<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAC Advice Status</th>
<th>AR-004101</th>
<th>AR-004105</th>
<th>AR-004103</th>
<th>AR-004106</th>
<th>AR-004104</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advice Item Number</td>
<td>ICANN66 Montréal Communiqué</td>
<td>ICANN66 Montréal Communiqué</td>
<td>ICANN66 Montréal Communiqué</td>
<td>ICANN66 Montréal Communiqué</td>
<td>ICANN66 Montréal Communiqué</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICANN66 Montréal Communiqué</td>
<td>ICANN66 Montréal Communiqué</td>
<td>ICANN66 Montréal Communiqué</td>
<td>ICANN66 Montréal Communiqué</td>
<td>ICANN66 Montréal Communiqué</td>
<td>ICANN66 Montréal Communiqué</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>Item 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>Item 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation &amp; Consider</td>
<td>Follow up</td>
<td>Follow up</td>
<td>Follow up</td>
<td>Follow up</td>
<td>Follow up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Action(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As of 31 December 2019

**GAC Advice Status**

**AR-002300**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Action Text</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Board Action(s)</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| AR-002300             | Follow up 3 | The GAC noted the Board’s intention in a working member note and that it considered the advice in that document to be provided in the AR-002300 application, based on the current phase and the Board’s consideration of the matter. The Board is requested to consider any feedback or comments related to this advice or to re-examine its advice. The Board’s consideration of this advice is consistent with its advice from the ICANN64 Kobe Communique.

**ICANN64 Kobe Communique**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Communique</th>
<th>Recommendation(s)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/27/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ICANN65 Marrakech Communique**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Communique</th>
<th>Recommendation(s)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/27/19</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 Montreal Communique (November 2019).
## Notes:
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the Montreal Communique (November 2019).

### Action Request Number (AR) and Communique

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-002294</td>
<td>ICANN64 Kobe Communique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-002295</td>
<td>ICANN64 Kobe Communique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-002296</td>
<td>ICANN64 Kobe Communique</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Board Action(s) and Board Resolution Link

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Action(s)</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Board Scorecard Link

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/14/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Close Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Close Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/10/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Current Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Board Resolution

- **GAC Advice Status**: AR-002294
- **Action Request Number**: AR-002294

### Text:

As of 31 December 2019

### Communique

- **ICANN64 Kobe Communique**
- **Date of Communique**: 3/14/19

### Category

- **WHOIS and Data Protection**

### Advice Item

- **activities;**
- **facilitate swift implementation of new registration data directory services policies, and if possible, send distinct parts to implementation as and when they are agreed. This item is currently in implementation.**
- **Institute concrete milestones and progress reports. The Board acknowledges this advice and will continue to monitor its progress to ensure the EPDP and its communications with the community are collaborative and effective.**
- **Take necessary steps to ensure that the scope of phase 2 activities is clearly defined with a view to expeditious conclusion and implementation.**
- **Consider instituting additional parallel work efforts on technical implementation, such as that carried out by the Technical Study Group, for purposes of informing and complementing the EPDP’s Phase 2 activities;**
- **The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the Montreal Communique (November 2019).**
- **communique-scorecard-15may19-en.pdf**
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the Montreal Communique (November 2019).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>Date of Issue</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Advice Text</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Scorecard Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the Barcelona Communique and provided this response in its scorecard: The Board acknowledges and appreciates this follow-up on the comments. The Board stands ready to facilitate a substantive, solutions-oriented dialogue between the GNSO and the government and international organizations within the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies in relevant languages, as well as of the GAC's consistent advice and the GNSO's past policy decisions on the protection of these designations. The Board intends to consider GAC advice in accordance with the process documented in the GAC Advice Procedure. The Board will continue to keep the community apprised and updated. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 27 January 2019.

On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the Barcelona Communique and provided this response in its scorecard: The Board is taking this action today to further the possibility of delegation of .AMAZON that would be of mutual benefit to the peoples of the Amazon region, as well as of ACTO member states and the Amazon corporation to develop a solution for the delegation of .AMAZON to one registry operator or another. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 27 January 2019.

On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the Barcelona Communique and provided this response in its scorecard: The Board acknowledges and appreciates this follow-up on the comments. The Board stands ready to facilitate a substantive, solutions-oriented discussion should be carried out to allow for the GAC and the GNSO to agree on a Dialogue framework related between the GNSO and the GAC on this topic. The Board intends to consider GAC advice in accordance with the process documented in the GAC Advice Procedure. The Board intends to consider GAC advice in accordance with the process documented in the GAC Advice Procedure. The Board will continue to keep the community apprised and updated. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 27 January 2019.

On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the Barcelona Communique and provided this response in its scorecard: The Board acknowledges and appreciates this follow-up on the comments. The Board stands ready to facilitate a substantive, solutions-oriented discussion should be carried out to allow for the GAC and the GNSO to agree on a Dialogue framework related between the GNSO and the GAC on this topic. The Board intends to consider GAC advice in accordance with the process documented in the GAC Advice Procedure. The Board will continue to keep the community apprised and updated. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 27 January 2019.

On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the Barcelona Communique and provided this response in its scorecard: The Board acknowledges and appreciates this follow-up on the comments. The Board stands ready to facilitate a substantive, solutions-oriented discussion should be carried out to allow for the GAC and the GNSO to agree on a Dialogue framework related between the GNSO and the GAC on this topic. The Board intends to consider GAC advice in accordance with the process documented in the GAC Advice Procedure. The Board will continue to keep the community apprised and updated. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 27 January 2019.

On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the Barcelona Communique and provided this response in its scorecard: The Board acknowledges and appreciates this follow-up on the comments. The Board stands ready to facilitate a substantive, solutions-oriented discussion should be carried out to allow for the GAC and the GNSO to agree on a Dialogue framework related between the GNSO and the GAC on this topic. The Board intends to consider GAC advice in accordance with the process documented in the GAC Advice Procedure. The Board will continue to keep the community apprised and updated. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 27 January 2019.

On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the Barcelona Communique and provided this response in its scorecard: The Board acknowledges and appreciates this follow-up on the comments. The Board stands ready to facilitate a substantive, solutions-oriented discussion should be carried out to allow for the GAC and the GNSO to agree on a Dialogue framework related between the GNSO and the GAC on this topic. The Board intends to consider GAC advice in accordance with the process documented in the GAC Advice Procedure. The Board will continue to keep the community apprised and updated. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 27 January 2019.

On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the Barcelona Communique and provided this response in its scorecard: The Board acknowledges and appreciates this follow-up on the comments. The Board stands ready to facilitate a substantive, solutions-oriented discussion should be carried out to allow for the GAC and the GNSO to agree on a Dialogue framework related between the GNSO and the GAC on this topic. The Board intends to consider GAC advice in accordance with the process documented in the GAC Advice Procedure. The Board will continue to keep the community apprised and updated. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 27 January 2019.

Notes: The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2012) through the Montreal Communique (November 2016).
As of 31 December 2019

GAC Advice Status

AR-001874
Follow up to the joint statement by ALAC and GAC at ICANN60 (November 2017) Follow up to the joint GAC advice issued at ICANN62 on 9 November 2018. In this respect, the Board referred the information to the Board on Internet Numbering (ITI), which was tasked at ICANN62 to interpret the advice and develop a report. The Board considered the advice at ICANN62 on 9 November 2018. In this respect, the Board referred the information to the Board on Internet Numbering (ITI), which was tasked at ICANN62 to interpret the advice and develop a report. The Board notes that it is considering the advice and will make a recommendation to the Board on Internet Numbering (ITI) in the next meeting.

Date of issuance: 27 January 2019

AR-001870
Joint GAC Advice on the protection of IGO identifiers on the Internet (2017)
Follow up to the joint GAC advice issued at ICANN62 on 9 November 2018. In this respect, the Board referred the information to the Board on Internet Numbering (ITI), which was tasked at ICANN62 to interpret the advice and develop a report. The Board notes that it is considering the advice and will make a recommendation to the Board on Internet Numbering (ITI) in the next meeting.

Date of issuance: 27 January 2019

AGAC Advisory Status

AGAC Agreement on the Protection of IGO Identifiers on the Internet (2017)
Follow up to the joint GAC advice issued at ICANN62 on 9 November 2018. In this respect, the Board referred the information to the Board on Internet Numbering (ITI), which was tasked at ICANN62 to interpret the advice and develop a report. The Board notes that it is considering the advice and will make a recommendation to the Board on Internet Numbering (ITI) in the next meeting.

Date of issuance: 27 January 2019

Notes:
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2012) through the Montevideo Communique (November 2018).

GAC Advice Status

AR-001874
Follow up to the joint statement by ALAC and GAC at ICANN60 (November 2017) Follow up to the joint GAC advice issued at ICANN62 on 9 November 2018. In this respect, the Board referred the information to the Board on Internet Numbering (ITI), which was tasked at ICANN62 to interpret the advice and develop a report. The Board considered the advice at ICANN62 on 9 November 2018. In this respect, the Board referred the information to the Board on Internet Numbering (ITI), which was tasked at ICANN62 to interpret the advice and develop a report. The Board notes that it is considering the advice and will make a recommendation to the Board on Internet Numbering (ITI) in the next meeting.

Date of issuance: 27 January 2019

AR-001870
Joint GAC Advice on the protection of IGO identifiers on the Internet (2017)
Follow up to the joint GAC advice issued at ICANN62 on 9 November 2018. In this respect, the Board referred the information to the Board on Internet Numbering (ITI), which was tasked at ICANN62 to interpret the advice and develop a report. The Board notes that it is considering the advice and will make a recommendation to the Board on Internet Numbering (ITI) in the next meeting.

Date of issuance: 27 January 2019

AGAC Advisory Status

AGAC Agreement on the Protection of IGO Identifiers on the Internet (2017)
Follow up to the joint GAC advice issued at ICANN62 on 9 November 2018. In this respect, the Board referred the information to the Board on Internet Numbering (ITI), which was tasked at ICANN62 to interpret the advice and develop a report. The Board notes that it is considering the advice and will make a recommendation to the Board on Internet Numbering (ITI) in the next meeting.

Date of issuance: 27 January 2019

Notes:
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2012) through the Montevideo Communique (November 2018).

GAC Advice Status

AR-001874
Follow up to the joint statement by ALAC and GAC at ICANN60 (November 2017) Follow up to the joint GAC advice issued at ICANN62 on 9 November 2018. In this respect, the Board referred the information to the Board on Internet Numbering (ITI), which was tasked at ICANN62 to interpret the advice and develop a report. The Board considered the advice at ICANN62 on 9 November 2018. In this respect, the Board referred the information to the Board on Internet Numbering (ITI), which was tasked at ICANN62 to interpret the advice and develop a report. The Board notes that it is considering the advice and will make a recommendation to the Board on Internet Numbering (ITI) in the next meeting.

Date of issuance: 27 January 2019

AR-001870
Joint GAC Advice on the protection of IGO identifiers on the Internet (2017)
Follow up to the joint GAC advice issued at ICANN62 on 9 November 2018. In this respect, the Board referred the information to the Board on Internet Numbering (ITI), which was tasked at ICANN62 to interpret the advice and develop a report. The Board notes that it is considering the advice and will make a recommendation to the Board on Internet Numbering (ITI) in the next meeting.

Date of issuance: 27 January 2019

AGAC Advisory Status

AGAC Agreement on the Protection of IGO Identifiers on the Internet (2017)
Follow up to the joint GAC advice issued at ICANN62 on 9 November 2018. In this respect, the Board referred the information to the Board on Internet Numbering (ITI), which was tasked at ICANN62 to interpret the advice and develop a report. The Board notes that it is considering the advice and will make a recommendation to the Board on Internet Numbering (ITI) in the next meeting.

Date of issuance: 27 January 2019

Notes:
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2012) through the Montevideo Communique (November 2018).
The Board initially considered this advice on 29 May 2018. However at the time, the Board requested, “The Board will hold a formal hearing to the list of GAC advice pending further discussion of this item.” The Board noted that it considered this item on 29 January 2019 and did so in a similar manner; two items on 29 January 2019 (The Board acknowledged the advice and refers to the list if the Board’s response on items §1.a.I, II and §3.a.I above in the Barcelona consensus advice section. The Board also directs the GAC to the ICANN org’s reserves (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-2018-05-30-en#1.b) for further details): “The Board will defer a formal response to the GAC on this advice pending further discussion of this item.” The Board then considered this advice on 20 May 2019 and directed the GAC to the Board’s responses on items §1.a.I, II and §3.a.I above in the Barcelona consensus advice section. The Board also directs the GAC to the ICANN org’s reserves (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-2018-05-30-en#1.b) for further details: “The Board will defer a formal response to the GAC on this advice pending further discussion of this item.”

**Summary**

The Board supports the GAC’s recommendation and provides that the Board’s recommendation is to the fullest extent possible.

**Notes:**

- The GAC advice text is available at the Board Resolution Link.
- The Board Scorecard Link contains the Board’s response to this advice.
- The Board also directs the GAC to the ICANN org’s reserves (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-2018-05-30-en#1.b) for further details: “The Board will defer a formal response to the GAC on this advice pending further discussion of this item.”

---

**Date** | **Board Resolution Link** | **Board Scorecard Link**
--- | --- | ---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communiqué</th>
<th>Date of Action</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Advice Text</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Board Action/s</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Formation Link</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

**Notes:**

The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the Montreal Communique (November 2019).
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the Montreal Communique (November 2019).

Notes:
- The advice text is compatible with these values and reflects the full factual record.
- The Board consensually considered this advice on 10 May 2019.
- The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the Montreal Communique (November 2019).
- The Board consensually considered this advice on 10 May 2019.
- The Board consensually considered this advice on 10 May 2019.
- The Board consensually considered this advice on 11 July 2019.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>Date of Creation</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>About Town</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Board Reference(s)</th>
<th>Board Formation Link</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018-02-01</td>
<td>Abu Dhabi Communique</td>
<td>03/07/17</td>
<td>GAC/Pathway</td>
<td>4.1.1</td>
<td>This item advises the ICANN Board that 4.1 is subject to address these points and that the 4.1 item should be fully addressed in the draft and final versions of the new GAC practice transparency and to ensure multistakeholder community is by ICANN action.</td>
<td>In February 2018 the ICANN Board considered the Abu Dhabi Communique and provided the GAC's advice and welcomed the GAC's full compliance. It noted that the GAC had received updated drafts from the organization and the GAC Board had compliments the ICANN adoption at transparency to facilitate this discussion is sustainable. The Board has noted and working on updates from the organization on the Abu Dhabi Communique, under the guidance of the Board and ICANN action, the organization be referred to the GAC. The organization grants for the opportunity to address these ongoing challenges. One example of this is the regular calls between the ICANN and the GAC about GDPR. These calls provide the opportunity to discuss the concerns of different issues. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration on 4 February 2018.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/resources-board/m/materials-2018-02-04-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/resources-board/m/materials-2018-02-04-en.pdf</a></td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-2018-02-04-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-2018-02-04-en.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-02-02</td>
<td>Abu Dhabi Communique</td>
<td>03/07/17</td>
<td>GAC/Pathway</td>
<td>4.2.1</td>
<td>This item advises the ICANN Board that 4.2 is subject to address these points and that the 4.2 item should be fully addressed in the draft and final versions of the new GAC practice transparency and to ensure multistakeholder community is by ICANN action.</td>
<td>In February 2018 the ICANN Board considered the Abu Dhabi Communique and provided the GAC's advice and welcomed the GAC's full compliance. It noted that the GAC had received updated drafts from the organization and the GAC Board had compliments the ICANN adoption at transparency to facilitate this discussion is sustainable. The Board has noted and working on updates from the organization on the Abu Dhabi Communique, under the guidance of the Board and ICANN action, the organization be referred to the GAC. The organization grants for the opportunity to address these ongoing challenges. One example of this is the regular calls between the ICANN and the GAC about GDPR. These calls provide the opportunity to discuss the concerns of different issues. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration on 4 February 2018.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/resources-board/m/materials-2018-02-04-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/resources-board/m/materials-2018-02-04-en.pdf</a></td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-2018-02-04-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-2018-02-04-en.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-02-03</td>
<td>Abu Dhabi Communique</td>
<td>03/07/17</td>
<td>GAC/Pathway</td>
<td>4.3.1</td>
<td>This item advises the ICANN Board that 4.3 is subject to address these points and that the 4.3 item should be fully addressed in the draft and final versions of the new GAC practice transparency and to ensure multistakeholder community is by ICANN action.</td>
<td>In February 2018 the ICANN Board considered the Abu Dhabi Communique and provided the GAC's advice and welcomed the GAC's full compliance. It noted that the GAC had received updated drafts from the organization and the GAC Board had compliments the ICANN adoption at transparency to facilitate this discussion is sustainable. The Board has noted and working on updates from the organization on the Abu Dhabi Communique, under the guidance of the Board and ICANN action, the organization be referred to the GAC. The organization grants for the opportunity to address these ongoing challenges. One example of this is the regular calls between the ICANN and the GAC about GDPR. These calls provide the opportunity to discuss the concerns of different issues. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration on 4 February 2018.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/resources-board/m/materials-2018-02-04-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/resources-board/m/materials-2018-02-04-en.pdf</a></td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-2018-02-04-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-2018-02-04-en.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-02-04</td>
<td>Abu Dhabi Communique</td>
<td>03/07/17</td>
<td>GAC/Pathway</td>
<td>4.4.1</td>
<td>This item advises the ICANN Board that 4.4 is subject to address these points and that the 4.4 item should be fully addressed in the draft and final versions of the new GAC practice transparency and to ensure multistakeholder community is by ICANN action.</td>
<td>In February 2018 the ICANN Board considered the Abu Dhabi Communique and provided the GAC's advice and welcomed the GAC's full compliance. It noted that the GAC had received updated drafts from the organization and the GAC Board had compliments the ICANN adoption at transparency to facilitate this discussion is sustainable. The Board has noted and working on updates from the organization on the Abu Dhabi Communique, under the guidance of the Board and ICANN action, the organization be referred to the GAC. The organization grants for the opportunity to address these ongoing challenges. One example of this is the regular calls between the ICANN and the GAC about GDPR. These calls provide the opportunity to discuss the concerns of different issues. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration on 4 February 2018.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/resources-board/m/materials-2018-02-04-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/resources-board/m/materials-2018-02-04-en.pdf</a></td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-2018-02-04-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-2018-02-04-en.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GAC Advice Status
As of 21 December 2019

Notes:
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communiqué (April 2016) through the Montreal Communiqué (November 2019).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>Start of Consideration</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Issue Text</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Board Action(s)</th>
<th>Board Submission Link</th>
<th>Board Formal Link</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001516</td>
<td></td>
<td>6/29/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Notes: ICANN59 Johannesburg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001516</td>
<td>Communique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Notes: ICANN60 Abu Dhabi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-002413</td>
<td></td>
<td>6/29/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Notes: ICANN59 Johannesburg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-002416</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/1/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Notes: ICANN60 Abu Dhabi</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 and provided this response to its concerns. The Board accepted this advice and directed the ICANN Org to continue to seek to maintain the existing WHOIS services to the maximum extent consistent with GDPR compliance. The Board acknowledged that the GDPR issues are complex and that differences of opinion exist and are reflected in the various inputs. The Board also recognizes that the WHOIS data is used for many legitimate activities, such as those described by the community in the user comment on the Privacy Protection and Privacy legislation. The Board welcomes the ICANN Org’s engagement with the community on the GDPR-related discussions and is committed to providing ongoing feedback to the community on this critical topic. The Board directs the ICANN Org to continue to seek to maintain the existing WHOIS services to the maximum extent consistent with GDPR compliance. The Board also recognizes that there is a need to preserve the functionality of the WHOIS to the greatest extent possible for these legitimate activities, including fundamental individual liberties. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 4 February 2018.

On 4 February 2018 the Board considered the Abu Dhabi Communique and provided this response to its concerns. The Board accepted the advice and directs the ICANN Org to continue to seek to maintain the existing WHOIS services to the maximum extent consistent with GDPR compliance. The Board also acknowledges that the WHOIS data is used for many legitimate activities, such as those described by the community in the user comment on the Privacy Protection and Privacy legislation. The Board welcomes the ICANN Org’s engagement with the community on the GDPR-related discussions and is committed to providing ongoing feedback to the community on this critical topic. The Board directs the ICANN Org to continue to seek to maintain the existing WHOIS services to the maximum extent consistent with GDPR compliance. The Board also recognizes that there is a need to preserve the functionality of the WHOIS to the greatest extent possible for these legitimate activities, including fundamental individual liberties. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 4 February 2018.

On 4 February 2018 the Board considered the Abu Dhabi Communique and provided this response to its concerns. The Board accepted the advice and directs the ICANN Org to continue to seek to maintain the existing WHOIS services to the maximum extent consistent with GDPR compliance. The Board acknowledged that the GDPR issues are complex and that differences of opinion exist and are reflected in the various inputs. The Board also recognizes that the WHOIS data is used for many legitimate activities, such as those described by the community in the user comment on the Privacy Protection and Privacy legislation. The Board welcomes the ICANN Org’s engagement with the community on the GDPR-related discussions and is committed to providing ongoing feedback to the community on this critical topic. The Board directs the ICANN Org to continue to seek to maintain the existing WHOIS services to the maximum extent consistent with GDPR compliance. The Board also recognizes that there is a need to preserve the functionality of the WHOIS to the greatest extent possible for these legitimate activities, including fundamental individual liberties. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 4 February 2018.

On 4 February 2018 the Board considered the Abu Dhabi Communique and provided this response to its concerns. The Board accepted the advice and directs the ICANN Org to continue to seek to maintain the existing WHOIS services to the maximum extent consistent with GDPR compliance. The Board acknowledged that the GDPR issues are complex and that differences of opinion exist and are reflected in the various inputs. The Board also recognizes that the WHOIS data is used for many legitimate activities, such as those described by the community in the user comment on the Privacy Protection and Privacy legislation. The Board welcomes the ICANN Org’s engagement with the community on the GDPR-related discussions and is committed to providing ongoing feedback to the community on this critical topic. The Board directs the ICANN Org to continue to seek to maintain the existing WHOIS services to the maximum extent consistent with GDPR compliance. The Board also recognizes that there is a need to preserve the functionality of the WHOIS to the greatest extent possible for these legitimate activities, including fundamental individual liberties. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 4 February 2018.

On 4 February 2018 the Board considered the Abu Dhabi Communique and provided this response to its concerns. The Board accepted the advice and directs the ICANN Org to continue to seek to maintain the existing WHOIS services to the maximum extent consistent with GDPR compliance. The Board acknowledged that the GDPR issues are complex and that differences of opinion exist and are reflected in the various inputs. The Board also recognizes that the WHOIS data is used for many legitimate activities, such as those described by the community in the user comment on the Privacy Protection and Privacy legislation. The Board welcomes the ICANN Org’s engagement with the community on the GDPR-related discussions and is committed to providing ongoing feedback to the community on this critical topic. The Board directs the ICANN Org to continue to seek to maintain the existing WHOIS services to the maximum extent consistent with GDPR compliance. The Board also recognizes that there is a need to preserve the functionality of the WHOIS to the greatest extent possible for these legitimate activities, including fundamental individual liberties. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 4 February 2018.

The Board received this item and determined a formal response was not necessary. Follow-up to previous advice will be tracked on open advice items related to the same topic.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>Date of Issue</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Action Item Number</th>
<th>Advice Text</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Board Action(s)</th>
<th>Board Observation Link</th>
<th>Board Statement Link</th>
<th>Scorecard Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-002418</td>
<td>ICANN Work</td>
<td>6/29/17</td>
<td>Meaningful Engagement with IGOs</td>
<td>6/29/17</td>
<td>The GAC expressed concerns to the Board and other parts of the ICANN framework; and b) the provision of documentation that would allow stakeholders with limited resources to more easily understand and implement the GAC framework; and c) the provision of documentation that would allow stakeholders with limited resources to more easily understand and implement the GAC framework.</td>
<td>Follow up I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-002414</td>
<td>ICANN Work</td>
<td>6/29/17</td>
<td>Meaningful Engagement with IGOs</td>
<td>6/29/17</td>
<td>The Board reviewed this advice and determined that necessary follow up to a previous advice will be tracked as open advice items related to the same topic.</td>
<td>Follow up I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-002412</td>
<td>ICANN Work</td>
<td>6/29/17</td>
<td>Meaningful Engagement with IGOs</td>
<td>6/29/17</td>
<td>The Board reviewed this advice and determined that necessary follow up to a previous advice will be tracked as open advice items related to the same topic.</td>
<td>Follow up I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-00170</td>
<td>ICANN Work</td>
<td>6/29/17</td>
<td>Guidelines on Country-Code Top Level Domain Protections</td>
<td>6/29/17</td>
<td>The GAC reiterates its Advice that IGO access to curative dispute resolution mechanisms should: (i) continue to follow all stakeholder groups to participate equally; (ii) take into account the history and scale of the arrangements currently in place; and (iii) apply in a manner based on professional principles to any arrangements for future arrangements. Regarding the use of geographic names at the top level, the GAC supports the advice and position stated in the following documents: ICANN Principles Regarding New gTLDs (October 2005), Section 7 of the ICANN Durban Communiqué (2010), Application of ICANN Principles – GAC Durban Communiqué (2010), Future Application of ICANN Principles – GAC Initial Communiqué (2013).</td>
<td>Follow up I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-00170</td>
<td>ICANN Work</td>
<td>6/29/17</td>
<td>Guidelines on Country-Code Top Level Domain Protections</td>
<td>6/29/17</td>
<td>The Board reviewed this advice and determined that necessary follow up to a previous advice will be tracked as open advice items related to the same topic.</td>
<td>Follow up I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-00170</td>
<td>ICANN Work</td>
<td>6/29/17</td>
<td>Guidelines on Country-Code Top Level Domain Protections</td>
<td>6/29/17</td>
<td>The Board reviewed this advice and determined that necessary follow up to a previous advice will be tracked as open advice items related to the same topic.</td>
<td>Follow up I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-00170</td>
<td>ICANN Work</td>
<td>6/29/17</td>
<td>Guidelines on Country-Code Top Level Domain Protections</td>
<td>6/29/17</td>
<td>The Board reviewed this advice and determined that necessary follow up to a previous advice will be tracked as open advice items related to the same topic.</td>
<td>Follow up I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As of 31 December 2019

GAC Advice Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>Date of Consideration</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Notes:</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Board Resolution(s)</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Notes:
- The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communiqué (April 2016) through the Montreal Communiqué (November 2018).
- See the Board of Directors’ Resolution Link for Board consideration of this advice.
- The Board has recorded its decision to accept or revise this advice in its respective written scorecards.
- The full text of this advice is available online at: [https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/marby-to-schneider-30may17-advice.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/marby-to-schneider-30may17-advice.pdf).
- The Board considers this advice closed as of 31 December 2019.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communiqué</th>
<th>Start of Period</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Advice Text</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Board Action(s)</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001363</td>
<td>Copenhagen/Beijing Communique</td>
<td>3/15/17</td>
<td>9.a.8</td>
<td>The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the Montreal Communique (November 2019).</td>
<td>On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the Copenhagen/Beijing Communique and provided the resolution in its scorecard. The Board, in its Helsinki Communique, reiterated the need for any Registry to take specific mandatory steps to avoid confusion with respect to 2-character labels, and also identified several voluntary measures that Registry/Registry Operators could consider.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/en/section-board-actions/secretarys-notice-2017-06-12-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/resources/en/section-board-actions/secretarys-notice-2017-06-12-en.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001365</td>
<td>Copenhagen/Beijing Communique</td>
<td>3/15/17</td>
<td>9.a.8</td>
<td>The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the Montreal Communique (November 2019).</td>
<td>On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the Copenhagen/Beijing Communique and provided the resolution in its scorecard. The Board, in its Helsinki Communique, reiterated the need for any Registry to take specific mandatory steps to avoid confusion with respect to 2-character labels, and also identified several voluntary measures that Registry/Registry Operators could consider.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/en/section-board-actions/secretarys-notice-2017-06-12-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/resources/en/section-board-actions/secretarys-notice-2017-06-12-en.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001366</td>
<td>Copenhagen/Beijing Communique</td>
<td>3/15/17</td>
<td>9.a.8</td>
<td>The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the Montreal Communique (November 2019).</td>
<td>On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the Copenhagen/Beijing Communique and provided the resolution in its scorecard. The Board, in its Helsinki Communique, reiterated the need for any Registry to take specific mandatory steps to avoid confusion with respect to 2-character labels, and also identified several voluntary measures that Registry/Registry Operators could consider.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/en/section-board-actions/secretarys-notice-2017-06-12-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/resources/en/section-board-actions/secretarys-notice-2017-06-12-en.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As of 31 December 2019

GAC Advice Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item ID</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Date of Approval</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>GAC Advice Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001361</td>
<td>Protection of IGO Names and codes at the second level</td>
<td>11/8/16</td>
<td>Category 5.a.I.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001359</td>
<td>Protection of Red Cross/Red Acronyms</td>
<td>3/15/17</td>
<td>Category 4.a.III.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Advice Item 1: Protection of IGO Names and Codes at the Second Level

- Effectively combat risk of imminent harm.
- Provide a procedure to notify IGOs to the GNSO, namely that ICANN would establish a mechanism to manage potential conflicts between IGO acronyms and domain names.
- Develop a procedure that includes the following points: no substantive changes to existing rights protection mechanisms are needed for IGOs; no specific new dispute resolution procedures should be created for IGOs; and clarifying policy guidance is to be developed as to when the filing of a complaint to a GNSO dispute resolution body is appropriate.

Advice Item 2: Protection of Red Cross/Red Acronyms

- Clearly indicate whether the actions taken by the Board as referred to in the Board's consideration of 3 February 2017.
- The Board should apply the views expressed by the GAC in the letter from the ICANN Board Chair of 12 June 2017 on the second string similarity review process.
- The Board should consider the scorecard of 3 February 2017.
- The Board should consider the comments on the Initial Report.

Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider

- The Board noted the Board's letter of 20 August 2019. After the public comments period closes, the Board will meet to consider whether to adopt the above advice. This advice item remains open for further Board consideration.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communiqué</th>
<th>Date of Adoption</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>About This Action</th>
<th>Action Text</th>
<th>Current Piece</th>
<th>Board Reference</th>
<th>Board Formation Link</th>
<th>Board Template Link</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001346</td>
<td>Helsinki</td>
<td>6/30/16</td>
<td>3.a.I.</td>
<td>Cooperate to enhance the understanding of the roles of national committees.</td>
<td>On 6 February 2017 the Board considered the Helsinki Communiqué and provided this advice in its scorecard. The Board accepts this advice and encourages the relevant Registry to foster better mutual understanding of the roles of national committees. It should be noted that the GAC’s actions are aimed to foster mutual understanding of the roles of the national committees and need to be taken in the context of the upcoming Helsinki Communiqué.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001321</td>
<td>Hyderabad</td>
<td>11/8/16</td>
<td>6.a.I.</td>
<td>Ensure regular communication between the Board and the GAC, via regular calls to discuss the GAC Communiques.</td>
<td>On 11 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communiqué and requested the Board to engage in more regular communication with the GAC to foster better mutual understanding with the Board.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001317</td>
<td>Hyderabad</td>
<td>11/8/16</td>
<td>1.a.I.</td>
<td>To provide written responses to the questions listed in Annex 1 to this Communiqué.</td>
<td>On 11 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communiqué and provided this response in its scorecard. The Board accepts this advice and will continue to look for ways to engage in more regular communication to foster better mutual understanding with the GAC.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001316</td>
<td>Hyderabad</td>
<td>11/8/16</td>
<td>5.a.II.</td>
<td>Confirm the protections of the Red Cross and Red Crescent names and associated national language, and the acronyms ICRC, IFRC, CICR, FICR (in UN6); as associated national language, and the acronyms ICRC, IFRC, CICR, FICR (in UN6);</td>
<td>On 11 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communiqué and requested the Board to address the issue of the Red Cross/Red Crescent names.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001315</td>
<td>Hyderabad</td>
<td>11/8/16</td>
<td>1.a.I.</td>
<td>To provide a third-party assessment of the situation if the name is already registered.</td>
<td>On 11 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communiqué and requested the Board to address the issue of the Red Cross/Red Crescent names.</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### GAC Advice Status

**As of 31 December 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communiqué</th>
<th>Date of Accreditation Issues</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Action Request Text</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Board Reference</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001303</td>
<td></td>
<td>3/9/16</td>
<td>2.a.I.</td>
<td>The Board requested the Board to encourage dialogue on constructive ways to address GAC concerns.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001304</td>
<td></td>
<td>6/30/16</td>
<td>2.a.IV.</td>
<td>The Board advises the Board to facilitate an exchange at ICANN 56 between the Board and relevant regions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001311</td>
<td></td>
<td>6/30/16</td>
<td>1.a.II.</td>
<td>The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary. This item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 1 November 2017.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001312</td>
<td></td>
<td>6/30/16</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary. This item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 1 November 2017.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001314</td>
<td></td>
<td>6/30/16</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary. This item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 1 November 2017.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001303</td>
<td></td>
<td>6/30/16</td>
<td>2.a.IV.</td>
<td>The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary. This item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 1 November 2017.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001304</td>
<td></td>
<td>6/30/16</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary. This item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 1 November 2017.</td>
<td></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 Montreal Communique (November 2019).
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the Montreal Communique (November 2019).

1. Action Request Number (AR) - AR-001301
   - **GAC Advice Status**
   - **Notes:**
   - **Action Item:**
   - **Advice Text:**
   - **Board Resolution Link:**
   - **Board Scorecard Link:**

2. **Communique**
   - **ICANN54 Dublin**
   - **Notes:**
   - **Action Item:**
   - **Advice Text:**
   - **Board Resolution Link:**
   - **Board Scorecard Link:**

3. **Communique**
   - **ICANN54 Dublin**
   - **Notes:**
   - **Action Item:**
   - **Advice Text:**
   - **Board Resolution Link:**
   - **Board Scorecard Link:**

4. **Communique**
   - **ICANN54 Dublin**
   - **Notes:**
   - **Action Item:**
   - **Advice Text:**
   - **Board Resolution Link:**
   - **Board Scorecard Link:**

5. **Advice Text**
   - **Advisory Committee on Internet Generic-Top-Level-Domain Names (GAC)**
   - **Notes:**
   - **Board Resolution Link:**
   - **Board Scorecard Link:**

6. **Advice Text**
   - **Advisory Committee on Internet Generic-Top-Level-Domain Names (GAC)**
   - **Notes:**
   - **Board Resolution Link:**
   - **Board Scorecard Link:**
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the Montreal Communique (November 2019).

Notes:
- ICANN53 Buenos Aires
- gTLD Safeguards
- Protection for Inter-(ATRT2)
- Community Priority Category
- 1.b.I.
- 1.a.I.
- 3.
- 4.a.I - 4.a.IV.
- Number
- Advice Item
- within the current exercise of assessment of the new gTLD program.
- regulated sectors.
- protection of public interests in each of the new gTLDs related to highly
- the bona fide of the Registrants listed. Relevant stakeholders should be
- of credentials for domains in highly regulated sectors to serve as a model.
- interest commitment (PIC) examples related to verification and validation
- towards developing mechanisms in line with previous GAC advice, and
- Stakeholder Engagement staff.
- regard to recommendation 6.8, the GAC agreed on guidelines for engaging
- work in several areas is ongoing as a process of continuous improvement. With
- recommendations as conveyed to the Board in its letter of 8 May 2015, noting that
- will take into account the final report of the ICANN Ombudsman on this
- recourse by competing applicants to other accountability mechanisms;
- notes possibly unforeseen consequences for community applicants of
- the GAC expects the current specific problems faced by individual
- applications are currently the subject of dispute resolution procedures; ii.
- met the expectations of applicants and notes that all the successful
- recommendations were included in the following: (i) the GAC’s advice on
- issue of abusive domain names as part of the current exercise of assessing the New gTLD
- response in its scorecard: OThe NGPC notes that the ICANN community is considering the
- consumer trust (CCT) Review is comprised of metrics recommended by an Implementation
- a form of “trust mark” that signals to endusers that the website they are engaging with has
- Category 1 Safeguard advice (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-new-
- Committee Priority Evaluation (CPE) process and applicants’ ability to
- items are engaging in a process of continuous improvement. While
- recommendations as guidelines for engaging governments and for consultation between the ICANN and the GDNSS Global
- the NGPC sent to the GNSO and the GAC regarding the protection of IGO names and acronyms (the “Proposal”). The Proposal will be circulated to the ICANN community for review and consultation. As previously discussed, on 30 April 2015 the Board took action requesting additional time to consider certain ICANN consensus policy recommendations that differ from those in the NGPC to be considered whether or not to undertake a policy development process (see Section A of the Preliminary Issues Report). At its 17 December 2015 meeting, the Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary. This item was considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 17 December 2015.

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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 NGPC’s consideration of 18 October 2015.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Report Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>Date of Report</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>About Item Number</th>
<th>About Text</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Board Action(s)</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Formulation Link</th>
<th>Close Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01/01/19</td>
<td>GAC Advice Status</td>
<td>30/09/19</td>
<td>GAC Public</td>
<td>3.8.4</td>
<td>The Board additionally recommends that the NGPC review its current policies on the subject of indirect gTLDs. The NGPC is requested to consider revising the gTLD set for Orphan gTLDs, as the decision for the Berlin 2013 GAC Communique on the subject of indirect gTLDs is not final and must be interpreted.</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td> </td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-annex-1-18oct15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-annex-1-18oct15-en.pdf</a></td>
<td> </td>
<td>01/10/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/02/19</td>
<td>GAC Advice Status</td>
<td>30/09/19</td>
<td>GAC Public</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>The NGPC recommended that the GAC Chair advise the Board of the NGPC's consideration of what constitutes GAC advice.</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td> </td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-scorecard-07oct15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-scorecard-07oct15-en.pdf</a></td>
<td> </td>
<td>01/10/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/03/19</td>
<td>GAC Advice Status</td>
<td>30/09/19</td>
<td>GAC Public</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>The NGPC recommended that the GAC Chair advise the Board of the NGPC's consideration of what constitutes GAC advice.</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td> </td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-scorecard-07oct15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-scorecard-07oct15-en.pdf</a></td>
<td> </td>
<td>01/10/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/04/19</td>
<td>GAC Advice Status</td>
<td>30/09/19</td>
<td>GAC Public</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>The NGPC recommended that the GAC Chair advise the Board of the NGPC's consideration of what constitutes GAC advice.</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td> </td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-scorecard-07oct15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-scorecard-07oct15-en.pdf</a></td>
<td> </td>
<td>01/10/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/05/19</td>
<td>GAC Advice Status</td>
<td>30/09/19</td>
<td>GAC Public</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>The NGPC recommended that the GAC Chair advise the Board of the NGPC's consideration of what constitutes GAC advice.</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td> </td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-scorecard-07oct15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-scorecard-07oct15-en.pdf</a></td>
<td> </td>
<td>01/10/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/06/19</td>
<td>GAC Advice Status</td>
<td>30/09/19</td>
<td>GAC Public</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>The NGPC recommended that the GAC Chair advise the Board of the NGPC's consideration of what constitutes GAC advice.</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td> </td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-scorecard-07oct15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-scorecard-07oct15-en.pdf</a></td>
<td> </td>
<td>01/10/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/07/19</td>
<td>GAC Advice Status</td>
<td>30/09/19</td>
<td>GAC Public</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>The NGPC recommended that the GAC Chair advise the Board of the NGPC's consideration of what constitutes GAC advice.</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td> </td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-scorecard-07oct15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-scorecard-07oct15-en.pdf</a></td>
<td> </td>
<td>01/10/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/08/19</td>
<td>GAC Advice Status</td>
<td>30/09/19</td>
<td>GAC Public</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>The NGPC recommended that the GAC Chair advise the Board of the NGPC's consideration of what constitutes GAC advice.</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td> </td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-scorecard-07oct15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-scorecard-07oct15-en.pdf</a></td>
<td> </td>
<td>01/10/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/09/19</td>
<td>GAC Advice Status</td>
<td>30/09/19</td>
<td>GAC Public</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>The NGPC recommended that the GAC Chair advise the Board of the NGPC's consideration of what constitutes GAC advice.</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td> </td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-scorecard-07oct15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-scorecard-07oct15-en.pdf</a></td>
<td> </td>
<td>01/10/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/10/19</td>
<td>GAC Advice Status</td>
<td>30/09/19</td>
<td>GAC Public</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>The NGPC recommended that the GAC Chair advise the Board of the NGPC's consideration of what constitutes GAC advice.</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td> </td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-scorecard-07oct15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-scorecard-07oct15-en.pdf</a></td>
<td> </td>
<td>01/10/15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the Montreal Communique (November 2019).

**Action Request Number**

The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the Montreal Communique (November 2019).

**Notes:**

Communique

ICANN52 Singapore

Communique

2/11/15

Communiqué

Report

Working Group (FOIWG)

and Country Names at the Release of Two-Letter Codes

Regulated markets) and protection, sensitive strings

Category 1 (consumer
government.

As such, nothing in the FOIWG report should be read to limit interpretive clarity to RFC1591. The GAC welcomes the FOIWG's intention to agree to all requests and do not require notification will be proceeding with pending and future requests. A list of GAC Members who intend to agree to all requests and do not require notification will be published on the GAC website.

The Board considered the above advice at its February 2015 meeting (Resolution 2015.02.12.16), the Board accepts the advice of the GAC from the 11 February 2015 SAC Communique regarding the release of two-letter codes at the second level (gTLD). The Board directs the President and CEO, or his designee(s), to: (i) develop an implementation plan for releasing two-character gTLDs and implementing procedures for gTLDs, including improved procedures for ensuring relevant governments, when requests are completed. Economic from relevant governments will be fully considered. For new requests, the comment period will be for 60 days. For requests with pending or completed comment periods, we intend to publish the comment period on full-text request resolution. The Board resolves that the GAC Chair notify the Board of any new requests for which no comment period has been completed. There is consensus complete as of the Board's resolution of 12 February 2015.

The Board considered the above advice at its February 2015 meeting (Resolution 2015.02.12.16), the Board accepts the advice of the GAC from the 11 February 2015 SAC Communique regarding the release of two-letter codes at the second level (gTLD). The Board directs the President and CEO, or his designee(s), to develop an implementation plan for releasing two-character gTLDs and implementing procedures for gTLDs, including improved procedures for ensuring relevant governments, when requests are completed. Economic from relevant governments will be fully considered. For new requests, the comment period will be for 60 days. For requests with pending or completed comment periods, we intend to publish the comment period on full-text request resolution. The Board resolves that the GAC Chair notify the Board of any new requests for which no comment period has been completed. There is consensus complete as of the Board's resolution of 12 February 2015.

To be made public in the public notice, the draft report of the Evaluation of the Geographical Names and Country Names at the Second Level (2017-05-18.05) was published as the Advisory Committee for new gTLDs (ACAG) and recently the Board resolved (2015.06.25.07) that the Board accepts the advice of the GAC from the 11 February 2015 SAC Communique regarding the release of two-letter codes at the second level (gTLD). The Board resolves (2015.06.25.08) that the Board requests the ccNSO to appoint as soon as possible a small advisory team of subject matter experts to remain available to assist ICANN with the development of the Relist Plan. The Board resolves (2015.06.25.09) that the Board requests the GAC to review means and ways of introducing such provisions in the PICDRP and/or to consider developing a "fast track" process for future requests.

The Board resolves (2015.06.25.10) that the Board requests the ICANN to consider developing a "fast track" process for future requests. The Board resolves (2015.06.25.11) that the Board accepts the advice of the GAC from the 11 February 2015 SAC Communique regarding the release of two-letter codes at the second level (gTLD). The Board requests the Board Chair to communicate the recommendations to the Board in March 2015.” This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s report of 7 October 2015.

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of its findings and recommendations and published it on the Board’s website (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/gac-advice-scorecard-dec2014.pdf). This item is considered complete as of the Board's resolution of 12 May 2015.

The Board considers the above advice from the GAC that the Board resolve that the Board Chair notify the Board of any new requests for which no comment period has been completed. There is consensus complete as of the Board’s resolution of 12 May 2015.

The GAC published a comprehensive report of its findings and recommendations and published it on the Board’s website (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/gac-advice-scorecard-dec2014.pdf). This item is considered complete as of the Board's resolution of 12 May 2015.

The Board considers the above advice from the GAC that the Board resolve that the Board Chair notify the Board of any new requests for which no comment period has been completed. There is consensus complete as of the Board’s resolution of 12 May 2015.

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of its findings and recommendations and published it on the Board’s website (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/gac-advice-scorecard-dec2014.pdf). This item is considered complete as of the Board's resolution of 12 May 2015.

The Board considers the above advice from the GAC that the Board resolve that the Board Chair notify the Board of any new requests for which no comment period has been completed. There is consensus complete as of the Board’s resolution of 12 May 2015.
GAC Advice Status
As of 31 December 2019

The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the Montreal Communique (November 2019).

Notes:

The GAC published a comprehensive report of new gTLD requirements and updates to ICANN Advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response to the ICANN Board. The Board took action to adopt the GNSO policy recommendations that are not inconsistent with the GAC's advice, (ii) requested additional time to consider them, and to continue to Solicit discussion among the relevant parties to reconcile any remaining differences between the policy recommendations and the GAC advice on the topic (https://www.icann.org/en/news/2015/10/07oct15-en.pdf). The NGPC published a comprehensive report of new gTLD requirements and updates to ICANN Advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 November 2015 and provided this response to the ICANN Board.

The Board took action to adopt the GNSO policy recommendations that are not inconsistent with the GAC's advice, (ii) requested additional time to consider them, and to continue to Solicit discussion among the relevant parties to reconcile any remaining differences between the policy recommendations and the GAC advice on the topic (https://www.icann.org/en/news/2015/10/07oct15-en.pdf).

The GAC notes that key operational details for the ICANN Board are still outstanding. The Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability and Governance (CCWG-AAC) took the following resolution: Resolved (2019.05.10.4), the Board commits to following the NGPC recommendations. This advice item remains open for further Board consideration.

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of new gTLD requirements and updates to ICANN Advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response to the ICANN Board. The Board took action to adopt the GNSO policy recommendations that are not inconsistent with the GAC's advice, (ii) requested additional time to consider them, and to continue to Solicit discussion among the relevant parties to reconcile any remaining differences between the policy recommendations and the GAC advice on the topic (https://www.icann.org/en/news/2015/10/07oct15-en.pdf).

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of new gTLD requirements and updates to ICANN Advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response to the ICANN Board. The Board took action to adopt the GNSO policy recommendations that are not inconsistent with the GAC's advice, (ii) requested additional time to consider them, and to continue to Solicit discussion among the relevant parties to reconcile any remaining differences between the policy recommendations and the GAC advice on the topic (https://www.icann.org/en/news/2015/10/07oct15-en.pdf).

The GAC notes that key operational details for the ICANN Board are still outstanding. The Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability and Governance (CCWG-AAC) took the following resolution: Resolved (2019.05.10.4), the Board commits to following the NGPC recommendations. This advice item remains open for further Board consideration.

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of new gTLD requirements and updates to ICANN Advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response to the ICANN Board. The Board took action to adopt the GNSO policy recommendations that are not inconsistent with the GAC's advice, (ii) requested additional time to consider them, and to continue to Solicit discussion among the relevant parties to reconcile any remaining differences between the policy recommendations and the GAC advice on the topic (https://www.icann.org/en/news/2015/10/07oct15-en.pdf).

The GAC notes that key operational details for the ICANN Board are still outstanding. The Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability and Governance (CCWG-AAC) took the following resolution: Resolved (2019.05.10.4), the Board commits to following the NGPC recommendations. This advice item remains open for further Board consideration.

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of new gTLD requirements and updates to ICANN Advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response to the ICANN Board. The Board took action to adopt the GNSO policy recommendations that are not inconsistent with the GAC's advice, (ii) requested additional time to consider them, and to continue to Solicit discussion among the relevant parties to reconcile any remaining differences between the policy recommendations and the GAC advice on the topic (https://www.icann.org/en/news/2015/10/07oct15-en.pdf).

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of new gTLD requirements and updates to ICANN Advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response to the ICANN Board. The Board took action to adopt the GNSO policy recommendations that are not inconsistent with the GAC's advice, (ii) requested additional time to consider them, and to continue to Solicit discussion among the relevant parties to reconcile any remaining differences between the policy recommendations and the GAC advice on the topic (https://www.icann.org/en/news/2015/10/07oct15-en.pdf).

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of new gTLD requirements and updates to ICANN Advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response to the ICANN Board. The Board took action to adopt the GNSO policy recommendations that are not inconsistent with the GAC's advice, (ii) requested additional time to consider them, and to continue to Solicit discussion among the relevant parties to reconcile any remaining differences between the policy recommendations and the GAC advice on the topic (https://www.icann.org/en/news/2015/10/07oct15-en.pdf).

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of new gTLD requirements and updates to ICANN Advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response to the ICANN Board. The Board took action to adopt the GNSO policy recommendations that are not inconsistent with the GAC's advice, (ii) requested additional time to consider them, and to continue to Solicit discussion among the relevant parties to reconcile any remaining differences between the policy recommendations and the GAC advice on the topic (https://www.icann.org/en/news/2015/10/07oct15-en.pdf).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>Date of Communique</th>
<th>GAC Advice Status</th>
<th>Advice Text</th>
<th>Date of Board Action</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001282</td>
<td>ICANN51 Los Angeles</td>
<td>10/15/14</td>
<td>Action Request Number</td>
<td>The GAC notes that there are a wide range of WHOIS-related issues that have significant workload implications for both the GAC and the wider community. This includes:</td>
<td>11/1/17</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-schneider-22jan15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-schneider-22jan15-en.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001281</td>
<td>ICANN51 Los Angeles</td>
<td>10/15/14</td>
<td>Action Request Number</td>
<td>The GAC convened an open session for the community to inform about the possible role of human rights considerations. The GAC will continue to address and resolve inaccurate WHOIS records and respond to non-compliance</td>
<td>11/1/17</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-schneider-22jan15-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-schneider-22jan15-en.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the Montreal Communique (November 2019).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>End of Phase Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Board Action(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001269</td>
<td>ICANN51 Los Angeles Communiqué</td>
<td>6/25/14</td>
<td>Close</td>
<td>The Board considered the advice and the general type of evaluation of the community’s current process in the Los Angeles Communiqué on 14 October 2016 and made the following resolution (resolved (2016.10.14.10)), the Board notes that the NGPC’s response to the GAC’s advice was in the Los Angeles Communiqué. In its rationale for this resolution, the Board states: “The Board has taken action to this date to direct the NGPC and ICANN to consider the advice in the Los Angeles Communiqué.” This item is still considered incomplete as of the Board’s resolution of 16 October 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001285</td>
<td>ICANN51 Los Angeles Communiqué</td>
<td>10/15/14</td>
<td>Close</td>
<td>The Board considered the advice and the general type of evaluation of the community’s current process in the Los Angeles Communiqué on 14 October 2016 and made the following resolution (resolved (2016.10.14.10)), the Board notes that the NGPC’s response to the GAC’s advice was in the Los Angeles Communiqué. In its rationale for this resolution, the Board states: “The Board has taken action to this date to direct the NGPC and ICANN to consider the advice in the Los Angeles Communiqué.” This item is still considered incomplete as of the Board’s resolution of 16 October 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001338</td>
<td>ICANN51 Los Angeles Communiqué</td>
<td>10/7/15</td>
<td>Close</td>
<td>The Board considered the advice and the general type of evaluation of the community’s current process in the Los Angeles Communiqué on 14 October 2016 and made the following resolution (resolved (2016.10.14.10)), the Board notes that the NGPC’s response to the GAC’s advice was in the Los Angeles Communiqué. In its rationale for this resolution, the Board states: “The Board has taken action to this date to direct the NGPC and ICANN to consider the advice in the Los Angeles Communiqué.” This item is still considered incomplete as of the Board’s resolution of 16 October 2019.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the Montreal Communique (November 2019).
The Board considered the Council of the International Committee of the Red Cross and the International Federation of Red Crescent Societies (ICRC and IFRC) - GAC Letter of 16 June 2014 to the GAC/GNSO (Recommendation 10.2) – The GAC notes that the GAC-GNSO Consultation Group is addressing all the aspects of this recommendation. The GAC noted that the GAC-GNSO Consultation Group is addressing this.

- The implementation of such process should be completed by the end of 2015.
- The GAC advises the Board to continue the process and to provide support for the implementation of such process in 2016 and 2017.
- The GAC advises the Board to continue the process and to provide support for the implementation of such process in 2016 and 2017.
- The GAC advises the Board to continue the process and to provide support for the implementation of such process in 2016 and 2017.
- The GAC advises the Board to continue the process and to provide support for the implementation of such process in 2016 and 2017.

**Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider**

- The Board considered the Council of the International Committee of the Red Cross and the International Federation of Red Crescent Societies (ICRC and IFRC) - GAC Letter of 16 June 2014 to the GAC/GNSO (Recommendation 10.2) – The GAC notes that the GAC-GNSO Consultation Group is addressing all the aspects of this recommendation. The GAC noted that the GAC-GNSO Consultation Group is addressing this.

- The implementation of such process should be completed by the end of 2015.
- The GAC advises the Board to continue the process and to provide support for the implementation of such process in 2016 and 2017.
- The GAC advises the Board to continue the process and to provide support for the implementation of such process in 2016 and 2017.
- The GAC advises the Board to continue the process and to provide support for the implementation of such process in 2016 and 2017.

**Board Action(s)**

- The Board considered the Second Accountability and Transparency Review Team (ATRT2) – GAC Letter of 16 June 2014 to the GAC/GNSO (Recommendation 10.2) – The GAC notes that the GAC-GNSO Consultation Group is addressing all the aspects of this recommendation. The GAC noted that the GAC-GNSO Consultation Group is addressing this.

- The implementation of such process should be completed by the end of 2015.
- The GAC advises the Board to continue the process and to provide support for the implementation of such process in 2016 and 2017.
- The GAC advises the Board to continue the process and to provide support for the implementation of such process in 2016 and 2017.
- The GAC advises the Board to continue the process and to provide support for the implementation of such process in 2016 and 2017.

**Reference**

- The Board considered the Second Accountability and Transparency Review Team (ATRT2) – GAC Letter of 16 June 2014 to the GAC/GNSO (Recommendation 10.2) – The GAC notes that the GAC-GNSO Consultation Group is addressing all the aspects of this recommendation. The GAC noted that the GAC-GNSO Consultation Group is addressing this.

- The implementation of such process should be completed by the end of 2015.
- The GAC advises the Board to continue the process and to provide support for the implementation of such process in 2016 and 2017.
- The GAC advises the Board to continue the process and to provide support for the implementation of such process in 2016 and 2017.
- The GAC advises the Board to continue the process and to provide support for the implementation of such process in 2016 and 2017.

**Scorecard:**

- On 3 November 2014, the Board notified the GAC that it had some concerns regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response in its public comment period closes, the Board will consider the GAC's consideration of this advice, this item is now considered complete as of 26 June 2018.
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- All references in the inventory reflect the date of publication of the relevant document.
- The inventory is organized by the name of the advice or recommendation from the relevant Communique.
- The inventory includes a summary of the advice or recommendation, the relevant Communique, and the date of publication.
- The inventory also includes a reference to the relevant document, if available.
AR-001262
Communique
ICANN49 Singapore
3/27/14
Advice Item 14.I.a.
To the ICANN Board Chair: We have finalised its consideration of the .spa string and welcomes the report that an agreement has been reached between the city of Spa and one of the Registrars under the 2013 RAA. As required by the process, the Board provided this response in its scorecard: The NGPC accepts this advice and acknowledges that the GAC has finalised its consideration of the .spa string in a constructive and structured way that is both fair and comprehensive. This item is considered complete as of the Board Chair’s letter of 5 June 2014.

AR-001260
Communique
ICANN49 Singapore
3/27/14
Advice Item 3.1.a.
To the ICANN Board Chair: The GAC reiterates its advice from the Beijing and Durban Communiques as an annex to a letter dated 5 June 2014. The Board provided this response in its scorecard: The NGPC accepts this advice and provides this response in its scorecard: On 9 May 2014, ICANN reported that waivers might be necessary for data provision requirements pending a decision on these waivers. They further recalled that ICANN would work with other registrars to avoid the need for making payments. The Board provided this response in its scorecard: The NGPC accepts this advice and acknowledges that the GAC has finalised its consideration of the .dtl string. The Board Chair provided this response in its scorecard: The NGPC accepts this advice and acknowledges that the GAC has finalised its consideration of the .dtl string. This item is considered complete as of the Board Chair’s letter of 5 June 2014.

AR-001259
Communique
ICANN49 Singapore
3/27/14
High Level Meeting
6. For the Audit Program, refer to http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-dryden-05jun14-en.pdf. This item is considered complete as of the Board Chair’s letter of 5 June 2014.

AR-001262
Communique
ICANN49 Singapore
3/27/14
High Level Meeting
6. For the Audit Program, refer to http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-dryden-05jun14-en.pdf. This item is considered complete as of the Board Chair’s letter of 5 June 2014.

AR-001259
Communique
ICANN49 Singapore
3/27/14
High Level Meeting
6. For the Audit Program, refer to http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-dryden-05jun14-en.pdf. This item is considered complete as of the Board Chair’s letter of 5 June 2014.

AR-001259
Communique
ICANN49 Singapore
3/27/14
Community Applications
5.a.4. To the ICANN Board Chair: We have finalised its consideration of the .spa string in a constructive and structured way that is both fair and comprehensive. This item is considered complete as of the Board Chair’s letter of 5 June 2014.

AR-001259
Communique
ICANN49 Singapore
3/27/14
Community Applications
5.a.4. To the ICANN Board Chair: We have finalised its consideration of the .spa string in a constructive and structured way that is both fair and comprehensive. This item is considered complete as of the Board Chair’s letter of 5 June 2014.

AR-001259
Communique
ICANN49 Singapore
3/27/14
Community Applications
5.a.4. To the ICANN Board Chair: We have finalised its consideration of the .spa string in a constructive and structured way that is both fair and comprehensive. This item is considered complete as of the Board Chair’s letter of 5 June 2014.
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the Montreal Communique (November 2019).

Notes:
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC acknowledges the Board's action stated in the Singapore Communique as related to the applications for .vin and .INDIANS.
- The GAC also acknowledges the Board’s action stated in the Singapore Communique as related to the applications for .vin and .INDIANS.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
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- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
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- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
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- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has considered the advice and provided the requested response.
- The GAC notes that the Board has consid
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Request Number</th>
<th>Communiqué</th>
<th>Status of Advice</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Advice Text</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Work Request(s)</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
<th>Board Termination Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014-01044</td>
<td>Governmental/1044</td>
<td>Decision on the application for .spaa</td>
<td>Implement new Protections for International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement - terms that are protected in international law (names and Acronyms)</td>
<td>Item 1.1.1 Request the Board considers new protections for .spaa and .spa domain names, and provides this opportunity to the GAC to propose additional terms associated with the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement. The GAC is requested to take into consideration objections raised by the Governmental Organizations (IGOs).</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>02-07-en#2.a</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-scorecard-march-2014-01044-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-scorecard-march-2014-01044-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>2014-01099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-01054</td>
<td>Governmental/1044</td>
<td>Decision on the application for .spaa</td>
<td>Implement new Protections for International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement - terms that are protected in international law (names and Acronyms)</td>
<td>Item 1.1.1 Request the Board considers new protections for .spaa and .spa domain names, and provides this opportunity to the GAC to propose additional terms associated with the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement. The GAC is requested to take into consideration objections raised by the Governmental Organizations (IGOs).</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>02-07-en#2.a</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-scorecard-march-2014-01044-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-scorecard-march-2014-01044-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>2014-01099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-01099</td>
<td>Governmental/1044</td>
<td>Decision on the application for .spaa</td>
<td>Implement new Protections for International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement - terms that are protected in international law (names and Acronyms)</td>
<td>Item 1.1.1 Request the Board considers new protections for .spaa and .spa domain names, and provides this opportunity to the GAC to propose additional terms associated with the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement. The GAC is requested to take into consideration objections raised by the Governmental Organizations (IGOs).</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>02-07-en#2.a</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-scorecard-march-2014-01044-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-scorecard-march-2014-01044-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>2014-01099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-01099</td>
<td>Governmental/1044</td>
<td>Decision on the application for .spaa</td>
<td>Implement new Protections for International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement - terms that are protected in international law (names and Acronyms)</td>
<td>Item 1.1.1 Request the Board considers new protections for .spaa and .spa domain names, and provides this opportunity to the GAC to propose additional terms associated with the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement. The GAC is requested to take into consideration objections raised by the Governmental Organizations (IGOs).</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>02-07-en#2.a</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-scorecard-march-2014-01044-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-advice-scorecard-march-2014-01044-en.pdf</a></td>
<td>2014-01099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Request Number</td>
<td>Beijing Communique</td>
<td>Date of Communique</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Draft Advice</td>
<td>Current Phase</td>
<td>Fixed Resolution Link</td>
<td>Board Formation Link</td>
<td>Note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-01500</td>
<td>AR-001250</td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>1.a</td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its correspondence. The NGPC accepts the advice. The NGPC has previously provided advice on the application, which is available here: <a href="http://gac-advice-scorecard.com/gac-advice-scorecard.html">http://gac-advice-scorecard.com/gac-advice-scorecard.html</a>. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 5 February 2014.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-01501</td>
<td>AR-001245</td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>1.a</td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its correspondence. The NGPC accepts the advice. The NGPC has previously provided advice on the application, which is available here: <a href="http://gac-advice-scorecard.com/gac-advice-scorecard.html">http://gac-advice-scorecard.com/gac-advice-scorecard.html</a>. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 5 February 2014.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-01502</td>
<td>AR-001244</td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>1.a</td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its correspondence. The NGPC accepts the advice. The NGPC has previously provided advice on the application, which is available here: <a href="http://gac-advice-scorecard.com/gac-advice-scorecard.html">http://gac-advice-scorecard.com/gac-advice-scorecard.html</a>. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 5 February 2014.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-01503</td>
<td>AR-001242</td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>1.a</td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its correspondence. The NGPC accepts the advice. The NGPC has previously provided advice on the application, which is available here: <a href="http://gac-advice-scorecard.com/gac-advice-scorecard.html">http://gac-advice-scorecard.com/gac-advice-scorecard.html</a>. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 5 February 2014.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-01504</td>
<td>AR-001241</td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>1.a</td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its correspondence. The NGPC accepts the advice. The NGPC has previously provided advice on the application, which is available here: <a href="http://gac-advice-scorecard.com/gac-advice-scorecard.html">http://gac-advice-scorecard.com/gac-advice-scorecard.html</a>. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 5 February 2014.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-01505</td>
<td>AR-001238</td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>1.a</td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its correspondence. The NGPC accepts the advice. The NGPC has previously provided advice on the application, which is available here: <a href="http://gac-advice-scorecard.com/gac-advice-scorecard.html">http://gac-advice-scorecard.com/gac-advice-scorecard.html</a>. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 5 February 2014.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-01506</td>
<td>AR-001237</td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>1.a</td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its correspondence. The NGPC accepts the advice. The NGPC has previously provided advice on the application, which is available here: <a href="http://gac-advice-scorecard.com/gac-advice-scorecard.html">http://gac-advice-scorecard.com/gac-advice-scorecard.html</a>. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 5 February 2014.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-01507</td>
<td>AR-001236</td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>1.a</td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its correspondence. The NGPC accepts the advice. The NGPC has previously provided advice on the application, which is available here: <a href="http://gac-advice-scorecard.com/gac-advice-scorecard.html">http://gac-advice-scorecard.com/gac-advice-scorecard.html</a>. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 5 February 2014.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-01508</td>
<td>AR-001235</td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>1.a</td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its correspondence. The NGPC accepts the advice. The NGPC has previously provided advice on the application, which is available here: <a href="http://gac-advice-scorecard.com/gac-advice-scorecard.html">http://gac-advice-scorecard.com/gac-advice-scorecard.html</a>. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 5 February 2014.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-01509</td>
<td>AR-001234</td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>1.a</td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its correspondence. The NGPC accepts the advice. The NGPC has previously provided advice on the application, which is available here: <a href="http://gac-advice-scorecard.com/gac-advice-scorecard.html">http://gac-advice-scorecard.com/gac-advice-scorecard.html</a>. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 5 February 2014.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-01510</td>
<td>AR-001233</td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>1.a</td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its correspondence. The NGPC accepts the advice. The NGPC has previously provided advice on the application, which is available here: <a href="http://gac-advice-scorecard.com/gac-advice-scorecard.html">http://gac-advice-scorecard.com/gac-advice-scorecard.html</a>. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 5 February 2014.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the Montreal Communique (November 2019).
The GAC has met with the NGPC to discuss the Committee’s response to
applications (ref. Beijing 30301) ii. .persiangulf (application number 1-2128-55439)
not object to them proceeding: i. .date (application number 1-1247-
92115). 2. The application for .yun (application number 1-1318-12524).
The GAC has reached consensus on GAC Objection Advice according to
implementation of preventative protection for IGO acronyms at the
NGPC at its meeting of 2 July 2013 should remain in place until the
agreements between the relevant parties are reached. 1. The
applications: The application for .thai (application number 1-2112-4478).
The GAC recognizes the importance of the priority inclusion of
strings are identified as being generic.
GAC appreciates that the Trademark Clearing House (TMCH) is an
and continued administration of community and geographic TLDs. The
GAC recognizes the priority inclusion of community and geographic TLDs.
be completed so that it can be considered by the GAC when it meets in
Buenos Aires. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10
September 2013.
On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its
consideration of 10 September 2013.
On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its
consideration of 10 September 2013.
scorecard: The NGPC notes the concerns expressed in this advice. This item is considered
complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 5 February 2014.
On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its
consideration of 10 September 2013.
On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its
consideration of 10 September 2013.
On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its
consideration of 10 September 2013.
On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its
consideration of 10 September 2013.
On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its
consideration of 10 September 2013.
On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its
consideration of 10 September 2013.
On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its
consideration of 10 September 2013.
On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its
consideration of 10 September 2013.
On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its
consideration of 10 September 2013.
On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its
consideration of 10 September 2013.
GAC Advice Status
As of 31 December 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>Date of Communique</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Action Item Number</th>
<th>Action Text</th>
<th>Current Piece</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
<th>Board Approval Link</th>
<th>Board Formation Link</th>
<th>Status Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001326</td>
<td>ICANN47 Durban Communique</td>
<td>7/18/13</td>
<td>Geographic Names and Community Applications</td>
<td>1.7.a.</td>
<td>The GAC recommends that ICANN collaborate with the IAO in crafting, for future rounds, the Applicant Guidebook with regard to the protection of terms with national, cultural, geographic and religious significance, in accordance with the 2007 GAC Principles on New gTLDs.</td>
<td>On 31 December 2019, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its Scorecard. The NGPC accepts this recommendation. The NGPC will add it to the NGPC's Scorecard. The NGPC will also take into consideration the advice that the ICANN Board develops the Applicant Guidebook with regard to the protection of terms with national, cultural, geographic and religious significance, in accordance with the 2007 GAC Principles on New gTLDs. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 10 September 2013.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2013-09-10-en#2.c">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2013-09-10-en#2.c</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>
<td>9/10/13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001241</td>
<td>ICANN47 Durban Communique</td>
<td>7/18/13</td>
<td>Geographic Names and Community Applications</td>
<td>1.7.a.</td>
<td>The GAC refers to the NGPC for the Beijing Communique regarding preferential treatment for all applications which have demonstrable community support, while omitting community concerns over the high costs for pursuing a Community-Benefit process as well as the need for a threshold for passing Community-Priority Involvement. Therefore the GAC advances the NGPC Board to consider to take better account of community views, and impose sanctions for controversies, within the existing framework, independent of whether those communities have utilized ICANN's formal community processes to date.</td>
<td>On 31 December 2019, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its Scorecard. The NGPC accepts this advice. The NGPC accepts this advice as follows: “The NGPC notes that it is not practical to impose any sanctions for controversies that may result from the adoption of the ICANN community process while at the same time retaining within the existing framework. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 26 January 2014.”</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-09-08-en#1.b">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-09-08-en#1.b</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>
<td>9/8/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001240</td>
<td>ICANN47 Durban Communique</td>
<td>7/18/13</td>
<td>Registry and Registry Agreement conflicts with law</td>
<td>3.6.b.</td>
<td>The GAC advises the NGPC to: i. In the Registry Agreement, the ICANN Board and the ICANN should ensure that an accommodation is reached with the IGOs on the protection of acronyms. The GAC believes that all such stability and security analysis should be made public as possible prior to the delegation of new gTLDs. ii. The NGPC Advise the GOBN to: a. In a manner of urgency consider the recommendations contained in the NGPC Report on Generic Top-Level Domains (GTLD) and Internal Name Certificates (ICANN).</td>
<td>On 31 December 2019, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its Scorecard. The NGPC accepts this advice and stated as follows: “The NGPC, taking the advice of the GAC, notes that in general it may not be possible to impose any sanctions for controversies that may result from the adoption of the ICANN community process while at the same time retaining within the existing framework. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 26 January 2014.”</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2013-09-10-en#2.c">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2013-09-10-en#2.c</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>
<td>9/10/13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001239</td>
<td>ICANN47 Durban Communique</td>
<td>7/18/13</td>
<td>Registry and Registry Agreement conflicts with law</td>
<td>3.6.b.</td>
<td>The GAC advises the NGPC to: a. As a matter of urgency consider the recommendations contained in the NGPC Report on Generic Top-Level Domains (GTLD) and Internal Name Certificates (ICANN).</td>
<td>On 31 December 2019, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its Scorecard. The NGPC accepts this advice and stated as follows: “The NGPC takes this advice into consideration but does not consider it urgent. The NGPC will review the recommendations and report back to the NGPC in the near future. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 26 January 2014.”</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2013-09-10-en#2.c">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2013-09-10-en#2.c</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>
<td>9/10/13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the Montreal Communique (November 2019).
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the Montreal Communique (November 2019).

**ICANN46 Beijing Communiqué**

| Item Request Number | Date of Item | Category | Item 1.0 | Item 1.1 | Item 1.2 | Date
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20160725</td>
<td>6/3/13</td>
<td>Safeguards Advice for New gTLDs</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>To reinforce existing processes for listing and addressing concerns the GAC identified safeguard advice as a result of consultations with governments. The GAC requests to consider and support this advice in its subsequent work.</td>
<td>The GAC requests to consider this advice in its subsequent work.</td>
<td>6/4/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20160725</td>
<td>6/23/13</td>
<td>Safeguards Advice for New gTLDs</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>The NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to GAC Advice on 25 June 2013 and passed a resolution adopting the “NGPC Proposal for Implementation of GAC Safeguards Applicable to All New gTLDs” dated 19 June 2013. In its proposal the NGPC requested a series of recommendations for consideration. The NGPC notes that the NGPC has not made appropriate changes to the first draft of the New gTLD Registry Agreement, as presented in Annex 5 (2013.06.18), and recommends that the NGPC proceed to adopt the NGPC’s Category 2 Safeguard Advice as appropriate to address the GAC’s concerns, particularly as regards the public interest commitments applicable to new gTLDs.</td>
<td>The NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to GAC Advice on 25 June 2013 and passed a resolution adopting the “NGPC Proposal for Implementation of GAC Safeguards Applicable to All New gTLDs” dated 19 June 2013. In its proposal the NGPC requested a series of recommendations for consideration. The NGPC notes that the NGPC has not made appropriate changes to the first draft of the New gTLD Registry Agreement, as presented in Annex 5 (2013.06.18), and recommends that the NGPC proceed to adopt the NGPC’s Category 2 Safeguard Advice as appropriate to address the GAC’s concerns, particularly as regards the public interest commitments applicable to new gTLDs.</td>
<td>6/23/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20160725</td>
<td>6/19/13</td>
<td>Safeguards Advice for New gTLDs</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>The NGPC responded to this advice item referring to the two categories of string as described in Annex 1 of the Beijing Communique as follows: Category 1: Consumer protection. Category 2: Personal data protection, sensitive strings, and regulated markets. On 5 February 2014, the NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to GAC Advice on 5 February 2014 and passed a resolution adopting the “NGPC Proposal for Implementation of GAC Safeguards Applicable to All New gTLDs” dated 18 February 2014. In its proposal the NGPC requested a series of recommendations for consideration. The NGPC notes that the NGPC has not made appropriate changes to the first draft of the New gTLD Registry Agreement, as presented in Annex 5 (2013.06.18), and recommends that the NGPC proceed to adopt the NGPC’s Category 2 Safeguard Advice as appropriate to address the GAC’s concerns, particularly as regards the public interest commitments applicable to new gTLDs.</td>
<td>The NGPC responded to this advice item referring to the two categories of string as described in Annex 1 of the Beijing Communique as follows: Category 1: Consumer protection. Category 2: Personal data protection, sensitive strings, and regulated markets. On 5 February 2014, the NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to GAC Advice on 5 February 2014 and passed a resolution adopting the “NGPC Proposal for Implementation of GAC Safeguards Applicable to All New gTLDs” dated 18 February 2014. In its proposal the NGPC requested a series of recommendations for consideration. The NGPC notes that the NGPC has not made appropriate changes to the first draft of the New gTLD Registry Agreement, as presented in Annex 5 (2013.06.18), and recommends that the NGPC proceed to adopt the NGPC’s Category 2 Safeguard Advice as appropriate to address the GAC’s concerns, particularly as regards the public interest commitments applicable to new gTLDs.</td>
<td>6/19/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20160725</td>
<td>6/4/13</td>
<td>Safeguards Advice for New gTLDs</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>The NGPC responded to this advice item referring to the two categories of string as described in Annex 1 of the Beijing Communique as follows: Category 1: Consumer protection. Category 2: Personal data protection, sensitive strings, and regulated markets. On 5 February 2014, the NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to GAC Advice on 5 February 2014 and passed a resolution adopting the “NGPC Proposal for Implementation of GAC Safeguards Applicable to All New gTLDs” dated 18 February 2014. In its proposal the NGPC requested a series of recommendations for consideration. The NGPC notes that the NGPC has not made appropriate changes to the first draft of the New gTLD Registry Agreement, as presented in Annex 5 (2013.06.18), and recommends that the NGPC proceed to adopt the NGPC’s Category 2 Safeguard Advice as appropriate to address the GAC’s concerns, particularly as regards the public interest commitments applicable to new gTLDs.</td>
<td>The NGPC responded to this advice item referring to the two categories of string as described in Annex 1 of the Beijing Communique as follows: Category 1: Consumer protection. Category 2: Personal data protection, sensitive strings, and regulated markets. On 5 February 2014, the NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to GAC Advice on 5 February 2014 and passed a resolution adopting the “NGPC Proposal for Implementation of GAC Safeguards Applicable to All New gTLDs” dated 18 February 2014. In its proposal the NGPC requested a series of recommendations for consideration. The NGPC notes that the NGPC has not made appropriate changes to the first draft of the New gTLD Registry Agreement, as presented in Annex 5 (2013.06.18), and recommends that the NGPC proceed to adopt the NGPC’s Category 2 Safeguard Advice as appropriate to address the GAC’s concerns, particularly as regards the public interest commitments applicable to new gTLDs.</td>
<td>6/4/13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to GAC Advice on 25 June 2013 and passed a resolution adopting the “NGPC Proposal for Implementation of GAC Safeguards Applicable to All New gTLDs” dated 19 June 2013. In its proposal the NGPC requested a series of recommendations for consideration. The NGPC notes that the NGPC has not made appropriate changes to the first draft of the New gTLD Registry Agreement, as presented in Annex 5 (2013.06.18), and recommends that the NGPC proceed to adopt the NGPC’s Category 2 Safeguard Advice as appropriate to address the GAC’s concerns, particularly as regards the public interest commitments applicable to new gTLDs. On 25 June 2013 the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of Safeguards for New gTLDs and passed a resolution adopting the “NGPC Proposal for Implementation of GAC Safeguards Applicable to All New gTLDs” dated 19 June 2013. In its proposal the NGPC requested a series of recommendations for consideration. The NGPC notes that the NGPC has not made appropriate changes to the first draft of the New gTLD Registry Agreement, as presented in Annex 5 (2013.06.18), and recommends that the NGPC proceed to adopt the NGPC’s Category 2 Safeguard Advice as appropriate to address the GAC’s concerns, particularly as regards the public interest commitments applicable to new gTLDs.
Notes:
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the Montreal Communique (November 2019).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>Date of Communique</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Action Text</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Draft Reference</th>
<th>Used Formulation Link</th>
<th>Haunted Formulation Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001217</td>
<td>ICANN46 Beijing</td>
<td>6/19/13</td>
<td>Security checks</td>
<td>Registry operators will maintain statistical reports that identify the number of inaccurate WHOIS records or security threats identified and actions taken as a result of periodic security checks. Registry operators will maintain these reports for the agreed contractual period and provide them to ICANN upon request in connection with contractual obligations.</td>
<td>In June 2013 the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of Safeguards Applicable to all gTLDs and passed a resolution adopting the &quot;NGPC Proposal for Implementation of GAC Safeguards Applicable to All New gTLDs&quot; dated 19 June 2013. In its proposal the NGPC requested as follows: in order to be accepted by ICANN, WHOIS data will be maintained statistical reports that identify the number of inaccurate WHOIS records or security threats identified as part of the checks to detect registration with deliberate intent, inaccurate or incomplete WHOIS data. Also, in order to be accepted by ICANN, Registry Operators will be required to maintain statistical data on the number of security threats detected through periodic and other security checks. Registry operators will maintain these reports for the agreed contractual period and provide them to ICANN upon request. The contents of the reports will be publicly available as appropriate. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's response of 19 June 2013.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/syste">http://www.icann.org/en/syste</a>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001218</td>
<td>ICANN46 Beijing</td>
<td>6/19/13</td>
<td>Security checks</td>
<td>Registry operators will maintain statistical reports that provide the number of inaccurate WHOIS records and security threats identified and actions taken as a result of periodic security checks. Registry operators will maintain these reports for the agreed contractual period and provide them to ICANN upon request in connection with contractual obligations.</td>
<td>In June 2013 the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of Safeguards Applicable to all New gTLDs and passed a resolution adopting the &quot;NGPC Proposal for Implementation of GAC Safeguards Applicable to All New gTLDs&quot; dated 19 June 2013. In its proposal the NGPC requested as follows: ICANN will require Registry Operators to periodically conduct a technical analysis to examine whether domains in its gTLDs are being used to support security threats, such as phishing, gambling, malware, and botnets. The providers will also require Registry Operators to perform statistical reports on the number of security threats detected and actions taken as a result of the periodic security checks. Registry Operators will maintain these reports for the agreed contractual period and provide them to ICANN upon request in connection with contractual obligations.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/syste">http://www.icann.org/en/syste</a>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001219</td>
<td>ICANN46 Beijing</td>
<td>6/19/13</td>
<td>Security checks</td>
<td>Registry operators will maintain statistical reports that provide the number of inaccurate WHOIS records and security threats identified and actions taken as a result of periodic security checks. Registry operators will maintain these reports for the agreed contractual period and provide them to ICANN upon request in connection with contractual obligations.</td>
<td>In June 2013 the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of Safeguards Applicable to all New gTLDs and passed a resolution adopting the &quot;NGPC Proposal for Implementation of GAC Safeguards Applicable to All New gTLDs&quot; dated 19 June 2013. In its proposal the NGPC requested as follows: ICANN will require Registry Operators to periodically conduct a technical analysis to examine whether domains in its gTLDs are being used to support security threats, such as phishing, gambling, malware, and botnets. The providers will also require Registry Operators to perform statistical reports on the number of security threats detected and actions taken as a result of the periodic security checks. Registry Operators will maintain these reports for the agreed contractual period and provide them to ICANN upon request in connection with contractual obligations.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/syste">http://www.icann.org/en/syste</a>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001220</td>
<td>ICANN46 Beijing</td>
<td>6/19/13</td>
<td>Security checks</td>
<td>Registry operators will maintain statistical reports that provide the number of inaccurate WHOIS records and security threats identified and actions taken as a result of periodic security checks. Registry operators will maintain these reports for the agreed contractual period and provide them to ICANN upon request in connection with contractual obligations.</td>
<td>In June 2013 the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of Safeguards Applicable to all New gTLDs and passed a resolution adopting the &quot;NGPC Proposal for Implementation of GAC Safeguards Applicable to All New gTLDs&quot; dated 19 June 2013. In its proposal the NGPC requested as follows: ICANN will require Registry Operators to periodically conduct a technical analysis to examine whether domains in its gTLDs are being used to support security threats, such as phishing, gambling, malware, and botnets. The providers will also require Registry Operators to perform statistical reports on the number of security threats detected and actions taken as a result of the periodic security checks. Registry Operators will maintain these reports for the agreed contractual period and provide them to ICANN upon request in connection with contractual obligations.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/syste">http://www.icann.org/en/syste</a>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001221</td>
<td>ICANN46 Beijing</td>
<td>6/19/13</td>
<td>Security checks</td>
<td>Registry operators will maintain statistical reports that provide the number of inaccurate WHOIS records and security threats identified and actions taken as a result of periodic security checks. Registry operators will maintain these reports for the agreed contractual period and provide them to ICANN upon request in connection with contractual obligations.</td>
<td>In June 2013 the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of Safeguards Applicable to all New gTLDs and passed a resolution adopting the &quot;NGPC Proposal for Implementation of GAC Safeguards Applicable to All New gTLDs&quot; dated 19 June 2013. In its proposal the NGPC requested as follows: ICANN will require Registry Operators to periodically conduct a technical analysis to examine whether domains in its gTLDs are being used to support security threats, such as phishing, gambling, malware, and botnets. The providers will also require Registry Operators to perform statistical reports on the number of security threats detected and actions taken as a result of the periodic security checks. Registry Operators will maintain these reports for the agreed contractual period and provide them to ICANN upon request in connection with contractual obligations.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/syste">http://www.icann.org/en/syste</a>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001222</td>
<td>ICANN46 Beijing</td>
<td>6/19/13</td>
<td>Security checks</td>
<td>Registry operators will maintain statistical reports that provide the number of inaccurate WHOIS records and security threats identified and actions taken as a result of periodic security checks. Registry operators will maintain these reports for the agreed contractual period and provide them to ICANN upon request in connection with contractual obligations.</td>
<td>In June 2013 the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of Safeguards Applicable to all New gTLDs and passed a resolution adopting the &quot;NGPC Proposal for Implementation of GAC Safeguards Applicable to All New gTLDs&quot; dated 19 June 2013. In its proposal the NGPC requested as follows: ICANN will require Registry Operators to periodically conduct a technical analysis to examine whether domains in its gTLDs are being used to support security threats, such as phishing, gambling, malware, and botnets. The providers will also require Registry Operators to perform statistical reports on the number of security threats detected and actions taken as a result of the periodic security checks. Registry Operators will maintain these reports for the agreed contractual period and provide them to ICANN upon request in connection with contractual obligations.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/syste">http://www.icann.org/en/syste</a>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In June 2013, the GAC considered this advice and proceeded with the application in its entirety. The GAC advises ICANN that it is the consensus of the GAC that a particular application should not proceed. This will create a strong presumption for the ICANN Board that the application should not be approved.

In June 2013, the GAC considered this advice and proceeded with the application in its entirety. The GAC advises ICANN that it is the consensus of the GAC that a particular application should not proceed. This will create a strong presumption for the ICANN Board that the application should not be approved.

In June 2013, the GAC considered this advice and proceeded with the application in its entirety. The GAC advises ICANN that it is the consensus of the GAC that a particular application should not proceed. This will create a strong presumption for the ICANN Board that the application should not be approved.

In June 2013, the GAC considered this advice and proceeded with the application in its entirety. The GAC advises ICANN that it is the consensus of the GAC that a particular application should not proceed. This will create a strong presumption for the ICANN Board that the application should not be approved.

In June 2013, the GAC considered this advice and proceeded with the application in its entirety. The GAC advises ICANN that it is the consensus of the GAC that a particular application should not proceed. This will create a strong presumption for the ICANN Board that the application should not be approved.

In June 2013, the GAC considered this advice and proceeded with the application in its entirety. The GAC advises ICANN that it is the consensus of the GAC that a particular application should not proceed. This will create a strong presumption for the ICANN Board that the application should not be approved.

In June 2013, the GAC considered this advice and proceeded with the application in its entirety. The GAC advises ICANN that it is the consensus of the GAC that a particular application should not proceed. This will create a strong presumption for the ICANN Board that the application should not be approved.

In June 2013, the GAC considered this advice and proceeded with the application in its entirety. The GAC advises ICANN that it is the consensus of the GAC that a particular application should not proceed. This will create a strong presumption for the ICANN Board that the application should not be approved.

In June 2013, the GAC considered this advice and proceeded with the application in its entirety. The GAC advises ICANN that it is the consensus of the GAC that a particular application should not proceed. This will create a strong presumption for the ICANN Board that the application should not be approved.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Close</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Notes:**
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communiqué (April 2013) through the Montreal Communiqué (November 2019).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communiqué</th>
<th>End of Communique</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Advice Item Number</th>
<th>Advice Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001221</td>
<td>Beijing Communique</td>
<td>4/11/13</td>
<td>Restricted Registration Policies</td>
<td>2. Exclusive Access</td>
<td>For strings representing generic terms, exclusive registry access should serve a public interest goal. In the current round, the GAC has identified the following non-exhaustive list of strings that it considers to be generic terms, where the applicant is currently proposing to provide exclusive registry access for: antivirus, .app, .autoinsurance, .baby, .beauty, .blog, .book, .broker, .carinsurance, .cars, .cloud, .courses, .cpa, .cruise, .data, .dvr, .financialaid, .flowers, .food, .gamer, .gaming, .hifi, .hotel, .insurance, .jewelry, .mail, .makeup, .map, .mobile, .motorcycles, .movie, .music, .news, .phone, .salon, .search, .shop, .show, .skin, .song, .store, .tennis, .theater, .theatre, .tires, .tunes, .video, .watch, .weather, .yachts, .???? [cloud], .??? [store], .?? [sale], .???? [fashion], .?? [consumer electronics], .?? [watches], .?? [book], .?? [jewelry], .?? [online shopping], .?? [food]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The NGPC considered this advice on several occasions. 1. For applicants not seeking to impose exclusive registry access the NGPC passed the following resolution on 25 June 2013: Resolved (2013.06.25.NG05), the NGPC directs staff to make appropriate changes to the final draft of the New gTLD Registry Agreement, as presented in resolution (2013.06.25.BB) attached to this resolution, to implement the GAC’s Category 2 Safeguard Advice for applicants not seeking to impose exclusive registry access. 2. For applicants seeking to impose exclusive registry access the NGPC passed the following resolution on 21 June 2015: Resolved (2015.06.21.NG02), to address the GAC’s Category 2 Safeguard Advice, the NGPC requests that the GNSO specifically include the issue of exclusive registry access for generic strings serving a public interest goal as part of the policy work it is planning to undertake on subsequent rounds of the New gTLD Program, and then inform the Board on a regular basis with regards to the progress on the issue. Also, the NGPC directs the President and CEO, or his designee(s), to proceed as follows... This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration and resolution of 21 June 2015.