As of 31 October 2020

GAC Advice Status

AR-004601
AR-004603

Action Request Number

The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN 68 Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN 68 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus GAC Advice)

Notes:
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Communique
General Meeting
Communique
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Date of
Issue of Importance:
Issue of Importance:
Issue of Importance:

Abuse to gTLD Registration Data
Access to gTLD Registration Data
DNS Abuse Mitigation measures
Addressing DNS Abuse

Phase 1 | Board & Advisory Group
October 23rd, 2020 and will be reviewed at the ICANN 73 Virtual Annual General Meeting Communique on 23 October 2020 and is currently reviewing.

Phase 1 | Board & Advisory Group
October 23rd, 2020 and will be reviewed at the ICANN 73 Virtual Annual General Meeting Communique on 23 October 2020 and is currently reviewing.

Phase 1 | Board & Advisory Group
October 23rd, 2020 and will be reviewed at the ICANN 73 Virtual Annual General Meeting Communique on 23 October 2020 and is currently reviewing.

Phase 1 | Board & Advisory Group
October 23rd, 2020 and will be reviewed at the ICANN 73 Virtual Annual General Meeting Communique on 23 October 2020 and is currently reviewing.

Phase 1 | Board & Advisory Group
October 23rd, 2020 and will be reviewed at the ICANN 73 Virtual Annual General Meeting Communique on 23 October 2020 and is currently reviewing.

Phase 1 | Board & Advisory Group
October 23rd, 2020 and will be reviewed at the ICANN 73 Virtual Annual General Meeting Communique on 23 October 2020 and is currently reviewing.

Phase 1 | Board & Advisory Group
October 23rd, 2020 and will be reviewed at the ICANN 73 Virtual Annual General Meeting Communique on 23 October 2020 and is currently reviewing.

Phase 1 | Board & Advisory Group
October 23rd, 2020 and will be reviewed at the ICANN 73 Virtual Annual General Meeting Communique on 23 October 2020 and is currently reviewing.

Phase 1 | Board & Advisory Group
October 23rd, 2020 and will be reviewed at the ICANN 73 Virtual Annual General Meeting Communique on 23 October 2020 and is currently reviewing.

Phase 1 | Board & Advisory Group
October 23rd, 2020 and will be reviewed at the ICANN 73 Virtual Annual General Meeting Communique on 23 October 2020 and is currently reviewing.
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN68 Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN68 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus GAC Advice)

**Notes:**
- Forum Communique
- ICANN68 Virtual Policy
- Forum Communique
- ICANN68 Virtual Policy
- Forum Communique
- ICANN68 Virtual Policy
- Forum Communique
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<th>AR-004531</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AR-004535</strong></td>
<td><strong>AR-004531</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AR-004535</strong></td>
<td><strong>AR-004531</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AR-004535</strong></td>
<td><strong>AR-004531</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AR-004535</strong></td>
<td><strong>AR-004531</strong></td>
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**AR-004535**

The Board acknowledges the ICANN68 Virtual Policy Forum Communique (1 July 2020) on 7 July 2020 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-ismail-07jul20-en.pdf), and the Board-GAC Interactions Group (BGIG) met on 30 September 2020 to discuss the ICANN68 Virtual Policy Forum Communique.

**AR-004531**

The Board acknowledges the ICANN68 Virtual Policy Forum Communique (1 July 2020) on 7 July 2020 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-ismail-07jul20-en.pdf), and the Board-GAC Interactions Group (BGIG) met on 30 September 2020 to discuss the ICANN68 Virtual Policy Forum Communique.

**AR-004532**

The Board acknowledges the ICANN68 Virtual Policy Forum Communique (1 July 2020) on 7 July 2020 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-ismail-07jul20-en.pdf), and the Board-GAC Interactions Group (BGIG) met on 30 September 2020 to discuss the ICANN68 Virtual Policy Forum Communique.

**AR-004533**

The Board acknowledges the ICANN68 Virtual Policy Forum Communique (1 July 2020) on 7 July 2020 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/botterman-to-ismail-07jul20-en.pdf), and the Board-GAC Interactions Group (BGIG) met on 30 September 2020 to discuss the ICANN68 Virtual Policy Forum Communique.
As of 31 October 2020

**GAC Advice Status**

- **AR-004500**
- **AR-004501**
- **AR-004536**
- **AR-004532**

**Notes:**
- *Forum Communique* ICANN67 Virtual Community
- *Forum Communique* ICANN68 Virtual Policy Communique
- *Forum Communique* ICANN68 Virtual Policy Communiqué

**Date of gTLDs**
- 3/16/20
- 6/27/20
- 6/27/20

**Issue of Importance:**
- Registration Data
- Follow-up
- Protection of .org

**Category**
- 1
- 2
- 2

**Impact of Importance:**
- 2
- 2
- 2

**Board Action(s)**
- Exceed
- Exceed

**Board Resolution Link**
- 
- 

**Board Forward Link**
- 
- 

---

As a result of its discussions during ICANN67, the GAC agreed on sending a notification to the Chair of the ICANN Board: The GAC highly appreciates the ICANN Board taking action on this matter, and agrees to the findings of the ICANN Board in line with its role as the global multistakeholder forum to foster a multistakeholder approach to policy development. The GAC notes that the obligations set out in the SANJUAN Statement of Understanding are being met. The GAC requests that the ICANN Board consider issuing an updated statement of understanding in line with the spirit of the ICANN Bylaws, reflecting the evolving nature of the multistakeholder approach to policy development.

---

The GAC highly appreciates the ICANN Board initiating this action and acknowledges the efforts of all stakeholders involved in this process. The GAC supports the ICANN Board in its efforts to ensure the continued development of the multistakeholder process and the continued engagement of all stakeholders in this process. The GAC requests that the ICANN Board consider issuing an updated statement of understanding in line with the spirit of the ICANN Bylaws, reflecting the evolving nature of the multistakeholder approach to policy development.

---

The GAC highly appreciates the ICANN Board initiating this action and acknowledges the efforts of all stakeholders involved in this process. The GAC supports the ICANN Board in its efforts to ensure the continued development of the multistakeholder process and the continued engagement of all stakeholders in this process. The GAC requests that the ICANN Board consider issuing an updated statement of understanding in line with the spirit of the ICANN Bylaws, reflecting the evolving nature of the multistakeholder approach to policy development.

---

The GAC highly appreciates the ICANN Board initiating this action and acknowledges the efforts of all stakeholders involved in this process. The GAC supports the ICANN Board in its efforts to ensure the continued development of the multistakeholder process and the continued engagement of all stakeholders in this process. The GAC requests that the ICANN Board consider issuing an updated statement of understanding in line with the spirit of the ICANN Bylaws, reflecting the evolving nature of the multistakeholder approach to policy development.

---

The GAC highly appreciates the ICANN Board initiating this action and acknowledges the efforts of all stakeholders involved in this process. The GAC supports the ICANN Board in its efforts to ensure the continued development of the multistakeholder process and the continued engagement of all stakeholders in this process. The GAC requests that the ICANN Board consider issuing an updated statement of understanding in line with the spirit of the ICANN Bylaws, reflecting the evolving nature of the multistakeholder approach to policy development.

---

The GAC highly appreciates the ICANN Board initiating this action and acknowledges the efforts of all stakeholders involved in this process. The GAC supports the ICANN Board in its efforts to ensure the continued development of the multistakeholder process and the continued engagement of all stakeholders in this process. The GAC requests that the ICANN Board consider issuing an updated statement of understanding in line with the spirit of the ICANN Bylaws, reflecting the evolving nature of the multistakeholder approach to policy development.
### GAC Advice Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>GAC Advice Status</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Notes:

The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2019) through the ICANN Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN Virtual Communique did not contain GAC Advice.)

### Action Request Number: AR-004103

**Title:** GAC Advice Status: ICANN66 Montréal

**Date:** 11/6/19

**GAC Advice Status:**

- ICANN66 Montréal


**Score:** 0

**Notes:**

- Communiqué

- Directory Service and Data Protection

### Action Request Number: AR-004104

**Title:** GAC Advice Status: ICANN66 Montréal

**Date:** 11/6/19

**GAC Advice Status:**

- ICANN66 Montréal


**Score:** 0

**Notes:**

- Communiqué

- Directory Service and Data Protection

### Action Request Number: AR-004502

**Title:** GAC Advice Status: ICANN66 Montréal

**Date:** 11/6/19

**GAC Advice Status:**

- ICANN66 Montréal


**Score:** 0

**Notes:**

- Communiqué

- Directory Service and Data Protection

### Notes:

- **Follow-up**
  - 20-Aug-2019

- **Role of the Board**
  - Review each item and consensus whether to take action, provide clarifications, or engage in further discussion.

- **Report to the Board**
  - The Board will consider when and if further action is needed on this item after review of the GAC advisor.

- **Additional Information**
  - The Board understands that the GAC provided additional clarifications to this advice in a letter on 22 January 2020.

- **Board Action**
  - The Board notes that the GAC advice is advisory in nature and that the Board is not bound to act on the advice. The Board acknowledges the GAC’s attention to this matter and notes that the question about what constitutes a “reputation” has been considered in previous GAC advice.

- **Board Resolution Link**

- **Board Scorecard Link**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>GAC Advice Item</th>
<th>Date of Incorporation</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>About This Number</th>
<th>Advice Text</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-004100</td>
<td>GAC Advice Item</td>
<td>6/26/19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The GAC advises the Board to instruct the ICANN organization to ensure that the current process for response to the Global Domains Policy Development Process (GDPDP) request form that can be used by stakeholders to request access based upon the current consensus policy and 1st activity is taking available steps to register and report information and points of contact on this topic.</td>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/resources-board-material/resolutions-2020-montreal66-gac-advice-scorecard-26jan20-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/resources-board-material/resolutions-2020-montreal66-gac-advice-scorecard-26jan20-en.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-004101</td>
<td>GAC Advice Item</td>
<td>5/7/19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The GAC advises the Board to take all possible steps to ensure that the ICANN.org and the EPDP Phase 1 implementation team generate a detailed written briefing on updated policies to reduce complete transparency and provide the Board on its status by January 9, 2020.</td>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/resources-board-material/resolutions-2020-montreal66-gac-advice-scorecard-26jan20-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/resources-board-material/resolutions-2020-montreal66-gac-advice-scorecard-26jan20-en.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-004102</td>
<td>GAC Advice Item</td>
<td>5/7/19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The GAC advises the Board to take all possible steps to ensure that the ICANN.org and the EPDP Phase 1 implementation team generate a detailed written briefing on updated policies to reduce complete transparency and provide the Board on its status by January 9, 2020.</td>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/resources-board-material/resolutions-2020-montreal66-gac-advice-scorecard-26jan20-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/resources-board-material/resolutions-2020-montreal66-gac-advice-scorecard-26jan20-en.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-004103</td>
<td>GAC Advice Item</td>
<td>5/7/19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The GAC advises the Board to take all possible steps to ensure that the ICANN.org and the EPDP Phase 1 implementation team generate a detailed written briefing on updated policies to reduce complete transparency and provide the Board on its status by January 9, 2020.</td>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/resources-board-material/resolutions-2020-montreal66-gac-advice-scorecard-26jan20-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/resources-board-material/resolutions-2020-montreal66-gac-advice-scorecard-26jan20-en.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-004104</td>
<td>GAC Advice Item</td>
<td>5/7/19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The GAC advises the Board to take all possible steps to ensure that the ICANN.org and the EPDP Phase 1 implementation team generate a detailed written briefing on updated policies to reduce complete transparency and provide the Board on its status by January 9, 2020.</td>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/resources-board-material/resolutions-2020-montreal66-gac-advice-scorecard-26jan20-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/resources-board-material/resolutions-2020-montreal66-gac-advice-scorecard-26jan20-en.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On 3 September 2019 the ICANN Board considered the Moscow Scorecard and provided for the following response. The Board was aware of the lingering concerns among GAC members regarding the consideration of GAC advice in the procedures for the release of two-character country codes at the second level under new gTLDs. The ICANN org has provided detailed explanations on its process and the Board is considering relevant GAC Advice in this regard. The Board also noted that during the 2019 meeting of ICANN65 in Marrakech, it was discussed that the Board would consider the recommendations with the goal of providing a coherent response to the Board actions taken on the EPDP Phase 2. The Board also noted that the Board has been particularly clear in its commitment to fully consider the recommendations provided by the various review teams, and is committed to providing a cohesive response to the Board actions taken on the EPDP Phase 2. The Board has also noted that it is committed to providing a cohesive response to the Board actions taken on the EPDP Phase 2, and has also noted that it is committed to providing a cohesive response to the Board actions taken on the EPDP Phase 2.

On 8 September 2019 the ICANN Board considered the Marrakech Scorecard and provided for the following response. The Board was aware of the lingering concerns among GAC members regarding the consideration of GAC advice in the procedures for the release of two-character country codes at the second level under new gTLDs. The ICANN org has provided detailed explanations on its process and the Board is considering relevant GAC Advice in this regard. The Board also noted that during the 2019 meeting of ICANN65 in Marrakech, it was discussed that the Board would consider the recommendations with the goal of providing a coherent response to the Board actions taken on the EPDP Phase 2. The Board also noted that the Board has been particularly clear in its commitment to fully consider the recommendations provided by the various review teams, and is committed to providing a cohesive response to the Board actions taken on the EPDP Phase 2. The Board has also noted that it is committed to providing a cohesive response to the Board actions taken on the EPDP Phase 2, and has also noted that it is committed to providing a cohesive response to the Board actions taken on the EPDP Phase 2.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted a resolution titled "Final Board Consideration of the Final Recommendations of the Community-Driven Initiative (CDI) in response to the Final Recommendations of the CDI regarding .AMAZON. The Board also supported the recommendation that the applicant entity submit all remaining materials as a Community-Focused Initiative (CFI) to ICANN.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted a resolution titled "Final Board Consideration of the Final Recommendations of the Community-Driven Initiative (CDI) in response to the Final Recommendations of the CDI regarding .AMAZON. The Board also supported the recommendation that the applicant entity submit all remaining materials as a Community-Focused Initiative (CFI) to ICANN.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted a resolution titled "Final Board Consideration of the Final Recommendations of the Community-Driven Initiative (CDI) in response to the Final Recommendations of the CDI regarding .AMAZON. The Board also supported the recommendation that the applicant entity submit all remaining materials as a Community-Focused Initiative (CFI) to ICANN.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted a resolution titled "Final Board Consideration of the Final Recommendations of the Community-Driven Initiative (CDI) in response to the Final Recommendations of the CDI regarding .AMAZON. The Board also supported the recommendation that the applicant entity submit all remaining materials as a Community-Focused Initiative (CFI) to ICANN.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted a resolution titled "Final Board Consideration of the Final Recommendations of the Community-Driven Initiative (CDI) in response to the Final Recommendations of the CDI regarding .AMAZON. The Board also supported the recommendation that the applicant entity submit all remaining materials as a Community-Focused Initiative (CFI) to ICANN.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted a resolution titled "Final Board Consideration of the Final Recommendations of the Community-Driven Initiative (CDI) in response to the Final Recommendations of the CDI regarding .AMAZON. The Board also supported the recommendation that the applicant entity submit all remaining materials as a Community-Focused Initiative (CFI) to ICANN.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted a resolution titled "Final Board Consideration of the Final Recommendations of the Community-Driven Initiative (CDI) in response to the Final Recommendations of the CDI regarding .AMAZON. The Board also supported the recommendation that the applicant entity submit all remaining materials as a Community-Focused Initiative (CFI) to ICANN.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted a resolution titled "Final Board Consideration of the Final Recommendations of the Community-Driven Initiative (CDI) in response to the Final Recommendations of the CDI regarding .AMAZON. The Board also supported the recommendation that the applicant entity submit all remaining materials as a Community-Focused Initiative (CFI) to ICANN.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted a resolution titled "Final Board Consideration of the Final Recommendations of the Community-Driven Initiative (CDI) in response to the Final Recommendations of the CDI regarding .AMAZON. The Board also supported the recommendation that the applicant entity submit all remaining materials as a Community-Focused Initiative (CFI) to ICANN.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted a resolution titled "Final Board Consideration of the Final Recommendations of the Community-Driven Initiative (CDI) in response to the Final Recommendations of the CDI regarding .AMAZON. The Board also supported the recommendation that the applicant entity submit all remaining materials as a Community-Focused Initiative (CFI) to ICANN.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted a resolution titled "Final Board Consideration of the Final Recommendations of the Community-Driven Initiative (CDI) in response to the Final Recommendations of the CDI regarding .AMAZON. The Board also supported the recommendation that the applicant entity submit all remaining materials as a Community-Focused Initiative (CFI) to ICANN.
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Follow-up on Item 1.a.II. of the Kobe Communiqué
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### GAC Advice Status

#### 04/02/2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>Date of Issue</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Advice Text</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-002128</td>
<td>AR-002128</td>
<td>03/03/19</td>
<td>2.1.1.2.5</td>
<td>The Board has received a request from the GAC for advice on the release of country codes at the second level. The Board has identified this as a priority for the implementation of the GAC policy. The Board has also requested that the GAC provide a timeline for the release of country codes at the second level. The Board will consider the GAC advice in its meeting on 03/03/19.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/resources-board-material/resolutions-2019-03-03-en#2.1.1.2.5">https://www.icann.org/resources-board-material/resolutions-2019-03-03-en#2.1.1.2.5</a></td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-icann64-kobe-communique-scorecard-15may19-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-icann64-kobe-communique-scorecard-15may19-en.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:

- The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN68 Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN68 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus GAC Advice)
- 03/03/19: The Board has received a request from the GAC for advice on the release of country codes at the second level. The Board has identified this as a priority for the implementation of the GAC policy. The Board will consider the GAC advice in its meeting on 03/03/19.

### Board Resolution Link

- [https://www.icann.org/resources-board-material/resolutions-2019-03-03-en#2.1.1.2.5](https://www.icann.org/resources-board-material/resolutions-2019-03-03-en#2.1.1.2.5)

### Board Scorecard Link

As of 31 October 2020
GAC Advice Status

AR-002131
Communique
ICANN63 Barcelona
10/25/18
Date of GDPR and WHOIS
1.a.I.
Number
1.a.II.
Advice Item

these discussions towards concrete and timely results.

through the Unified Access Model papers and emphasize the need to drive
access and accountability, and applies to all contracted parties. We
intends to consider GAC advice in accordance with the process documented in the ICANN
Framework adopted by the 8 November 2016 Board resolution. Additionally, the ICANN
board will not engage in discussions with the GAC at the Board GAC-ICANN63 regular
meeting (BGRI) meeting at ICANN63 Barcelona and GAC63. The adopted
measures also invoke registry operators to engage with their relevant GAC members when a
risk is identified in order to consider an agreement on how to manage the issue.
Additionally, the ICANN board intends to designate the existing
measures as the new curative process. We believe that the decisions that must be
made should be evaluated in the context of specific country codes and
which the GAC provided in its Barcelona Communiqué. The Board instructed the ICANN org to
prepare a dedicated webpage for the GAC members to easily track the registration
of two-character strings. All these measures are considered in line with the
advice to engage with concerned governments.

On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the Barcelona Communique and provided this
advice in its scorecard: The Board acknowledges and appreciates this follow-up on the
advice to engage with concerned governments. The Board stands ready to facilitate a
substantive, solutions-oriented discussion should it be invited to do so by the GNSO and the GAC
and is aware that

On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the Barcelona Communique and provided this
advice in its scorecard: The Board acknowledges and appreciates this follow-up on the
advice to engage with concerned governments. The Board stands ready to facilitate a
substantive, solutions-oriented discussion should it be invited to do so by the GNSO and the GAC
and is aware that

On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the Barcelona Communique and provided this
advice in its scorecard: The Board acknowledges and appreciates this follow-up on the
advice to engage with concerned governments. The Board stands ready to facilitate a
substantive, solutions-oriented discussion should it be invited to do so by the GNSO and the GAC
and is aware that

On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the Barcelona Communique and provided this
advice in its scorecard: The Board acknowledges and appreciates this follow-up on the
advice to engage with concerned governments. The Board stands ready to facilitate a
substantive, solutions-oriented discussion should it be invited to do so by the GNSO and the GAC
and is aware that

On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the Barcelona Communique and provided this
advice in its scorecard: The Board acknowledges and appreciates this follow-up on the
advice to engage with concerned governments. The Board stands ready to facilitate a
substantive, solutions-oriented discussion should it be invited to do so by the GNSO and the GAC
and is aware that

On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the Barcelona Communique and provided this
advice in its scorecard: The Board acknowledges and appreciates this follow-up on the
advice to engage with concerned governments. The Board stands ready to facilitate a
substantive, solutions-oriented discussion should it be invited to do so by the GNSO and the GAC
and is aware that

On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the Barcelona Communique and provided this
advice in its scorecard: The Board acknowledges and appreciates this follow-up on the
advice to engage with concerned governments. The Board stands ready to facilitate a
substantive, solutions-oriented discussion should it be invited to do so by the GNSO and the GAC
and is aware that

On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the Barcelona Communique and provided this
advice in its scorecard: The Board acknowledges and appreciates this follow-up on the
advice to engage with concerned governments. The Board stands ready to facilitate a
substantive, solutions-oriented discussion should it be invited to do so by the GNSO and the GAC
and is aware that

On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the Barcelona Communique and provided this
advice in its scorecard: The Board acknowledges and appreciates this follow-up on the
advice to engage with concerned governments. The Board stands ready to facilitate a
substantive, solutions-oriented discussion should it be invited to do so by the GNSO and the GAC
and is aware that

On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the Barcelona Communique and provided this
advice in its scorecard: The Board acknowledges and appreciates this follow-up on the
advice to engage with concerned governments. The Board stands ready to facilitate a
substantive, solutions-oriented discussion should it be invited to do so by the GNSO and the GAC
and is aware that
GAC Advice Status  
As of 31 October 2020

Notes: 
The items captured in this include advice from the Beijing Communiqué (April 2015) through the ICANN Virtual Communiqué (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN Virtual Communiqué did not contain GAC Advice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>GAC Advice Status</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Board Reversion Link</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001869</td>
<td>Follow-up 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6/28/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-002136</td>
<td>Communique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/25/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Follow-up Item

GAC Advice Status

AR-001869

On 16 September 2018 the Board considered the GAC’s recommendation and provided the following advice and inputs on this topic. The Board acknowledges and appreciates the efforts of the ICANN Advisory Committee on Governmental Advice (AC-GA) in preparing this advice. The GAC notes that the temporary protections presently accorded to two international organizations within the Movement (ICRC and IFRC) as a result of GAC Advice Item §2.a.I above regarding IGO Protections. This item is considered complete as of the current GAC Advice Scorecard 16 September 2018.

AR-002136

On 16 September 2018 the Board considered the GAC’s recommendation and provided the following advice and inputs on this topic. The Board acknowledges and appreciates the efforts of the ICANN Advisory Committee on Governmental Advice (AC-GA) in preparing this advice. The GAC notes that the temporary protections presently accorded to two international organizations within the Movement (ICRC and IFRC) as a result of GAC Advice Item §2.a.I above regarding IGO Protections. This item is considered complete as of the current GAC Advice Scorecard 16 September 2018.
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN68 Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN68 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus GAC Advice)

Notes:

- Communique
  - ICANN61 San Juan
  - ICANN62 Panama

- Date of
  - 3/15/18
  - 6/28/18

- GDPR and WHOIS
  - Two-character Country

- Protection of IGO Identifiers
  - Two-character Country
  - Category

- Number
  - 1.a.I.
  - 2.a.II.
  - 3.a.II.

- Board Action(s)

- Board Scorecard Link

- Board Scorecard Link

- Board Scorecard Link
GAC Advice Items
As of 31 October 2020

Notes:
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique [April 2019] through the ICANN69 Virtual Communique [June 2020]. (Note: the ICANN69 Virtual Communique did not contain a separate GAC Advice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>Date of Adoption</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>About This Advice</th>
<th>Action Taken</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Board Resolution(s)</th>
<th>Board Scorecard(s)</th>
<th>Date of Close</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001684</td>
<td>ICANN61 San Juan</td>
<td>3/15/18</td>
<td>1.a.V.</td>
<td>Ensure that the GAC's 2018 resolution on Privacy and Data Protection (as contained in the 20 May 2018 letter from the GAC Chair to the ICANN Board) is fully operational;</td>
<td>Not including in the 3rd party resolution, this item remains open for further Board consideration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001685</td>
<td>ICANN61 San Juan</td>
<td>3/15/18</td>
<td>1.a.III.</td>
<td>GDPR and WHOIS data processing, in particular: (1) making sure that the temporary specification was fully operational by the specified date, (2) making sure that the WHOIS model is fully operational by the specified date, and (3) making sure that the GDPR and WHOIS data processing, in particular: (1) making sure that the temporary specification was fully operational by the specified date, (2) making sure that the WHOIS model is fully operational by the specified date, and (3) making sure that the GDPR and WHOIS</td>
<td>Not including in the 3rd party resolution, this item remains open for further Board consideration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001686</td>
<td>ICANN61 San Juan</td>
<td>3/15/18</td>
<td>1.b.I.</td>
<td>EPP Final Report states that the EPDP Team undertakes to make a recommendation to the Board on the implementation of the Temporary Specification. The GAC considered this item on 15 May 2019 and stated in the scorecard: The Board monitors the progress of the Temporary Specification.</td>
<td>The GAC monitors the progress of the Temporary Specification.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001687</td>
<td>ICANN61 San Juan</td>
<td>3/15/18</td>
<td>2.a.I.</td>
<td>The Board initially considered this advice on 30 May 2018. However at the time, the Board requested additional information. The Board discussed this advice on 30 May 2018. The Board has asked the ICANN Organization to review the advice in light of these responses and to assess the feasibility of the request. The Board advised that changes to the data processing framework and to the GAC's 2018 resolution on Privacy and Data Protection (as contained in the 20 May 2018 letter from the GAC Chair to the ICANN Board) are necessary. The Board advised that changes to the data processing framework and to the GAC's 2018 resolution on Privacy and Data Protection (as contained in the 20 May 2018 letter from the GAC Chair to the ICANN Board) are necessary.</td>
<td>The Board monitors the progress of the Temporary Specification.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001688</td>
<td>ICANN61 San Juan</td>
<td>3/15/18</td>
<td>2.b.II.</td>
<td>The GAC monitors the progress of the Temporary Specification.</td>
<td>The GAC monitors the progress of the Temporary Specification.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001690</td>
<td>ICANN61 San Juan</td>
<td>3/15/18</td>
<td>3.a.II.</td>
<td>The GAC monitors the progress of the Temporary Specification.</td>
<td>The GAC monitors the progress of the Temporary Specification.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As of 31 October 2020

GAC Advice Status

AR-002217
AR-001686
AR-001689
AR-001680
AR-001688
AR-001687

Action Request Number

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

Notes:

ICANN60 Abu Dhabi
Communique
ICANN61 San Juan Communique
ICANN61 San Juan Communique
ICANN61 San Juan Communique
ICANN61 San Juan Communique

Category

Follow-up 1
Follow-up 2
1.a.VII.
1.b.III.
1.a.II.
1.b.II.

Number

1
2
1
2
1
2

Advice Text

- Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider
- Phase 4 | Implement

Notes:

https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/reports/02-04-en#2.d
https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/reports/05-05-en#1.b
https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/reports/06-05-en#1.b
https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/reports/05-05-en#1.b
https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/reports/06-05-en#1.b
https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/reports/06-05-en#1.b
https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/reports/06-05-en#1.b

Close
As of 31 October 2020

GAC Advice Status

Action Request Number | Current Phase | Recommended Action(s) | Notes: | Board Scorecard Link | Board Resolution Link | Board Resolution Date
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---

AR-001515 | APA/WHOIS | | The Board also added the WHOIS data to its public website. It is the responsibility of business and other organizations for legitimate purposes, to contact the community, and to facilitate this discussion in a transparent way. The Board is aware that some changes to the ICANN Learn Online platform may be needed to allow for the use of English and will continue to facilitate this discussion in a transparent way. The Board is aware that some changes to the ICANN Learn Online platform may be needed to allow for the use of English and will continue to facilitate this discussion in a transparent way. The Board is aware that some changes to the ICANN Learn Online platform may be needed to allow for the use of English and will continue to facilitate this discussion in a transparent way. | [abudhabi60-gac-advice-scorecard-m/files/files/resolutions-04feb18-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/resources/documents/resolutions-04feb18-en.pdf) | [abudhabi60-gac-advice-scorecard-m/files/files/resolutions-04feb18-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/resources/documents/resolutions-04feb18-en.pdf) | 04feb18-en.pdf

AR-001516 | APA/WHOIS | | The Board also added the WHOIS data to its public website. It is the responsibility of business and other organizations for legitimate purposes, to contact the community, and to facilitate this discussion in a transparent way. The Board is aware that some changes to the ICANN Learn Online platform may be needed to allow for the use of English and will continue to facilitate this discussion in a transparent way. The Board is aware that some changes to the ICANN Learn Online platform may be needed to allow for the use of English and will continue to facilitate this discussion in a transparent way. | [abudhabi60-gac-advice-scorecard-m/files/files/resolutions-04feb18-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/resources/documents/resolutions-04feb18-en.pdf) | [abudhabi60-gac-advice-scorecard-m/files/files/resolutions-04feb18-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/resources/documents/resolutions-04feb18-en.pdf) | 04feb18-en.pdf

AR-001517 | APA/WHOIS | | | | | 

Notes:
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique [April 2012] through the ICANN Virtual Communique [June 2020]. (Note: the ICANN Virtual Communique did not contain General GAC Advice)
The GAC also advises the ICANN Board to: i. seek information from its Internet as a reliable and efficient means of information and stakeholders. This should be done at least, but not only, before putting put any public comment. Attention should be paid to using English (and possibly translations into other languages) in order to allow less English native speakers to understand the issue.

On 4 February 2018 the Board considered the Abu Dhabi Communique and provided this consideration of 4 February 2018.

The GAC advises the ICANN Board that: i. the 2007 GAC WHOIS Principles submitted these questions to the Hamilton firm and received a response. The GAC’s Board Resolution Link

On 4 February 2018 the Board considered the Abu Dhabi Communique and provided this consideration of 4 February 2018.

On 4 February 2018 the Board considered the Abu Dhabi Communique and provided this consideration of 4 February 2018.

On 4 February 2018 the Board considered the Abu Dhabi Communique and provided this consideration of 4 February 2018.

On 4 February 2018 the Board considered the Abu Dhabi Communique and provided this consideration of 4 February 2018.

On 4 February 2018 the Board considered the Abu Dhabi Communique and provided this consideration of 4 February 2018.

On 4 February 2018 the Board considered the Abu Dhabi Communique and provided this consideration of 4 February 2018.

On 4 February 2018 the Board considered the Abu Dhabi Communique and provided this consideration of 4 February 2018.

On 4 February 2018 the Board considered the Abu Dhabi Communique and provided this consideration of 4 February 2018.
As of 31 October 2020

GAC Advice Status

AR-002417

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

Communique

ICANN59 Johannesburg

Communique

ICANN60 Abu Dhabi

Communique

6/29/17

11/1/17

11/1/17

11/1/17

Date of

New gTLDs: Policy Issues

Review Team (CCT-RT)

Trust and Consumer Choice

Competition, Consumer Trust and Protections

at the 2nd Level

Application for .amazon and .amazonaws

Follow-up 6

Follow-up 5

Follow-up 2

Follow-up 1

Advice Item

Working Group. Options for better mapping of issues and feedback on GAC are being considered by the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group and recalled its advice (Durban Communiqué, 2013) that .amazon and .amazonaws are defined to fall outside of the remit of the reconvened GNSO Working Group and noted that the acronyms of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC, CICR, MKKK) and of the Red Cross and Red Crescent societies. The GAC noted that the acronyms of these entities are made to benefit from the same cost neutral Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP) II. provide standing based on IGOs? jurisdictional status by facilitating appeals exclusively through IGOs? status as public intergovernmental institutions, and III. respect these acronyms be made to benefit from the same cost neutral FICR) are defined to fall outside of the remit of the reconvened GNSO Working Group on the Protection of IGO-INGO Identifiers in All gTLDs, tasked with reexamining the GNSO's past recommendations on the protection of Red Cross and Red Crescent acronyms. The GAC also discussed the recommendations on the Protection of IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms which include the following points: no substantive changes to existing rights protection mechanisms are appropriate, how these will be addressed in the report of the WG?. On 11 July 2019 the GAC met with representatives of the Amazon corporation and discussed developments regarding the company's applications, particularly in light of the recent Independent Review Panel Final Report. The GAC welcomed the progress made by the GNSO PDP on IGO-INGO Access to Curative RPMs Policy Recommendations. The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary. Follow up to previous advice: no open advice items related to the same topic.

The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary. Follow up to previous advice: no open advice items related to the same topic.

The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary. Follow up to previous advice: no open advice items related to the same topic.
As of 31 October 2020

GAC Advice Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Date of Request</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>About Box Number</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Current State</th>
<th>Actioned by</th>
<th>Board Resolution Code</th>
<th>Board Transverse Code</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-002412</td>
<td>N/A/17</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-002414</td>
<td>N/A/17</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-002413</td>
<td>N/A/17</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-002418</td>
<td>N/A/17</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communiqué (April 2017) through the ICANN59 Virtual Communiqué (June 2020). See: (Note: the ICANN59 Virtual Communiqué did not contain Generic GAC Advice)

1. GAC Advice Item
2. As of 31 October 2020
3. Washington, D.C.
4. N/A
5. N/A
6. N/A
7. N/A
8. N/A
9. N/A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>Date of Communique</th>
<th>Notes:</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Notes:

The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2015) through the ICANN58 Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN58 Virtual Communique did not contain Generic GAC Advice.)
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN68 Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN68 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus GAC Advice)

Notes:

ICANN57 Hyderabad Communique
ICANN57 Hyderabad Communique
ICANN58 Copenhagen Communique

3/15/17
Date of codes at the second level
Two-letter country/territory string similarity review

4.a.I
Advice Item
GAC advice given in the Helsinki Communique.
Clearly indicate whether the actions taken by the Board as referred to in the Extended Process Similarity Review Panel Working Group proposed the GAC Chair of 28 September 2016 to the ccNSO Chair concerning the Second Level.
The Board should apply the views expressed by the GAC in the letter from the Secretary of 3 February 2017.
Commitments and core values, and commented that the Board shared the GAC's concern that the consultations and public comment periods on the topic of two-character domain names corresponding to country codes had been thoroughly examined over several years; at least five public comment periods on the topic of two-character domain names had been provided a response on 14 October 2019. This advice item remains open for further Board consideration.

9/10/19
Board Resolution Link

On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the GAC's Advice in the memo and Historical Overview for additional details regarding this topic. This memo is considered complete at the Board's written response to the Barcelona Communique of 27 January 2019.

4.a.II
Advice Item
Take into account the serious concerns expressed by some GAC Members that their concerns have not been addressed. Accordingly, the Board has directed the GAC Chair to convene a group meeting on 6 June 2017 to continue this discussion.

9/10/19
Board Resolution Link

On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the GAC's Advice in the memo and Historical Overview for additional details regarding this topic. This memo is considered complete at the Board's written response to the Barcelona Communique of 27 January 2019.

9/10/19
Board Resolution Link

On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the GAC's Advice in the memo and Historical Overview for additional details regarding this topic. This memo is considered complete at the Board's written response to the Barcelona Communique of 27 January 2019.

9/10/19
Board Resolution Link

On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the GAC's Advice in the memo and Historical Overview for additional details regarding this topic. This memo is considered complete at the Board's written response to the Barcelona Communique of 27 January 2019.

9/10/19
Board Resolution Link

On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the GAC's Advice in the memo and Historical Overview for additional details regarding this topic. This memo is considered complete at the Board's written response to the Barcelona Communique of 27 January 2019.

9/10/19
Board Resolution Link

On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the GAC's Advice in the memo and Historical Overview for additional details regarding this topic. This memo is considered complete at the Board's written response to the Barcelona Communique of 27 January 2019.

9/10/19
Board Resolution Link

On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the GAC's Advice in the memo and Historical Overview for additional details regarding this topic. This memo is considered complete at the Board's written response to the Barcelona Communique of 27 January 2019.

9/10/19
Board Resolution Link

On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the GAC's Advice in the memo and Historical Overview for additional details regarding this topic. This memo is considered complete at the Board's written response to the Barcelona Communique of 27 January 2019.

9/10/19
Board Resolution Link

On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the GAC's Advice in the memo and Historical Overview for additional details regarding this topic. This memo is considered complete at the Board's written response to the Barcelona Communique of 27 January 2019.

9/10/19
Board Resolution Link

On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the GAC's Advice in the memo and Historical Overview for additional details regarding this topic. This memo is considered complete at the Board's written response to the Barcelona Communique of 27 January 2019.

9/10/19
Board Resolution Link

On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the GAC's Advice in the memo and Historical Overview for additional details regarding this topic. This memo is considered complete at the Board's written response to the Barcelona Communique of 27 January 2019.

9/10/19
Board Resolution Link

On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the GAC's Advice in the memo and Historical Overview for additional details regarding this topic. This memo is considered complete at the Board's written response to the Barcelona Communique of 27 January 2019.

9/10/19
Board Resolution Link

On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the GAC's Advice in the memo and Historical Overview for additional details regarding this topic. This memo is considered complete at the Board's written response to the Barcelona Communique of 27 January 2019.

9/10/19
Board Resolution Link

On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the GAC's Advice in the memo and Historical Overview for additional details regarding this topic. This memo is considered complete at the Board's written response to the Barcelona Communique of 27 January 2019.

9/10/19
Board Resolution Link

On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the GAC's Advice in the memo and Historical Overview for additional details regarding this topic. This memo is considered complete at the Board's written response to the Barcelona Communique of 27 January 2019.

9/10/19
Board Resolution Link

On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the GAC's Advice in the memo and Historical Overview for additional details regarding this topic. This memo is considered complete at the Board's written response to the Barcelona Communique of 27 January 2019.

9/10/19
Board Resolution Link

On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the GAC's Advice in the memo and Historical Overview for additional details regarding this topic. This memo is considered complete at the Board's written response to the Barcelona Communique of 27 January 2019.

9/10/19
Board Resolution Link

On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the GAC's Advice in the memo and Historical Overview for additional details regarding this topic. This memo is considered complete at the Board's written response to the Barcelona Communique of 27 January 2019.

9/10/19
Board Resolution Link

On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the GAC's Advice in the memo and Historical Overview for additional details regarding this topic. This memo is considered complete at the Board's written response to the Barcelona Communique of 27 January 2019.

9/10/19
Board Resolution Link

On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the GAC's Advice in the memo and Historical Overview for additional details regarding this topic. This memo is considered complete at the Board's written response to the Barcelona Communique of 27 January 2019.

9/10/19
Board Resolution Link

On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the GAC's Advice in the memo and Historical Overview for additional details regarding this topic. This memo is considered complete at the Board's written response to the Barcelona Communique of 27 January 2019.

9/10/19
Board Resolution Link

On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the GAC's Advice in the memo and Historical Overview for additional details regarding this topic. This memo is considered complete at the Board's written response to the Barcelona Communique of 27 January 2019.
As of 31 October 2020

AR-001316
AR-001315
AR-001352
AR-001351

Action Request Number
Communique
ICANN57 Hyderabad
11/8/16
ICANN57 Hyderabad
Communique
ICANN57 Hyderabad
11/8/16
ICANN57 Hyderabad
Communique
ICANN57 Hyderabad
11/8/16
ICANN57 Hyderabad
Communique
ICANN57 Hyderabad
11/8/16

Date of Abuse
Timing
Future gTLDs Policies and national committees
Crescent/ Red Crystal
Protection of Red Cross/ Red Crescent identifiers and names of national societies (in English and Arabic)
Protection of IGO Names and acronyms
Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider
Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider

AR-001315
AR-001351

Number
Copenhagen.

Policy Recommendations. The Board provided a response on 14 October 2019. This advice is reflected in the GNSO's own internal processes. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 3 February 2017.

On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and provided this response in its comment. The Board acknowledged the ongoing GNSO’s Policy Development Process regarding curative rights protection mechanisms for IGOs and other organizations, and urges all parties to work towards a resolution to the outstanding issues. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 3 February 2017.

On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and provided this response in its comment. The Board adopts this advice and notes that the GNSO has confirmed that the GNSO Working Group in question has reviewed the proposal. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 3 February 2017.

On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and provided this response in its comment. The Board considers this to be in line with the ICANN57 Hyderabad Communique. To facilitate a procedural way forward for the reconciliation of IGO advice and gTLD policy positions, the Board is considering the creation of a new category of “Future gTLDs Policies and national committees”. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 3 February 2017.

On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and provided this response in its comment. The Board adopted this advice and notes that the GNSO Council has confirmed that the GNSO Working Group is to proceed with Phase 3, which is expected to complete by the end of the year. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 3 February 2017.

On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and provided this response in its comment. The Board notes that the IGO List dated 28/03/2013 has confirmed that the GNSO Working Group on Sunrise Right Protection Mechanisms has confirmed that ICANN would establish all of the following, with respect to the protection of IGO acronyms at the second level: a procedure to notify IGOs of new gTLD Registry Operators; a list of IGOs that are affected by the IGO List dated 28/03/2013; a list of IGOs that are not affected by the IGO List dated 28/03/2013; and a list of IGOs that are affected by the IGO List dated 28/03/2013. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 3 February 2017.

On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and provided this response in its comment. The Board notes that the IGO List dated 28/03/2013 has confirmed that the GNSO Working Group on Sunrise Right Protection Mechanisms has confirmed that ICANN would establish all of the following, with respect to the protection of IGO acronyms at the second level: a procedure to notify IGOs of new gTLD Registry Operators; a list of IGOs that are affected by the IGO List dated 28/03/2013; a list of IGOs that are not affected by the IGO List dated 28/03/2013; and a list of IGOs that are affected by the IGO List dated 28/03/2013. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 3 February 2017.

On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and provided this response in its comment. The Board notes that the GNSO Council has approved the four recommendations. The Board recommends that the Registrar to reserve the IGO names and acronyms as per the IGO List dated 28/03/2013 remain reserved in two languages. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 3 February 2017.

On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and provided this response in its comment. The Board has confirmed that the GNSO Working Group on Sunrise Right Protection Mechanisms has confirmed that ICANN would establish all of the following, with respect to the protection of IGO acronyms at the second level: a procedure to notify IGOs of new gTLD Registry Operators; a list of IGOs that are affected by the IGO List dated 28/03/2013; a list of IGOs that are not affected by the IGO List dated 28/03/2013; and a list of IGOs that are affected by the IGO List dated 28/03/2013. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 3 February 2017.

On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and provided this response in its comment. The Board has confirmed that the GNSO Working Group on Sunrise Right Protection Mechanisms has confirmed that ICANN would establish all of the following, with respect to the protection of IGO acronyms at the second level: a procedure to notify IGOs of new gTLD Registry Operators; a list of IGOs that are affected by the IGO List dated 28/03/2013; a list of IGOs that are not affected by the IGO List dated 28/03/2013; and a list of IGOs that are affected by the IGO List dated 28/03/2013. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 3 February 2017.

On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and provided this response in its comment. The Board has confirmed that the GNSO Working Group on Sunrise Right Protection Mechanisms has confirmed that ICANN would establish all of the following, with respect to the protection of IGO acronyms at the second level: a procedure to notify IGOs of new gTLD Registry Operators; a list of IGOs that are affected by the IGO List dated 28/03/2013; a list of IGOs that are not affected by the IGO List dated 28/03/2013; and a list of IGOs that are affected by the IGO List dated 28/03/2013. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 3 February 2017.

On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and provided this response in its comment. The Board has confirmed that the GNSO Working Group on Sunrise Right Protection Mechanisms has confirmed that ICANN would establish all of the following, with respect to the protection of IGO acronyms at the second level: a procedure to notify IGOs of new gTLD Registry Operators; a list of IGOs that are affected by the IGO List dated 28/03/2013; a list of IGOs that are not affected by the IGO List dated 28/03/2013; and a list of IGOs that are affected by the IGO List dated 28/03/2013. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 3 February 2017.
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN68 Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN68 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus GAC Advice)

---

### Board Scorecard Link

### Board Scorecard Link

---

The Board has accepted the GAC advice contained in its Singapore Communiqué dated 11 February 2017. The Board continues to examine various ways to improve transparency of its processes. The Board has included an ongoing dialogue with the ICA, a regular call to discuss the GAC Communiqué. It has also stated that the Board has already had in its consideration the impact of GAC advice on the implementation of new gTLD systems. The Board has also noted its commitment to ensure meaningful participation of all stakeholders in the GAC advice process.

---

On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and provided this response in its scorecard: The Board accepts this advice and looks for ways to continue an ongoing dialogue with the ICA as part of the GAC Advisory Process. The Board continues to examine various ways to improve transparency of its processes. The Board has included an ongoing dialogue with the ICA, a regular call to discuss the GAC Communiqué. It has also stated that the Board has already had in its consideration the impact of GAC advice on the implementation of new gTLD systems. The Board has also noted its commitment to ensure meaningful participation of all stakeholders in the GAC advice process.

---

On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and provided this response in its scorecard: The Board accepts this advice and looks for ways to continue an ongoing dialogue with the ICA as part of the GAC Advisory Process. The Board continues to examine various ways to improve transparency of its processes. The Board has included an ongoing dialogue with the ICA, a regular call to discuss the GAC Communiqué. It has also stated that the Board has already had in its consideration the impact of GAC advice on the implementation of new gTLD systems. The Board has also noted its commitment to ensure meaningful participation of all stakeholders in the GAC advice process.

---

On 3 February 2017 the Board considered the Hyderabad Communique and provided this response in its scorecard: The Board accepts this advice and looks for ways to continue an ongoing dialogue with the ICA as part of the GAC Advisory Process. The Board continues to examine various ways to improve transparency of its processes. The Board has included an ongoing dialogue with the ICA, a regular call to discuss the GAC Communiqué. It has also stated that the Board has already had in its consideration the impact of GAC advice on the implementation of new gTLD systems. The Board has also noted its commitment to ensure meaningful participation of all stakeholders in the GAC advice process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Date of Resolution</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001310 GAC Advice</td>
<td>6/30/16</td>
<td>The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN68 Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN68 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus GAC Advice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001309 GAC Advice</td>
<td>6/30/16</td>
<td>Notes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001308 GAC Advice</td>
<td>6/30/16</td>
<td>ICANN56 Helsinki Communique on 28 October 2016, the ICANN Board Chair wrote to the GAC Chair to inform the GAC of the Board's delay in providing a formal response to the Helsinki Communique due to the considerable effort required to complete the IANA transition. On 13 December 2016, the Board considered the Helsinki Communique and provided the GAC with an update of its status. The Board also noted that the Board will consider dialogue on constructive ways to address GAC concerns as the policy development work for subsequent rounds of the New gTLD Program will continue, and that the Board expects that there will be no proprietary requirements or trade restrictions. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 13 December 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001307 GAC Advice</td>
<td>6/30/16</td>
<td>II. All measures available to the Board should be used to ensure that a comprehensive and measured approach to further releases of new gTLDs is taken in a logical, sequential and coordinated way rather than through parallel and overlapping efforts and/or timeframes that may not be agreed by all stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001306 GAC Advice</td>
<td>6/30/16</td>
<td>III. The Board should ensure that the dialogue on constructive and effective ways to address late comments is continued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001305 GAC Advice</td>
<td>6/30/16</td>
<td>II. The Board resolved to adopt the PPSAI recommendations. If a Board delay in providing formal response to the Helsinki Communique is required, the Board expects that there will be no proprietary requirements or trade restrictions. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 13 December 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001304 GAC Advice</td>
<td>6/30/16</td>
<td>This action calls for the Board to ensure that the implementation process for the new gTLD Program is completed. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 13 December 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001303 GAC Advice</td>
<td>6/30/16</td>
<td>This action requests the Board to ensure that the implementation process for the new gTLD Program is completed. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 13 December 2016.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As of 31 October 2020
GAC Advice Status

AR-001345
AR-001344
AR-001306
AR-001305
AR-001304
AR-001314

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

Communique
ICANN54 Dublin
Communique
ICANN55 Marrakech
Communique
ICANN60 Abu Dhabi
Communique
ICANN62 Nairobi
Communique
ICANN67 Kuala Lumpur
Communique
ICANN68 Shanghai

Date of

Second Level and Country Names at the Protection for IGOs workload management
Work scheduling and Accreditation Issues Privacy and Proxy Services
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3.a.I.
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Advice Text
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001303</td>
<td>AR-001301</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001300</td>
<td>AR-001303</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

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

**Action Request Number**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001303</td>
<td>AR-001301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001300</td>
<td>AR-001303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communiqué (April 2015) through the ICANN Virtual Communiqué (June 2021). (Note: the ICANN Virtual Communiqué did not contain Generic GAC Advice)
As of 31 October 2020

GAC Advice Status

Action Request Number

Communique

Category

Advisory Text

Board Action(s)

Board Resolution Link

Date

AR-001298

6/24/15

AR-001295

6/24/15

AR-001294

6/24/15

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

Notes:

Communique

ICANN53 Buenos Aires

Transparency Review Team 2

gTLD Safeguards

Category 4.

1.b.I.

1.a.I.

Number

review the situation at its meeting in Dublin. ICANN Ombudsman on this matter following his current inquiry and will process for new gTLDs, noting that it does not appear to have met the GAC recommendations as conveyed to the Board in its letter of 8 May 2015, The GAC confirmed the status of its implementation of GAC-related ATRT2 recommendations as conveyed to the Board in its letter of 8 May 2015.

The GAC recommends that the NGPC creates a list of commended public interest commitments (PICs) and monitors their implementation to serve as a model.

The NGPC continues to monitor the progress being made in the community on these matters. With respect to highly regulated sectors, the NGPC notes that on 30 September 2015, the NGPC sent to the GNSO and the ALAC a proposal from a community member to establish a highly regulated sector PIC council. This proposal was discussed and encouraged at the GAC meeting in Abu Dhabi in June 2016. The NGPC notes that on 29 September 2015, the NGPC sent to the GNSO and the ALAC a proposal from a community member to establish a highly regulated sector PIC council. This proposal was discussed and encouraged at the GAC meeting in Abu Dhabi in June 2016. The NGPC notes that on 29 September 2015, the NGPC sent to the GNSO and the ALAC a proposal from a community member to establish a highly regulated sector PIC council. This proposal was discussed and encouraged at the GAC meeting in Abu Dhabi in June 2016. The NGPC notes that on 29 September 2015, the NGPC sent to the GNSO and the ALAC a proposal from a community member to establish a highly regulated sector PIC council. This proposal was discussed and encouraged at the GAC meeting in Abu Dhabi in June 2016. The NGPC notes that on 29 September 2015, the NGPC sent to the GNSO and the ALAC a proposal from a community member to establish a highly regulated sector PIC council. This proposal was discussed and encouraged at the GAC meeting in Abu Dhabi in June 2016. The NGPC notes that on 29 September 2015, the NGPC sent to the GNSO and the ALAC a proposal from a community member to establish a highly regulated sector PIC council. This proposal was discussed and encouraged at the GAC meeting in Abu Dhabi in June 2016. The NGPC notes that on 29 September 2015, the NGPC sent to the GNSO and the ALAC a proposal from a community member to establish a highly regulated sector PIC council. This proposal was discussed and encouraged at the GAC meeting in Abu Dhabi in June 2016. The NGPC notes that on 29 September 2015, the NGPC sent to the GNSO and the ALAC a proposal from a community member to establish a highly regulated sector PIC council. This proposal was discussed and encouraged at the GAC meeting in Abu Dhabi in June 2016. The NGPC notes that on 29 September 2015, the NGPC sent to the GNSO and the ALAC a proposal from a community member to establish a highly regulated sector PIC council. This proposal was discussed and encouraged at the GAC meeting in Abu Dhabi in June 2016. The NGPC notes that on 29 September 2015, the NGPC sent to the GNSO and the ALAC a proposal from a community member to establish a highly regulated sector PIC council. This proposal was discussed and encouraged at the GAC meeting in Abu Dhabi in June 2016. The NGPC notes that on 29 September 2015, the NGPC sent to the GNSO and the ALAC a proposal from a community member to establish a highly regulated sector PIC council. This proposal was discussed and encouraged at the GAC meeting in Abu Dhabi in June 2016. The NGPC notes that on 29 September 2015, the NGPC sent to the GNSO and the ALAC a proposal from a community member to establish a highly regulated sector PIC council. This proposal was discussed and encouraged at the GAC meeting in Abu Dhabi in June 2016. The NGPC notes that on 29 September 2015, the NGPC sent to the GNSO and the ALAC a proposal from a community member to establish a highly regulated sector PIC council. This proposal was discussed and encouraged at the GAC meeting in Abu Dhabi in June 2016. The NGPC notes that on 29 September 2015, the NGPC sent to the GNSO and the ALAC a proposal from a community member to establish a highly regulated sector PIC council. This proposal was discussed and encouraged at the GAC meeting in Abu Dhabi in June 2016. The NGPC notes that on 29 September 2015, the NGPC sent to the GNSO and the ALAC a proposal from a community member to establish a highly regulated sector PIC council. This proposal was discussed and encouraged at the GAC meeting in Abu Dhabi in June 2016. The NGPC notes that on 29 September 2015, the NGPC sent to the GNSO and the ALAC a proposal from a community member to establish a highly regulated sector PIC council. This proposal was discussed and encouraged at the GAC meeting in Abu Dhabi in June 2016. The NGPC notes that on 29 September 2015, the NGPC sent to the GNSO and the ALAC a proposal from a community member to establish a highly regulated sector PIC council. This proposal was discussed and encouraged at the GAC meeting in Abu Dhabi in June 2016. The NGPC notes that on 29 September 2015, the NGPC sent to the GNSO and the ALAC a proposal from a community member to establish a highly regulated sector PIC council. This proposal was discussed and encouraged at the GAC meeting in Abu Dhabi in June 2016. The NGPC notes that on 29 September 2015, the NGPC sent to the GNSO and the ALAC a proposal from a community member to establish a highly regulated sector PIC council. This proposal was discussed and encouraged at the GAC meeting in Abu Dhabi in June 2016. The NGPC notes that on 29 September 2015, the NGPC sent to the GNSO and the ALAC a proposal from a community member to establish a highly regulated sector PIC council. This proposal was discussed and encouraged at the GAC meeting in Abu Dhabi in June 2016. The NGPC notes that on 29 September 2015, the NGPC sent to the GNSO and the ALAC a proposal from a community member to establish a highly regulated sector PIC council. This proposal was discussed and encouraged at the GAC meeting in Abu Dhabi in June 2016. The NGPC notes that on 29 September 2015, the NGPC sent to the GNSO and the ALAC a proposal from a community member to establish a highly regulated sector PIC council. This proposal was discussed and encouraged at the GAC meeting in Abu Dhabi in June 2016. The NGPC notes that on 29 September 2015, the NGPC sent to the GNSO and the ALAC a proposal from a community member to establish a highly regulated sector PIC council. This proposal was discussed and encouraged at the GAC meeting in Abu Dhabi in June 2016. The NGPC notes that on 29 September 2015, the NGPC sent to the GNSO and the ALAC a proposal from a community member to establish a highly regulated sector PIC council. This proposal was discussed and encouraged at the GAC meeting in Abu Dhabi in June 2016. The NGPC notes that on 29 September 2015, the NGPC sent to the GNSO and the ALAC a proposal from a community member to establish a highly regulated sector PIC council. This proposal was discussed and encouraged at the GAC meeting in Abu Dhabi in June 2016. The NGPC notes that on 29 September 2015, the NGPC sent to the GNSO and the ALAC a proposal from a community member to establish a highly regulated sector PIC council. This proposal was discussed and encouraged at the GAC meeting in Abu Dhabi in June 2016. The NGPC notes that on 29 September 2015, the NGPC sent to the GNSO and the ALAC a proposal from a community member to establish a highly regulated sector PIC council. This proposal was discussed and encouraged at the GAC meeting in Abu Dhabi in June 2016. The NGPC notes that on 29 September 2015, the NGPC sent to the GNSO and the ALAC a proposal from a community member to establish a highly regulated sector PIC council. This proposal was discussed and encouraged at the GAC meeting in Abu Dhabi in June 2016. The NGPC notes that on 29 September 2015, the NGPC sent to the GNSO and the ALAC a proposal from a community member to establish a highly regulated sector PIC council. This proposal was discussed and encouraged at the GAC meeting in Abu D...
The GAC reiterates its advice that ICANN should work with the GAC to develop a collaborative framework for 
permanent protection of the Red Cross and Red Crescent terms and names in the DNS and the GAC continues to 
work with interested parties to reach agreement. The GAC recommends that the ICANN Board consider 
the following points: no substantive changes to existing rights protection mechanisms are to be made; the 
ICANN and GAC agreement process should be streamlined for the release of second-level, (2) to periodically 
remind GAC members to update or offer their comments, (3) to consider steps to develop a public database 
to streamline the process for the release of two-letter codes to establish an effective notification mechanism, 
and (4) to report back to the Board if there is any input from relevant governments. The Board action on this 
item is considered complete as of the Board's resolution of 18 May 2017.

The Board considered this advice item on 12 February 2015 and took the following action. Pursuant to 
Paragraph 12.4 of the Bylaws, the Board requested additional time to consider the remaining recommendations, 
and (iii) decided to facilitate discussions among the relevant parties to reconcile any remaining differences 
between the policy recommendations and the GAC advice on this topic. The four recommendations were posted for public 
comment on 11 July 2019 and will close on 20 August 2019. After the public comment period closes, the Board will 
meet to consider whether to adopt the final recommendations and, if not, request additional time to consider the 
remaining recommendations, the ICANN Board requested the GAC to provide temporary protections for names and acronyms for Inter-
Governmental Organisations (IGOs) in accordance with Article 11.11(b) of the NGPC Forward-looking Policy Recommendation. 
The ICANN Board Council approved policy recommendations for temporary protections for names and acronyms for Inter-
Governmental Organisations (IGOs) in accordance with Article 11.11(b) of the NGPC Forward-looking Policy Recommendation. 
The ICANN Board Council approved policy recommendations for temporary protections for names and acronyms for Inter-
Governmental Organisations (IGOs) in accordance with Article 11.11(b) of the NGPC Forward-looking Policy Recommendation. 
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The community is invited to provide input on the GAC Advice on Human Rights and IGO Names and Acronyms in a number of open discussion forums.

The GAC published a comprehensive report of GAC recommendations and updates to ICANN Advice relating to Human Rights and IGO Names and Acronyms on 31 October 2017, and provided this updated report to the Board for consideration at its meeting on 1 November 2017. 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. The GAC publishes a report of human rights considerations in the context of the minutes to its meetings which are available at: https://gnso.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#20171101-en.

The GNSO published a comprehensive report of GNSO recommendations and updates to ICANN Advice relating to Human Rights and IGO Names and Acronyms on 11 October 2017, and provided this report to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 1 November 2017. The GAC published a comprehensive report of GAC recommendations and updates to ICANN Advice relating to Human Rights and IGO Names and Acronyms on 1 November 2017, and provided this updated report to the Board for consideration at its meeting on 3 November 2017. The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary. This item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN61 in Berlin on 3 November 2017. The GAC publishes a report of human rights considerations in the context of the minutes to its meetings which are available at: https://gnso.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#20171101-en.

The GAC held outreach meetings with the ICANN Board on 26 October 2015 and provided this response in its Board Resolution. Resolved (2015.10.26.01), the ICANN Board notes the GAC's advice and requests the GAC to file its advice with the Board for consideration on 26 November 2015. The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary. This item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN59 in Benidorm on 26 October 2015.

The GAC published a comprehensive report of GAC recommendations and updates to ICANN Advice relating to Human Rights and IGO Names and Acronyms on 1 November 2017, and provided this report to the Board for consideration at its meeting on 3 November 2017. The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary. This item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN61 in Berlin on 3 November 2017. The GAC publishes a report of human rights considerations in the context of the minutes to its meetings which are available at: https://gnso.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#20171101-en.

The GAC published a comprehensive report of GAC recommendations and updates to ICANN Advice relating to Human Rights and IGO Names and Acronyms on 1 November 2017, and provided this report to the Board for consideration at its meeting on 3 November 2017. The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary. This item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN61 in Berlin on 3 November 2017. The GAC publishes a report of human rights considerations in the context of the minutes to its meetings which are available at: https://gnso.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#20171101-en.

The GAC held outreach meetings with the ICANN Board on 26 October 2015 and provided this response in its Board Resolution. Resolved (2015.10.26.01), the ICANN Board notes the GAC's advice and requests the GAC to file its advice with the Board for consideration on 26 November 2015. The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary. This item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN59 in Benidorm on 26 October 2015. The GAC publishes a report of human rights considerations in the context of the minutes to its meetings which are available at: https://gnso.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#20171101-en.

The GAC published a comprehensive report of GAC recommendations and updates to ICANN Advice relating to Human Rights and IGO Names and Acronyms on 1 November 2017, and provided this report to the Board for consideration at its meeting on 3 November 2017. The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary. This item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN61 in Berlin on 3 November 2017. The GAC publishes a report of human rights considerations in the context of the minutes to its meetings which are available at: https://gnso.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#20171101-en.

The GAC held outreach meetings with the ICANN Board on 26 October 2015 and provided this response in its Board Resolution. Resolved (2015.10.26.01), the ICANN Board notes the GAC's advice and requests the GAC to file its advice with the Board for consideration on 26 November 2015. The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary. This item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN59 in Benidorm on 26 October 2015. The GAC publishes a report of human rights considerations in the context of the minutes to its meetings which are available at: https://gnso.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#20171101-en.

The GAC published a comprehensive report of GAC recommendations and updates to ICANN Advice relating to Human Rights and IGO Names and Acronyms on 1 November 2017, and provided this report to the Board for consideration at its meeting on 3 November 2017. The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary. This item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN61 in Berlin on 3 November 2017. The GAC publishes a report of human rights considerations in the context of the minutes to its meetings which are available at: https://gnso.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#20171101-en.

The GAC held outreach meetings with the ICANN Board on 26 October 2015 and provided this response in its Board Resolution. Resolved (2015.10.26.01), the ICANN Board notes the GAC's advice and requests the GAC to file its advice with the Board for consideration on 26 November 2015. The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary. This item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN59 in Benidorm on 26 October 2015. The GAC publishes a report of human rights considerations in the context of the minutes to its meetings which are available at: https://gnso.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#20171101-en.
The GAC has published a comprehensive report on ICANN's ongoing and upcoming work to address the ICANN Board's recommendations on improving the ICANN accountability and governance framework. The report includes recommendations to enhance ICANN's accountability and governance, as well as recommendations for improvements to the ICANN accountability and governance framework. The GAC has also published a document outlining its advice to ICANN on the topic of accountability and governance. The document includes recommendations for improvements to the ICANN accountability and governance framework, as well as recommendations for improvements to the ICANN accountability and governance framework. The report is available for download on the ICANN website.
The GAC advises the ICANN Board that:

1. The review processes should be reconsidered to ensure that they are applied consistently across the various applications. a. The GAC has concerns about the consistency of the Community Priority Evaluations (CPEs) for Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs (28 April 2015 letter) and their implementation, including the Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) scorecard. The Board agrees with the GAC’s concern about the consistency of the Community Priority Evaluations and the CPE scorecard. The Board directs the NGPC to provide an update on this item and to take any necessary action to ensure consistency in the CPEs.

2. Security Risks 1. Inform the GAC and provide GAC with responses to some of the GAC advice items raised in its Los Angeles Communiqué and coordinate efforts on this issue, including a community session to be held during the WHOIS conference.

3. Implementation of WHOIS Related-Safeguards: 1. Provide the GAC with a comprehensive update on the implementation of the WHOIS roadmap. The Board recognizes that the WHOIS roadmap is a critical component of the New gTLD Program. The Board appreciates the request and has identified, in consultation with the NGPC and the GAC, the need to ensure that the WHOIS roadmap is implemented effectively and timely. The Board directs the NGPC to provide an update on this item and to take any necessary action to ensure the timely implementation of the WHOIS roadmap.

4. Commit to defining the process to implement options; and 4. Commit to defining the process to implement options.

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to GAC Advice regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response in its 7 October 2015 letter. This GAC advice concerns a subject of an exchange between some members of the NGPC and the NGPC. The NGPC, following the exchange on 13 January 2016, provided its findings of this consultation no later than three weeks before the ICANN 52 meeting, and it has since then engaged in a series of discussions with the GAC. The NGPC noted that at its 12-14 October meeting, it took action to address the GAC advice concerning the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response in its 7 October 2015 letter. The NGPC noted that at its 12-14 October meeting, it took action to address the GAC advice concerning the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response in its 7 October 2015 letter. The NGPC noted that at its 12-14 October meeting, it took action to address the GAC advice concerning the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response in its 7 October 2015 letter. The NGPC noted that at its 12-14 October meeting, it took action to address the GAC advice concerning the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response in its 7 October 2015 letter.
On 8 September 2014, the NGPC adopted another iteration of the board report (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/minutes/2014/en20140814rpt-08sep14-en.pdf) reporting the second round of the community comment period. The board noted that the NGPC had received a total of eight comments from the community. Of these, five comments supported the NGPC’s resolution while three comments did not. The NGPC noted that it had made some editorial changes to the original resolution.

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to GAC Advice (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-07oct15-en.pdf) to address this advice. At that time, the NGPC reported that it was considering the next steps for the gTLD Directory Services Expert Working Group on Implementation of 2013 RAA requirements and the new WHOIS-Related Requirements. The NGPC also discussed the next steps for the GNSO PDP Working Group on Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information – Implementation of Thick WHOIS. The NGPC highlighted the need to work quickly to address the differences between the GAC advice and the GNSO policy.

The NGPC noted that there were a wide range of WHOIS-related issues that needed to be addressed, including Bulk Transfer, Privacy/Proxy Accreditation issues, the IANA WHOIS database, and conflicts with National Privacy Laws. The NGPC also noted that the ICANN Board had published the NGPC report (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-07oct15-en.pdf) to address this advice. At that time, the NGPC reported that it was considering the next steps for the GNSO PDP Working Group on Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information – Implementation of Thick WHOIS. The NGPC also discussed the next steps for the GNSO PDP Working Group on Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information – Implementation of Thick WHOIS. The NGPC highlighted the need to work quickly to address the differences between the GAC advice and the GNSO policy.

The NGPC noted that there were a wide range of WHOIS-related issues that needed to be addressed, including Bulk Transfer, Privacy/Proxy Accreditation issues, the IANA WHOIS database, and conflicts with National Privacy Laws. The NGPC also noted that the ICANN Board had published the NGPC report (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-07oct15-en.pdf) to address this advice. At that time, the NGPC reported that it was considering the next steps for the GNSO PDP Working Group on Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information – Implementation of Thick WHOIS. The NGPC also discussed the next steps for the GNSO PDP Working Group on Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information – Implementation of Thick WHOIS. The NGPC highlighted the need to work quickly to address the differences between the GAC advice and the GNSO policy.
GAC Advice Status
As of 26 October 2020

Notes:
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communiqué (April 2015) through the ICANN50 Virtual Communiqué (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN50 Virtual Communiqué did not contain GAC Advice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Date of Issue</th>
<th>WHOIS Protection of Children</th>
<th>Specific Strings - .africa registration policies</th>
<th>pro(protection, sensitive strings)</th>
<th>Category 1 (consumer enforcement, consumer protection, consumer education, and consumer outreach)</th>
<th>11.</th>
<th>12.</th>
<th>13.</th>
<th>Close Date</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Resolution Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**WHOIS Protection of Children**

4. The GAC advises the Board to follow the public notice framework that is consistent with the ICANN50 London Communiqué.

3.b. The ICANN50 London Communiqué stated that: I. ICANN make further efforts to explain and clarify the linkages that: I. ICANN make further efforts to explain and clarify the linkages between the Board of a given TLD and the government, law enforcement, or other public sector. The GAC reiterates its advice (https://gacweb.icann.org/display/GACADV/2014-09-08-board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-09-08-en#1.b) that, following the release of the IRP scorecard: The NGPC accepts this advice. The NGPC will continue to provide the GAC with a scorecard showing the status of the IRP implementation. This item is considered complete as of the 8 September 2014.

The Board considered the WHOIS Protection of Children. The Board reiterates the WHOIS Protection of Children through the WHOIS scorecard, which is considered completed as of the 8 September 2014.

The GAC advised the Board to call on the NGPC to provide the GAC with a scorecard showing the status of the IRP implementation. This item is considered complete as of the 8 September 2014.

**Category 1 (consumer enforcement, consumer protection, consumer education, and consumer outreach)**

1. The GAC advises that the Board make a public notice that is consistent with the ICANN50 London Communiqué.

11. The GAC advises the Board to follow the public notice framework that is consistent with the ICANN50 London Communiqué.

12. The ICANN50 London Communiqué stated that: I. ICANN make further efforts to explain and clarify the linkages between the Board of a given TLD and the government, law enforcement, or other public sector. The GAC reiterates its advice (https://gacweb.icann.org/display/GACADV/2014-09-08-board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-09-08-en#1.b) that, following the release of the IRP scorecard: The NGPC accepts this advice. The NGPC will continue to provide the GAC with a scorecard showing the status of the IRP implementation. This item is considered complete as of the 8 September 2014.

The Board considered the WHOIS Protection of Children. The Board reiterates the WHOIS Protection of Children through the WHOIS scorecard, which is considered completed as of the 8 September 2014.

The GAC advised the Board to call on the NGPC to provide the GAC with a scorecard showing the status of the IRP implementation. This item is considered complete as of the 8 September 2014.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>About This Action</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019-07-28</td>
<td>GAC Notice</td>
<td>31 October 2020</td>
<td>Advisable and Transparent</td>
<td>Action Request Number: AR-001332</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-06-14</td>
<td>GAC Notice</td>
<td>31 October 2020</td>
<td>Achievable and Transparency</td>
<td>Action Request Number: AR-001332</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-06-12</td>
<td>GAC Notice</td>
<td>31 October 2020</td>
<td>Proportionate</td>
<td>Action Request Number: AR-001332</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-06-11</td>
<td>GAC Notice</td>
<td>31 October 2020</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>Action Request Number: AR-001332</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-06-06</td>
<td>GAC Notice</td>
<td>31 October 2020</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
<td>Action Request Number: AR-001332</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique [April 2015] through the ICANN Virtual Communique [June 2020]. (Note: the ICANN Virtual Communique did not contain Generic GAC Advice).
### GAC Advice Status

**As of 31 October 2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Detailed Description</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Notes:**

The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2014) through the ICANN94 Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN94 Virtual Communique did not contain GAC Advice)
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN68 Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN68 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus GAC Advice)

Specific Strings - .amazon
Specific Strings - .spa
Registration policies) Strings protection, sensitive strings Category 1 (consumer Safeguard Advice Applicable

GAC Advice Status
AR-001263
The GAC Board Chair provided the Chair with a consensus Board resolution in response to the Global Village (GV) advice, the NGPC noted that the decision was without prejudice to the continuing efforts related IDNs in Japanese (application number 1-1318-83995) and Chinese (application number 1-1318-5581) filed by Amazon EU S.à r.l. should not proceed. By adopting the GAC advice on the application of the domain name .amazon, as stated in the GAC communiqué, approved in Durban, evaluating the GAC Objection Advice on the application of the domain to work with the applicants in an open and transparent manner in an demonstrable community support. The GAC advises ICANN to continue to regarding preferential treatment for all applications which have demonstrated community support. The NGPC directed ICANN to continue to protect the public interest and improve outcomes for communities, and to work with the applicants as an open and transparent manner in an effort to assist those communities. The NGPC further notes that once protected, the applicants’ interests relating to community applications and need to be dealt with in a manner consistent with this guidance.

20140614 GAC Advice Item
GAC Advice Item
AR-001260
AS Board Resolution Link
Board Resolution Link
Board Resolution Link

20140614 GAC Advice Item
GAC Advice Item
AR-001258
AS Board Resolution Link
Board Resolution Link
Board Resolution Link

20140614 GAC Advice Item
GAC Advice Item
AR-001256
AS Board Resolution Link
Board Resolution Link
Board Resolution Link

20140614 GAC Advice Item
GAC Advice Item
AR-001254
AS Board Resolution Link
Board Resolution Link
Board Resolution Link

20140614 GAC Advice Item
GAC Advice Item
AR-001252
AS Board Resolution Link
Board Resolution Link
Board Resolution Link

20140614 GAC Advice Item
GAC Advice Item
AR-001250
AS Board Resolution Link
Board Resolution Link
Board Resolution Link

20140614 GAC Advice Item
GAC Advice Item
AR-001248
AS Board Resolution Link
Board Resolution Link
Board Resolution Link

20140614 GAC Advice Item
GAC Advice Item
AR-001246
AS Board Resolution Link
Board Resolution Link
Board Resolution Link

20140614 GAC Advice Item
GAC Advice Item
AR-001244
AS Board Resolution Link
Board Resolution Link
Board Resolution Link

Notes:
GAC Advice Status
AR-001263
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN68 Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN68 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus GAC Advice)

20140327 GAC Advice Item
GAC Advice Item
AR-001258
AS Board Resolution Link
Board Resolution Link
Board Resolution Link

20140327 GAC Advice Item
GAC Advice Item
AR-001256
AS Board Resolution Link
Board Resolution Link
Board Resolution Link

20140327 GAC Advice Item
GAC Advice Item
AR-001254
AS Board Resolution Link
Board Resolution Link
Board Resolution Link

20140327 GAC Advice Item
GAC Advice Item
AR-001252
AS Board Resolution Link
Board Resolution Link
Board Resolution Link

20140327 GAC Advice Item
GAC Advice Item
AR-001248
AS Board Resolution Link
Board Resolution Link
Board Resolution Link

20140327 GAC Advice Item
GAC Advice Item
AR-001246
AS Board Resolution Link
Board Resolution Link
Board Resolution Link

20140327 GAC Advice Item
GAC Advice Item
AR-001244
AS Board Resolution Link
Board Resolution Link
Board Resolution Link

Notes:
GAC Advice Status
AR-001263
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN68 Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN68 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus GAC Advice)
As of 31 October 2020

GAC Advice Status

| Action Request Number | Communique | Date of Issue | Category | About This Number | Action Taken | Current Phase | Action Requested | Resolution Link | Board Resolution Link | Notes
|-----------------------|------------|--------------|----------|-------------------|--------------|---------------|-----------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------
| AR-001328             | GAC49 Singapore Communique | 3/27/14 | ICANN49 | gac001328          |            |               |                 |                     |                     |                     |
|                       |            |              |          |                   |              |               |                 |                     |                     |                     |
|                       |            |              |          |                   |              |               |                 |                     |                     |                     |
|                       |            |              |          |                   |              |               |                 |                     |                     |                     |

The GAC Chair will also respond to the ICANN Chair's advice in its Beijing Communique, when it concluded its discussions on relation to the strings .islam and .halal. The GAC has previously provided GAC took note of letters sent by the OIC and the ICANN Chairman in according in the Registry Agreement.

The GAC welcomes the explanation provided to the GAC by ICANN in

The GAC notes the work being accomplished by the Expert Working Group

vulnerable to deceptive practices that exploit this confusion.

The GAC notes the NGPC Resolution 2014.03.22.NG01 concerning .wine

The ICANN Board Chair provided the GAC Chair with a scorecard of the Board’s responses to

representatives from countries at the high level meeting. This item is considered complete

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

Program. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 8 September

On 14 May 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided the NGPC resolution in December 2013 communicating its official objection to the use of the applied-

resulting GAC Communiqué. The Buenos Aires Communiqué took note of the letters sent by

the Telecommunications Regulatory Authority of the UAE. n a 4 October 2013 decisions were posted in favor of the applicant on the community

preliminary determination that it is prepared to grant three (3) data retention waiver request and supporting documentation was posted for public comment, which

RegistryGate GmbH (the “Registrars”) under the 2013 RAA. As required by the process, the

On 25 June 2013, the NGPC

advised the Board to reconsider its decision to allow singular and

Concerning the .wine and .vin TLDs. The NGPC adopted a resolution

The NGPC noted the recommendation in the Nominating Committee report on.

was the proper venue in which to resolve these issues, or whether there are venues or forums

recommended that the full Board consider the larger implications of legally complex and

relevant impacted parties to negotiate, which they are encouraged to do. The NGPC also

On 14 May 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided the NGPC resolution in

The NGPC resolved to reconsider the matter before delegating

The NGPC also

action, the NGPC: (1) accepted the GAC advice identified in the Singapore Communiqué as

in the Singapore Communiqué concerning the applications for .WINE and .VIN. In its

On 9 June 2014, the NGPC adopted a resolution

the Applicant Guidebook to address potential consumer confusion resulting from allowing

thereof in the .wine and .vin TLDs. The NGPC resolves to revisit the matter before delegating

In addition, the NGPC recommended that the full Board consider the larger implications of legally complex and

On 14 May 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided the NGPC resolution in

plural versions of the same strings. The NGPC adopted a resolution

the ICANN Chair's advice in its Beijing Communique, when it concluded its discussions on

On 14 May 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided the NGPC resolution in

Concerning .wine and .vin TLD applications. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s

better suited to address concerns such as those raised by GAC members in relation to the

is the proper venue in which to resolve these issues, or whether there are venues or forums

On 9 June 2014, the NGPC adopted a resolution

On 25 June 2013, the NGPC

The NGPC also

On 14 May 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided the NGPC resolution in

Concerning the .wine and .vin TLDs. The NGPC adopted a resolution

The NGPC also

On 9 June 2014, the NGPC adopted a resolution

On 25 June 2013, the NGPC

On 14 May 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided the NGPC resolution in

Concerning .wine and .vin TLD applications. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s

better suited to address concerns such as those raised by GAC members in relation to the

is the proper venue in which to resolve these issues, or whether there are venues or forums

On 9 June 2014, the NGPC adopted a resolution

On 25 June 2013, the NGPC

On 14 May 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided the NGPC resolution in

Concerning the .wine and .vin TLDs. The NGPC adopted a resolution

The NGPC also

The NGPC also

On 9 June 2014, the NGPC adopted a resolution

On 25 June 2013, the NGPC

On 14 May 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided the NGPC resolution in

Concerning .wine and .vin TLD applications. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s

better suited to address concerns such as those raised by GAC members in relation to the

is the proper venue in which to resolve these issues, or whether there are venues or forums

On 9 June 2014, the NGPC adopted a resolution

On 25 June 2013, the NGPC

On 14 May 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided the NGPC resolution in

Concerning the .wine and .vin TLDs. The NGPC adopted a resolution

The NGPC also

On 9 June 2014, the NGPC adopted a resolution

On 25 June 2013, the NGPC

On 14 May 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided the NGPC resolution in

Concerning .wine and .vin TLD applications. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s

better suited to address concerns such as those raised by GAC members in relation to the
As of 31 October 2020

Notes:
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communiqué (April 2013) through the ICANN Virtual Communiqué (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN Virtual Communiqué did not contain any GAC Advice.)
|-----------------------|------------|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|---------|

**Notes:**
- The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communiqué (April 2011) through the ICANN47 Virtual Communiqué (June 2020). (Note: The ICANN47 Virtual Communiqué did not contain GAC Advice)
As of 31 October 2020

GAC Advice Status

AR-001240
AR-001239
AR-001236
AR-001235

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

Notes:

ICANN47 Durban Communique 7/18/13

Date of Advice

- with Law Agreements and Conflicts
- Geographic Names and
Community Applications

Advice Item

1.9.a.
1.6
1.1.b.i.i.

Advice Text

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard: The NGPC accepts this advice. On 5 August, ICANN opened a public comment period with respect to the social, cultural, geographic and religious significance in accordance with the ICANN’s formal community procedures for the delegation of new gTLDs. On 29 August 2013 regarding its conclusion on applications for .vin and .wine. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10 September 2013.

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard: The NGPC accepts this recommendation. The NGPC stands ready to hear from the GAC regarding possible refinements, for future rounds, of the Applicant Guidebook with respect to the designation of new gTLDs. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10 September 2013.

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard: ICANN will continue to process the application in accordance with the ICANN’s formal community procedures for the delegation of new gTLDs. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10 September 2013.

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard: The NGPC accepted this advice and stated as follows: Criterion 4 for the Community Priority Evaluation process takes into account “community support and/or objection” (AGB § 3.1). At this time, ICANN will not proceed beyond initial evaluation of these identified strings. ICANN will allow .vin and .wine to continue through the stages of the application process (AGB § 3.1). At this time, ICANN will not proceed beyond initial evaluation of these identified strings. ICANN will allow .vin and .wine to continue through the stages of the application process (AGB § 3.1).

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard: ICANN will continue with the NGPC on this issue. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10 September 2013.

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard: The NGPC accepts this advice. On 5 August, ICANN opened a public comment period with respect to the designation of new gTLDs. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10 September 2013.

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard: The NGPC accepts this advice. On 5 August, ICANN opened a public comment period with respect to the designation of new gTLDs. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10 September 2013.

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard: The NGPC accepts this advice. On 5 August, ICANN opened a public comment period with respect to the designation of new gTLDs. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10 September 2013.

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard: The NGPC accepts this advice. On 5 August, ICANN opened a public comment period with respect to the designation of new gTLDs. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10 September 2013.

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard: The NGPC accepts this advice. On 5 August, ICANN opened a public comment period with respect to the designation of new gTLDs. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10 September 2013.

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard: The NGPC accepts this advice. On 5 August, ICANN opened a public comment period with respect to the designation of new gTLDs. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10 September 2013.

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard: The NGPC accepts this advice. On 5 August, ICANN opened a public comment period with respect to the designation of new gTLDs. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10 September 2013.

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard: The NGPC accepts this advice. On 5 August, ICANN opened a public comment period with respect to the designation of new gTLDs. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10 September 2013.

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard: The NGPC accepts this advice. On 5 August, ICANN opened a public comment period with respect to the designation of new gTLDs. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10 September 2013.

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard: The NGPC accepts this advice. On 5 August, ICANN opened a public comment period with respect to the designation of new gTLDs. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10 September 2013.

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard: The NGPC accepts this advice. On 5 August, ICANN opened a public comment period with respect to the designation of new gTLDs. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10 September 2013.
In February 2014, the GAC considered the advice and adopted the following positions. The Board will consider this advice at its 6 June 2014 meeting.

The GAC notes that .africa is a legacy gTLD. The GAC has reached consensus on GAC Objection Advice according to Module 3.1 of the Application Number Scorecard. The GAC recommended that the .africa application should not proceed.

Note: The text above is an excerpt from the ICANN46 Beijing Communique.
As of 31 October 2020

GAC Advice Status

AR-001229

Action Request Number

Notes:

Communique

WHOIS

of the same string as a TLD

Applications

Community Support for

Strings for Further GAC

Safeguard Advice for New

1.5.1) or seek relief according to ICANN’s accountability mechanisms (see ICANN Bylaws, approved. In accordance with the AGB the applicant may withdraw (pursuant to AGB §

3.1 of the Applicant Guidebook, Application number 1-1936-2101 for .gcc will not be

create a strong presumption for the ICANN Board that the application should not be

approved. For non-registrars, the ICANN Board has discretion to cease the processing of any application, i.e., an application will not be expedited but will progress through the normal processing channels under §3.1 of the AGB. WHOIS will not provide any initial exclusion of these disputed strings. In other words, WHOIS will allow expiration and disqualification processes according to the ICANN Board’s Resolution, but will not enter into registry agreements with applicants for the identified strings. In response, the public comment reply period for the 2013 RAA closes on 4 June 2013. The ICANN Board directs the President and ICANN’s General Counsel to provide the public notice for the 2013 RAA. The process takes into account “community support and/or opposition to the application” in the scoring of applications. The AGB provides that “GAC advice will not toll

impose exclusive registry access the NGPC passed the following resolution on 21 June 2015. To address the GAC's Category 2.2 Safeguard Advice, the NGPC decided that the application for .ZULU was withdrawn. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration and resolution of 21 June 2015.

2.4.2) and 2.4.3) (See Module 3.1: Register Agreement Approval (RAA). This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 4 June 2013.

2.4.1) and 2.4.3) (See Module 3.1: Register Agreement Approval (RAA).

2.4.2). This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 4 June 2013.

5.3) in order to address concerns raised by a TLD. Likewise, with respect to any problematic string, on 5 February 2014, the NGPC adopted the implementation framework described in Annex 1 of the Beijing Communique as follows: Category 1: Consumer protection, sensitive strings, and regulated markets (3 February 2016). The NGPC provided this guidance and presented this concept to the GAC. The NGPC accepts the advice. The NGPC adopts the implementation framework attached as Module 3 (http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-25jun13-en.htm#2.d). In addition, the NGPC President and GAC, to issue a joint statement, to identify a mutually acceptable solution. The NGPC has determined that no changes are needed to address potential consumer confusion specifically resulting from allowing TLDs with the same name of the same organization or company. This item is considered complete as of the Chair's letter of 6 June 2013.

The GAC advises the Board: that in those cases where a community, which has

The GAC advises the ICANN Board to: not proceed beyond Initial Evaluation with the following strings: .shenzhen (IDN in Chinese), .academia and .org. The GAC believes that singular and plural versions of the string as a TLD is clearly impacted by a set of new gTLD applications in contention, has

The GAC believes that the best way to handle the above situation is to control the string as a TLD in the WHOIS database and to create a strong presumption in favor of this control. The GAC advises the ICANN Board to: &middot; specify the domain name in the applications for further safeguard advice; &middot; provide advice about the application of similar strings to the next NGPC meeting. The NGPC has determined that no changes are needed to address potential consumer confusion specifically resulting from allowing TLDs with the same name of the same organization or company. This item is considered complete as of the Chair's letter of 6 June 2013.

The GAC urges the ICANN Board to ensure that the GAC Principles have been shared with the Expert Working Group. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 4 June 2013. The NGPC intends to consider the 2013 RAA shortly thereafter. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration of 4 June 2013.

The NGPC has determined that the application for .amazone was properly reviewed. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration and resolution of 21 June 2015.

The GAC advises the ICANN Board to: &middot; not proceed beyond Initial Evaluation with the following strings: .shenzhen (IDN in Chinese), .academia and .org. The GAC believes that singular and plural versions of the string as a TLD is clearly impacted by a set of new gTLD applications in contention, has

The NGPC has determined that the application for .amazone was properly reviewed. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration and resolution of 21 June 2015.

The NGPC has determined that the application for .amazone was properly reviewed. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration and resolution of 21 June 2015.

The NGPC has determined that the application for .amazone was properly reviewed. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration and resolution of 21 June 2015.

The NGPC has determined that the application for .amazone was properly reviewed. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's consideration and resolution of 21 June 2015.
Operators will maintain these reports for the agreed contracted period and provide them on 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.

On 25 June 2013 the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of “Safeguards Applicable to all New gTLDs and passed a resolution adopting the “NGPC Proposal for Implementation of GAC Safeguards Applicable to All New gTLDs” dated 19 June 2013. In its response the NGPC requests ICANN to include in the proposed New gTLD Registry Agreement a mandatory Public Interest Commitment in Specification 11) requiring all Registry Operators to include a provision in their Registry Registrar Agreement to include a provision requiring Registrars to include a provision requiring Registrars to maintain such statistical reports and, where appropriate, to develop the framework for Registry Operators to respond to identified security risks that pose an actual risk of harm, notification procedures, and appropriate consequences, including a process for suspending domain names until the matter is resolved.

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of NGPC responses and updates to GAC Advice as of 17 October 2013 and provided this response to it. An HTML version of this scorecard is available at the GAC’s internet site: http://www.icann.org/en/groups/bd/documents/resolutions-new-gtld-25jun13-en.htm#2.b

Recommendation 2.1.2.1. Registry operators will maintain statistical reports that identify the number of inaccurate WHOIS records or security threats identified and provide them on request. The contents of the reports will be publicly available as appropriate. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s response of 29 March 2013.

On 25 March 2013 the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of “Implementation of GAC Safeguards Applicable to All New gTLDs” dated 19 June 2013 and proposed the NGPC requests in its advice in section 2.1.2 as follows. ICANN should speed up the development of an implementation strategy to develop the framework for Registry Operators to respond to identified security risks that pose an actual risk of harm and appropriate consequences, including a process for suspending domain names until the matter is resolved. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s response of 29 March 2013.

On 25 March 2013 the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of “Implementation of GAC Safeguards Applicable to All New gTLDs” dated 19 June 2013 and proposed the NGPC requests in its advice in section 2.1.2 as follows. ICANN should speed up the development of an implementation strategy to develop the framework for Registry Operators to respond to identified security risks that pose an actual risk of harm and appropriate consequences, including a process for suspending domain names until the matter is resolved. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s response of 29 March 2013.

On 25 March 2013 the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of “Implementation of GAC Safeguards Applicable to All New gTLDs” dated 19 June 2013 and proposed the NGPC requests in its advice in section 2.1.2 as follows. ICANN should speed up the development of an implementation strategy to develop the framework for Registry Operators to respond to identified security risks that pose an actual risk of harm and appropriate consequences, including a process for suspending domain names until the matter is resolved. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s response of 29 March 2013.

On 25 March 2013 the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of “Implementation of GAC Safeguards Applicable to All New gTLDs” dated 19 June 2013 and proposed the NGPC requests in its advice in section 2.1.2 as follows. ICANN should speed up the development of an implementation strategy to develop the framework for Registry Operators to respond to identified security risks that pose an actual risk of harm and appropriate consequences, including a process for suspending domain names until the matter is resolved. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s response of 29 March 2013.

On 25 March 2013 the NGPC considered this advice and the general topic of “Implementation of GAC Safeguards Applicable to All New gTLDs” dated 19 June 2013 and proposed the NGPC requests in its advice in section 2.1.2 as follows. ICANN should speed up the development of an implementation strategy to develop the framework for Registry Operators to respond to identified security risks that pose an actual risk of harm and appropriate consequences, including a process for suspending domain names until the matter is resolved. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s response of 29 March 2013.
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN68 Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN68 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus GAC Advice)

Notes: