 29 September 2017 the Final Report of the IGO-INGO access to curative and remedial health services report was published. The Board notes the recommendation of the IGO-INGO report. This advice was considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 30 September 2017.

6. The Board notes that on 1 January 2017 the Final Report of the IGO-INGO access to curative and remedial health services report was published. The Board notes the recommendation of the IGO-INGO report. This advice was considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 1 January 2017.

7. The Board notes that on 1 July 2016 the Final Report of the IGO-INGO access to curative and remedial health services report was published. The Board notes the recommendation of the IGO-INGO report. This advice was considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 1 July 2016.

8. The Board notes that on 1 January 2016 the Final Report of the IGO-INGO access to curative and remedial health services report was published. The Board notes the recommendation of the IGO-INGO report. This advice was considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 1 January 2016.

9. The Board notes that on 1 July 2015 the Final Report of the IGO-INGO access to curative and remedial health services report was published. The Board notes the recommendation of the IGO-INGO report. This advice was considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 1 July 2015.

10. The Board notes that on 1 January 2015 the Final Report of the IGO-INGO access to curative and remedial health services report was published. The Board notes the recommendation of the IGO-INGO report. This advice was considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 1 January 2015.

11. The Board notes that on 1 January 2014 the Final Report of the IGO-INGO access to curative and remedial health services report was published. The Board notes the recommendation of the IGO-INGO report. This advice was considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 1 January 2014.

12. The Board notes that on 1 January 2013 the Final Report of the IGO-INGO access to curative and remedial health services report was published. The Board notes the recommendation of the IGO-INGO report. This advice was considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 1 January 2013.

13. The Board notes that on 1 January 2012 the Final Report of the IGO-INGO access to curative and remedial health services report was published. The Board notes the recommendation of the IGO-INGO report. This advice was considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 1 January 2012.

14. The Board notes that on 1 January 2011 the Final Report of the IGO-INGO access to curative and remedial health services report was published. The Board notes the recommendation of the IGO-INGO report. This advice was considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 1 January 2011.
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GAC-001672</td>
<td>AR-001672</td>
<td>As of 8 June 2020</td>
<td>The Beijing Communique (April 2013) to the ICANN67 Virtual Communique (March 2020). (Note: the ICANN67 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus or Follow-up to Previous GAC Advice)</td>
<td>GAC-001689</td>
<td>As of 8 June 2020</td>
<td>The ICANN61 San Juan Communique</td>
<td>GAC-001680</td>
<td>As of 8 June 2020</td>
<td>The ICANN61 San Juan Communique</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Amazon corporation. Several GAC members expressed serious concerns without prejudging how this should be linked to the Board’s request, both in terms of process and substance. In that context, the GAC will contain in this Board decision, which might set a worrisome precedent.

The GAC met with representatives of the Amazon corporation and discussed developments regarding the company’s applications, particularly as it will be adopted for ICANN61, which will address the representations noted in the previous advice and will outline next steps to be taken in light of Amazon’s need.

Phase 1 | Eval/Wks Consider

The GAC Board initially considered this advice on 20 May 2018. However, at the time, the Board requested, “as requested by the GAC,” to 15 May 2018 letter to the ICANN Board, that the GAC, “Any information to provide to the Board as it relates to the application for .amazon domain, and the recent developments, including the WHOIS and GDPR matters. The Board most recently considered this time on 15 May 2018 and stated its agreement. As noted in the previous recommendation, the Board in principle supports the principles of the EPDP, which has been cancelled in the Board’s considerations. The public comment is on the EPDP Phase 1 report (Comunic) and the EPDP Phase 1 report that “will determine and route the review of Notification of Phase II.” The Board responds to this open advice on the advice.

Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider

The ICANN Board initially considered this advice on 30 May 2018. However, at the time, the Board requested, “as requested by the GAC,” to 15 May 2018 letter to the ICANN Board, that the Board defers consideration of this advice pending further discussion with the Board. The Board most recently considered this time on 15 May 2018 and stated in the comments, “The Board notes the recommendation in the EPDP Phase 1 report that “will determine the review of notification of Phase II” and that the EPDP Phase 1 report that “will determine and route the review of Notification of Phase II.” The Board continues to defer action on this advice.

Phase 1 | Eval/Wks Consider

The ICANN Board initially considered this advice on 20 May 2018. However, at the time, the Board requested, “as requested by the GAC,” to 15 May 2018 letter to the ICANN Board, that the Board defers consideration of this advice pending further discussion with the Board. The Board most recently considered this time on 15 May 2018 and stated in the comments, “The Board notes the recommendation in the EPDP Phase 1 report that “will determine the review of notification of Phase II” and that the EPDP Phase 1 report that “will determine and route the review of Notification of Phase II.” The Board continues to defer action on this advice.

Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider

The ICANN Board initially considered this advice on 20 May 2018. However, at the time, the Board requested, “as requested by the GAC,” to 15 May 2018 letter to the ICANN Board, that the Board defers consideration of this advice pending further discussion with the Board. The Board most recently considered this time on 15 May 2018 and stated in the comments, “The Board notes the recommendation in the EPDP Phase 1 report that “will determine the review of notification of Phase II” and that the EPDP Phase 1 report that “will determine and route the review of Notification of Phase II.” The Board continues to defer action on this advice.

Phase 1 | Eval/Wks Consider

The ICANN Board initially considered this advice on 20 May 2018. However, at the time, the Board requested, “as requested by the GAC,” to 15 May 2018 letter to the ICANN Board, that the Board defers consideration of this advice pending further discussion with the Board. The Board most recently considered this time on 15 May 2018 and stated in the comments, “The Board notes the recommendation in the EPDP Phase 1 report that “will determine the review of notification of Phase II” and that the EPDP Phase 1 report that “will determine and route the review of Notification of Phase II.” The Board continues to defer action on this advice.

Phase 1 | Eval/Wks Consider

The ICANN Board initially considered this advice on 20 May 2018. However, at the time, the Board requested, “as requested by the GAC,” to 15 May 2018 letter to the ICANN Board, that the Board defers consideration of this advice pending further discussion with the Board. The Board most recently considered this time on 15 May 2018 and stated in the comments, “The Board notes the recommendation in the EPDP Phase 1 report that “will determine the review of notification of Phase II” and that the EPDP Phase 1 report that “will determine and route the review of Notification of Phase II.” The Board continues to defer action on this advice.
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN67 Virtual Communique (March 2020). (Note: the ICANN67 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus or Follow-up to Previous GAC Advice)
Advice Item for content and services online.

Through user-friendly and easy access to comprehensive information to facilitate any action. 3. Duping WHOIS quickly accessible to the public, including businesses and other organizations for legitimate purposes, including to contact them directly and develop contact, to contact them and establish a business relationship and other communications.

2. The GAC advises the ICANN Board that: i. the 2007 GAC WHOIS Principles provide a good framework for the WHOIS service. ii. The GAC recommends that the ICANN Board consider the implications of the recent WHOIS/WHOIS service changes. iii. The GAC recommends that the ICANN Board consider the implications of the recent WHOIS/WHOIS service changes.

The Board accepts this advice and welcomes the GAC's full engagement with the community on the WHOIS-related discussions and is committed to continue engaging in facilitative discussions in a transparent way. The Board expresses its gratitude to the GAC for its engagement and welcomes its commitment to continue engaging in facilitative discussions in a transparent way.

The Board expresses its gratitude to the GAC for its engagement and welcomes its commitment to continue engaging in facilitative discussions in a transparent way.

The Board expresses its gratitude to the GAC for its engagement and welcomes its commitment to continue engaging in facilitative discussions in a transparent way.

The Board expresses its gratitude to the GAC for its engagement and welcomes its commitment to continue engaging in facilitative discussions in a transparent way.

The Board expresses its gratitude to the GAC for its engagement and welcomes its commitment to continue engaging in facilitative discussions in a transparent way.
provision of advice. This means that a high level of participation by all interested parties is essential, as this is a critical component of the process. The GAC encourages the inclusion of representatives from all relevant stakeholders, including governments, industry, and civil society, to ensure a comprehensive and fair consideration of all aspects.

The GAC notes that this is an important consideration for the development of the new domain name system (DNS) and the future of the internet. By including a wide range of perspectives, the GAC ensures that the decisions made are well-informed and reflect the needs and interests of all stakeholders.

The GAC recommends that all interested parties participate in the forthcoming advice process to ensure that their views are heard. The GAC also encourages participation in the upcoming consultation on the new gTLD program, which will provide an opportunity for all stakeholders to contribute to the development of this important initiative.

The GAC looks forward to working closely with all interested parties to ensure that the new gTLD program is successful and meets the needs of all stakeholders. By working together, we can ensure that the DNS continues to evolve and meet the needs of a rapidly changing digital world.

The GAC also encourages the development of guidelines and best practices to ensure that the new gTLD program is successful. By doing so, we can ensure that the DNS continues to evolve and meet the needs of all stakeholders.

The GAC also encourages the development of guidelines and best practices to ensure that the new gTLD program is successful. By doing so, we can ensure that the DNS continues to evolve and meet the needs of all stakeholders.

The GAC also encourages the development of guidelines and best practices to ensure that the new gTLD program is successful. By doing so, we can ensure that the DNS continues to evolve and meet the needs of all stakeholders.

The GAC also encourages the development of guidelines and best practices to ensure that the new gTLD program is successful. By doing so, we can ensure that the DNS continues to evolve and meet the needs of all stakeholders.

The GAC also encourages the development of guidelines and best practices to ensure that the new gTLD program is successful. By doing so, we can ensure that the DNS continues to evolve and meet the needs of all stakeholders.
As of 8 June 2020

**GAC Advice Status**

**AR-001359**
- **Notes:**
  - Communique
  - ICANN58 Copenhagen
  - 3/15/17

**AR-001362**
- **Notes:**
  - Communique
  - ICANN58 Copenhagen
  - 3/15/17

**AR-001358**
- **Notes:**
  - Communique
  - ICANN58 Copenhagen
  - 3/15/17

**AR-001366**
- **Notes:**
  - Communique
  - ICANN59 Johannesburg
  - 3/15/17

**AR-002418**
- **Notes:**
  - Communiqué
  - ICANN59 Johannesburg
  - 3/15/17

**Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider**

On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the Copenhagen Communique and provided this response to the participants. The Board, in its Copenhagen advice, reiterated the need to recognize the risk of confusion between country codes and diffident names or domain names at the 2-character level. The Board highlighted that the GAC advice, given the potential for confusion, should be considered in the context of efforts made by the ICANN community to ensure that the GNSO recommendations are in line with both previous GAC advice and the decisions of the Board. The Board also acknowledged the unique perspectives and valuable contributions of the Board and other parts of the ICANN community that are leading efforts to address this challenge for effective and efficient name resolution. The Board noted that the GAC advice was consistent with the Board's ongoing efforts to implement important policy development work aimed at being carried out in a timely and efficient manner. The Board also noted the level of support for the resolution of this issue as reflected in the GAC advice.

**Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider**

On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the Copenhagen Communique and provided this response to the participants. The Board, in its Copenhagen advice, reiterated the need to recognize the risk of confusion between country codes and 2-letter registrations at the second level in line with the Copenhagen Communique. The Board highlighted that the GNSO recommendations reflect the Board's previous advice to the community to ensure that the GNSO recommendations are in line with the ICANN organization's framework, the IANA’s framework, and the Board's previous advice in the Copenhagen Communique. The Board also acknowledged the valuable input provided by the community and noted the level of support for the resolution of this issue as reflected in the GAC advice.

**Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider**

On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the Copenhagen Communique and provided this response to the participants. The Board, in its Copenhagen advice, reiterated the need to recognize the risk of confusion between country codes and 2-letter registrations at the second level. The Board highlighted that the GNSO recommendations reflect the Board's previous advice to the community to ensure that the GNSO recommendations are in line with the ICANN organization's framework, the IANA’s framework, and the Board's previous advice in the Copenhagen Communique. The Board also acknowledged the valuable input provided by the community and noted the level of support for the resolution of this issue as reflected in the GAC advice.

**Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider**

On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the Copenhagen Communique and provided this response to the participants. The Board, in its Copenhagen advice, reiterated the need to recognize the risk of confusion between country codes and 2-letter registrations at the second level. The Board highlighted that the GNSO recommendations reflect the Board's previous advice to the community to ensure that the GNSO recommendations are in line with the ICANN organization's framework, the IANA’s framework, and the Board's previous advice in the Copenhagen Communique. The Board also acknowledged the valuable input provided by the community and noted the level of support for the resolution of this issue as reflected in the GAC advice.

**Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider**

On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the Copenhagen Communique and provided this response to the participants. The Board, in its Copenhagen advice, reiterated the need to recognize the risk of confusion between country codes and 2-letter registrations at the second level. The Board highlighted that the GNSO recommendations reflect the Board's previous advice to the community to ensure that the GNSO recommendations are in line with the ICANN organization's framework, the IANA’s framework, and the Board's previous advice in the Copenhagen Communique. The Board also acknowledged the valuable input provided by the community and noted the level of support for the resolution of this issue as reflected in the GAC advice.

**Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider**

On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the Copenhagen Communique and provided this response to the participants. The Board, in its Copenhagen advice, reiterated the need to recognize the risk of confusion between country codes and 2-letter registrations at the second level. The Board highlighted that the GNSO recommendations reflect the Board's previous advice to the community to ensure that the GNSO recommendations are in line with the ICANN organization's framework, the IANA’s framework, and the Board's previous advice in the Copenhagen Communique. The Board also acknowledged the valuable input provided by the community and noted the level of support for the resolution of this issue as reflected in the GAC advice.
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN67 Virtual Communique (March 2020). (Note: the ICANN67 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus or Follow-up to Previous GAC Advice)
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The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN67 Virtual Communique (March 2020). (Note: the ICANN67 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus or Follow-up to Previous GAC Advice)

10/02/18
ICANN68 board meeting document
3/22/17
Advisory Committee
4.1
Pursuant to ICANN68, the GAC has considered the second level response from the Board given in its scorecard: The Board understands that the GAC has provided comments to the GNSO's Extended Process Intervening Panel Working Group, and looks forward to receiving these comments. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 3 February 2017.

10/03/18
ICANN69 board meeting document
3/22/17
Advisory Committee
4.1
The GAC has considered the second level response from the Board given in its scorecard: The Board understands that the GAC has provided comments to the GNSO's Extended Process Intervening Panel Working Group, and looks forward to receiving these comments. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 3 February 2017.

10/03/18
ICANN69 board meeting document
3/22/17
Advisory Committee
4.1
The GAC has considered the second level response from the Board given in its scorecard: The Board understands that the GAC has provided comments to the GNSO's Extended Process Intervening Panel Working Group, and looks forward to receiving these comments. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 3 February 2017.

10/03/18
ICANN69 board meeting document
3/22/17
Advisory Committee
4.1
The GAC has considered the second level response from the Board given in its scorecard: The Board understands that the GAC has provided comments to the GNSO's Extended Process Intervening Panel Working Group, and looks forward to receiving these comments. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 3 February 2017.

10/03/18
ICANN69 board meeting document
3/22/17
Advisory Committee
4.1
The GAC has considered the second level response from the Board given in its scorecard: The Board understands that the GAC has provided comments to the GNSO's Extended Process Intervening Panel Working Group, and looks forward to receiving these comments. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 3 February 2017.
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN67 Virtual Communique (March 2020). (Note: the ICANN67 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus or Follow-up to Previous GAC Advice).
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### Action Request Number

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>Date of Consideration</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>About This Item</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>GAC Advice Status</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
<th>Close Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001307</td>
<td>ICANN56 Helsinki Communique</td>
<td>12/13/16</td>
<td>GAC Advice Status</td>
<td>The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN67 Virtual Communique (March 2020). (Note: the ICANN67 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus or Follow-up to Previous GAC Advice)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2016-12-13-en#1.d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001307</td>
<td>ICANN56 Helsinki Communique</td>
<td>12/13/16</td>
<td>GAC Advice Status</td>
<td>Future gTLDs Policies and Procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2016-12-13-en#1.d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001307</td>
<td>ICANN56 Helsinki Communique</td>
<td>12/13/16</td>
<td>GAC Advice Status</td>
<td>The GAC advises the ICANN Board that the starting point for development of policy on further releases of new gTLDs should first take into consideration the results of all relevant reviews of the new gTLD round and determine which aspects and elements need adjustment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2016-12-13-en#1.d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001307</td>
<td>ICANN56 Helsinki Communique</td>
<td>12/13/16</td>
<td>GAC Advice Status</td>
<td>The GAC advises the ICANN Board to: i. pursue its engagement with both the ICANN community (cross-section of all points known in an effort to resolve differences between GAC and ICANN advice on this topic) while remaining responsive to concerns laid out in its advice in advance to the Helsinki Communique. Taking into account the number of individuals who have provided feedback (ICANN and the GAC) since the ICANN Board reached the consensus view presented in its scorecard, the concern is that the ICANN Board still engages in its discussions both with the ICANN community and governments under international law.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2016-12-13-en#1.d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001307</td>
<td>ICANN56 Helsinki Communique</td>
<td>12/13/16</td>
<td>GAC Advice Status</td>
<td>The GAC and the GNSO on the issue of IGO protections in an effort to remain responsive to concerns laid out in its advice in advance to the Helsinki Communique. The GAC advises the ICANN Board to: a. The GAC advises the ICANN Board to: i. continue in depth analyses and discussions on all aspects related to the potential use of letter codes in the ISO-3166 list as gTLDs in future rounds, in particular with regard to whether such uses potentially serve a public interest. ii. the ICANN Board should consider this in the context of other letter codes at ISO-3166, and discuss this with relevant governments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2016-12-13-en#1.d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001307</td>
<td>ICANN56 Helsinki Communique</td>
<td>12/13/16</td>
<td>GAC Advice Status</td>
<td>The GAC advises the ICANN Board to encourage the community to present its views on potential use of 3-letter ISO codes at the second level. As noted in the letter, the Cross-Community Working Group on Use of Country/Territory Names in gTLDs provided this response in its scorecard: The Board accepts this advice. The Board sent a letter to the Cross-Community Working Group on Use of Country/Territory Names in gTLDs (CCWG-usagroups.org) on 11 February 2015. Specifically, the Board directed the CCWG to make the process for the release of letter codes at the second level follow: a) stipulate a timeframe in terms of actions that will be required for the community to achieve consensus and b) consider the need for more general guidelines on potential uses of letter codes at the second level. The Board also encouraged the CCWG to continue its discussions and find a mechanism to handle the potential use of letter codes at the second level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2016-12-13-en#1.d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN67 Virtual Communique (March 2020). (Note: the ICANN67 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus or Follow-up to Previous GAC Advice.)
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN67 Virtual Communique (March 2020). (Note: the ICANN67 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus or Follow-up to Previous GAC Advice)

**Notes:**

- The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary. This response in its scorecard: The Board accepts this advice while noting that the advice received is consistent with the Board's position on the matter.
- The Board recognizes that the CCT Review Team is concluding its work and that recommendations from the Review Team could be incorporated into the policy implementation. The Board will consider such recommendations at its next meeting, if any.
- The Board agrees that the GAC's advice with the community as appropriate. The Board is consulting with the GAC and stakeholders on the implementation of the PDP Working Group (WG), as the Board agrees the PDP will need to be adapted to ensure that the goals and objectives of the PDP are achieved.
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GAC Advice Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>Date of Communique</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>About this Number</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
<th>Finalized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95-01-1344 AR-001344</td>
<td>ICANN54 Dublin Communique</td>
<td>10/21/15</td>
<td>Protection for IGOs</td>
<td>6.a.I.</td>
<td>With respect to new requests for release, the Board to facilitate simplification of the process for providing comments.</td>
<td>Resolved (2016.05.15.07), the Board thanks the GNSO for the timely submission of comments. The Board also wishes to note that the comments received from governments, particularly for issues of high interest across the community at large, are important for the Board to consider the impact on the community’s views. The Board is considering whether to authorize the release of requested Letters/Letter Two-Character comments consideration process launched on 6 October 2015 “is not consistent with the concerns of the community that the two-character comments consideration process is consistent with the concerns of the community.” The Board advised the GNSO not to proceed with the two-character comments consideration process.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-1-654660-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-1-654660-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1/1/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95-01-1345 AR-001345</td>
<td>ICANN54 Dublin Communique</td>
<td>11/1/15</td>
<td>Use of 2-letter Country Code Country Names of the Second Level</td>
<td>5.a.I. - 5.c.II.</td>
<td>The Board advised the Board to offer alternative means for comments. With the Board’s intention of ensuring meaningful engagement and conversation, particularly for issues of high interest across the community at large, the Board considers that a strong GAC voice will ensure the Board’s action aligns with the views of those who are not able to attend meetings. The Board is considering whether to authorize the release of requested Letters/Letter Two-Character comments consideration process launched on 6 October 2015 “is not consistent with the concerns of the community that the two-character comments consideration process is consistent with the concerns of the community.” The Board advised the GNSO not to proceed with the two-character comments consideration process.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-1-654660-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-1-654660-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1/1/16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95-01-1346 AR-001346</td>
<td>ICANN54 Dublin Communique</td>
<td>11/9/16</td>
<td>Privacy Proxy Services Accreditation Issues</td>
<td>3.a.I.</td>
<td>The Board advises the Board to address their concerns. c. With respect to new requests for release, the Board to facilitate simplification of the process for providing comments.</td>
<td>Resolved (2016.05.15.07), the Board thanks the GNSO for the timely submission of comments. The Board also wishes to note that the comments received from governments, particularly for issues of high interest across the community at large, are important for the Board to consider the impact on the community’s views. The Board is considering whether to authorize the release of requested Letters/Letter Two-Character comments consideration process launched on 6 October 2015 “is not consistent with the concerns of the community that the two-character comments consideration process is consistent with the concerns of the community.” The Board advised the GNSO not to proceed with the two-character comments consideration process.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-1-654660-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-1-654660-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1/1/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95-01-1347 AR-001347</td>
<td>ICANN54 Dublin Communique</td>
<td>3/9/16</td>
<td>Privacy and Proxy Services</td>
<td>2.a.I.</td>
<td>The GAC advises the Board to facilitate the timely conclusion of discussions of the “small group” and the NGPC in an effort to resolve the conflict of interest between the sides of the issue. The GAC advises the Board would like to clarify that all comments from relevant governments are fully considered. The ICANN60 Board Meeting Resolution 2016-05-15-07, the Board thanks the GNSO for the timely submission of comments. The Board also wishes to note that the comments received from governments, particularly for issues of high interest across the community at large, are important for the Board to consider the impact on the community’s views. The Board is considering whether to authorize the release of requested Letters/Letter Two-Character comments consideration process launched on 6 October 2015 “is not consistent with the concerns of the community that the two-character comments consideration process is consistent with the concerns of the community.” The Board advised the GNSO not to proceed with the two-character comments consideration process.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-1-654660-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-1-654660-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1/1/16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN67 Virtual Communique (March 2020). (Note: the ICANN67 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus or Follow-up to Previous GAC Advice)
GAC Advice Status
As of 8 June 2020

Notes: The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN67 Virtual Communique (March 2020). (Note: the ICANN67 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus or Follow-up to Previous GAC Advice)

Action Request Number | Communique Date | Communique Type | Category | Advice Item | Presentations | Action Taken | Status
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---

On 3 February 2016 the Board considered the Public Comment on proposals for improving the process to submit this advice to the GNSO Council and requested the Council to consider and analyze these issues further as part of the PDP to consider community applications. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 3 February 2016.


On 3 February 2016 the Board considered the Public Comment on proposals for improving the process to submit this advice to the GNSO Council. The Board directed the Council to consider and analyze these issues further as part of the PDP to consider community applications. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 3 February 2016.


On 3 February 2016 the Board considered the Public Comment on proposals for improving the process to submit this advice to the GNSO Council. The Board directed the Council to consider and analyze these issues further as part of the PDP to consider community applications. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 3 February 2016.

Action Request Number | Communique Date | Communique Type | Category | Advice Item | Presentations | Action Taken | Status
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---

On 3 February 2016 the Board considered the Public Comment on proposals for improving the process to submit this advice to the GNSO Council and requested the Council to consider and analyze these issues further as part of the PDP to consider community applications. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 3 February 2016.


On 3 February 2016 the Board considered the Public Comment on proposals for improving the process to submit this advice to the GNSO Council. The Board directed the Council to consider and analyze these issues further as part of the PDP to consider community applications. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 3 February 2016.


On 3 February 2016 the Board considered the Public Comment on proposals for improving the process to submit this advice to the GNSO Council. The Board directed the Council to consider and analyze these issues further as part of the PDP to consider community applications. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 3 February 2016.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Request Number</th>
<th>Communique Date</th>
<th>Date of Item</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
<th>Board Action Type</th>
<th>Board Action</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCTO50/18/14</td>
<td>10/18/15</td>
<td>GAC55 Buenos Aires Communiqué</td>
<td>4.1.1</td>
<td>Advice in response to 18 October 2015 Abu Dhabi Communiqué and the ensuing Comment Board Action(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTO50/18/15</td>
<td>10/18/15</td>
<td>GAC55 Buenos Aires Communiqué</td>
<td>4.1.2</td>
<td>Advice in response to 18 October 2015 Abu Dhabi Communiqué and the ensuing Comment Board Action(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTO50/18/16</td>
<td>10/18/15</td>
<td>GAC55 Buenos Aires Communiqué</td>
<td>4.1.3</td>
<td>Advice in response to 18 October 2015 Abu Dhabi Communiqué and the ensuing Comment Board Action(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTO50/18/17</td>
<td>10/18/15</td>
<td>GAC55 Buenos Aires Communiqué</td>
<td>4.1.4</td>
<td>Advice in response to 18 October 2015 Abu Dhabi Communiqué and the ensuing Comment Board Action(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTO50/18/18</td>
<td>10/18/15</td>
<td>GAC55 Buenos Aires Communiqué</td>
<td>4.1.5</td>
<td>Advice in response to 18 October 2015 Abu Dhabi Communiqué and the ensuing Comment Board Action(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Action Request Number

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>MoM Approval</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Decision Link</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
As of 8 June 2020

GAC Advice Status

AR-001342

AR-001291

AR-001341

Action Request Number

Current Phase

Board Resolution Link

GAC Advice Scorecard - 10/7/15

GAC Advice Scorecard - 6/25/15

GAC Advice Scorecard - 2/12/15

GAC Advice Scorecard - 10/7/15

GAC Advice Scorecard - 10/7/15

The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN67 Virtual Communique (March 2020). (Note: the ICANN67 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus or Follow-up to Previous GAC Advice)

Category

Country and Territory Names

Framework of Interpretation Working Group (FOIWG)

Framework of Interpretation Working Group (FOIWG)

Second Level Country and Territory Names

Safeguards Advice

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

Considering the advice as incomplete, because the work is ongoing, and the Board is directed to continue to collaborate with the GAC on the second-level to the extent the relevant government has indicated its approval in the second-level database, and reporting back to the Board if there is input from a relevant government.

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

Considering the advice as complete as of the Board's resolution of 18 May 2017.

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

Considering the advice as complete as of the Board's consideration and resolution 25 June 2015.

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

Considering the advice as complete as of the Board's resolution of 25 June 2015.

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


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

Considering the advice as complete as of the Board's resolution of 25 June 2015.

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

Considering the advice as complete as of the Board's resolution of 25 June 2015.

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

Considering the advice as complete as of the Board's resolution of 25 June 2015.

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

Considering the advice as complete as of the Board's resolution of 25 June 2015.

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

Considering the advice as complete as of the Board's resolution of 25 June 2015.

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

Considering the advice as complete as of the Board's resolution of 25 June 2015.

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

Considering the advice as complete as of the Board's resolution of 25 June 2015.

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

Considering the advice as complete as of the Board's resolution of 25 June 2015.

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

Considering the advice as complete as of the Board's resolution of 25 June 2015.

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

Considering the advice as complete as of the Board's resolution of 25 June 2015.

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

Considering the advice as complete as of the Board's resolution of 25 June 2015.

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

Considering the advice as complete as of the Board's resolution of 25 June 2015.

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

Considering the advice as complete as of the Board's resolution of 25 June 2015.

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

Considering the advice as complete as of the Board's resolution of 25 June 2015.

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

Considering the advice as complete as of the Board's resolution of 25 June 2015.

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

Considering the advice as complete as of the Board's resolution of 25 June 2015.

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

Considering the advice as complete as of the Board's resolution of 25 June 2015.

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

Considering the advice as complete as of the Board's resolution of 25 June 2015.

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

Considering the advice as complete as of the Board's resolution of 25 June 2015.

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

Considering the advice as complete as of the Board's resolution of 25 June 2015.

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

Considering the advice as complete as of the Board's resolution of 25 June 2015.

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

Considering the advice as complete as of the Board's resolution of 25 June 2015.

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

Considering the advice as complete as of the Board's resolution of 25 June 2015.

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

Considering the advice as complete as of the Board's resolution of 25 June 2015.

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

Considering the advice as complete as of the Board's resolution of 25 June 2015.

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

Considering the advice as complete as of the Board's resolution of 25 June 2015.

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

Considering the advice as complete as of the Board's resolution of 25 June 2015.

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

Considering the advice as complete as of the Board's resolution of 25 June 2015.

1.a.I. - 1.d.I.
As of 8 June 2020

GAC Advice Status

Communique

AR-001280

Advice Item 1. The GAC reaffirms its advice from the Toronto, Beijing, Durban, Buenos Aires and Lima Cross Community Working Groups on Enhancing ICANN Accountability and Governance. In particular, the GAC notes that key operational decisions for ICANN, as mandated by its charter, are determined by ICANN's Board. The GAC also notes that ICANN's Board and the ICANN Accountability and Governance Cross Community Working Group (CCWG) should ensure that any public interest considerations are properly considered in each decision. The GAC further notes that any GAC advice should also consider the views of other stakeholders. The GAC reaffirms that any such advice should not exceed the scope of the CCWG's mandate and should avoid duplication of advice that already exists. The GAC notes that key operational decisions for ICANN are determined by ICANN's Board, and that the CCWG should align its recommendations with the Board's decisions. The GAC further notes that the CCWG's recommended advice should be based on a clear and comprehensive understanding of the issues under consideration. The GAC recommends that any advice issued by the CCWG should be consistent with the principles of accountability and transparency and should be subject to public consultation.

Phase 1: Evaluated & Considered

NA

Board Resolution Link


Board Scorecard Link


Notes:

The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2015) through the GNAC-ICANN Virtual Communique (March 2019). (Note: the GAC/ICANN Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus or Follow-up to Previous GAC Advice.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communiqué</th>
<th>Date of Issue</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Board Action(s)</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
<th>Close Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001281</td>
<td>Beijing</td>
<td>10/15/14</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Safeguard Advice Applicable to Categories 2, 3 and 4, including protection, personal data and privacy, law and gTLDs</td>
<td>11.</td>
<td>The GAC continued its discussions on the revised category of items applicable to Categories 2, 3, and 4, including protection, personal data and privacy, law and gTLDs. The GAC discussed the revised category with relevance to the upcoming ICANN 52 meeting and decided to present the revised category for consideration to the ICANN 52 meeting and the Board.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001282</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>11/1/17</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Implementation of WHOIS Related-Safeguards: 1. Provide the GAC with a comprehensive report indicating implementation options and, subject to defining the timeline; 2. Inform the GAC of the findings of this consultation no later than the ICANN 52 meeting; 3. Complete the WHOIS pilot study on the accuracy and timeliness of the WHOIS database; and 4. Plan the implementation of WHOIS-related safeguards referred to in the GAC advice regarding the new gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response in its Los Angeles Communiqué and its scorecard.</td>
<td>11.</td>
<td>The Board reviewed this item and determined that no further action was necessary. The item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 5 November 2017.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001283</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>11/1/17</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Implementation of WHOIS Related-Safeguards: 1. Provide the GAC with a comprehensive report indicating implementation options and, subject to defining the timeline; 2. Inform the GAC of the findings of this consultation no later than the ICANN 52 meeting; 3. Complete the WHOIS pilot study on the accuracy and timeliness of the WHOIS database; and 4. Plan the implementation of WHOIS-related safeguards referred to in the GAC advice regarding the new gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response in its Los Angeles Communiqué and its scorecard.</td>
<td>11.</td>
<td>The Board reviewed this item and determined that no further action was necessary. The item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 5 November 2017.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001284</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>11/1/17</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Implementation of WHOIS Related-Safeguards: 1. Provide the GAC with a comprehensive report indicating implementation options and, subject to defining the timeline; 2. Inform the GAC of the findings of this consultation no later than the ICANN 52 meeting; 3. Complete the WHOIS pilot study on the accuracy and timeliness of the WHOIS database; and 4. Plan the implementation of WHOIS-related safeguards referred to in the GAC advice regarding the new gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response in its Los Angeles Communiqué and its scorecard.</td>
<td>11.</td>
<td>The Board reviewed this item and determined that no further action was necessary. The item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 5 November 2017.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001285</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>11/1/17</td>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Implementation of WHOIS Related-Safeguards: 1. Provide the GAC with a comprehensive report indicating implementation options and, subject to defining the timeline; 2. Inform the GAC of the findings of this consultation no later than the ICANN 52 meeting; 3. Complete the WHOIS pilot study on the accuracy and timeliness of the WHOIS database; and 4. Plan the implementation of WHOIS-related safeguards referred to in the GAC advice regarding the new gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response in its Los Angeles Communiqué and its scorecard.</td>
<td>11.</td>
<td>The Board reviewed this item and determined that no further action was necessary. The item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 5 November 2017.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communiqué (April 2015) through the ICANN67 Virtual Communiqué (March 2020). (Note: the ICANN67 Virtual Communiqué did not contain Consensus or Follow-up to Previous GAC Advice)
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN67 Virtual Communique (March 2020). (Note: the ICANN67 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus or Follow-up to Previous GAC Advice)

Notes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>Date of Communique</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>About Item Number</th>
<th>Action Text</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Close</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The Board notes the recent Accountability and Transparency Review Team (ATRT2) recommendations (26 June 2014) and passed the following resolutions:

Resolved: (2014.06.26.14), the Board accepts all ATRT2 Recommendations and directs the President and CEO to provide the Board on 20 August 2019 regarding the GNSO PDP on IGO-INGO Access to Curative RPMs and will close on 20 August 2019. After the public comment period closes, the Board will consider the GAC's consideration of this advice, this item is now considered complete as of 26 June 2014.

The Board notes the recent Accountability and Transparency Review Team (ATRT2) recommendations (20 June 2014) and passed the following resolution. Resolved: (2014.06.20.14), the Board accepts all ATRT2 Recommendations and directs the President and CEO to provide the Board on 20 August 2019 regarding the GNSO PDP on IGO-INGO Access to Curative RPMs and will close on 20 August 2019. After the public comment period closes, the Board will consider the GAC's consideration of this advice, this item is now considered complete as of 26 June 2014.

The Board notes the recent Accountability and Transparency Review Team (ATRT2) recommendations (20 June 2014) and passed the following resolution. Resolved: (2014.06.20.14), the Board accepts all ATRT2 Recommendations and directs the President and CEO to provide a response on 14 October 2019. This advice was the result of the Second Accountability and Transparency Review Team (ATRT2) report on 26 June 2014, the Board accepts all ATRT2 Recommendations and directs the President and CEO to provide a response on 14 October 2019. The Board will consider the GAC's consideration of this advice, this item is now considered complete as of 26 June 2014.
As of 8 September 2014, the NGPC reviewed this advice and provided its response to the advice
on Initial Community Feedback, of the Principles and Mechanisms and the Process to
Gather Public Input. The NGPC noted the parallel work on the transition of the IANA functions
by ICANN, the NGPC, and a new public-private multi-stakeholder model. The NGPC also
noted that a Final public comment period is scheduled to begin in mid-September, so
please keep this item under discussion. The NGPC also noted that a Final public comment
period is scheduled to begin in mid-September, so please keep this item under discussion.
As of 8 September 2014, the NGPC reviewed this advice and provided its response to the advice
on Initial Community Feedback, of the Principles and Mechanisms and the Process to
Gather Public Input. The NGPC noted the parallel work on the transition of the IANA functions
by ICANN, the NGPC, and a new public-private multi-stakeholder model. The NGPC also
noted that a Final public comment period is scheduled to begin in mid-September, so
please keep this item under discussion. The NGPC also noted that a Final public comment
period is scheduled to begin in mid-September, so please keep this item under discussion.
As of 8 September 2014, the NGPC reviewed this advice and provided its response to the advice
on Initial Community Feedback, of the Principles and Mechanisms and the Process to
Gather Public Input. The NGPC noted the parallel work on the transition of the IANA functions
by ICANN, the NGPC, and a new public-private multi-stakeholder model. The NGPC also
noted that a Final public comment period is scheduled to begin in mid-September, so
please keep this item under discussion. The NGPC also noted that a Final public comment
period is scheduled to begin in mid-September, so please keep this item under discussion.
As of 8 September 2014, the NGPC reviewed this advice and provided its response to the advice
on Initial Community Feedback, of the Principles and Mechanisms and the Process to
Gather Public Input. The NGPC noted the parallel work on the transition of the IANA functions
by ICANN, the NGPC, and a new public-private multi-stakeholder model. The NGPC also
noted that a Final public comment period is scheduled to begin in mid-September, so
please keep this item under discussion. The NGPC also noted that a Final public comment
period is scheduled to begin in mid-September, so please keep this item under discussion.
As of 8 September 2014, the NGPC reviewed this advice and provided its response to the advice
on Initial Community Feedback, of the Principles and Mechanisms and the Process to
Gather Public Input. The NGPC noted the parallel work on the transition of the IANA functions
by ICANN, the NGPC, and a new public-private multi-stakeholder model. The NGPC also
noted that a Final public comment period is scheduled to begin in mid-September, so
please keep this item under discussion. The NGPC also noted that a Final public comment
period is scheduled to begin in mid-September, so please keep this item under discussion.
As of 8 September 2014, the NGPC reviewed this advice and provided its response to the advice
on Initial Community Feedback, of the Principles and Mechanisms and the Process to
Gather Public Input. The NGPC noted the parallel work on the transition of the IANA functions
by ICANN, the NGPC, and a new public-private multi-stakeholder model. The NGPC also
noted that a Final public comment period is scheduled to begin in mid-September, so
please keep this item under discussion. The NGPC also noted that a Final public comment
period is scheduled to begin in mid-September, so please keep this item under discussion.
As of 8 September 2014, the NGPC reviewed this advice and provided its response to the advice
on Initial Community Feedback, of the Principles and Mechanisms and the Process to
Gather Public Input. The NGPC noted the parallel work on the transition of the IANA functions
by ICANN, the NGPC, and a new public-private multi-stakeholder model. The NGPC also
noted that a Final public comment period is scheduled to begin in mid-September, so
please keep this item under discussion. The NGPC also noted that a Final public comment
period is scheduled to begin in mid-September, so please keep this item under discussion.
96/0126 - AR-001259

ICANN/49 Singapore Communique

3/27/14

7.


The GAC expresses its thanks for a briefing provided by Ambassador

accordingly in the Registry Agreement.

requirements pending a decision on these waivers. They further recalled

Specification waiver foreseen in the Registrar Accreditation Agreement, in

developing countries, in line with existing GAC travel support guidelines.

that the high level meeting scheduled for London has representation from

The GAC requests that additional funding for travel be provided to ensure

meeting on compliance with ICANN safeguards for registry operators,

registrars and registrants.

Formal advice (AGA) and some are GAC internal matters, which will feed into the overall

report of the Accountability and Transparency Review Team (ATRT2) process. The GAC has established a working group to develop guidance on

ATRT2 and ICANN engagement, and will work with the ICANN Global Stakeholder Engagement Team, and within the WHOIS process, to progress relevant recommendations from the ATRT2 report.

The GAC Board requested the Board Chair to encourage the WHOIS/ATRT2 Committee to publish a report on this issue in line with the ATRT2 process and timelines.

The Board Chair agreed with a revised charter for coordination of the Board’s work on compliance and transparency that was presented by the Board Chair at the ICANN 51 Board meeting.

The GAC requested the Board Chair to provide the GAC with quarterly progress reports on the implementation of this item.

The Board Chair agreed to the timeline presented.

The GAC requested the Board Chair to provide quarterly reports to the GAC on progress of this item.

The GAC Chair declined receipt of the TLD Board’s report and an updated meeting schedule for this item.

The GAC requested the Board Chair to provide the GAC with a quarterly report on the implementation of this item.

The Board Chair responded that the Board would continue to provide quarterly reports to the GAC.

The GAC Chair declined receipt of this report.

The GAC Chair noted that the GAC would provide periodic updates to the community on implementation progress of this item.

The GAC Chair noted that the GAC would provide periodic updates to the community on implementation progress of this item.

The GAC Chair noted that the GAC would provide periodic updates to the community on implementation progress of this item.

The GAC Chair noted that the GAC would provide periodic updates to the community on implementation progress of this item.

The GAC Chair noted that the GAC would provide periodic updates to the community on implementation progress of this item.

The GAC Chair noted that the GAC would provide periodic updates to the community on implementation progress of this item.

The GAC Chair noted that the GAC would provide periodic updates to the community on implementation progress of this item.

The GAC Chair noted that the GAC would provide periodic updates to the community on implementation progress of this item.

The GAC Chair noted that the GAC would provide periodic updates to the community on implementation progress of this item.

The GAC Chair noted that the GAC would provide periodic updates to the community on implementation progress of this item.

The GAC Chair noted that the GAC would provide periodic updates to the community on implementation progress of this item.

The GAC Chair noted that the GAC would provide periodic updates to the community on implementation progress of this item.

The GAC Chair noted that the GAC would provide periodic updates to the community on implementation progress of this item.

The GAC Chair noted that the GAC would provide periodic updates to the community on implementation progress of this item.

The GAC Chair noted that the GAC would provide periodic updates to the community on implementation progress of this item.

The GAC Chair noted that the GAC would provide periodic updates to the community on implementation progress of this item.

The GAC Chair noted that the GAC would provide periodic updates to the community on implementation progress of this item.

The GAC Chair noted that the GAC would provide periodic updates to the community on implementation progress of this item.

The GAC Chair noted that the GAC would provide periodic updates to the community on implementation progress of this item.

The GAC Chair noted that the GAC would provide periodic updates to the community on implementation progress of this item.

The GAC Chair noted that the GAC would provide periodic updates to the community on implementation progress of this item.

The GAC Chair noted that the GAC would provide periodic updates to the community on implementation progress of this item.

The GAC Chair noted that the GAC would provide periodic updates to the community on implementation progress of this item.

The GAC Chair noted that the GAC would provide periodic updates to the community on implementation progress of this item.

The GAC Chair noted that the GAC would provide periodic updates to the community on implementation progress of this item.

The GAC Chair noted that the GAC would provide periodic updates to the community on implementation progress of this item.

The GAC Chair noted that the GAC would provide periodic updates to the community on implementation progress of this item.

The GAC Chair noted that the GAC would provide periodic updates to the community on implementation progress of this item.

The GAC Chair noted that the GAC would provide periodic updates to the community on implementation progress of this item.

The GAC Chair noted that the GAC would provide periodic updates to the community on implementation progress of this item.

The GAC Chair noted that the GAC would provide periodic updates to the community on implementation progress of this item.

The GAC Chair noted that the GAC would provide periodic updates to the community on implementation progress of this item.

The GAC Chair noted that the GAC would provide periodic updates to the community on implementation progress of this item.

The GAC Chair noted that the GAC would provide periodic updates to the community on implementation progress of this item.

The GAC Chair noted that the GAC would provide periodic updates to the community on implementation progress of this item.

The GAC Chair noted that the GAC would provide periodic updates to the community on implementation progress of this item.
As of 8 June 2020
GAC Advice Status

Communique
ICANN49 Singapore

3/27/14

Category 1 (Consumer Safeguard Advice Applicable Specific Strings - .amazon of the Same String)

Category 2 (restricted)

4.b.

2.a.

3.1.a.

4.a.

3/27/14

3/27/14

3/27/14

3/27/14

Communiqué
ICANN49 Singapore

Communiqué
ICANN49 Singapore

Communiqué
ICANN49 Singapore

Communiqué
ICANN49 Singapore

4.a.

3.1.a.

Number
Advice Item

4.b.

5.

This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration and written scorecard: On 14 May 2014, the NGPC accepted the GAC advice identified in the GAC Advice Scorecard as 2013-07-18-Obj-Amazon, and directed the President and CEO, or his delegate, to not commence the contracting process for the applications for .WINE and .VIN for 60 days from the date of receipt as a precautionary measure to provide an opportunity for those parties to come together to reach an agreement on the matter. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.

4.a.

3.1.a.

Number
Advice Item

4.b.

5.

This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration and written scorecard: On 14 May 2014, the NGPC accepted the GAC advice identified in the GAC Advice Scorecard as 2013-07-18-Obj-Amazon, and directed the President and CEO, or his delegate, to not commence the contracting process for the applications for .WINE and .VIN for 60 days from the date of receipt as a precautionary measure to provide an opportunity for those parties to come together to reach an agreement on the matter. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.

3/27/14

3/27/14

3/27/14

3/27/14

Communiqué
ICANN49 Singapore

Communiqué
ICANN49 Singapore

Communiqué
ICANN49 Singapore

Communiqué
ICANN49 Singapore

4.a.

3.1.a.

Number
Advice Item

4.b.

5.

This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration and written scorecard: On 14 May 2014, the NGPC accepted the GAC advice identified in the GAC Advice Scorecard as 2013-07-18-Obj-Amazon, and directed the President and CEO, or his delegate, to not commence the contracting process for the applications for .WINE and .VIN for 60 days from the date of receipt as a precautionary measure to provide an opportunity for those parties to come together to reach an agreement on the matter. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.

3/27/14

3/27/14

3/27/14

3/27/14

Communiqué
ICANN49 Singapore

Communiqué
ICANN49 Singapore

Communiqué
ICANN49 Singapore

Communiqué
ICANN49 Singapore

4.a.

3.1.a.

Number
Advice Item

4.b.

5.

This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration and written scorecard: On 14 May 2014, the NGPC accepted the GAC advice identified in the GAC Advice Scorecard as 2013-07-18-Obj-Amazon, and directed the President and CEO, or his delegate, to not commence the contracting process for the applications for .WINE and .VIN for 60 days from the date of receipt as a precautionary measure to provide an opportunity for those parties to come together to reach an agreement on the matter. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.

3/27/14

3/27/14

3/27/14

3/27/14

Communiqué
ICANN49 Singapore

Communiqué
ICANN49 Singapore

Communiqué
ICANN49 Singapore

Communiqué
ICANN49 Singapore

4.a.

3.1.a.

Number
Advice Item

4.b.

5.

This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration and written scorecard: On 14 May 2014, the NGPC accepted the GAC advice identified in the GAC Advice Scorecard as 2013-07-18-Obj-Amazon, and directed the President and CEO, or his delegate, to not commence the contracting process for the applications for .WINE and .VIN for 60 days from the date of receipt as a precautionary measure to provide an opportunity for those parties to come together to reach an agreement on the matter. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.
The GAC advises the ICANN Board not to proceed beyond initial evaluation of applications for .spa (application number 1-1309-12524 and 1-1619-13091) in Phase 3 of the gTLD application process. The GAC welcomes the Board's acceptance of its advice in the Durban Communiqué.

The GAC advises that, for clarity, this should also include: a. the 189 National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies in the six (6) United Nations Language States of origin. b. The full names of the International Committee of the Red Cross and International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent. With respect to the GNSO policy recommendations that differ from the GAC advice on IGO acronym protections at the second level, the NGPC notes concern about the need for additional time for GAC and GNSO to arrive at a conclusion. The NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to GAC Advice Item 1 in its Scorecard.

On 30 April 2014, the ICANN Board passed a resolution recommending that the ICANN Board Chair send a letter notifying the GAC Chair that the GNSO Council has approved four policy recommendations that were developed by the GNSO’s PDP Working Group on IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms which include the following points: no substantive changes to existing rights protection mechanisms are needed for INGOs; no policy guidance is to be developed as to the filing of complaints by IGOs under the existing rights protection mechanisms; and clarifying policy guidance is to be developed as to the filing of complaints by IGOs under the existing rights protection mechanisms.

On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its Scorecard: The GNSO Council approved four policy recommendations that were developed by the GNSO’s PDP Working Group on IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms which include the following points: no substantive changes to existing rights protection mechanisms are needed for INGOs; no policy guidance is to be developed as to the filing of complaints by IGOs under the existing rights protection mechanisms; and clarifying policy guidance is to be developed as to the filing of complaints by IGOs under the existing rights protection mechanisms.

The GAC must confirm that the advice it has issued on .spa and .indians is complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 1 November 2017. The GAC will present as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 1 November 2017.

The GAC will present as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 1 November 2017.

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to GAC Advice Item 1 in its Scorecard: In response to the GAC’s advice in the Durban Communiqué concerning the blocking of .RAM, in the 14 May 2014 iteration of the Scorecard the ICANN Board Chair sent a letter notifying the GAC Chair that the GNSO Council has approved four policy recommendations that were developed by the GNSO’s PDP Working Group on IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms which include the following points: no substantive changes to existing rights protection mechanisms are needed for INGOs; no policy guidance is to be developed as to the filing of complaints by IGOs under the existing rights protection mechanisms; and clarifying policy guidance is to be developed as to the filing of complaints by IGOs under the existing rights protection mechanisms.

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to GAC Advice Item 1 in its Scorecard: The GNSO Council approved four policy recommendations that were developed by the GNSO’s PDP Working Group on IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms which include the following points: no substantive changes to existing rights protection mechanisms are needed for INGOs; no policy guidance is to be developed as to the filing of complaints by IGOs under the existing rights protection mechanisms; and clarifying policy guidance is to be developed as to the filing of complaints by IGOs under the existing rights protection mechanisms.

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to GAC Advice Item 1 in its Scorecard: On 11 July 2019, the ICANN Board Chair sent a letter notifying the GAC Chair that the GNSO Council has approved four policy recommendations that were developed by the GNSO’s PDP Working Group on IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms which include the following points: no substantive changes to existing rights protection mechanisms are needed for INGOs; no policy guidance is to be developed as to the filing of complaints by IGOs under the existing rights protection mechanisms; and clarifying policy guidance is to be developed as to the filing of complaints by IGOs under the existing rights protection mechanisms.

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to GAC Advice Item 1 in its Scorecard: On 14 May 2014, the NGPC adopted the Board’s resolution regarding the blocking of .RAM in the 14 May 2014 iteration of the Scorecard. On 30 April 2014, the ICANN Board passed a resolution recommending that the ICANN Board Chair send a letter notifying the GAC Chair that the GNSO Council has approved four policy recommendations that were developed by the GNSO’s PDP Working Group on IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms which include the following points: no substantive changes to existing rights protection mechanisms are needed for INGOs; no policy guidance is to be developed as to the filing of complaints by IGOs under the existing rights protection mechanisms; and clarifying policy guidance is to be developed as to the filing of complaints by IGOs under the existing rights protection mechanisms.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>Date of Communique</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Notes:</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001244</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001247</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001248</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>a.i.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes:*

The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the GAC4918 Virtual Communique (March 2020). (Note: the GAC4918 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus or Follow up to Previous GAC Advice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
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<th>Category</th>
<th>Notes:</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001244</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001247</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001248</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>a.i.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>Date of Communique</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Notes:</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001244</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001247</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001248</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>a.i.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>Date of Communique</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Notes:</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001244</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001247</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001248</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>a.i.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>Date of Communique</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Notes:</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001244</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001247</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001248</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>a.i.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>Date of Communique</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Notes:</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001244</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001247</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001248</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>a.i.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Request Number</td>
<td>Communique</td>
<td>Date of Action</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>About Item Number</td>
<td>Advice Type</td>
<td>Current Phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001254</td>
<td>ICANN47 Durban Communique</td>
<td>7/18/13</td>
<td>1.1.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001253</td>
<td>ICANN48 Buenos Aires Communique</td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>1.1.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001248</td>
<td>ICANN48 Buenos Aires Communique</td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>1.1.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001247</td>
<td>ICANN48 Buenos Aires Communique</td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>1.1.a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN67 Virtual Communique (March 2020). (Note: the ICANN67 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus or Follow-up to Previous GAC Advice)
- The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN67 Virtual Communique (March 2020). (Note: the ICANN67 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus or Follow-up to Previous GAC Advice)
- The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN67 Virtual Communique (March 2020). (Note: the ICANN67 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus or Follow-up to Previous GAC Advice)
- The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN67 Virtual Communique (March 2020). (Note: the ICANN67 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus or Follow-up to Previous GAC Advice)

**As of:** 06/02/2020
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN67 Virtual Communique (March 2020). (Note: the ICANN67 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus or Follow-up to Previous GAC Advice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>Date of Request</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>About Item</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Board Resolution</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001241</td>
<td>GAC Advice</td>
<td>08/06/2020</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001237</td>
<td>GAC Advice</td>
<td>05/24/2020</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001236</td>
<td>GAC Advice</td>
<td>05/24/2020</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001235</td>
<td>GAC Advice</td>
<td>05/24/2020</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001234</td>
<td>GAC Advice</td>
<td>05/24/2020</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001233</td>
<td>GAC Advice</td>
<td>05/24/2020</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

- **ICANN47 Durban Communique**  
  - (Compliance with ICANN bylaws and other agreements)  
  - (SAC053) and Internal Name Certificates (SAC057).

- **GAC Advice**  
  - Registrar Accreditation Agreement that may conflict with applicable law.

- **Scorecard**  
  - DNS Security and Stability.

- **GAC Guidance**  
  - Registration Authority Agreement and Registrar Accreditation Agreement (SAC053) and Internal Name Certificates (SAC057).

- **GAC Board**  
  - DNS Security and Stability.

- **GAC Advice**  
  - Registrar Accreditation Agreement and Registrar Accreditation Agreement (SAC053) and Internal Name Certificates (SAC057).

- **GAC Board**  
  - DNS Security and Stability.
As of 8 June 2020

GAC Advice Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>About Item</th>
<th>Action Text</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Resolution Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001214</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001231</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2015) through the GAC47 Virtual Communique (March 2018). (Note: the GAC47 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus or Follow-up to Previous GAC Advice.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>Date of Communique</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Advice Text</th>
<th>Close Date</th>
<th>Advice Status</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Request Number</td>
<td>Communique Date</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>About Item Number</td>
<td>Advice Point</td>
<td>Current Phase</td>
<td>Board Resolution Link</td>
<td>Board Resolution Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/11/13</td>
<td>Beijing Communique</td>
<td>4/11/13</td>
<td>1.a.i.i.2</td>
<td>The GAC advises the ICANN Board that the application should not be approved.</td>
<td>In accordance with the AGB § 3.1, the NGPC responds to this advice item as follows: In accordance with the AGB § 3.1, the NGPC responds to this advice item as follows:</td>
<td>On 4 June 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of Safeguards and the NGPC provided this response in its On 4 June 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of Safeguards and the NGPC provided this response in its</td>
<td>module 3.1 part I of the Applicant Guidebook and the following applications: Application number 1-1936-2101 for .gcc: The GAC has reached consensus on GAC Objection Advice according to</td>
<td>July 2013</td>
<td>New gTLD Program, April 2012, to exercise the ICANN Board’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/11/13</td>
<td>Beijing Communique</td>
<td>4/11/13</td>
<td>1.a.ii.1</td>
<td>The GAC decides to allow singular and plural versions of the same string, and to withhold approval of the application for these strings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On 25 June 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of Safeguards and the NGPC provided this response in its On 25 June 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of Safeguards and the NGPC provided this response in its</td>
<td>module 3.1 part I of the Applicant Guidebook and the following applications: Application number 1-1936-2101 for .gcc: The GAC has reached consensus on GAC Objection Advice according to</td>
<td>July 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/11/13</td>
<td>Beijing Communique</td>
<td>4/11/13</td>
<td>1.a.ii.1</td>
<td>The GAC decides to allow singular and plural versions of the same string, and to withhold approval of the application for these strings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On 25 June 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of Safeguards and the NGPC provided this response in its On 25 June 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of Safeguards and the NGPC provided this response in its</td>
<td>module 3.1 part I of the Applicant Guidebook and the following applications: Application number 1-1936-2101 for .gcc: The GAC has reached consensus on GAC Objection Advice according to</td>
<td>July 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/11/13</td>
<td>Beijing Communique</td>
<td>4/11/13</td>
<td>1.a.ii.1</td>
<td>The GAC decides to allow singular and plural versions of the same string, and to withhold approval of the application for these strings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On 25 June 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of Safeguards and the NGPC provided this response in its On 25 June 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of Safeguards and the NGPC provided this response in its</td>
<td>module 3.1 part I of the Applicant Guidebook and the following applications: Application number 1-1936-2101 for .gcc: The GAC has reached consensus on GAC Objection Advice according to</td>
<td>July 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/11/13</td>
<td>Beijing Communique</td>
<td>4/11/13</td>
<td>1.a.ii.1</td>
<td>The GAC decides to allow singular and plural versions of the same string, and to withhold approval of the application for these strings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On 25 June 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of Safeguards and the NGPC provided this response in its On 25 June 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of Safeguards and the NGPC provided this response in its</td>
<td>module 3.1 part I of the Applicant Guidebook and the following applications: Application number 1-1936-2101 for .gcc: The GAC has reached consensus on GAC Objection Advice according to</td>
<td>July 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN67 Virtual Communique (March 2020). (Note: the ICANN67 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus or Follow-up to Previous GAC Advice)
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communiqué (April 2013) through the ICANN67 Virtual Communique (March 2020). (Note: the ICANN67 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus or Follow-up to Previous GAC Advice)

Notes:

1. **ICANN46 Beijing Communique**: The GAC notes the Director of the GAC Secretariat’s observation that the GoGAC Account Agreement (GAA) was initialed before any new gTLDs’ contract was agreed.

2. **ICANN47 Beijing Communique**: On 1st January 2014, the GAC considered the advice and provided the request to re-categorize new gTLD applications for workable implementation. The GAC is mindful of outstanding implementation issues for protecting IGO names and while the GAC, NGPC, ICANN Staff and community continue to actively work through such implementation issues, registry operators will implement temporary protections for the IGOs and other relevant parties as provided by the GAC guidance. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s resolution of 4 June 2013.

3. **ICANN48 Beijing Communique**: The GAC advises the ICANN Board that the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA), approved. The GAC advises the ICANN Board that the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA), approved.

4. **ICANN49 Beijing Communique**: The GAC recognizes that Religious terms are sensitive issues. Some GAC members have noted that the applications for .islam and .halal. The GAC members concerned have noted that the applications for .islam and .halal. The GAC members concerned have noted that the applications for .islam and .halal. The GAC members concerned have noted that the applications for .islam and .halal. The GAC members concerned have noted that the applications for .islam and .halal. The GAC members concerned have noted that the applications for .islam and .halal. The GAC members concerned have noted that the applications for .islam and .halal. The GAC members concerned have noted that the applications for .islam and .halal. The GAC members concerned have noted that the applications for .islam and .halal. The GAC members concerned have noted that the applications for .islam and .halal. The GAC members concerned have noted that the applications for .islam and .halal. The GAC members concerned have noted.
As of 8 June 2020

Notes:
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN67 Virtual Communique (March 2020). (Note: the ICANN67 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus or Follow-up to Previous GAC Advice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>Date of Communique</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Advice Item Number</th>
<th>Advice Text</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Board Action(s)</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
<th>Close Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| AR-001221             | ICANN46 Beijing Communique | 4/11/13 | Restricted Registration Policies | Category 2 | Restricted Access As an exception to the general rule that the gTLD domain name space is operated in an open manner, registration may be restricted, in particular for strings mentioned under Category 1 above. In these cases, the registration restrictions should be proportionate to the level of risk associated with the TLD. The registry operator should ensure access to these levels of registries is transparent in a way that does not give an undue preference to any registrar or registrant, including itself, and should not subject registrants to an undue disadvantage. 2.Exclusive Access For strings representing generic terms, exclusive registry access should serve a public interest goal. In the current round, the GAC has identified the following non-exhaustive list of strings that represent generic terms. Where an applicant is considering applying for registry access to such generic terms, it should take into account the following.

- .cloud, .com, .coop, .data, .de, .dev, .design, . drużyn, .education, .email, .energy, .finance, .firm, .global, .gov, .hotel, .info, .int, .jobs, .justice, .museum, .name, .net, .nom, .online, .org, .post, .science, .security, .shop, .taxi, .tel, .travel, .w wig, .world

**The NGPC considered this advice on several occasions.**
1. For applicants not seeking to impose exclusive registry access, the NGPC passed the following resolution on 25 June 2013: Resolved (2013.06.25.NG05), the NGPC directs staff to make appropriate changes to the final draft of the New gTLD Registry Agreement, as presented in Annex I [PDF, 52 KB] attached to this resolution, to implement the GAC’s Category 2 Safeguard Advice for applicants not seeking to impose exclusive registry access. 2. For applicants seeking to impose exclusive registry access, the NGPC passed the following resolution on 21 June 2015: Resolved (2015.06.21.NG02), to address the GAC’s Category 2.2 Safeguard Advice, the NGPC requests that the GNSO specifically include the issue of exclusive registry access for generic strings serving a public interest goal as part of the policy work it is planning to do in the next round of the New gTLD Program, and inform the Board on a regular basis with regards to the progress on this item. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration and resolution of 21 June 2015.

https://www.icann.org/resources-board/material/resolutions-new-gtld-2015-06-21-en#2.a
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