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### GAC Advice Status

**As of 14 July 2020**

**Notes:** The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN68 Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN68 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus GAC Advice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Domain of Action</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Adverse Action</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

The advice provided considered a list of issues related to Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs during ICANN68. The Board noted the discussion which took place during ICANN68, including the GAC priorities for this phase.

The GAC notes that the ICANN67 Virtual Community Future of the Service and Data Protection Issue of Importance was not discussed in detail during ICANN68. The Board welcomed the ICANN68 Virtual Community Forum Communique on 27 June 2020, which noted the importance of the future of the Service and Data Protection Issue of Importance.

The GAC considers the importance of the future of the Service and Data Protection Issue of Importance. The Board welcomes the progress made in the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on gTLD Registration Data and in particular considers that the ICANN68 Virtual Policy Forum Communique included a commitment to develop a report that provides recommendations for the future of the Service and Data Protection Issue of Importance.

The GAC agreed on sending the ICANN68 Virtual Community Forum Communique to the ICANN Board. The Board agreed to send the ICANN68 Virtual Community Forum Communique to the ICANN Board. The ICANN Board noted the increased importance of the Service and Data Protection Issue of Importance. The Board also noted the importance of the future of the Service and Data Protection Issue of Importance.

---

The GAC welcomes the progress made in the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on gTLD Registration Data and in particular considers that the ICANN68 Virtual Policy Forum Communique included a commitment to develop a report that provides recommendations for the future of the Service and Data Protection Issue of Importance.

The GAC notes that the ICANN68 Virtual Community Forum Communique included a commitment to develop a report that provides recommendations for the future of the Service and Data Protection Issue of Importance. The Board welcomes the progress made in the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on gTLD Registration Data and in particular considers that the ICANN68 Virtual Policy Forum Communique included a commitment to develop a report that provides recommendations for the future of the Service and Data Protection Issue of Importance.

The GAC emphasizes that the creation of a standard form is the most efficient way to develop a document that represents the minimum requirements for access to non-public information. In response, the ICANN Board noted that it could not obligate the advised parties to use a standard form but that it could offer guidance and encouragement to develop and adopt such a form. The GAC notes that the ICANN Board has not yet made a decision on the future of the Service and Data Protection Issue of Importance.

The GAC notes that the ICANN Board has not yet made a decision on the future of the Service and Data Protection Issue of Importance. The Board welcomes the progress made in the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on gTLD Registration Data and in particular considers that the ICANN68 Virtual Policy Forum Communique included a commitment to develop a report that provides recommendations for the future of the Service and Data Protection Issue of Importance.
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN68 Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN68 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus GAC Advice.)

1/8/2019

The Board actions led the Board not to proceed with a revision of the EPDP with other than complete implementation of the recommendations in the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice reviews that were labeled as “preferred” or as “high priority.”

Phase 3 | Make a Recommendation

The Board advised the GAC to make a recommendation to the Board to take all possible steps to ensure that the EPDP Phase 1 Implementation Review process generates a detailed work plan identifying an updated realistic schedule to complete the EPDP Phase 1 Implementation Review process. The Board also agreed that the EPDP Phase 1 Implementation Review process generates a detailed work plan identifying an updated realistic schedule to complete the EPDP Phase 1 Implementation Review process.

Board Action(s)

- The Board considered the EPDP Phase 1 Implementation Review process.
- The Board advised the GAC to make a recommendation to the Board to take all possible steps to ensure that the EPDP Phase 1 Implementation Review process generates a detailed work plan identifying an updated realistic schedule to complete the EPDP Phase 1 Implementation Review process.
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The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN68 Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN68 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus GAC Advice).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>Date of Issue</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Advice Text</th>
<th>Board Resolution</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Close Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-002300</td>
<td>ICANN64 Kobe Communique</td>
<td>3/14/19</td>
<td>2.a.II.</td>
<td>Follow up: Subsequent Domain Names</td>
<td>ICANN65 Marrakech Communique</td>
<td>6/27/19</td>
<td>9/8/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-002300</td>
<td>ICANN65 Marrakech Communique</td>
<td>3/14/19</td>
<td>2.a.II.</td>
<td>Follow up: Subsequent Domain Names</td>
<td>ICANN65 Marrakech Communique</td>
<td>6/27/19</td>
<td>9/8/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2012) through the ICANN Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN Virtual Communique did not contain Generic GAC Advice)
As of 14 July 2020
GAC Advice Status

AR-002296

AR-002297

AR-002293

Notes:
ICANN64 Kobe Communique
3/14/19

Date of Legislation
WHOIS and Data Protection

1.a.II.

Consider instituting additional parallel work efforts on technical implementation, in coordination with the EPDP Team, to complement the EPDP's Phase 2 work.

1.a.V.

Take necessary steps to ensure that the scope of phase 2 activities is clearly concluded Phase 2 activities;

2.a.I.

Promptly meet with the CCT Review Team leadership to discuss the CCT recommendations, for the reasons set forth in the letter issued in Kobe; however, this item has been moved to Phase 5 and will be closed.

2.a.V.

Make available the necessary resources for Phase 2 to expeditiously advance on the complex legal issues deferred from Phase 1?

Number activities; for purposes of informing and complementing the EPDP's Phase 2 implementations, such as that carried out by the Technical Study Group, Consider instituting additional parallel work efforts on technical implementation as and when they are agreed, such as the questions deferred from Phase 1, the Board will ensure, subject to normal budgetary prudence, that there is support for the work of the EPDP in sorting through these legal issues. This item is considered complete of the Board's consideration for the reasons set forth in the letter issued in Kobe; however, this item has been moved to Phase 5 and will be closed.

Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)? in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué, the Board determines its own processes, the Board does support the request that the financial phase of the policy development institute concrete milestones and progress reports. The Board also understands the letter's request to split its work into two phases; however, this item has been moved to Phase 5 and will be closed.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled ?GAC Advice ? Kobe Communiqué: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)? in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué. The Board acknowledges this advice and agrees. This item is currently in implementation.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled ?GAC Advice ? Kobe Communiqué: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)? in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué. The Board acknowledges this advice and agrees. This item is currently in implementation.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled ?GAC Advice ? Kobe Communiqué: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)? in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué. The Board acknowledges this advice and agrees. This item is currently in implementation.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled ?GAC Advice ? Kobe Communiqué: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)? in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué. The Board acknowledges this advice and agrees. This item is currently in implementation.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled ?GAC Advice ? Kobe Communiqué: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)? in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué. The Board acknowledges this advice and agrees. This item is currently in implementation.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled ?GAC Advice ? Kobe Communiqué: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)? in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué. The Board acknowledges this advice and agrees. This item is currently in implementation.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled ?GAC Advice ? Kobe Communiqué: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)? in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué. The Board acknowledges this advice and agrees. This item is currently in implementation.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled ?GAC Advice ? Kobe Communiqué: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)? in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué. The Board acknowledges this advice and agrees. This item is currently in implementation.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled ?GAC Advice ? Kobe Communiqué: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)? in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué. The Board acknowledges this advice and agrees. This item is currently in implementation.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled ?GAC Advice ? Kobe Communiqué: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)? in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué. The Board acknowledges this advice and agrees. This item is currently in implementation.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled ?GAC Advice ? Kobe Communiqué: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)? in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué. The Board acknowledges this advice and agrees. This item is currently in implementation.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled ?GAC Advice ? Kobe Communiqué: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)? in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué. The Board acknowledges this advice and agrees. This item is currently in implementation.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled ?GAC Advice ? Kobe Communiqué: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)? in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué. The Board acknowledges this advice and agrees. This item is currently in implementation.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled ?GAC Advice ? Kobe Communiqué: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)? in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué. The Board acknowledges this advice and agrees. This item is currently in implementation.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled ?GAC Advice ? Kobe Communiqué: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)? in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué. The Board acknowledges this advice and agrees. This item is currently in implementation.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled ?GAC Advice ? Kobe Communiqué: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)? in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué. The Board acknowledges this advice and agrees. This item is currently in implementation.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled ?GAC Advice ? Kobe Communiqué: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)? in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué. The Board acknowledges this advice and agrees. This item is currently in implementation.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled ?GAC Advice ? Kobe Communiqué: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)? in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué. The Board acknowledges this advice and agrees. This item is currently in implementation.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled ?GAC Advice ? Kobe Communiqué: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)? in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué. The Board acknowledges this advice and agrees. This item is currently in implementation.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled ?GAC Advice ? Kobe Communiqué: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)? in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué. The Board acknowledges this advice and agrees. This item is currently in implementation.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled ?GAC Advice ? Kobe Communiqué: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)? in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué. The Board acknowledges this advice and agrees. This item is currently in implementation.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled ?GAC Advice ? Kobe Communiqué: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)? in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué. The Board acknowledges this advice and agrees. This item is currently in implementation.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled ?GAC Advice ? Kobe Communiqué: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)? in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué. The Board acknowledges this advice and agrees. This item is currently in implementation.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled ?GAC Advice ? Kobe Communiqué: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)? in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué. The Board acknowledges this advice and agrees. This item is currently in implementation.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled ?GAC Advice ? Kobe Communiqué: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)? in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué. The Board acknowledges this advice and agrees. This item is currently in implementation.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled ?GAC Advice ? Kobe Communiqué: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)? in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué. The Board acknowledges this advice and agrees. This item is currently in implementation.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled ?GAC Advice ? Kobe Communiqué: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)? in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué. The Board acknowledges this advice and agrees. This item is currently in implementation.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled ?GAC Advice ? Kobe Communiqué: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)? in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué. The Board acknowledges this advice and agrees. This item is currently in implementation.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled ?GAC Advice ? Kobe Communiqué: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)? in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué. The Board acknowledges this advice and agrees. This item is currently in implementation.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled ?GAC Advice ? Kobe Communiqué: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)? in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué. The Board acknowledges this advice and agrees. This item is currently in implementation.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled ?GAC Advice ? Kobe Communiqué: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)? in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué. The Board acknowledges this advice and agrees. This item is currently in implementation.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled ?GAC Advice ? Kobe Communiqué: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)? in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué. The Board acknowledges this advice and agrees. This item is currently in implementation.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled ?GAC Advice ? Kobe Communiqué: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)? in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communiqué and the San Juan Communiqué. The Board acknowledges this advice and agrees. This item is currently in implementation.
As of 14 July 2020

GAC Advice Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>Date of Action</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>About Item</th>
<th>Close Date</th>
<th>Board Resolution(s)</th>
<th>Board Action(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-002131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-002134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-002135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-002298</td>
<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 2019) through the ICANN Virtual Communique (June 2020). Not all the ICANN Virtual Communique did not contain GAC Advice.

Action Request Number

1. AR-002131 - (ICANN63 Barcelona)
   - GAC 10/25/18 IGO Protections
   - GDPR and WHOIS
   - 2017
   - Statement by ALAC and GAC
     - To the creation of a curative mechanism and maintenance of temporary protections, on which it reaffirms its previous advice, notably with respect to ICANN operations and the GAC in an effort to resolve the longstanding issue of IGO protections.
     - Follow-up 2
     - Number 6
     - Advice Item to the creation of a curative mechanism and maintenance of temporary protections, on which it reaffirms its previous advice, notably with respect to ICANN operations and the GAC in an effort to resolve the longstanding issue of IGO protections.
   - Category: Statement
   - Current Phase: Follow-up 2
   - Close Date: 10/25/18
   - Board Resolution(s): https://www.icann.org/resources-board-material/resolutions-2019-10-25-en#2.c

2. AR-002134 - (ICANN63 Barcelona)
   - GAC 10/25/18 IGO Protections
   - GDPR and WHOIS
   - 2017
   - Follow-up 2
   - Number 6
   - Advice Item to the creation of a curative mechanism and maintenance of temporary protections, on which it reaffirms its previous advice, notably with respect to ICANN operations and the GAC in an effort to resolve the longstanding issue of IGO protections.
   - Category: Statement
   - Current Phase: Follow-up 2
   - Close Date: 10/25/18
   - Board Resolution(s): https://www.icann.org/resources-board-material/resolutions-2019-10-25-en#2.c

3. AR-002135 - (ICANN63 Barcelona)
   - GAC 10/25/18 IGO Protections
   - GDPR and WHOIS
   - 2017
   - Follow-up 2
   - Number 6
   - Advice Item to the creation of a curative mechanism and maintenance of temporary protections, on which it reaffirms its previous advice, notably with respect to ICANN operations and the GAC in an effort to resolve the longstanding issue of IGO protections.
   - Category: Statement
   - Current Phase: Follow-up 2
   - Close Date: 10/25/18
   - Board Resolution(s): https://www.icann.org/resources-board-material/resolutions-2019-10-25-en#2.c

4. AR-002298 - (ICANN63 Barcelona)
   - GAC 10/25/18 IGO Protections
   - GDPR and WHOIS
   - 2017
   - Follow-up 2
   - Number 6
   - Advice Item to the creation of a curative mechanism and maintenance of temporary protections, on which it reaffirms its previous advice, notably with respect to ICANN operations and the GAC in an effort to resolve the longstanding issue of IGO protections.
   - Category: Statement
   - Current Phase: Follow-up 2
   - Close Date: 10/25/18
   - Board Resolution(s): https://www.icann.org/resources-board-material/resolutions-2019-10-25-en#2.c
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>Date of Requested</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Board Action(s)</th>
<th>Close Date</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Transparent Link</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Notes:

The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2015) through the ICANN68 Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN68 Virtual Communique did not contain GAC Advice)
As of 14 July 2020
GAC Advice Status

AR-001870
AR-001871
AR-001867
AR-002129

Notes:
Communique
ICANN62 Panama
ICANN62 Panama
Communique
ICANN63 Barcelona

Date of Codes at the Second Level
Protection of IGO Identifiers
GDPR and WHOIS
Codes at the Second Level
Two-Character Country
Category

Follow-up 1
1.a.I.
1.a.II.
Number
country/territory codes at the second level in order to establish an
work, as soon as possible, with those GAC members who have expressed
available ?small group? proposal, is adequately taken into account also in
PDP on IGO-INGO access to curative rights protection mechanisms to
Work with the GNSO and the GAC following the completion of the ongoing
Continue working with the GAC in order to ensure accuracy and
Publish a status report, four weeks prior to ICANN 63.
as possible; and
a unified access model that addresses accreditation, authentication,
this matter stands.
its explanation in writing by 31 December 2018. Previous GAC advice on
constitutes a rejection of GAC advice. The GAC advises the Board to set out
change from the preexisting release process (indicated in specification 5. 2
Board directs the ICANN org to provide adequate resources to assist the GAC in its endeavor
This was implemented through the update to the reserved names list:
progress related to the development of a unified access model, in addition to providing a
Board directs the ICANN org to continue to provide the GAC with regular updates on
European Data Protection Board. Any guidance and clarification will inform ICANN org?s
accordance to any guidance or clarification ICANN org might receive from the DPAs and the
Board directs the ICANN org to amend the current drafts of the guidelines for the GAC to
Published a status report, four weeks prior to ICANN 63.
facilitate access to the third parties that constitute GAC and/or the GAC?
accordance to any guidance or clarification ICANN org might receive from the DPAs and the
Board directs the ICANN org to continue to provide adequate resources to assist the GAC in its endeavor
This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration and written response
Board notes that on 9 July 2018 the Final Report from the IGO-INGO access to curative
On 16 September 2018 the Board considered this advice and stated in its scorecard: The
On 16 September 2018 the Board considered this advice and stated in its scorecard: The
On 16 September 2018 the Board considered this advice and stated in its scorecard: The
Board notes that the GAC advice continues to seek input on the critical components of verified access model for continued access by WHOIS
data. The Board welcomes and encourages the GAC's input into this process. This item is
completed in implementation.
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AR-002129

Notes:
Communique
ICANN62 Panama
ICANN62 Panama
Communique
ICANN63 Barcelona

Date of Codes at the Second Level
Protection of IGO Identifiers
GDPR and WHOIS
Codes at the Second Level
Two-Character Country
Category

Follow-up 1
1.a.I.
1.a.II.
Number
country/territory codes at the second level in order to establish an
work, as soon as possible, with those GAC members who have expressed
available ?small group? proposal, is adequately taken into account also in
PDP on IGO-INGO access to curative rights protection mechanisms to
Work with the GNSO and the GAC following the completion of the ongoing
Continue working with the GAC in order to ensure accuracy and
Publish a status report, four weeks prior to ICANN 63.
as possible; and
a unified access model that addresses accreditation, authentication,
this matter stands.
its explanation in writing by 31 December 2018. Previous GAC advice on
constitutes a rejection of GAC advice. The GAC advises the Board to set out
change from the preexisting release process (indicated in specification 5. 2
Board directs the ICANN org to provide adequate resources to assist the GAC in its endeavor
This was implemented through the update to the reserved names list:
progress related to the development of a unified access model, in addition to providing a
Board directs the ICANN org to continue to provide the GAC with regular updates on
European Data Protection Board. Any guidance and clarification will inform ICANN org?s
accordance to any guidance or clarification ICANN org might receive from the DPAs and the
Board directs the ICANN org to amend the current drafts of the guidelines for the GAC to
Published a status report, four weeks prior to ICANN 63.
facilitate access to the third parties that constitute GAC and/or the GAC?
accordance to any guidance or clarification ICANN org might receive from the DPAs and the
Board directs the ICANN org to continue to provide adequate resources to assist the GAC in its endeavor
This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration and written response
Board notes that on 9 July 2018 the Final Report from the IGO-INGO access to curative
On 16 September 2018 the Board considered this advice and stated in its scorecard: The
On 16 September 2018 the Board considered this advice and stated in its scorecard: The
On 16 September 2018 the Board considered this advice and stated in its scorecard: The
Board notes that the GAC advice continues to seek input on the critical components of verified access model for continued access by WHOIS
data. The Board welcomes and encourages the GAC's input into this process. This item is
completed in implementation.

As of 14 July 2020
GAC Advice Status

AR-001870
AR-001871
AR-001867
AR-002129

Notes:
Communique
ICANN62 Panama
ICANN62 Panama
Communique
ICANN63 Barcelona

Date of Codes at the Second Level
Protection of IGO Identifiers
GDPR and WHOIS
Codes at the Second Level
Two-Character Country
Category

Follow-up 1
1.a.I.
1.a.II.
Number
country/territory codes at the second level in order to establish an
work, as soon as possible, with those GAC members who have expressed
available ?small group? proposal, is adequately taken into account also in
PDP on IGO-INGO access to curative rights protection mechanisms to
Work with the GNSO and the GAC following the completion of the ongoing
Continue working with the GAC in order to ensure accuracy and
Publish a status report, four weeks prior to ICANN 63.
as possible; and
a unified access model that addresses accreditation, authentication,
this matter stands.
its explanation in writing by 31 December 2018. Previous GAC advice on
constitutes a rejection of GAC advice. The GAC advises the Board to set out
change from the preexisting release process (indicated in specification 5. 2
Board directs the ICANN org to provide adequate resources to assist the GAC in its endeavor
This was implemented through the update to the reserved names list:
progress related to the development of a unified access model, in addition to providing a
Board directs the ICANN org to continue to provide the GAC with regular updates on
European Data Protection Board. Any guidance and clarification will inform ICANN org?s
accordance to any guidance or clarification ICANN org might receive from the DPAs and the
Board directs the ICANN org to amend the current drafts of the guidelines for the GAC to
Published a status report, four weeks prior to ICANN 63.
facilitate access to the third parties that constitute GAC and/or the GAC?
accordance to any guidance or clarification ICANN org might receive from the DPAs and the
Board directs the ICANN org to continue to provide adequate resources to assist the GAC in its endeavor
This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration and written response
Board notes that on 9 July 2018 the Final Report from the IGO-INGO access to curative
On 16 September 2018 the Board considered this advice and stated in its scorecard: The
On 16 September 2018 the Board considered this advice and stated in its scorecard: The
On 16 September 2018 the Board considered this advice and stated in its scorecard: The
Board notes that the GAC advice continues to seek input on the critical components of verified access model for continued access by WHOIS
data. The Board welcomes and encourages the GAC's input into this process. This item is
completed in implementation.
As of 14 July 2020
GAC Advice Status

The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN68 Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN68 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus GAC Advice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Date of Request</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>About This Issue</th>
<th>Advice Text</th>
<th>Action Taken</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20190718</td>
<td>GAC</td>
<td>05/15-en#1.a</td>
<td>1.2.i</td>
<td>The Board has decided to defer action on this advice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20200428</td>
<td>GAC</td>
<td>06/15-en#1.b</td>
<td>1.2.i</td>
<td>The Board has decided to defer action on this advice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20200318</td>
<td>GAC</td>
<td>05/15-en#1.a</td>
<td>1.2.i</td>
<td>The Board has decided to defer action on this advice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20200218</td>
<td>GAC</td>
<td>05/15-en#1.a</td>
<td>1.2.i</td>
<td>The Board has decided to defer action on this advice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20200118</td>
<td>GAC</td>
<td>05/15-en#1.a</td>
<td>1.2.i</td>
<td>The Board has decided to defer action on this advice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20191218</td>
<td>GAC</td>
<td>05/15-en#1.a</td>
<td>1.2.i</td>
<td>The Board has decided to defer action on this advice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20191118</td>
<td>GAC</td>
<td>05/15-en#1.a</td>
<td>1.2.i</td>
<td>The Board has decided to defer action on this advice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20191018</td>
<td>GAC</td>
<td>05/15-en#1.a</td>
<td>1.2.i</td>
<td>The Board has decided to defer action on this advice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20190918</td>
<td>GAC</td>
<td>05/15-en#1.a</td>
<td>1.2.i</td>
<td>The Board has decided to defer action on this advice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20190818</td>
<td>GAC</td>
<td>05/15-en#1.a</td>
<td>1.2.i</td>
<td>The Board has decided to defer action on this advice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20190718</td>
<td>GAC</td>
<td>05/15-en#1.a</td>
<td>1.2.i</td>
<td>The Board has decided to defer action on this advice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Request Number</td>
<td>Communique</td>
<td>Date of Communique</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>About Item Number</td>
<td>Advice Text</td>
<td>Current Phase</td>
<td>Board Action(s)</td>
<td>Board Resolution Link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20180515-06</td>
<td>ICANN61 San Juan Communique</td>
<td>3/15/18</td>
<td>GAC and WHOIS</td>
<td>1.a</td>
<td>To ensure continued access to the WHOIS, including non-public data, for users with legitimate purposes, until such a time when a WHOIS model is fully operational, on a voluntary basis for all contracted parties, and with a mandatory basis for all governmental users.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resolutions-sanjuan61-gac-advice-scorecard-30may18-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resolutions-sanjuan61-gac-advice-scorecard-30may18-en.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20180515-07</td>
<td>ICANN61 San Juan Communique</td>
<td>3/15/18</td>
<td>GAC and WHOIS</td>
<td>1.b</td>
<td>The Board continues to consider this advice on 30 May 2018. However at this time, the Board responded, “as requested by the GAC in its 17 May 2018 letter to the ICANN Board”.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resolutions-2019-05-30-en#1.b">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resolutions-2019-05-30-en#1.b</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20180515-08</td>
<td>ICANN61 San Juan Communique</td>
<td>3/15/18</td>
<td>GAC and WHOIS</td>
<td>1.b</td>
<td>The Board continues to consider this advice on 30 May 2018. However at this time, the Board responded, “as requested by the GAC in its 17 May 2018 letter to the ICANN Board”.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resolutions-2019-05-30-en#1.b">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resolutions-2019-05-30-en#1.b</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20180515-09</td>
<td>ICANN61 San Juan Communique</td>
<td>3/15/18</td>
<td>GAC and WHOIS</td>
<td>1.b</td>
<td>The Board continues to consider this advice on 30 May 2018. However at this time, the Board responded, “as requested by the GAC in its 17 May 2018 letter to the ICANN Board”.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resolutions-2019-05-30-en#1.b">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resolutions-2019-05-30-en#1.b</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20180515-10</td>
<td>ICANN61 San Juan Communique</td>
<td>3/15/18</td>
<td>GAC and WHOIS</td>
<td>1.b</td>
<td>The Board continues to consider this advice on 30 May 2018. However at this time, the Board responded, “as requested by the GAC in its 17 May 2018 letter to the ICANN Board”.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resolutions-2019-05-30-en#1.b">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resolutions-2019-05-30-en#1.b</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20180515-11</td>
<td>ICANN61 San Juan Communique</td>
<td>3/15/18</td>
<td>GAC and WHOIS</td>
<td>1.b</td>
<td>The Board continues to consider this advice on 30 May 2018. However at this time, the Board responded, “as requested by the GAC in its 17 May 2018 letter to the ICANN Board”.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resolutions-2019-05-30-en#1.b">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resolutions-2019-05-30-en#1.b</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20180515-12</td>
<td>ICANN61 San Juan Communique</td>
<td>3/15/18</td>
<td>GAC and WHOIS</td>
<td>1.b</td>
<td>The Board continues to consider this advice on 30 May 2018. However at this time, the Board responded, “as requested by the GAC in its 17 May 2018 letter to the ICANN Board”.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resolutions-2019-05-30-en#1.b">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resolutions-2019-05-30-en#1.b</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20180515-13</td>
<td>ICANN61 San Juan Communique</td>
<td>3/15/18</td>
<td>GAC and WHOIS</td>
<td>1.b</td>
<td>The Board continues to consider this advice on 30 May 2018. However at this time, the Board responded, “as requested by the GAC in its 17 May 2018 letter to the ICANN Board”.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resolutions-2019-05-30-en#1.b">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resolutions-2019-05-30-en#1.b</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20180515-14</td>
<td>ICANN61 San Juan Communique</td>
<td>3/15/18</td>
<td>GAC and WHOIS</td>
<td>1.b</td>
<td>The Board continues to consider this advice on 30 May 2018. However at this time, the Board responded, “as requested by the GAC in its 17 May 2018 letter to the ICANN Board”.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resolutions-2019-05-30-en#1.b">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resolutions-2019-05-30-en#1.b</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20180515-15</td>
<td>ICANN61 San Juan Communique</td>
<td>3/15/18</td>
<td>GAC and WHOIS</td>
<td>1.b</td>
<td>The Board continues to consider this advice on 30 May 2018. However at this time, the Board responded, “as requested by the GAC in its 17 May 2018 letter to the ICANN Board”.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resolutions-2019-05-30-en#1.b">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resolutions-2019-05-30-en#1.b</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20180515-16</td>
<td>ICANN61 San Juan Communique</td>
<td>3/15/18</td>
<td>GAC and WHOIS</td>
<td>1.b</td>
<td>The Board continues to consider this advice on 30 May 2018. However at this time, the Board responded, “as requested by the GAC in its 17 May 2018 letter to the ICANN Board”.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resolutions-2019-05-30-en#1.b">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resolutions-2019-05-30-en#1.b</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20180515-17</td>
<td>ICANN61 San Juan Communique</td>
<td>3/15/18</td>
<td>GAC and WHOIS</td>
<td>1.b</td>
<td>The Board continues to consider this advice on 30 May 2018. However at this time, the Board responded, “as requested by the GAC in its 17 May 2018 letter to the ICANN Board”.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resolutions-2019-05-30-en#1.b">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resolutions-2019-05-30-en#1.b</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20180515-18</td>
<td>ICANN61 San Juan Communique</td>
<td>3/15/18</td>
<td>GAC and WHOIS</td>
<td>1.b</td>
<td>The Board continues to consider this advice on 30 May 2018. However at this time, the Board responded, “as requested by the GAC in its 17 May 2018 letter to the ICANN Board”.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resolutions-2019-05-30-en#1.b">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resolutions-2019-05-30-en#1.b</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20180515-19</td>
<td>ICANN61 San Juan Communique</td>
<td>3/15/18</td>
<td>GAC and WHOIS</td>
<td>1.b</td>
<td>The Board continues to consider this advice on 30 May 2018. However at this time, the Board responded, “as requested by the GAC in its 17 May 2018 letter to the ICANN Board”.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resolutions-2019-05-30-en#1.b">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resolutions-2019-05-30-en#1.b</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20180515-20</td>
<td>ICANN61 San Juan Communique</td>
<td>3/15/18</td>
<td>GAC and WHOIS</td>
<td>1.b</td>
<td>The Board continues to consider this advice on 30 May 2018. However at this time, the Board responded, “as requested by the GAC in its 17 May 2018 letter to the ICANN Board”.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resolutions-2019-05-30-en#1.b">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resolutions-2019-05-30-en#1.b</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20180515-21</td>
<td>ICANN61 San Juan Communique</td>
<td>3/15/18</td>
<td>GAC and WHOIS</td>
<td>1.b</td>
<td>The Board continues to consider this advice on 30 May 2018. However at this time, the Board responded, “as requested by the GAC in its 17 May 2018 letter to the ICANN Board”.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resolutions-2019-05-30-en#1.b">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resolutions-2019-05-30-en#1.b</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20180515-22</td>
<td>ICANN61 San Juan Communique</td>
<td>3/15/18</td>
<td>GAC and WHOIS</td>
<td>1.b</td>
<td>The Board continues to consider this advice on 30 May 2018. However at this time, the Board responded, “as requested by the GAC in its 17 May 2018 letter to the ICANN Board”.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resolutions-2019-05-30-en#1.b">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resolutions-2019-05-30-en#1.b</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20180515-23</td>
<td>ICANN61 San Juan Communique</td>
<td>3/15/18</td>
<td>GAC and WHOIS</td>
<td>1.b</td>
<td>The Board continues to consider this advice on 30 May 2018. However at this time, the Board responded, “as requested by the GAC in its 17 May 2018 letter to the ICANN Board”.</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Evaluate &amp; Consider</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resolutions-2019-05-30-en#1.b">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/resolutions-2019-05-30-en#1.b</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As of 14 July 2020
GAC Advice Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>Date of Communique</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Adverse Action</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/2015/4</td>
<td>2016.01.31-01</td>
<td>1/12/17</td>
<td>AR-002420</td>
<td>Follow-up 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/2015/4</td>
<td>2016.01.31-01</td>
<td>1/12/17</td>
<td>AR-002421</td>
<td>Follow-up 2</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 ICANN68 Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN68 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus GAC Advice)
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN68 Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN68 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus GAC Advice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>Date of Request</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>About This Request</th>
<th>Advice Text</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Board Activity</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Follow-up Link</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001515</td>
<td>ICANN68 Communique</td>
<td>6/1/17</td>
<td>Improving public informational participation in GAC</td>
<td>1.a</td>
<td>To further prepare the GAC Board to react to GDPR (including a timely and thorough discussion of management options to allow the organization its freedom of action in all stakeholders. The Board is committed to its deliberative role with the necessary standards of transparency in order to allow our English native speakers to understand it.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001516</td>
<td>ICANN68 Communique</td>
<td>9/10/19</td>
<td>Improving public informational participation in GAC</td>
<td>2.a</td>
<td>To further prepare the GAC Board to react to GDPR (including a timely and thorough discussion of management options to allow the organization its freedom of action in all stakeholders. The Board is committed to its deliberative role with the necessary standards of transparency in order to allow our English native speakers to understand it.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001517</td>
<td>ICANN68 Communique</td>
<td>9/10/19</td>
<td>Improving public informational participation in GAC</td>
<td>2.a</td>
<td>To further prepare the GAC Board to react to GDPR (including a timely and thorough discussion of management options to allow the organization its freedom of action in all stakeholders. The Board is committed to its deliberative role with the necessary standards of transparency in order to allow our English native speakers to understand it.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001518</td>
<td>ICANN68 Communique</td>
<td>9/10/19</td>
<td>Improving public informational participation in GAC</td>
<td>2.a</td>
<td>To further prepare the GAC Board to react to GDPR (including a timely and thorough discussion of management options to allow the organization its freedom of action in all stakeholders. The Board is committed to its deliberative role with the necessary standards of transparency in order to allow our English native speakers to understand it.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On 4 February 2018 the Board considered the Abu Dhabi Communique provided the information in its communique. The Board accepts this advice and requests the Chair to make relevant recommendations in the context of its responsibilities to the Board and the ICANN community in GDPR activities.

As of 14 July 2020

GAC Advice Status

Action Request Number

Communique

Board of Directors

Category

About Item Number

Advice

Current Phase

Board Action(s)

Board Resolution Link

Board Scorecard Link

Note:

The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2015) through the ICANN94 Virtual Communique (June 2021). (Note: the ICANN94 Virtual Communique did not contain General GAC Advice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>Date of Request</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>About Item Number</th>
<th>Advice</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Board Action(s)</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
<th>Date of Close</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019-0151</td>
<td>ICANN60 Abu Dhabi Communique</td>
<td>11/1/17</td>
<td>GAC89/WHOIS</td>
<td>3.1.1.1</td>
<td>The Board advises the Board that it will be useful for ICANN to work with the States parties to the Indian Ocean Treaty Organization (IOT) to develop recommendations on methods to implement the provisions of the Law of the Sea Convention. The Board recommends that the ICANN Board should seek legal advice on the potentially significant implications of the ICANN's ability to use the Law of the Sea Convention.</td>
<td>On 11 July 2019 the Board considered the IOT's consultation and proposed implementing measures related to this. The Board directed ICANN to work with the States parties to the IOT to develop recommendations.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-2019-04feb18-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-2019-04feb18-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Close</td>
<td>9/10/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-0152</td>
<td>ICANN60 Abu Dhabi Communique</td>
<td>11/1/17</td>
<td>GAC89/WHOIS</td>
<td>3.4.1</td>
<td>The Board considers the discussion on this question in order to ensure that they are consistent with the views expressed and reflect the full factual record.</td>
<td>On 11 February 2019 the Board considered the ICANN Board's consultation and proposed implementing measures related to this. The Board directed ICANN to work with the States parties to the IOT to develop recommendations.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-2018-03dec17-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-2018-03dec17-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Close</td>
<td>9/10/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-0153</td>
<td>ICANN60 Abu Dhabi Communique</td>
<td>11/1/17</td>
<td>GAC89/WHOIS</td>
<td>3.4.1</td>
<td>The Board considers the discussion on this question in order to ensure that they are consistent with the views expressed and reflect the full factual record.</td>
<td>On 11 February 2019 the Board considered the ICANN Board's consultation and proposed implementing measures related to this. The Board directed ICANN to work with the States parties to the IOT to develop recommendations.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-2018-03dec17-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-2018-03dec17-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Close</td>
<td>9/10/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-0155</td>
<td>ICANN60 Abu Dhabi Communique</td>
<td>11/1/17</td>
<td>GAC89/WHOIS</td>
<td>3.1.1</td>
<td>On 11 July 2019 the Board considered the IOT's consultation and proposed implementing measures related to this. The Board directed ICANN to work with the States parties to the IOT to develop recommendations.</td>
<td>On 11 July 2019 the Board considered the IOT's consultation and proposed implementing measures related to this. The Board directed ICANN to work with the States parties to the IOT to develop recommendations.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-2019-04feb18-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-2019-04feb18-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Close</td>
<td>9/10/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-0156</td>
<td>ICANN60 Abu Dhabi Communique</td>
<td>11/1/17</td>
<td>GAC89/WHOIS</td>
<td>3.1.1</td>
<td>On 11 July 2019 the Board considered the IOT's consultation and proposed implementing measures related to this. The Board directed ICANN to work with the States parties to the IOT to develop recommendations.</td>
<td>On 11 July 2019 the Board considered the IOT's consultation and proposed implementing measures related to this. The Board directed ICANN to work with the States parties to the IOT to develop recommendations.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-2019-04feb18-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-2019-04feb18-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Close</td>
<td>9/10/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-0157</td>
<td>ICANN60 Abu Dhabi Communique</td>
<td>11/1/17</td>
<td>GAC89/WHOIS</td>
<td>3.1.1</td>
<td>On 11 July 2019 the Board considered the IOT's consultation and proposed implementing measures related to this. The Board directed ICANN to work with the States parties to the IOT to develop recommendations.</td>
<td>On 11 July 2019 the Board considered the IOT's consultation and proposed implementing measures related to this. The Board directed ICANN to work with the States parties to the IOT to develop recommendations.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-2019-04feb18-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-2019-04feb18-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>Close</td>
<td>9/10/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- The Board recommends that ICANN should seek legal advice on this matter.
- The Board directs ICANN to work with the States parties to the IOT to develop recommendations.
- The Board also notes that the proposal to develop recommendations is consistent with the views expressed and reflects the full factual record.

**Mechanisms:**
- The Board recommends various mechanisms to be worked out for the protection of acronyms of IGOs.
- These mechanisms include: giving ICANN the ability to make these acronyms be made to benefit from the same cost neutral mechanisms as those that are in play for INGOs.
- The Board also mentions that the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) was given guidance of this type.

**Advisory Process:**
- The Board notes that the ICANN Board should seek legal advice on this matter.
- The Board also mentions that the ICANN Board should seek legal advice on this matter.

**Recommendations:**
- The Board recommends that ICANN should seek legal advice on this matter.
- The Board also recommends that ICANN should seek legal advice on this matter.

**Next Steps:**
- The Board recommends that ICANN should seek legal advice on this matter.
- The Board also recommends that ICANN should seek legal advice on this matter.

**Follow-up:**
- The Board recommends that ICANN should seek legal advice on this matter.
- The Board also recommends that ICANN should seek legal advice on this matter.

**Legal Considerations:**
- The Board notes that the proposal to develop recommendations is consistent with the views expressed and reflects the full factual record.
- The Board also mentions that the proposal to develop recommendations is consistent with the views expressed and reflects the full factual record.

**International Mechanisms:**
- The Board recommends that ICANN should seek legal advice on this matter.
- The Board also recommends that ICANN should seek legal advice on this matter.

**Public Consultations:**
- The Board notes that the proposal to develop recommendations is consistent with the views expressed and reflects the full factual record.
- The Board also mentions that the proposal to develop recommendations is consistent with the views expressed and reflects the full factual record.

**Implementation:**
- The Board recommends that ICANN should seek legal advice on this matter.
- The Board also recommends that ICANN should seek legal advice on this matter.

**International Cooperation:**
- The Board notes that the proposal to develop recommendations is consistent with the views expressed and reflects the full factual record.
- The Board also mentions that the proposal to develop recommendations is consistent with the views expressed and reflects the full factual record.

**Resources:**
- The Board recommends that ICANN should seek legal advice on this matter.
- The Board also recommends that ICANN should seek legal advice on this matter.

**Conclusion:**
- The Board notes that the proposal to develop recommendations is consistent with the views expressed and reflects the full factual record.
- The Board also mentions that the proposal to develop recommendations is consistent with the views expressed and reflects the full factual record.

---

**GDPR/WHOIS Category:**
- Category: GDPR/WHOIS
- Description: GDPR/WHOIS
- Recommendations: To review closely the decisions on this issue in order to ensure that they are consistent with the views expressed and reflect the full factual record.

---

**Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider**
- Phase 3: Evaluate & Consider
- Description: To evaluate and consider the recommendations.
- Recommendations: To ensure the lawful availability of WHOIS data for consumer protection and law enforcement activities.

---

**Board Scorecard Links:**

---

**Board Resolution Links:**
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communiqué (April 2013) through the ICANN68 Virtual Communiqué (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN68 Virtual Communiqué did not contain Consensus GAC Advice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
<th>Date/Time</th>
<th>Close</th>
<th>Board Resolution Code</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Action(s)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-002412</td>
<td>GAC Advice Status</td>
<td>N/A/7/13</td>
<td>GAC Members</td>
<td>GAC</td>
<td>Follow-up 1</td>
<td>6/29/17</td>
<td>7/10/19</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>The Board reviewed this item and determined further advice was not necessary. The Board will continue to follow up previous advice will be tracked on open advice items related to the same topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-002413</td>
<td>GAC Advice Status</td>
<td>N/A/7/13</td>
<td>GAC Members</td>
<td>GAC</td>
<td>Follow-up 1</td>
<td>6/29/17</td>
<td>7/10/19</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>The Board reviewed this item and determined further advice was not necessary. The Board will continue to follow up previous advice will be tracked on open advice items related to the same topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-002414</td>
<td>GAC Advice Status</td>
<td>N/A/7/13</td>
<td>GAC Members</td>
<td>GAC</td>
<td>Follow-up 1</td>
<td>6/29/17</td>
<td>7/10/19</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>The Board reviewed this item and determined further advice was not necessary. The Board will continue to follow up previous advice will be tracked on open advice items related to the same topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-002415</td>
<td>GAC Advice Status</td>
<td>N/A/7/13</td>
<td>GAC Members</td>
<td>GAC</td>
<td>Follow-up 1</td>
<td>6/29/17</td>
<td>7/10/19</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>The Board reviewed this item and determined further advice was not necessary. The Board will continue to follow up previous advice will be tracked on open advice items related to the same topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-002416</td>
<td>GAC Advice Status</td>
<td>N/A/7/13</td>
<td>GAC Members</td>
<td>GAC</td>
<td>Follow-up 1</td>
<td>6/29/17</td>
<td>7/10/19</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>The Board reviewed this item and determined further advice was not necessary. The Board will continue to follow up previous advice will be tracked on open advice items related to the same topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-002417</td>
<td>GAC Advice Status</td>
<td>N/A/7/13</td>
<td>GAC Members</td>
<td>GAC</td>
<td>Follow-up 1</td>
<td>6/29/17</td>
<td>7/10/19</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>The Board reviewed this item and determined further advice was not necessary. The Board will continue to follow up previous advice will be tracked on open advice items related to the same topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-002418</td>
<td>GAC Advice Status</td>
<td>N/A/7/13</td>
<td>GAC Members</td>
<td>GAC</td>
<td>Follow-up 1</td>
<td>6/29/17</td>
<td>7/10/19</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>The Board reviewed this item and determined further advice was not necessary. The Board will continue to follow up previous advice will be tracked on open advice items related to the same topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-002419</td>
<td>GAC Advice Status</td>
<td>N/A/7/13</td>
<td>GAC Members</td>
<td>GAC</td>
<td>Follow-up 1</td>
<td>6/29/17</td>
<td>7/10/19</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>The Board reviewed this item and determined further advice was not necessary. The Board will continue to follow up previous advice will be tracked on open advice items related to the same topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-002420</td>
<td>GAC Advice Status</td>
<td>N/A/7/13</td>
<td>GAC Members</td>
<td>GAC</td>
<td>Follow-up 1</td>
<td>6/29/17</td>
<td>7/10/19</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>The Board reviewed this item and determined further advice was not necessary. The Board will continue to follow up previous advice will be tracked on open advice items related to the same topic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communiqué (April 2013) through the ICANN68 Virtual Communiqué (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN68 Virtual Communiqué did not contain Consensus GAC Advice)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>Date of Communique</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>About this Action</th>
<th>Issue Text</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Board Resolution(s)</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Resolution(s)</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Close</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001364</td>
<td>Communique</td>
<td>3/15/17</td>
<td>Country/Territory Codes at the Second Level</td>
<td>2-Character</td>
<td>Engage with concerned governments by the next ICANN meeting to resolve those concerns. Also, to further explain the Board’s decision-making process.</td>
<td>09/10/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/10/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001365</td>
<td>Communique</td>
<td>3/15/17</td>
<td>Country/Territory Codes at the Second Level</td>
<td>2-Character</td>
<td>Engage with concerned governments by the next ICANN meeting to resolve those concerns. Also, to further explain the Board’s decision-making process.</td>
<td>09/10/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/10/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001366</td>
<td>Communique</td>
<td>3/15/17</td>
<td>Country/Territory Codes at the Second Level</td>
<td>2-Character</td>
<td>Engage with concerned governments by the next ICANN meeting to resolve those concerns. Also, to further explain the Board’s decision-making process.</td>
<td>09/10/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9/10/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2015) through the ICANN Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN Virtual Communique did not contain Generous GAC Advice)
Note: The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN68 Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN68 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus GAC Advice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>About Item/Category</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Control Phase</th>
<th>Board Resolution</th>
<th>Board Scorecard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GAC-AR-001363</td>
<td>AR-001363</td>
<td>The items captured</td>
<td>The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN68 Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN68 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus GAC Advice)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAC-AR-001364</td>
<td>AR-001364</td>
<td>The items captured</td>
<td>The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN68 Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN68 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus GAC Advice)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN68 Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN68 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus GAC Advice)</td>
<td>The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN68 Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN68 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus GAC Advice)</td>
<td>The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN68 Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN68 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus GAC Advice)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN68 Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN68 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus GAC Advice)</td>
<td>The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN68 Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN68 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus GAC Advice)</td>
<td>The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN68 Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN68 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus GAC Advice)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and provided its advice in its scorecard. The Board accepts the advice and recommends it without substantive modifications.

To take action and engage with all parties in order to facilitate, through a facilitated, good faith discussion to attempt to resolve the outstanding inconsistencies.

On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and requested the GNSO to consider possible modifications to its 2013 recommendations relating to the protections of Red Cross and Red Crescent names and acronyms. The Board advises the GNSO to consult with relevant stakeholders, including the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) and the IFRC’s own decision-making bodies, in order to further clarify and make necessary changes to its 2013 recommendations.

On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and confirmed that the Board has received the GAC’s advice on this item.

On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and noted that the GAC of the GAC is considering the proposed modifications to the 2013 recommendations on Red Cross and Red Crescent names and acronyms. The GAC has requested the GNSO to consider these modifications in the context of the GAC’s ongoing focus on the protection of IGO acronyms. The GAC also noted that the GAC is working closely with the GNSO to ensure that it can provide feedback on the proposed modifications.

On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and noted that the GAC of the GAC is considering the proposed modifications to the 2013 recommendations on Red Cross and Red Crescent names and acronyms. The GAC has requested the GNSO to consider these modifications in the context of the GAC’s ongoing focus on the protection of IGO acronyms. The GAC also noted that the GAC is working closely with the GNSO to ensure that it can provide feedback on the proposed modifications.

On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and noted that the GAC of the GAC is considering the proposed modifications to the 2013 recommendations on Red Cross and Red Crescent names and acronyms. The GAC has requested the GNSO to consider these modifications in the context of the GAC’s ongoing focus on the protection of IGO acronyms. The GAC also noted that the GAC is working closely with the GNSO to ensure that it can provide feedback on the proposed modifications.

On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and noted that the GAC of the GAC is considering the proposed modifications to the 2013 recommendations on Red Cross and Red Crescent names and acronyms. The GAC has requested the GNSO to consider these modifications in the context of the GAC’s ongoing focus on the protection of IGO acronyms. The GAC also noted that the GAC is working closely with the GNSO to ensure that it can provide feedback on the proposed modifications.

On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and noted that the GAC of the GAC is considering the proposed modifications to the 2013 recommendations on Red Cross and Red Crescent names and acronyms. The GAC has requested the GNSO to consider these modifications in the context of the GAC’s ongoing focus on the protection of IGO acronyms. The GAC also noted that the GAC is working closely with the GNSO to ensure that it can provide feedback on the proposed modifications.

On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and noted that the GAC of the GAC is considering the proposed modifications to the 2013 recommendations on Red Cross and Red Crescent names and acronyms. The GAC has requested the GNSO to consider these modifications in the context of the GAC’s ongoing focus on the protection of IGO acronyms. The GAC also noted that the GAC is working closely with the GNSO to ensure that it can provide feedback on the proposed modifications.

On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and noted that the GAC of the GAC is considering the proposed modifications to the 2013 recommendations on Red Cross and Red Crescent names and acronyms. The GAC has requested the GNSO to consider these modifications in the context of the GAC’s ongoing focus on the protection of IGO acronyms. The GAC also noted that the GAC is working closely with the GNSO to ensure that it can provide feedback on the proposed modifications.

On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and noted that the GAC of the GAC is considering the proposed modifications to the 2013 recommendations on Red Cross and Red Crescent names and acronyms. The GAC has requested the GNSO to consider these modifications in the context of the GAC’s ongoing focus on the protection of IGO acronyms. The GAC also noted that the GAC is working closely with the GNSO to ensure that it can provide feedback on the proposed modifications.

On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and noted that the GAC of the GAC is considering the proposed modifications to the 2013 recommendations on Red Cross and Red Crescent names and acronyms. The GAC has requested the GNSO to consider these modifications in the context of the GAC’s ongoing focus on the protection of IGO acronyms. The GAC also noted that the GAC is working closely with the GNSO to ensure that it can provide feedback on the proposed modifications.

On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and noted that the GAC of the GAC is considering the proposed modifications to the 2013 recommendations on Red Cross and Red Crescent names and acronyms. The GAC has requested the GNSO to consider these modifications in the context of the GAC’s ongoing focus on the protection of IGO acronyms. The GAC also noted that the GAC is working closely with the GNSO to ensure that it can provide feedback on the proposed modifications.

On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and noted that the GAC of the GAC is considering the proposed modifications to the 2013 recommendations on Red Cross and Red Crescent names and acronyms. The GAC has requested the GNSO to consider these modifications in the context of the GAC’s ongoing focus on the protection of IGO acronyms. The GAC also noted that the GAC is working closely with the GNSO to ensure that it can provide feedback on the proposed modifications.

On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and noted that the GAC of the GAC is considering the proposed modifications to the 2013 recommendations on Red Cross and Red Crescent names and acronyms. The GAC has requested the GNSO to consider these modifications in the context of the GAC’s ongoing focus on the protection of IGO acronyms. The GAC also noted that the GAC is working closely with the GNSO to ensure that it can provide feedback on the proposed modifications.

On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and noted that the GAC of the GAC is considering the proposed modifications to the 2013 recommendations on Red Cross and Red Crescent names and acronyms. The GAC has requested the GNSO to consider these modifications in the context of the GAC’s ongoing focus on the protection of IGO acronyms. The GAC also noted that the GAC is working closely with the GNSO to ensure that it can provide feedback on the proposed modifications.

On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and noted that the GAC of the GAC is considering the proposed modifications to the 2013 recommendations on Red Cross and Red Crescent names and acronyms. The GAC has requested the GNSO to consider these modifications in the context of the GAC’s ongoing focus on the protection of IGO acronyms. The GAC also noted that the GAC is working closely with the GNSO to ensure that it can provide feedback on the proposed modifications.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>Date of Resolution</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>About This Action</th>
<th>Advise From</th>
<th>Board Action(s)</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Decision Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
GAC Advice Status
As of 14 July 2020

Notes:
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN68 Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN68 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus GAC Advice)

<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 Action(s)</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
<th>Scorecard</th>
<th>Date of Scorecard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-058</td>
<td>AR-001310</td>
<td>6/30/16</td>
<td>Communique</td>
<td>1.a.</td>
<td>The GAC advises the ICANN Board that: I. the recommendations set forth in this item are comprehensive and measured approach to further releases of new gTLDs is appropriate, experienced and necessary. Any changes through political and social aging efforts and/or transitions that may not be agreed by all relevant parties.</td>
<td>12/13/16</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-schneider-28oct16-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-schneider-28oct16-en.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-039</td>
<td>AR-001311</td>
<td>6/30/16</td>
<td>Communique</td>
<td>1.a.II.</td>
<td>The GAC advises the ICANN Board that: I. the recommendations set forth in this item are comprehensive and measured approach to further releases of new gTLDs is appropriate, experienced and necessary. Any changes through political and social aging efforts and/or transitions that may not be agreed by all relevant parties.</td>
<td>12/13/16</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-schneider-28oct16-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-schneider-28oct16-en.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-073</td>
<td>AR-001312</td>
<td>6/30/16</td>
<td>Communique</td>
<td>1.a.III-IV.</td>
<td>The GAC advises the ICANN Board that: I. the recommendations set forth in this item are comprehensive and measured approach to further releases of new gTLDs is appropriate, experienced and necessary. Any changes through political and social aging efforts and/or transitions that may not be agreed by all relevant parties.</td>
<td>12/13/16</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-schneider-28oct16-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-schneider-28oct16-en.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Request Number</td>
<td>Action Description</td>
<td>Board Approval Date</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001305</td>
<td>Future gTLDs Rounds: Public</td>
<td>11/1/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001304</td>
<td>Use of 3-letter codes in the top level of the domain name system</td>
<td>11/1/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001347</td>
<td>Community Working Group on Use of Country/Territory Names as TLDs</td>
<td>11/1/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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 Communiqué (April 2015) through the ICANN56 Virtual Communiqué (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN56 Virtual Communiqué did not contain new GAC Advice)
- The Board considered this advice item on 15 May 2016 and the general topic of GNSO community priorities are balanced; and ii. how this process can maximise the Board's delay in providing a formal response to the Helsinki Communique due to the considerable effort required to complete the IANA transition.

**GNSO Chair:**
- On 28 October 2016 the ICANN Board Chair wrote to the GAC Chair to inform the GAC of the considerable effort required to complete the IANA transition.
- On 13 December 2016 the Board considered the Helsinki Communiqué and provided this response in its scorecard: The Board accepts this advice. In adopting its approach to a Root Zone Dataset and the protection of IGO names and acronyms at the second level, the Board states that its recommendations are intended to be a path forward for the consideration of the ICG's recommendations. On 13 December 2016 the Board directed the GNSO to review the proposals for the release of ICG advice on third-level identifiers for IGO names and acronyms at the second level.

**GAC Chair:**
- On 28 October 2016 the ICANN Board Chair wrote to the GAC Chair to inform the GAC of the considerable effort required to complete the IANA transition.
- On 13 December 2016 the Board considered the Helsinki Communiqué and provided this response in its scorecard: The Board accepts this advice. In adopting its approach to a Root Zone Dataset and the protection of IGO names and acronyms at the second level, the Board states that its recommendations are intended to be a path forward for the consideration of the ICG's recommendations. On 13 December 2016 the Board directed the GNSO to review the proposals for the release of ICG advice on third-level identifiers for IGO names and acronyms at the second level.

**GNSO Chair:**
- On 28 October 2016 the ICANN Board Chair wrote to the GAC Chair to inform the GAC of the considerable effort required to complete the IANA transition.
- On 13 December 2016 the Board considered the Helsinki Communiqué and provided this response in its scorecard: The Board accepts this advice. In adopting its approach to a Root Zone Dataset and the protection of IGO names and acronyms at the second level, the Board states that its recommendations are intended to be a path forward for the consideration of the ICG's recommendations. On 13 December 2016 the Board directed the GNSO to review the proposals for the release of ICG advice on third-level identifiers for IGO names and acronyms at the second level.

**GAC Chair:**
- On 28 October 2016 the ICANN Board Chair wrote to the GAC Chair to inform the GAC of the considerable effort required to complete the IANA transition.
- On 13 December 2016 the Board considered the Helsinki Communiqué and provided this response in its scorecard: The Board accepts this advice. In adopting its approach to a Root Zone Dataset and the protection of IGO names and acronyms at the second level, the Board states that its recommendations are intended to be a path forward for the consideration of the ICG's recommendations. On 13 December 2016 the Board directed the GNSO to review the proposals for the release of ICG advice on third-level identifiers for IGO names and acronyms at the second level.

**GNSO Chair:**
- On 28 October 2016 the ICANN Board Chair wrote to the GAC Chair to inform the GAC of the considerable effort required to complete the IANA transition.
- On 13 December 2016 the Board considered the Helsinki Communiqué and provided this response in its scorecard: The Board accepts this advice. In adopting its approach to a Root Zone Dataset and the protection of IGO names and acronyms at the second level, the Board states that its recommendations are intended to be a path forward for the consideration of the ICG's recommendations. On 13 December 2016 the Board directed the GNSO to review the proposals for the release of ICG advice on third-level identifiers for IGO names and acronyms at the second level.

**GAC Chair:**
- On 28 October 2016 the ICANN Board Chair wrote to the GAC Chair to inform the GAC of the considerable effort required to complete the IANA transition.
- On 13 December 2016 the Board considered the Helsinki Communiqué and provided this response in its scorecard: The Board accepts this advice. In adopting its approach to a Root Zone Dataset and the protection of IGO names and acronyms at the second level, the Board states that its recommendations are intended to be a path forward for the consideration of the ICG's recommendations. On 13 December 2016 the Board directed the GNSO to review the proposals for the release of ICG advice on third-level identifiers for IGO names and acronyms at the second level.

**GNSO Chair:**
- On 28 October 2016 the ICANN Board Chair wrote to the GAC Chair to inform the GAC of the considerable effort required to complete the IANA transition.
- On 13 December 2016 the Board considered the Helsinki Communiqué and provided this response in its scorecard: The Board accepts this advice. In adopting its approach to a Root Zone Dataset and the protection of IGO names and acronyms at the second level, the Board states that its recommendations are intended to be a path forward for the consideration of the ICG's recommendations. On 13 December 2016 the Board directed the GNSO to review the proposals for the release of ICG advice on third-level identifiers for IGO names and acronyms at the second level.

**GAC Chair:**
- On 28 October 2016 the ICANN Board Chair wrote to the GAC Chair to inform the GAC of the considerable effort required to complete the IANA transition.
- On 13 December 2016 the Board considered the Helsinki Communiqué and provided this response in its scorecard: The Board accepts this advice. In adopting its approach to a Root Zone Dataset and the protection of IGO names and acronyms at the second level, the Board states that its recommendations are intended to be a path forward for the consideration of the ICG's recommendations. On 13 December 2016 the Board directed the GNSO to review the proposals for the release of ICG advice on third-level identifiers for IGO names and acronyms at the second level.

**GNSO Chair:**
- On 28 October 2016 the ICANN Board Chair wrote to the GAC Chair to inform the GAC of the considerable effort required to complete the IANA transition.
- On 13 December 2016 the Board considered the Helsinki Communiqué and provided this response in its scorecard: The Board accepts this advice. In adopting its approach to a Root Zone Dataset and the protection of IGO names and acronyms at the second level, the Board states that its recommendations are intended to be a path forward for the consideration of the ICG's recommendations. On 13 December 2016 the Board directed the GNSO to review the proposals for the release of ICG advice on third-level identifiers for IGO names and acronyms at the second level.
In its 10 December 2015 letter to the GAC Chair (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-robinson-24nov14-en.pdf), the Board requested that the GAC provide a detailed justification for any proposed changes to the current ICANN Bylaws, including the development of a mechanism for making recommendations to the Board on bylaw changes. The Board requested that the GAC consider the potential implications of such changes for the ICANN community, including the impact on the effectiveness of the Bylaws in achieving the goals of the new gTLD program. The Board also requested that the GAC provide its advice on the appropriate timeline for consideration of any proposed changes to the Bylaws.

In its 10 December 2015 letter to the GAC Chair (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-robinson-24nov14-en.pdf), the Board requested that the GAC provide a detailed justification for any proposed changes to the current ICANN Bylaws, including the development of a mechanism for making recommendations to the Board on bylaw changes. The Board requested that the GAC consider the potential implications of such changes for the ICANN community, including the impact on the effectiveness of the Bylaws in achieving the goals of the new gTLD program. The Board also requested that the GAC provide its advice on the appropriate timeline for consideration of any proposed changes to the Bylaws.

In its 10 December 2015 letter to the GAC Chair (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-robinson-24nov14-en.pdf), the Board requested that the GAC provide a detailed justification for any proposed changes to the current ICANN Bylaws, including the development of a mechanism for making recommendations to the Board on bylaw changes. The Board requested that the GAC consider the potential implications of such changes for the ICANN community, including the impact on the effectiveness of the Bylaws in achieving the goals of the new gTLD program. The Board also requested that the GAC provide its advice on the appropriate timeline for consideration of any proposed changes to the Bylaws.

In its 10 December 2015 letter to the GAC Chair (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-robinson-24nov14-en.pdf), the Board requested that the GAC provide a detailed justification for any proposed changes to the current ICANN Bylaws, including the development of a mechanism for making recommendations to the Board on bylaw changes. The Board requested that the GAC consider the potential implications of such changes for the ICANN community, including the impact on the effectiveness of the Bylaws in achieving the goals of the new gTLD program. The Board also requested that the GAC provide its advice on the appropriate timeline for consideration of any proposed changes to the Bylaws.

In its 10 December 2015 letter to the GAC Chair (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-robinson-24nov14-en.pdf), the Board requested that the GAC provide a detailed justification for any proposed changes to the current ICANN Bylaws, including the development of a mechanism for making recommendations to the Board on bylaw changes. The Board requested that the GAC consider the potential implications of such changes for the ICANN community, including the impact on the effectiveness of the Bylaws in achieving the goals of the new gTLD program. The Board also requested that the GAC provide its advice on the appropriate timeline for consideration of any proposed changes to the Bylaws.

In its 10 December 2015 letter to the GAC Chair (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-robinson-24nov14-en.pdf), the Board requested that the GAC provide a detailed justification for any proposed changes to the current ICANN Bylaws, including the development of a mechanism for making recommendations to the Board on bylaw changes. The Board requested that the GAC consider the potential implications of such changes for the ICANN community, including the impact on the effectiveness of the Bylaws in achieving the goals of the new gTLD program. The Board also requested that the GAC provide its advice on the appropriate timeline for consideration of any proposed changes to the Bylaws.

In its 10 December 2015 letter to the GAC Chair (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-robinson-24nov14-en.pdf), the Board requested that the GAC provide a detailed justification for any proposed changes to the current ICANN Bylaws, including the development of a mechanism for making recommendations to the Board on bylaw changes. The Board requested that the GAC consider the potential implications of such changes for the ICANN community, including the impact on the effectiveness of the Bylaws in achieving the goals of the new gTLD program. The Board also requested that the GAC provide its advice on the appropriate timeline for consideration of any proposed changes to the Bylaws.

In its 10 December 2015 letter to the GAC Chair (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-robinson-24nov14-en.pdf), the Board requested that the GAC provide a detailed justification for any proposed changes to the current ICANN Bylaws, including the development of a mechanism for making recommendations to the Board on bylaw changes. The Board requested that the GAC consider the potential implications of such changes for the ICANN community, including the impact on the effectiveness of the Bylaws in achieving the goals of the new gTLD program. The Board also requested that the GAC provide its advice on the appropriate timeline for consideration of any proposed changes to the Bylaws.
Notes:
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communiqué (April 2013) through the ICANN68 Virtual Communiqué (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN68 Virtual Communiqué did not contain Consensus GAC Advice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communiqué</th>
<th>Date of Request</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>About Box Number</th>
<th>Action Text</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Board Resolution</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
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AR-001292
AR-001343
Action Request Number

The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN68 Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN68 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus GAC Advice)

The GAC decided to establish a Working Group on Human Rights Issues and developments.

The GAC notes the work of the ccNSO FOIWG, and its efforts to provide interpretive clarity to RFC1591. The GAC welcomes the FOIWG's recommendation that, with respect to the continued interpretive authority as public policy, the IGAC is empowered to develop a public database to streamline the process for the release of country and territory names at the second level, as outlined in its 2015-06-25-R08 report.

The GAC will write to the Board, before the Buenos Aires meeting, to consider whether or not to adopt the Proposal and to address any remaining open issues.

The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary. This item was considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 18 October 2015.

The report is considered complete as of the Board's consideration and resolution 25 June 2015.

The Board considered this advice and the general topic of the Adoption of the Framework of Interpretation for ccTLD Delegations and Redelegations on 25 June 2014 and took the following resolution: Resolved (2015.06.25.08), the Board requests the ccNSO to develop a concrete proposal for these mechanisms before the next ICANN meeting in Dublin; and welcomes the general topic of the Adoption of the Framework of Interpretation for ccTLD Delegations and Redelegations on 25 June 2014 and took the following resolution: Resolved (2015.06.25.07), the Board directs the President and CEO, or his designee(s), to take all steps necessary to grant ICANN approvals for the release of country and territory names at the second level to thousands of governments that have indicated their approval in the GAC's database. In its Rationale for the actions that the NGPC has taken to address the safeguard advice. The summary of Implementation for ccTLD Delegations and Redelegations on 25 June 2014 and took the following resolution: Resolved (2015.06.25.08), the Board requests the ccNSO to develop an implementation plan for the recommendations for protection for IGO names and acronyms at the top and second levels.

The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary. This item was considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 18 October 2015.

The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary. This item was considered complete as of the Board's consideration and resolution 25 June 2015.

The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary. This item was considered complete as of the Board's consideration and resolution 25 June 2015.

The Board considered the above and the general topic of the Adoption of the Framework of Interpretation for ccTLD Delegation and Redelegation on 25 June 2014 and took the following recommendations: Resolved (2015.06.25.08), the Board requests the President and CEO, or his designee(s), to develop an implementation plan for the recommendations for adoption of the Framework of Interpretation for ccTLD Delegations and Redelegations on 25 June 2014 and took the following resolution: Resolved (2015.06.25.07), the Board directs the President and CEO, or his designee(s), to take all steps necessary to grant ICANN approvals for the release of country and territory names at the second level to thousands of governments that have indicated their approval in the GAC's database.

The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary. This item was considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 18 October 2015.

The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary. This item was considered complete as of the Board's consideration and resolution 25 June 2015.

The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary. This item was considered complete as of the Board's consideration and resolution 25 June 2015.
As of 14 July 2020
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GAC Advice Status

AR-001339

Action Request Number

Communique
ICANN52 Singapore
Communique
ICANN52 Singapore
Communiqué

Date of registration policies) strings
and Country Names at the Release of Two-Letter Codes
Public Safety and Law Enforcement.

Crescent Governmental Organisations

Acronyms for Inter-

7.a.I - 7.b.I
2.
Number

GAC urges the NGPC to: i. provide greater clarity as to the mechanisms for redress in ICANN contract compliance to effectively respond to issues involving serious risks of regulatory authorities, government agencies, and law enforcement to work with such provisions in view of the public policy concerns. This could also help to raise awareness and foster a culture of accountability throughout the industry.

In addition, b. The GAC recommends: i. that ICANN suggest to those Registries best practices standard that all Registries involved with such strings should strive to consider. b. The GAC further advises the Board to: i. extend the mechanism, so that relevant governments can be alerted as requests are made. The Board considered this advice item on 12 February 2015 and took the following action: (i) noted the amendment to the current and future new gTLD rounds.

The Board requested additional time to consider them, and continues to facilitate discussions and recommendations that differ from the GAC Advice received by the Board on the topic of protections for certain terms and names in the current and future new gTLD rounds.

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to GAC Advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response in its scorecard. On 28 April 2015, the Board took action to adopt the GNSO policy recommendations that are not inconsistent with GAC Advice received by the Board on the topic of protections for certain terms and names in the current and future new gTLD rounds.

The GAC will continue to work with interested parties to reach agreement on all remaining advice items that are considered. b. The Board's resolution of 12 February 2015.

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to GAC Advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response in its scorecard. On 28 April 2015, the Board took action to adopt the GNSO policy recommendations that are not inconsistent with GAC Advice received by the Board on the topic of protections for certain terms and names in the current and future new gTLD rounds.

The GAC welcomes the steps taken to implement the NGPC resolution on 7 October 2015 and provided this response in its scorecard: On 28 April 2015, the Board took action to adopt the GNSO policy recommendations that are not inconsistent with GAC Advice received by the Board on the topic of protections for certain terms and names in the current and future new gTLD rounds.

The GAC will continue to work with interested parties to reach agreement on all remaining advice items that are considered. b. The Board's resolution of 12 February 2015.

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to GAC Advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response in its scorecard. On 28 April 2015, the Board took action to adopt the GNSO policy recommendations that are not inconsistent with GAC Advice received by the Board on the topic of protections for certain terms and names in the current and future new gTLD rounds.

The GAC welcomes the steps taken to implement the NGPC resolution on 7 October 2015 and provided this response in its scorecard: On 28 April 2015, the Board took action to adopt the GNSO policy recommendations that are not inconsistent with GAC Advice received by the Board on the topic of protections for certain terms and names in the current and future new gTLD rounds.

The GAC will continue to work with interested parties to reach agreement on all remaining advice items that are considered. b. The Board's resolution of 12 February 2015.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>State 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 Resolution Text</th>
<th>Board Resolution Reference</th>
<th>Notes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001288</td>
<td>ICANN51 Los Angeles Communique</td>
<td>2020/03</td>
<td>Action Request Number</td>
<td>The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN68 Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN68 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus GAC Advice)</td>
<td>Notes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001283</td>
<td>ICANN51 Los Angeles Communique</td>
<td>2020/03</td>
<td>Action Request Number</td>
<td>The GAC was explicitly told by the Board, its Charter and ICANN's Bylaws, and in its ICANN51 Los Angeles Communiqué (Recommendation 1.1) that its advice should not be relied upon in any future decisions of ICANN, including the New gTLD Program. The Board also noted that the GAC had expressed its desire to receive a copy of the Notice of Intent (NOI) for each new gTLD application submitted to ICANN.</td>
<td>Notes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001281</td>
<td>ICANN51 Los Angeles Communique</td>
<td>2020/03</td>
<td>Action Request Number</td>
<td>The Board continued its discussions and determination of actions as no longer necessary. This item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 1 November 2017.</td>
<td>Notes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001280</td>
<td>ICANN51 Los Angeles Communique</td>
<td>2020/03</td>
<td>Action Request Number</td>
<td>The Board continued its discussions and determination of actions as not necessary. This item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 1 November 2017.</td>
<td>Notes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001279</td>
<td>ICANN51 Los Angeles Communique</td>
<td>2020/03</td>
<td>Action Request Number</td>
<td>The Board concluded its discussions and determination of actions as not necessary. This item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 1 November 2017.</td>
<td>Notes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001278</td>
<td>ICANN51 Los Angeles Communique</td>
<td>2020/03</td>
<td>Action Request Number</td>
<td>The Board concluded its discussions and determination of actions as not necessary. This item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 1 November 2017.</td>
<td>Notes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001277</td>
<td>ICANN51 Los Angeles Communique</td>
<td>2020/03</td>
<td>Action Request Number</td>
<td>The Board concluded its discussions and determination of actions as not necessary. This item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 1 November 2017.</td>
<td>Notes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001276</td>
<td>ICANN51 Los Angeles Communique</td>
<td>2020/03</td>
<td>Action Request Number</td>
<td>The Board concluded its discussions and determination of actions as not necessary. This item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 1 November 2017.</td>
<td>Notes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001275</td>
<td>ICANN51 Los Angeles Communique</td>
<td>2020/03</td>
<td>Action Request Number</td>
<td>The Board concluded its discussions and determination of actions as not necessary. This item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 1 November 2017.</td>
<td>Notes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001274</td>
<td>ICANN51 Los Angeles Communique</td>
<td>2020/03</td>
<td>Action Request Number</td>
<td>The Board concluded its discussions and determination of actions as not necessary. This item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 1 November 2017.</td>
<td>Notes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001273</td>
<td>ICANN51 Los Angeles Communique</td>
<td>2020/03</td>
<td>Action Request Number</td>
<td>The Board concluded its discussions and determination of actions as not necessary. This item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 1 November 2017.</td>
<td>Notes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001272</td>
<td>ICANN51 Los Angeles Communique</td>
<td>2020/03</td>
<td>Action Request Number</td>
<td>The Board concluded its discussions and determination of actions as not necessary. This item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 1 November 2017.</td>
<td>Notes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GAC Advice Status

AR-001285

Notes:

The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2015) through the ICANN54 Virtual Communique (June 2016). (Note: the ICANN54 Virtual Communique did not contain General GAC Advice)
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**As of 14 July 2020**

**GAC Advice Status**

**AR-001278**

**6/25/14**

**10/15/14**

**Communiqué**

**Date of Transparency**

**Accountability and Strengthening Transition of US Stewardship**

**Category 2 (restricted)**

**Category 1 (consumer)**

**Safety**

**Implementation of WHOIS**

**Privacy/Proxy Accreditation issues. 1. **Implementation of Thick WHOIS. 2. Conflicts with National Privacy Laws. 3. Privacy/Proxy Accreditation**

**The GAC was briefed by the Board-GAC Recommendation 10.2**

**The GAC notes that there are a wide range of WHOIS-related issues that have significant workload implications for both the GAC and the wider community. This includes:**

**ii. The IANA transition process should be guided by the necessary public policy considerations in addition to a consensus-based approach and serve the public interest with clearly defined roles and responsibilities.**

**The GAC advises the ICANN Board that:**

**i. Implementation of WHOIS- related safeguards:**

**1. Provide the GAC and other relevant authorities in case of doubt about the authenticity of credentials; 2. Security Risks:**

**2. Inform the GAC and provide GAC with responses in a 22 January 2015 letter dated 22 January 2015:**

**3. The GAC notes that key operational details for the ICANN transition process are structured in a way that all stakeholders are involved — including the technical community. This includes:**

**4. Bylaw changes to formally recommend being progressed by the BGRI as follows: o Implementation Working Group (BGRI) and agreed to specific ATRT2 implementation planning work. Resolved (2014.06.26.15), the President and CEO is required support to the GAC and the BGRI-WG to continue their assessment and recommendations pertaining to the GAC, and directs the President and CEO to provide reports on sub-agreements making up the recommendation, including key performance indicators and timelines and deadlines.**

**5. The Board considered the Second Accountability and Transparency Review Team (ATRT2) item is considered complete as of the Chair’s letter of 22 January 2015.**


**Notes:**

The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communiqué (April 2015) through the ICANN Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN Virtual Communique did not contain General GAC Advice)
The Board noted the Secured Transaction and Transparency Requirements section of the ICANN68 Virtual Communique (June 2020) and the Board noted the GAC's consideration of this advice, this item is now considered complete as of 26 June 2014.

9/20/2014

Communique

ASO/SSAC

5/15/14

GAC Open Forum

4

The Board provided clarification regarding the phase 2 rights protection mechanisms, noting that the NLPTP is currently in the process of developing rights protection mechanisms for future rounds of the New gTLD Program, and that efforts are underway to provide guidance to the ICANN community on the use of the rights protection mechanisms.

The Board noted the ICANN50 London Communique (June 2013) and the ICANN50 London Communique (June 2013) sections of the ICANN68 Virtual Communique (June 2020).

The Board noted the Security and Transparency Requirements section of the ICANN68 Virtual Communique (June 2020) and the Board noted the GAC's consideration of this advice, this item is now considered complete as of 26 June 2014.

9/20/2014

Communique

ASO/SSAC

5/15/14

GAC Open Forum

4

The Board noted the Security and Transparency Requirements section of the ICANN68 Virtual Communique (June 2020) and the Board noted the GAC's consideration of this advice, this item is now considered complete as of 26 June 2014.

9/20/2014

Communique

ASO/SSAC

5/15/14

GAC Open Forum

4

The Board noted the Security and Transparency Requirements section of the ICANN68 Virtual Communique (June 2020) and the Board noted the GAC's consideration of this advice, this item is now considered complete as of 26 June 2014.

9/20/2014

Communique

ASO/SSAC

5/15/14

GAC Open Forum

4

The Board noted the Security and Transparency Requirements section of the ICANN68 Virtual Communique (June 2020) and the Board noted the GAC's consideration of this advice, this item is now considered complete as of 26 June 2014.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>Date of Requested</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Must be complete by</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Board Resolution</th>
<th>Board Scorecard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
As of 14 July 2020

GAC Advice Status

ICANN49 Singapore
Communique

1.4.1.a.

Advice Item


In April 2014, the Board recommended to the public and private sectors to participate in the NETmundial meeting and to address the outcomes of the NETmundial meeting and the NETmundial Principles, as well as their interconnections with the NGPC (https://features.icann.org/compliance/audits

The GAC further noted that ICANN released a Communication of 6 March 2014 regarding applications for new top-level domain names (gTLDs), including extensions and applicants, and noted the GAC's advice that ICANN should continue to implement such applications in a manner consistent with the GAC's advice. The GAC also noted that the ICANN Board Chair provided the GAC with a response to the Board Chair's letter of 5 June 2014. The Board Chair's letter was addressed to the GAC and other governments that are not presently members of the GAC and also not part of the ICANN community and intended to recognize discussion in other fora as appropriate. This item is considered complete as of the Board Chair's letter of 5 June 2014.

The GAC welcomes the explanation provided to the GAC by ICANN in its response to the GAC's non-new gTLD concerns raised in the ICANN49 Singapore Communique as an opportunity to improve community participation in this important discussion, including possibly at ICANN meetings, or through webinars. ICANN looks forward to taking part in the GAC about enabling governments at times and ways of providing the public with more information and effective feedback. The GAC notes that the NGPC (https://features.icann.org/compliance/audits http://www.icann.org/en/resources/compliance/reports 6. For the Audit Program, refer to http://www.icann.org/en/resources/compliance/announcements 4. For the ICANN Contractual Compliance announcements, refer to http://www.icann.org/en/resources/compliance/announcements 3. To learn more about the ICANN Contractual Compliance activities and policies, refer to http://www.icann.org/en/resources/compliance/announcements 2. For the NGPC, refer to http://www.icann.org/en/resources/compliance/announcements 1. For the NGPC, refer to http://www.icann.org/en/resources/compliance/announcements 1.

The GAC requests that ICANN provide the Board with a scorecard of the Board's responses to the NGPC's non-new gTLD concerns raised in the ICANN49 Singapore Communique as an opportunity to improve community participation in this important discussion, including possibly at ICANN meetings, or through webinars. ICANN looks forward to taking part in the GAC about enabling governments at times and ways of providing the public with more information and effective feedback. The GAC notes that the NGPC (https://features.icann.org/compliance/audits http://www.icann.org/en/resources/compliance/reports 6. For the Audit Program, refer to http://www.icann.org/en/resources/compliance/announcements 4. For the ICANN Contractual Compliance announcements, refer to http://www.icann.org/en/resources/compliance/announcements 3. To learn more about the ICANN Contractual Compliance activities and policies, refer to http://www.icann.org/en/resources/compliance/announcements 2. For the NGPC, refer to http://www.icann.org/en/resources/compliance/announcements 1. For the NGPC, refer to http://www.icann.org/en/resources/compliance/announcements 1.

The GAC requests that ICANN provide the Board with a scorecard of the Board's responses to the NGPC's non-new gTLD concerns raised in the ICANN49 Singapore Communique as an opportunity to improve community participation in this important discussion, including possibly at ICANN meetings, or through webinars. ICANN looks forward to taking part in the GAC about enabling governments at times and ways of providing the public with more information and effective feedback. The GAC notes that the NGPC (https://features.icann.org/compliance/audits http://www.icann.org/en/resources/compliance/reports 6. For the Audit Program, refer to http://www.icann.org/en/resources/compliance/announcements 4. For the ICANN Contractual Compliance announcements, refer to http://www.icann.org/en/resources/compliance/announcements 3. To learn more about the ICANN Contractual Compliance activities and policies, refer to http://www.icann.org/en/resources/compliance/announcements 2. For the NGPC, refer to http://www.icann.org/en/resources/compliance/announcements 1. For the NGPC, refer to http://www.icann.org/en/resources/compliance/announcements 1.

The GAC requests that ICANN provide the Board with a scorecard of the Board's responses to the NGPC's non-new gTLD concerns raised in the ICANN49 Singapore Communique as an opportunity to improve community participation in this important discussion, including possibly at ICANN meetings, or through webinars. ICANN looks forward to taking part in the GAC about enabling governments at times and ways of providing the public with more information and effective feedback. The GAC notes that the NGPC (https://features.icann.org/compliance/audits http://www.icann.org/en/resources/compliance/reports 6. For the Audit Program, refer to http://www.icann.org/en/resources/compliance/announcements 4. For the ICANN Contractual Compliance announcements, refer to http://www.icann.org/en/resources/compliance/announcements 3. To learn more about the ICANN Contractual Compliance activities and policies, refer to http://www.icann.org/en/resources/compliance/announcements 2. For the NGPC, refer to http://www.icann.org/en/resources/compliance/announcements 1. For the NGPC, refer to http://www.icann.org/en/resources/compliance/announcements 1.
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN68 Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN68 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus GAC Advice)

Notes:
- Communique
- Date of
- Specific Strings - .amazon
- Singular and Plural Versions
- Protection, sensitive strings
- Category 1 (consumer protection, sensitive strings)
- Category 2 (proper names, geographic names, generic strings, and acronyms)
- 2.b.
- 5.
- 8.
- Advice Item
- name .amazon, as stated in the GAC communiqué, approved in Durban, evaluated on 30 April 2014, the NGPC accepted the GAC advice identified in the GAC scorecard: On 14 May 2014, the NGPC accepted the GAC advice identified in the GAC scorecard: The NGPC acknowledges the GAC’s reiteration of its advice in the Beijing
- Advice Text
- Board Resolution
- Board Resolution
- Board Resolution
- Board Resolution
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN68 Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN68 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus GAC Advice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>About This Issue</th>
<th>GAC Advice Status</th>
<th>Date of</th>
<th>Advice Text</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001247</td>
<td>Communique</td>
<td>.guangzhou (IDN in Chinese)</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>The GAC advises the ICANN Board not to proceed beyond initial evaluation until the agreements between the relevant parties are reached; the concerned applicants and interested parties should be encouraged to continue their negotiations. In the meantime concerned GAC members believe the applicants and interested parties should be encouraged to continue their negotiations with a view to reach an agreement on the matter.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-05-14-en#2.a">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-05-14-en#2.a</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001257</td>
<td>Communique</td>
<td>WHOIS</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>3/27/14</td>
<td>The NGPC considered this advice and provided the Board a scorecard. Therefore, the ICANN Board Chair provided the GAC Chair with a scorecard of the Board's responses to the GAC's advice on this subject. Adverse elements were identified in relation to the applications for .ram, .VIN, and .INDIANS, on 10 September 2013, the NGPC adopted resolutions to respond to the GAC’s advice in the Durban Communiqué concerning .RAM. In response to the GAC’s advice in the Durban Communiqué, the NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to GAC Advice. The NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to GAC Advice</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-scorecard-2016-09-12-v08-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-scorecard-2016-09-12-v08-en.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001331</td>
<td>Communique</td>
<td>.INDIANS</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>9/8/14</td>
<td>The NGPC adopted resolutions in response to the GAC’s advice in the Durban Communiqué concerning .INDIANS. In response to the GAC’s advice in the Durban Communiqué, the NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to GAC Advice. The NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to GAC Advice</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-scorecard-2016-09-12-v08-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-scorecard-2016-09-12-v08-en.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2 Close Request</td>
<td>Action Request Number</td>
<td>Phase 2 Close Request</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
<td>6/5/14</td>
<td>The ICANN Board Chair provided the GAC Chair with a scorecard of the Board’s responses to the GAC’s advice on this subject. Adverse elements were identified in relation to the applications for .ram, .VIN, and .INDIANS, on 10 September 2013, the NGPC adopted resolutions to respond to the GAC’s advice in the Durban Communiqué concerning .RAM. In response to the GAC’s advice in the Durban Communiqué, the NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to GAC Advice. The NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to GAC Advice</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-05-14-en#2.a">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-05-14-en#2.a</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN68 Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN68 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus GAC Advice)
- The GAC Advice Scorecard is available at the following link: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-scorecard-2016-09-12-v08-en.pdf
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN68 Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN68 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus GAC Advice)

Notes:

- ICANN48 Buenos Aires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>About GAC Advice</th>
<th>Close Date</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Action Request Number

GAC Advice Status

AR-001232

The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN68 Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN68 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus GAC Advice)

Notes:

Communique

Communique

ICANN47 Durban

ICANN47 Durban

ICANN47 Durban

ICANN48 Buenos Aires

ICANN48 Buenos Aires

Communiqué

Communiqué

7/18/13

7/18/13

7/18/13

11/20/13

11/20/13

11/20/13

Communiqué

Communiqué 1.c.)

.wine and .vin (ref. Beijing

.date and .persiangulf (ref.

Geographic and Community

Protection of Red Cross/Red

1.6

1.4.a.i.

1.3.a.

2.b.

2.c

Module 3.1 part I of the Applicant Guidebook on the following

The GAC has reached consensus on GAC Objection Advice according to

GAC advice contained in the Beijing Communique on safeguards that

conclude on the matter. As a

expressed by the Government of India not to proceed with the

.com and Chinese (application number 1-1318-5591)

.58086) and related IDNs in Japanese (application number 1-1318-83995)

information presented by the applicant and proposes to take action at a future NGPC

Given the volume of information presented, the NGPC continues to consider the

scorecard: Per §3.1 of the AGB, the applicant submitted a response to the ICANN Board. On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its

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

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

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

On 29 August 2013 regarding its conclusion on applications for .vin and .wine. This item is

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

The NGPC will provide a written briefing regarding how ICANN considers this SSAC advice with a view to

The NGPC informed the GAC that it looked forward to continuing the dialogue with the GAC on this issue. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10 September 2013.

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

The NGPC accepts this advice. ICANN published materials in December 2013 to

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

The Board provided a response on 14 October 2019. This advice

The NGPC accepts this advice. ICANN received notice on 15 November 2013 that

scorecard: The NGPC accepts this advice. ICANN published materials in December 2013 to

On 28 January 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its consideration of 28 January 2014.

On 11 July 2019 the NGPC Board Chair sent a letter notifying the Chair of the ICANN Board that ICANN approved the recommendations contained in paragraph 6 of the GAC Advice contained in the Beijing Communique on safeguards that

On 29 August 2013 regarding its conclusion on applications for .vin and .wine. This item is

The NGPC accepts this advice. ICANN received notice on 15 November 2013 that

On 28 January 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its consideration of 28 January 2014.

On 28 January 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its consideration of 28 January 2014.

On 28 January 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its consideration of 28 January 2014.

On 28 January 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its consideration of 28 January 2014.

The GAC advice contained in the Beijing Communique on safeguards that

The NGPC continues to consider the recommendations contained in the ICANN Board Resolution on Dotless Domain Name Security and

The NGPC notes the

The NGPC will provide a written briefing regarding how ICANN considers this SSAC advice with a view to

The NGPC accepts this advice. ICANN published materials in December 2013 to

On 29 August 2013 regarding its conclusion on applications for .vin and .wine. This item is

On 29 August 2013 regarding its conclusion on applications for .vin and .wine. This item is

On 29 August 2013 regarding its conclusion on applications for .vin and .wine. This item is

On 29 August 2013 regarding its conclusion on applications for .vin and .wine. This item is

On 29 August 2013 regarding its conclusion on applications for .vin and .wine. This item is

The NGPC will provide a written briefing regarding how ICANN considers this SSAC advice with a view to

The NGPC accepts this advice. ICANN published materials in December 2013 to

On 29 August 2013 regarding its conclusion on applications for .vin and .wine. This item is

On 29 August 2013 regarding its conclusion on applications for .vin and .wine. This item is

On 29 August 2013 regarding its conclusion on applications for .vin and .wine. This item is

The NGPC continues to consider the recommendations contained in the ICANN Board Resolution on Dotless Domain Name Security and
On 10 September 2013, the ICANN Board considered this advice (see above) and provided no response. The GAC utilizes its role to provide advice to the Board on matters that arise during the discussions, registry operators will be required to protect the acronyms of the ICRC/CICR and IFRC/FICR. The NGPC notes that the ICANN Board has accepted this advice, and the NGPC will ensure that the ICANN Board is kept informed and updated in this regard. The NGPC notes that the ICANN Board has accepted this advice, and the NGPC will ensure that the ICANN Board is kept informed and updated in this regard.

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided no response. The NGPC initially considered this advice on 10 September 2013. However at the time, the NGPC did not consider the advice to be acceptable, and the NGPC requested that the ICANN Board provide a response. The NGPC accepted the advice on 9 October 2013.

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided no response. The NGPC initially considered this advice on 10 September 2013. However at the time, the NGPC did not consider the advice to be acceptable, and the NGPC requested that the ICANN Board provide a response. The NGPC accepted the advice on 9 October 2013.

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided no response. The NGPC initially considered this advice on 10 September 2013. However at the time, the NGPC did not consider the advice to be acceptable, and the NGPC requested that the ICANN Board provide a response. The NGPC accepted the advice on 9 October 2013.

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided no response. The NGPC initially considered this advice on 10 September 2013. However at the time, the NGPC did not consider the advice to be acceptable, and the NGPC requested that the ICANN Board provide a response. The NGPC accepted the advice on 9 October 2013.

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided no response. The NGPC initially considered this advice on 10 September 2013. However at the time, the NGPC did not consider the advice to be acceptable, and the NGPC requested that the ICANN Board provide a response. The NGPC accepted the advice on 9 October 2013.

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided no response. The NGPC initially considered this advice on 10 September 2013. However at the time, the NGPC did not consider the advice to be acceptable, and the NGPC requested that the ICANN Board provide a response. The NGPC accepted the advice on 9 October 2013.

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided no response. The NGPC initially considered this advice on 10 September 2013. However at the time, the NGPC did not consider the advice to be acceptable, and the NGPC requested that the ICANN Board provide a response. The NGPC accepted the advice on 9 October 2013.
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN68 Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN68 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus GAC Advice).

### Notes:
- **Communique**
  - ICANN46 Beijing
  - ICANN46 Beijing
  - ICANN46 Beijing

- **4/11/13**
- **7/18/13**

The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN68 Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN68 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus GAC Advice.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Report Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>Date of Communique</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>About Box</th>
<th>Advice Text</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Scorecard URL</th>
<th>Board Resolution URL</th>
<th>ICANN68 Virtual Communique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001218</td>
<td>GAC Beijing</td>
<td>4/11/13</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Small Scale</td>
<td>The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN68 Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN68 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus GAC Advice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As of 14 July 2020
GAC Advice Status

AR-001323
AR-001215

The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN68 Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN68 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus GAC Advice)

Communique
ICANN46 Beijing

4/11/13

Restricted Registration Agreement (RAA)

Category 2

1. Restricted Access As an exception to the general rule that the gTLD registration space is operated in an open manner, registration may be restricted, in particular for strings representing generic terms, under circumstances specified in an expanded DNS. Such protection, which the GAC has previously advised, should be a priority. The GAC advises that ICANN does not have an objectively different category of other rights holders, warranting special protection (GAC43/IC2010), while ensuring sufficient flexibility for verifiable implementation. The GAC is in favor of a consistent implementation across the various TLDs, if possible, and the GAC requests to hold a workshop and/or workshop. In the interim, the GAC requests that ICANN provide additional information on the Public Interest Commitments in Specification 11 (http://www.icann.org/en/adv/gac-commitments-concerns-07oct15-en.pdf), in light of the expiration of the current Public Interest Commitments in Specification 11. The GAC recommends that the RAA be amended and made publicly available by the date of the ICANN68 meeting to ensure that the Public Interest Commitments in Specification 11 are aligned with the general rule that the gTLD registration space is operated in an open manner. As discussed in the ICANN48 meeting, the GAC recognizes the need for additional information on the Public Interest Commitments in Specification 11, particularly the need for specific guidance on the Public Interest Commitments in Specification 11.

2. Exclusive Access For strings representing generic terms, the GAC recognizes that ICANN does not have an objectively different category of other rights holders, warranting special protection (GAC43/IC2010), while ensuring sufficient flexibility for verifiable implementation. The GAC is in favor of a consistent implementation across the various TLDs, if possible, and the GAC requests to hold a workshop and/or workshop. In the interim, the GAC requests that ICANN provide additional information on the Public Interest Commitments in Specification 11 (http://www.icann.org/en/adv/gac-commitments-concerns-07oct15-en.pdf), in light of the expiration of the current Public Interest Commitments in Specification 11. The GAC recommends that the RAA be amended and made publicly available by the date of the ICANN68 meeting to ensure that the Public Interest Commitments in Specification 11 are aligned with the general rule that the gTLD registration space is operated in an open manner. As discussed in the ICANN48 meeting, the GAC recognizes the need for additional information on the Public Interest Commitments in Specification 11, particularly the need for specific guidance on the Public Interest Commitments in Specification 11.

The GAC requests more information on the Public Interest Commitments in Specification 11, in light of the expiration of the current Public Interest Commitments in Specification 11. The GAC recognizes that ICANN does not have an objectively different category of other rights holders, warranting special protection (GAC43/IC2010), while ensuring sufficient flexibility for verifiable implementation. The GAC is in favor of a consistent implementation across the various TLDs, if possible, and the GAC requests to hold a workshop and/or workshop. In the interim, the GAC requests that ICANN provide additional information on the Public Interest Commitments in Specification 11 (http://www.icann.org/en/adv/gac-commitments-concerns-07oct15-en.pdf), in light of the expiration of the current Public Interest Commitments in Specification 11. The GAC recommends that the RAA be amended and made publicly available by the date of the ICANN68 meeting to ensure that the Public Interest Commitments in Specification 11 are aligned with the general rule that the gTLD registration space is operated in an open manner. As discussed in the ICANN48 meeting, the GAC recognizes the need for additional information on the Public Interest Commitments in Specification 11, particularly the need for specific guidance on the Public Interest Commitments in Specification 11.

The GAC requests more information on the Public Interest Commitments in Specification 11, in light of the expiration of the current Public Interest Commitments in Specification 11. The GAC recognizes that ICANN does not have an objectively different category of other rights holders, warranting special protection (GAC43/IC2010), while ensuring sufficient flexibility for verifiable implementation. The GAC is in favor of a consistent implementation across the various TLDs, if possible, and the GAC requests to hold a workshop and/or workshop. In the interim, the GAC requests that ICANN provide additional information on the Public Interest Commitments in Specification 11 (http://www.icann.org/en/adv/gac-commitments-concerns-07oct15-en.pdf), in light of the expiration of the current Public Interest Commitments in Specification 11. The GAC recommends that the RAA be amended and made publicly available by the date of the ICANN68 meeting to ensure that the Public Interest Commitments in Specification 11 are aligned with the general rule that the gTLD registration space is operated in an open manner. As discussed in the ICANN48 meeting, the GAC recognizes the need for additional information on the Public Interest Commitments in Specification 11, particularly the need for specific guidance on the Public Interest Commitments in Specification 11.
The Global Advice is a document that outlines the expectations and guidelines for gTLD WHOIS Services, approved in 2007, as included in the Global Plans and gTLD Registry Agreement (GAA) as of 2013. The Global Advice was developed and approved by the GAC and is intended to provide a framework for gTLD WHOIS Services to ensure that they are effective, user-friendly, and compliant with international standards. The Global Advice includes several key components:

1. **Compliance with the GAA**: The Global Advice is consistent with the requirements outlined in the GAA, which is a legal document that protects the rights of gTLD Registry Operators.

2. **WHOIS Service Design**: This component outlines the design and functionality of the WHOIS service, including the types of information that must be provided, the format of the service, and the security measures to be implemented.

3. **WHOIS Access and Use**: This component addresses the issues related to access and use of WHOIS information, including privacy concerns and the protection of sensitive information.

4. **WHOIS Accuracy and Completeness**: This component ensures that the WHOIS information is accurate and complete, and that updates to the information are made in a timely manner.

5. **WHOIS Timeliness**: This component mandates that WHOIS information be updated in a timely manner, and that there are mechanisms in place to ensure that the information is up-to-date.

6. **WHOIS Security**: This component outlines the security measures that must be implemented to protect the WHOIS information from unauthorized access and use.

7. **WHOIS Interoperability**: This component ensures that the WHOIS service is interoperable with other systems and services, and that there are mechanisms in place to facilitate the exchange of information.

8. **WHOIS Privacy and Security**: This component includes guidelines for ensuring the privacy and security of WHOIS information, including the use of encryption and other security measures.

The Global Advice is intended to be a living document, and it is expected to evolve over time as the needs of the community change and new technologies are developed. The GAC and other stakeholders continue to work on improving the Global Advice to ensure that it remains relevant and effective.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communiqué</th>
<th>Start of Communiqué</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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001214</td>
<td>ICANN46 Beijing Communique</td>
<td>4/11/13</td>
<td>ANNEX I. 1.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Registry operators will conduct checks on a statistically significant basis to identify registrations in its gTLD with deliberately false, inaccurate or incomplete WHOIS data at least twice a year. Registry operators will notify the relevant registrar of any inaccurate or incomplete records identified during these checks, triggering the registrar's obligation to solicit accurate and complete information from the registrant.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>On 25 June 2013 the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of safeguards applicable to all New gTLDs and passed a resolution adopting the NGPC Proposal for Implementation of GAC Safeguards Applicable to All New gTLDs. The NGPC recommends to the Board that it adopt the NGPC Proposal for Implementation of GAC Safeguards Applicable to All New gTLDs. In its proposal the NGPC responds to this advice item as follows: ICANN is concluding its development of a WHOIS tool that gives it the ability to identify potentially inaccurate records registered in gTLDs. It is exploring using automated tools to identify potentially inaccurate records registered in gTLDs, and the resulting actions to encourage improved accuracy. ICANN continues to work on the related NGPC policy that is expected to be adopted by the NGPC in the future. ICANN is well positioned to implement the GAC’s advice that checks identifying registrations in a gTLD with deliberately false, inaccurate or incomplete WHOIS data be conducted at least twice a year. To achieve this, ICANN will perform a periodic sampling of WHOIS data to identify potentially inaccurate records and notify the relevant registrar. This will be focused on the current version of WHOIS requirements, but will eventually broaden to include other directory services. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s response of 19 June 2013.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-11-08-en#1.a">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2012-11-08-en#1.a</a></td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-scorecard-07oct15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-scorecard-07oct15-en.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>