As of 31 October 2020

**GAC Advice Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
<th>Date Close</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>202001402</td>
<td>Beijing Virtual Annual General Meeting Communique</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/gac/advice/2020/01402">www.icann.org/en/gac/advice/2020/01402</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>23 October 2020 and is currently reviewing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202001403</td>
<td>Beijing Virtual Annual General Meeting Communique</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/gac/advice/2020/01403">www.icann.org/en/gac/advice/2020/01403</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>23 October 2020 and is currently reviewing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communiqué (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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
<th>Date Close</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>202001402</td>
<td>Beijing Virtual Annual General Meeting Communique</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/gac/advice/2020/01402">www.icann.org/en/gac/advice/2020/01402</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>23 October 2020 and is currently reviewing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202001403</td>
<td>Beijing Virtual Annual General Meeting Communique</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/gac/advice/2020/01403">www.icann.org/en/gac/advice/2020/01403</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>23 October 2020 and is currently reviewing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

As of 31 October 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
<th>Date Close</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>202001402</td>
<td>Beijing Virtual Annual General Meeting Communique</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/gac/advice/2020/01402">www.icann.org/en/gac/advice/2020/01402</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>23 October 2020 and is currently reviewing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202001403</td>
<td>Beijing Virtual Annual General Meeting Communique</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/gac/advice/2020/01403">www.icann.org/en/gac/advice/2020/01403</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>23 October 2020 and is currently reviewing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

As of 31 October 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
<th>Date Close</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>202001402</td>
<td>Beijing Virtual Annual General Meeting Communique</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/gac/advice/2020/01402">www.icann.org/en/gac/advice/2020/01402</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>23 October 2020 and is currently reviewing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202001403</td>
<td>Beijing Virtual Annual General Meeting Communique</td>
<td><a href="http://www.icann.org/en/gac/advice/2020/01403">www.icann.org/en/gac/advice/2020/01403</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>23 October 2020 and is currently reviewing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GAC Advice Status
As of 31 October 2020

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>GAC Advice Item</th>
<th>Date of Advice Issuance</th>
<th>Board Action Date</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
<th>Board Action(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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
- ICANN67 Virtual Community Forum Communique
- ICANN67 Virtual Policy Communique
- ICANN68 Virtual Policy Communique

Subsequent Rounds of New gTLD Alan Review Data Advice: EPDP on gTLD Issue of Importance: EPDP on Category Number Advice Item

The GAC expects that clear and enforceable safeguards in the contractually binding Public Interest Commitments (PICs) are duly put in place to protect the public interest, including the interests of the ?.org domain.

Further, the GAC notes that the GAC and other Advisory Committee Chairs have received similar advice in the past, and that the Board continues to consider this advice in its decision-making.

The GAC reiterates that this advice still stands and should be considered.

Moreover, the GAC emphasizes that all recommendations being drafted, in consideration of past, current and future discussions on key topics of high interest to the GAC: Closed Generics - in the context of the GAC's role in maintaining the integrity of the global public interest, including the interests of the ?.org domain.

Finally, the GAC encourages the ICANN Board to keep engaging with the WHOIS community, including the ICANN67 GAC Communique. (Note: the ICANN67 GAC Communique did not contain Consensus GAC Advice)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communiqué</th>
<th>Board of Directors</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Board of Directors</th>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Close</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Notes:
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2015) through the ICANN69 Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN69 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus GAC Advice).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communiqué</th>
<th>Date of Item Consideration</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>About Item Number</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Notes:**

The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing 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

AR-002295
AR-002408
AR-002407
AR-002406
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:

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted a scorecard titled “GAC Advice – Kobe Communique: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)” in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communique. On 8 September 2019 the ICANN Board considered the Marrakech Scorecard and provided the following response: In its 15 May 2019 resolution, the Board directed the ICANN org to follow up on the recommendations in the Kobe Communique, including expert legal resources. While it is ultimately up to the EPDP to expeditiously address its recommendations, the Board appreciates the need to ensure that necessary resources are available for the EPDP Phase 2, including expert legal resources. The Board has initiated communications with the CCT Review Team implementation Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team and accepts the advice.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted a scorecard titled “GAC Advice – Kobe Communique: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)” in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communique. On 8 September 2019 the ICANN Board considered the Marrakech Scorecard and provided the following response: In its 15 May 2019 resolution, the Board directed the ICANN org to follow up on the recommendations in the Kobe Communique, including expert legal resources. While it is ultimately up to the EPDP to expeditiously address its recommendations, the Board appreciates the need to ensure that necessary resources are available for the EPDP Phase 2, including expert legal resources. The Board has initiated communications with the CCT Review Team implementation Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team and accepts the advice.

The Board determined that it has done its due diligence based on its review of the .AMAZON applications at every stage of their processing through the New gTLD Program. However, the Board was also cognizant of the time that lapsed since the SOCA applications were submitted to the Independent Review Process (IRP) against ICANN in July 2017. Since that time the ICANN Board logged numerous emails with the World-Wide Web Foundation (ICANN65.P119), and the formation corporation in pursuit of formally acceptable variations, as evidenced by the numerous meetings, proposals, and letters received on the topic of the .AMAZON application scorecard clarified the timeline. For those reasons, the Board asked that this item be brought before the Board for further consideration at its meeting of 14 September 2019, if the ICANN Board determines that it has done its due diligence based on its review of the .AMAZON applications.

The Board has initiated communications with the CCT Review Team implementation Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team and accepts the advice.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted a scorecard titled “GAC Advice – Kobe Communique: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)” in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communique. On 8 September 2019 the ICANN Board considered the Marrakech Scorecard and provided the following response: In its 15 May 2019 resolution, the Board directed the ICANN org to follow up on the recommendations in the Kobe Communique, including expert legal resources. While it is ultimately up to the EPDP to expeditiously address its recommendations, the Board appreciates the need to ensure that necessary resources are available for the EPDP Phase 2, including expert legal resources. The Board has initiated communications with the CCT Review Team implementation Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team and accepts the advice.

The Board has initiated communications with the CCT Review Team implementation Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team and accepts the advice.

On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted a scorecard titled “GAC Advice – Kobe Communique: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)” in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communique. On 8 September 2019 the ICANN Board considered the Marrakech Scorecard and provided the following response: In its 15 May 2019 resolution, the Board directed the ICANN org to follow up on the recommendations in the Kobe Communique, including expert legal resources. While it is ultimately up to the EPDP to expeditiously address its recommendations, the Board appreciates the need to ensure that necessary resources are available for the EPDP Phase 2, including expert legal resources. The Board has initiated communications with the CCT Review Team implementation Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team and accepts the advice.

The Board has initiated communications with the CCT Review Team implementation Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team and accepts the advice.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>Start of Communique</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Advice Text</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Board Action(s)</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
<th>Close Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05-15-000.1.a.2</td>
<td>ICANN64 Kobe Communique</td>
<td>15 May 2019</td>
<td>Implement</td>
<td>WHOIS and Data Protection Regulation</td>
<td>On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled “GAC Advice – Kobe Communique: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)” in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communique. The Board accepts this advice and will do whatever is necessary, but reiterates that it will take actions only within its authority and remit, and in light of other relevant considerations, to facilitate swift implementation of new registration data directory services policies and, if necessary, to replace the work of the EPDP. The Board notes that ICANN org is also providing support to the EPDP Phase 2 to support its work. The EPDP Team has reported on its project milestones regularly, including regular updates to the EPDP Phase 2 Ruby overviewing the policy development as well as community updates via pre-ICANN webinars and cross-community sessions at ICANN meetings. For more information on EPDP Team workshops, please refer to <a href="https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=105388008">https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=105388008</a>. Based on the advice, the Board facilitates implementation and will be closed.</td>
<td>1.a.V.</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>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-icann64-kobe-communique-scorecard-15may19-es.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-icann64-kobe-communique-scorecard-15may19-es.pdf</a></td>
<td>6/8/20</td>
<td>6/8/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-15-000.1.a.3</td>
<td>ICANN64 Kobe Communique</td>
<td>15 May 2019</td>
<td>Implement</td>
<td>WHOIS and Data Protection Regulation</td>
<td>On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled “GAC Advice – Kobe Communique: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)” in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communique. The Board accepts this advice and will do whatever is necessary, but reiterates that it will take actions only within its authority and remit, and in light of other relevant considerations, to facilitate swift implementation of new registration data directory services policies and, if necessary, to replace the work of the EPDP. The Board notes that ICANN org is also providing support to the EPDP Phase 2 to support its work. The EPDP Team has reported on its project milestones regularly, including regular updates to the EPDP Phase 2 Ruby overviewing the policy development as well as community updates via pre-ICANN webinars and cross-community sessions at ICANN meetings. For more information on EPDP Team workshops, please refer to <a href="https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=105388008">https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=105388008</a>. Based on the advice, the Board facilitates implementation and will be closed.</td>
<td>1.a.I.</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>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-icann64-kobe-communique-scorecard-15may19-es.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-icann64-kobe-communique-scorecard-15may19-es.pdf</a></td>
<td>6/8/20</td>
<td>6/8/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-15-000.1.a.4</td>
<td>ICANN64 Kobe Communique</td>
<td>15 May 2019</td>
<td>Implement</td>
<td>WHOIS and Data Protection Regulation</td>
<td>On 15 May 2019 the Board adopted the scorecard titled “GAC Advice – Kobe Communique: Actions and Updates (15 May 2019)” in response to items of GAC advice in the Kobe Communique. The Board accepts this advice and will do whatever is necessary, but reiterates that it will take actions only within its authority and remit, and in light of other relevant considerations, to facilitate swift implementation of new registration data directory services policies and, if necessary, to replace the work of the EPDP. The Board notes that ICANN org is also providing support to the EPDP Phase 2 to support its work. The EPDP Team has reported on its project milestones regularly, including regular updates to the EPDP Phase 2 Ruby overviewing the policy development as well as community updates via pre-ICANN webinars and cross-community sessions at ICANN meetings. For more information on EPDP Team workshops, please refer to <a href="https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=105388008">https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=105388008</a>. Based on the advice, the Board facilitates implementation and will be closed.</td>
<td>1.a.I.</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>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-icann64-kobe-communique-scorecard-15may19-es.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gac-icann64-kobe-communique-scorecard-15may19-es.pdf</a></td>
<td>6/8/20</td>
<td>6/8/20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As of 31 October 2020

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>Date of Communique</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>About This Number</th>
<th>Advice Item</th>
<th>Close Out Phase</th>
<th>Board Resolution</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Request Number</td>
<td>Communique</td>
<td>Date of Execution</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>About This Action</td>
<td>Advice Text</td>
<td>Current Phase</td>
<td>Board Resolution Link</td>
<td>Board Scorecard Link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016001166</td>
<td>Copenhagen 61-62-63</td>
<td>6/8/20</td>
<td>01-27-en#2.c</td>
<td>9/10/19</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 2011) through the ICANN Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN Virtual Communique did not contain Generic GAC Advice)
On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the Barcelona Communique and provided this recommendation to the Board for its consideration and action. The Board notes that to ensure internal consistency and transparency, the Board has considered the recommendations of the Board Resolution 01-27-2019, which states: The Board acknowledges and appreciates this follow-up on the Board's consideration of 27 January 2019.

On 20 November 2018 the Board considered the Brussels Communique and provided this recommendation to the Board for its consideration and action. The Board notes that to ensure internal consistency and transparency, the Board has considered the recommendations of the Board Resolution 09-16-2018, which states: The Board acknowledges and appreciates this follow-up on the Board’s consideration of 27 January 2019.

On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the Barcelona Communique and provided this recommendation to the Board for its consideration and action. The Board notes that to ensure internal consistency and transparency, the Board has considered the recommendations of the Board Resolution 01-27-2019, which states: The Board acknowledges and appreciates this follow-up on the Board’s consideration of 27 January 2019.

On 20 November 2018 the Board considered the Brussels Communique and provided this recommendation to the Board for its consideration and action. The Board notes that to ensure internal consistency and transparency, the Board has considered the recommendations of the Board Resolution 09-16-2018, which states: The Board acknowledges and appreciates this follow-up on the Board’s consideration of 27 January 2019.

On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the Barcelona Communique and provided this recommendation to the Board for its consideration and action. The Board notes that to ensure internal consistency and transparency, the Board has considered the recommendations of the Board Resolution 01-27-2019, which states: The Board acknowledges and appreciates this follow-up on the Board’s consideration of 27 January 2019.

On 20 November 2018 the Board considered the Brussels Communique and provided this recommendation to the Board for its consideration and action. The Board notes that to ensure internal consistency and transparency, the Board has considered the recommendations of the Board Resolution 09-16-2018, which states: The Board acknowledges and appreciates this follow-up on the Board’s consideration of 27 January 2019.

On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the Barcelona Communique and provided this recommendation to the Board for its consideration and action. The Board notes that to ensure internal consistency and transparency, the Board has considered the recommendations of the Board Resolution 01-27-2019, which states: The Board acknowledges and appreciates this follow-up on the Board’s consideration of 27 January 2019.

On 20 November 2018 the Board considered the Brussels Communique and provided this recommendation to the Board for its consideration and action. The Board notes that to ensure internal consistency and transparency, the Board has considered the recommendations of the Board Resolution 09-16-2018, which states: The Board acknowledges and appreciates this follow-up on the Board’s consideration of 27 January 2019.

On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the Barcelona Communique and provided this recommendation to the Board for its consideration and action. The Board notes that to ensure internal consistency and transparency, the Board has considered the recommendations of the Board Resolution 01-27-2019, which states: The Board acknowledges and appreciates this follow-up on the Board’s consideration of 27 January 2019.

On 20 November 2018 the Board considered the Brussels Communique and provided this recommendation to the Board for its consideration and action. The Board notes that to ensure internal consistency and transparency, the Board has considered the recommendations of the Board Resolution 09-16-2018, which states: The Board acknowledges and appreciates this follow-up on the Board’s consideration of 27 January 2019.

On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the Barcelona Communique and provided this recommendation to the Board for its consideration and action. The Board notes that to ensure internal consistency and transparency, the Board has considered the recommendations of the Board Resolution 01-27-2019, which states: The Board acknowledges and appreciates this follow-up on the Board’s consideration of 27 January 2019.

On 20 November 2018 the Board considered the Brussels Communique and provided this recommendation to the Board for its consideration and action. The Board notes that to ensure internal consistency and transparency, the Board has considered the recommendations of the Board Resolution 09-16-2018, which states: The Board acknowledges and appreciates this follow-up on the Board’s consideration of 27 January 2019.

On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the Barcelona Communique and provided this recommendation to the Board for its consideration and action. The Board notes that to ensure internal consistency and transparency, the Board has considered the recommendations of the Board Resolution 01-27-2019, which states: The Board acknowledges and appreciates this follow-up on the Board’s consideration of 27 January 2019.

On 20 November 2018 the Board considered the Brussels Communique and provided this recommendation to the Board for its consideration and action. The Board notes that to ensure internal consistency and transparency, the Board has considered the recommendations of the Board Resolution 09-16-2018, which states: The Board acknowledges and appreciates this follow-up on the Board’s consideration of 27 January 2019.

On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the Barcelona Communique and provided this recommendation to the Board for its consideration and action. The Board notes that to ensure internal consistency and transparency, the Board has considered the recommendations of the Board Resolution 01-27-2019, which states: The Board acknowledges and appreciates this follow-up on the Board’s consideration of 27 January 2019.

On 20 November 2018 the Board considered the Brussels Communique and provided this recommendation to the Board for its consideration and action. The Board notes that to ensure internal consistency and transparency, the Board has considered the recommendations of the Board Resolution 09-16-2018, which states: The Board acknowledges and appreciates this follow-up on the Board’s consideration of 27 January 2019.

On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the Barcelona Communique and provided this recommendation to the Board for its consideration and action. The Board notes that to ensure internal consistency and transparency, the Board has considered the recommendations of the Board Resolution 01-27-2019, which states: The Board acknowledges and appreciates this follow-up on the Board’s consideration of 27 January 2019.

On 20 November 2018 the Board considered the Brussels Communique and provided this recommendation to the Board for its consideration and action. The Board notes that to ensure internal consistency and transparency, the Board has considered the recommendations of the Board Resolution 09-16-2018, which states: The Board acknowledges and appreciates this follow-up on the Board’s consideration of 27 January 2019.

On 27 January 2019 the Board considered the Barcelona Communique and provided this recommendation to the Board for its consideration and action. The Board notes that to ensure internal consistency and transparency, the Board has considered the recommendations of the Board Resolution 01-27-2019, which states: The Board acknowledges and appreciates this follow-up on the Board’s consideration of 27 January 2019.

On 20 November 2018 the Board considered the Brussels Communique and provided this recommendation to the Board for its consideration and action. The Board notes that to ensure internal consistency and transparency, the Board has considered the recommendations of the Board Resolution 09-16-2018, which states: The Board acknowledges and appreciates this follow-up on the Board’s consideration of 27 January 2019.
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:**
- GAC Advice Items
- As of 31 October 2020

**Action Request Number**

**Communique**

**Board of Directors**

**Category**

**About This Number**

**GAC Advice Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>Date of Communique</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>About This Number</th>
<th>Action Taken</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Board Resolution</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Close</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001874</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>NO/18</td>
<td>ICANN</td>
<td>1.a.</td>
<td>Work, as soon as possible, with the GAC members who have expressed concerns with respect to the release of ICANN’s WHOIS database to ensure that the protection mechanisms in place are effective and robust to prevent threats to the GAC members in a satisfying manner, ensuring in mind that previous advice on the matter stands.</td>
<td>The Board initially considered the advice on 30 May 2018. However, at the time, the Board had not received the ICANN-PRG's final report. The Board’s initial Action was to inform the GAC of the status of its consideration and its recommendation to the Board that the Board consider the board of directors (BOD) for the ICANN-PRG on 27 January 2019 and stated in its scorecard: The Board acknowledges this advice and refers the Board to the General Assembly on the matter, i.e., and 1.4 of the Phase 2 section.</td>
<td>Scorecard</td>
<td>30May18-en.pdf</td>
<td>9/10/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001873</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>NO/18</td>
<td>ICANN</td>
<td>1.a.</td>
<td>Work with the BOD to finalize and submit a proposal to the BOD for the ICANN-PRG on 20 August 2018 on the effectiveness measures and the GAC to ensure that GAC advice on protection of ICANN, which is included in particular, that group proposal, is adequately taken into account in any related Board decisions, and</td>
<td>The Board provided an update on 27 January 2019 to discuss the status of the advice. The Board also directed the GAC to the ICANN-PRG scorecard.</td>
<td>Scorecard</td>
<td>27jan19-en.pdf</td>
<td>9/10/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase 1: End Goal to Consider**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Close</th>
<th>Resolution Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/28/18</td>
<td>6/28/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/28/18</td>
<td>6/28/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/28/18</td>
<td>6/28/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase 2: Addressing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Close</th>
<th>Resolution Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.a.II.</td>
<td>9/10/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.a.I.</td>
<td>9/10/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase 3: Evaluate & Consider**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Close</th>
<th>Resolution Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09-16-en#2.a</td>
<td>09-16-en#2.a</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/board-material/resolutions-2019-09-16-en#2.a">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/board-material/resolutions-2019-09-16-en#2.a</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As of 31 October 2020

GAC Advice Status

AR-001685: GDPR and WHOIS

Communique

ICANN61 San Juan

3/15/18

GDPR and WHOIS

ICANN61 San Juan

3/15/18

IGO Reserved Acronyms

Category

Advice Item on law enforcement, cybersecurity and rights protection; ICANN’s outreach to the Article 29 Working Party, inviting them to access to? This advice item remains open for further Board consideration.

The ICANN Board initially considered this advice on 30 May 2018. However at the time, the Board requested, “The Board requests that ICANN develop a response to this advice and update the Board in the near future. The Board notes that the advice relates to the full range of the Article 29 Working Party’s charter and recommends that ICANN provide a written response to this advice.” The Board requested further clarification and a response to the advice.

On 30 May 2018 the Board considered the San Juan Communique and provided this response in its scorecard: The Board accepts this advice. ICANN has considered input from the community, the IFLA, and European Data Protection Authorities to refine the Temporary Specification that was ultimately adopted by the GAC on 17 May 2018. The Board welcomes the GAC’s continued outreach efforts to the Article 29 Working Party, as the Board is required to reaffirm the Temporary Specification every 90 days following adoption. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 30 May 2018.

Recommendation 3 of the ICANN Board’s response on 14 October 2019 makes clear that masking email addresses is a step toward compliance with the GDPR (https://www.icann.org/resources/tlds-data-email-address-masking). This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 30 May 2018.

The ICANN Board initially considered this advice on 30 May 2018. However at the time, the Board requested, “The Board requests that ICANN consider the following: The Board notes that the advice relates to the full range of the Article 29 Working Party’s charter and recommends that ICANN provide a written response to this advice.” The Board requested further clarification and a response to the advice.

On 30 May 2018 the Board considered the San Juan Communique and provided this response in its scorecard: The Board accepts this advice. ICANN org has considered input from the community, the IFLA, and European Data Protection Authorities to refine the Temporary Specification that was ultimately adopted by the GAC on 17 May 2018. The Board welcomes the GAC’s continued outreach efforts to the Article 29 Working Party, as the Board is required to reaffirm the Temporary Specification every 90 days following adoption. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 30 May 2018.

Recommendation 3 of the ICANN Board’s response on 14 October 2019 makes clear that masking email addresses is a step toward compliance with the GDPR (https://www.icann.org/resources/tlds-data-email-address-masking). This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 30 May 2018.

The ICANN Board initially considered this advice on 30 May 2018. However at the time, the Board requested, “The Board requests that ICANN consider the following: The Board notes that the advice relates to the full range of the Article 29 Working Party’s charter and recommends that ICANN provide a written response to this advice.” The Board requested further clarification and a response to the advice.

On 30 May 2018 the Board considered the San Juan Communique and provided this response in its scorecard: The Board accepts this advice. ICANN org has considered input from the community, the IFLA, and European Data Protection Authorities to refine the Temporary Specification that was ultimately adopted by the GAC on 17 May 2018. The Board welcomes the GAC’s continued outreach efforts to the Article 29 Working Party, as the Board is required to reaffirm the Temporary Specification every 90 days following adoption. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 30 May 2018.

Recommendation 3 of the ICANN Board’s response on 14 October 2019 makes clear that masking email addresses is a step toward compliance with the GDPR (https://www.icann.org/resources/tlds-data-email-address-masking). This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 30 May 2018.

The ICANN Board initially considered this advice on 30 May 2018. However at the time, the Board requested, “The Board requests that ICANN consider the following: The Board notes that the advice relates to the full range of the Article 29 Working Party’s charter and recommends that ICANN provide a written response to this advice.” The Board requested further clarification and a response to the advice.

On 30 May 2018 the Board considered the San Juan Communique and provided this response in its scorecard: The Board accepts this advice. ICANN org has considered input from the community, the IFLA, and European Data Protection Authorities to refine the Temporary Specification that was ultimately adopted by the GAC on 17 May 2018. The Board welcomes the GAC’s continued outreach efforts to the Article 29 Working Party, as the Board is required to reaffirm the Temporary Specification every 90 days following adoption. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 30 May 2018.

Recommendation 3 of the ICANN Board’s response on 14 October 2019 makes clear that masking email addresses is a step toward compliance with the GDPR (https://www.icann.org/resources/tlds-data-email-address-masking). This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 30 May 2018.

The ICANN Board initially considered this advice on 30 May 2018. However at the time, the Board requested, “The Board requests that ICANN consider the following: The Board notes that the advice relates to the full range of the Article 29 Working Party’s charter and recommends that ICANN provide a written response to this advice.” The Board requested further clarification and a response to the advice.

On 30 May 2018 the Board considered the San Juan Communique and provided this response in its scorecard: The Board accepts this advice. ICANN org has considered input from the community, the IFLA, and European Data Protection Authorities to refine the Temporary Specification that was ultimately adopted by the GAC on 17 May 2018. The Board welcomes the GAC’s continued outreach efforts to the Article 29 Working Party, as the Board is required to reaffirm the Temporary Specification every 90 days following adoption. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 30 May 2018.

Recommendation 3 of the ICANN Board’s response on 14 October 2019 makes clear that masking email addresses is a step toward compliance with the GDPR (https://www.icann.org/resources/tlds-data-email-address-masking). This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 30 May 2018.

The ICANN Board initially considered this advice on 30 May 2018. However at the time, the Board requested, “The Board requests that ICANN consider the following: The Board notes that the advice relates to the full range of the Article 29 Working Party’s charter and recommends that ICANN provide a written response to this advice.” The Board requested further clarification and a response to the advice.

On 30 May 2018 the Board considered the San Juan Communique and provided this response in its scorecard: The Board accepts this advice. ICANN org has considered input from the community, the IFLA, and European Data Protection Authorities to refine the Temporary Specification that was ultimately adopted by the GAC on 17 May 2018. The Board welcomes the GAC’s continued outreach efforts to the Article 29 Working Party, as the Board is required to reaffirm the Temporary Specification every 90 days following adoption. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 30 May 2018.

Recommendation 3 of the ICANN Board’s response on 14 October 2019 makes clear that masking email addresses is a step toward compliance with the GDPR (https://www.icann.org/resources/tlds-data-email-address-masking). This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 30 May 2018.

The ICANN Board initially considered this advice on 30 May 2018. However at the time, the Board requested, “The Board requests that ICANN consider the following: The Board notes that the advice relates to the full range of the Article 29 Working Party’s charter and recommends that ICANN provide a written response to this advice.” The Board requested further clarification and a response to the advice.

On 30 May 2018 the Board considered the San Juan Communique and provided this response in its scorecard: The Board accepts this advice. ICANN org has considered input from the community, the IFLA, and European Data Protection Authorities to refine the Temporary Specification that was ultimately adopted by the GAC on 17 May 2018. The Board welcomes the GAC’s continued outreach efforts to the Article 29 Working Party, as the Board is required to reaffirm the Temporary Specification every 90 days following adoption. This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 30 May 2018.

Recommendation 3 of the ICANN Board’s response on 14 October 2019 makes clear that masking email addresses is a step toward compliance with the GDPR (https://www.icann.org/resources/tlds-data-email-address-masking). This item is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 30 May 2018.
### GAC Advice Items

**As of 31 October 2020**

#### Notes:
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique [April 2015] through the ICANN64 Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: The ICANN64 Virtual Communique did not contain Generic GAC Advice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Request Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>First of Agreed Period</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>About This Advice</th>
<th>Close Out Advice</th>
<th>Close Date</th>
<th>Close Out Close Date</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Date</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Close Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

**Legal Considerations:**

- **Organization (IGO):**
  - Intergovernmental
- **Current Phase:**
  - 1.a.I
  - 1.a.II.
  - 1.b.II.
- **Advice Item:**
  - Ensure confidentiality of WHOIS queries by law enforcement agencies.
  - Ensure that the WHOIS system remains non-repudiable.
  - Ensure that all relevant measures are in place.

---

**Analysis:**

- The GAC received an update from several of its members regarding the GDPR and WHOIS.
- Some GAC members note that important concerns regarding the release of WHOIS data include the potential for misuse and the need for greater transparency.
- The GAC intends to follow up on implementation of the proposed initiative at ICANN62, bearing in mind that all previous GAC advice on the matter stands.
- The Board stands ready to move this issue forward at the conclusion of these discussions in accordance with the related Board resolution. Meanwhile, the Board continues to defer action on this advice.

---

**Conclusion:**

- The Board's consideration of 30 May 2018.
- The Board continues to defer action on this advice. Recommendation 3 of the Board's consideration of 30 May 2018.
- The Board's consideration of 30 May 2018.
- The Board's consideration of 30 May 2018.
- The Board's consideration of 30 May 2018.

---

**Recommendations:**

- The Board accepted the GAC advice.
- The Board accepted the GAC advice.
- The Board accepted the GAC advice.
- The Board accepted the GAC advice.
- The Board accepted the GAC advice.

---

**Adoption:**

- The Board adopted the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data on 17 May 2018 utilizing the Board-scored scorecard: The Board continues to defer action on this advice. Recommendation 3 of the Board's consideration of 30 May 2018.
- The Board's consideration of 30 May 2018.
- The Board's consideration of 30 May 2018.
- The Board's consideration of 30 May 2018.
- The Board's consideration of 30 May 2018.

---

**Timeline:**

- 3/15/18
- 3/15/18
- 3/15/18
- 3/15/18
- 3/15/18

---

**Board Scorecard:**

- The Board provided a response on 14 October 2019. This advice item remains open for further Board consideration.
- The Board considered the GAC advice.
- The Board considered the GAC advice.
- The Board considered the GAC advice.
- The Board considered the GAC advice.
- The Board considered the 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:**
- [51x553]
- [69x458]
- [69x520]
- [69x530]
- [69x535]
- [119x235]
- [119x240]
- [119x324]
- [119x458]
- [119x505]
- [167x240]
- [167x324]
- [198x240]
- [198x319]
- [198x448]
- [246x240]
- [246x458]
- [246x490]
- [246x495]
- [387x324]
- [387x448]
- [453x191]
- [453x201]
- [453x211]
- [453x221]
- [453x255]
- [453x270]
- [453x275]
- [453x285]
- [453x299]
- [453x319]
- [453x340]
- [453x345]
- [453x350]
- [453x355]
- [453x360]
- [453x374]
- [453x389]
- [453x394]
- [453x399]
- [453x404]
- [453x414]
- [453x418]
- [453x428]
- [453x433]
- [453x438]
- [453x443]
- [453x448]
- [453x453]
- [453x458]
- [453x459]
- [597x230]
- [597x319]
- [597x324]
- [597x448]
- [597x453]
- [597x500]
- [597x505]
- [653x226]
- [653x235]
- [653x309]
- [653x314]
- [653x319]
- [653x340]
- [653x345]
- [653x443]
- [653x448]
- [653x449]
- [653x448]
- [653x453]
- [653x458]
- [653x459]
- [653x464]
- [653x469]
- [653x471]
- [653x476]
- [653x485]
- [653x500]
- [653x505]
- [653x520]
- [653x525]
- [653x530]
- [653x535]
- [653x540]
- [653x545]
- [653x550]
- [95x114]
- [119x240]
- [119x324]
- [119x458]
- [119x505]
- [167x240]
- [167x324]
- [167x515]
- [198x240]
- [198x319]
- [198x448]
- [246x240]
- [246x458]
- [246x490]
- [246x495]
- [387x324]
- [387x448]
- [453x191]
- [453x201]
- [453x211]
- [453x221]
- [453x255]
- [453x270]
- [453x275]
- [453x285]
- [453x299]
- [453x319]
- [453x340]
- [453x345]
- [453x350]
- [453x355]
- [453x360]
- [453x374]
- [453x389]
- [453x394]
- [453x399]
- [453x404]
- [453x414]
- [453x418]
- [453x428]
- [453x433]
- [453x438]
- [453x443]
- [453x448]
- [453x449]
- [453x448]
- [453x449]
- [453x464]
- [453x469]
- [453x471]
- [453x476]
- [453x485]
- [453x500]
- [453x505]
- [453x520]
- [453x525]
- [453x530]
- [453x535]
- [453x540]
- [453x545]
- [453x550]
- [95x114]
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:

01/06/19 IANAID/WHOIS

03/11/19 IANAID/WHOIS

04/03/19 IANAID/WHOIS

04/16/19 IANAID/WHOIS

06/04/19 IANAID/WHOIS

09/06/19 ICANN Board

11/08/19 ICANN Board

12/05/19 ICANN Board

12/06/19 ICANN Board

12/13/19 ICANN Board

12/23/19 ICANN Board

12/31/19 ICANN Board

01/03/20 ICANN Board

01/15/20 ICANN Board

01/22/20 ICANN Board

01/30/20 ICANN Board

02/01/20 ICANN Board

02/04/20 ICANN Board

02/07/20 ICANN Board

02/13/20 ICANN Board

02/19/20 ICANN Board

02/20/20 ICANN Board

02/24/20 ICANN Board

02/27/20 ICANN Board

03/04/20 ICANN Board

03/18/20 ICANN Board

03/26/20 ICANN Board

04/03/20 ICANN Board

04/07/20 ICANN Board

04/24/20 ICANN Board

05/14/20 ICANN Board

05/21/20 ICANN Board

06/11/20 ICANN Board

06/23/20 ICANN Board

07/01/20 ICANN Board
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communiqué</th>
<th>Date of Action</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>About This Issue</th>
<th>Action Text</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
<th>Board Resolution link</th>
<th>Board Associate Link</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019-0161</td>
<td>2019.06.04.03</td>
<td>6/30/17</td>
<td>Application for .amazon and .amazona</td>
<td>Follow-up 3</td>
<td>Seeks feedback on the range of information exchanged during the .amazon gTLD applications and the process for the applicants to address the objections. The Board notes that .amazon has not yet addressed the objections raised by the GAC and welcomes the process for the applicants to address the objections in a way that is consistent with the gTLD Policy. The Board also notes that the objections raised by the GAC are based on public policy reasons but have not yet been formally presented to the Board. The GAC is currently working on a draft recommendation to address the objections raised by the GAC. The GAC is expected to deliver recommendations in light of the objections raised by the GAC.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-0162</td>
<td>2019.06.04.17</td>
<td>7/10/19</td>
<td>competition</td>
<td>Follow-up 3</td>
<td>Seeks feedback on the range of information exchanged during the .amazon gTLD applications and the process for the applicants to address the objections. The Board notes that .amazon has not yet addressed the objections raised by the GAC and welcomes the process for the applicants to address the objections in a way that is consistent with the gTLD Policy. The Board also notes that the objections raised by the GAC are based on public policy reasons but have not yet been formally presented to the Board. The GAC is currently working on a draft recommendation to address the objections raised by the GAC. The GAC is expected to deliver recommendations in light of the objections raised by the GAC.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communique (April 2013) through the ICANN68 Virtual Communique (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN68 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus GAC Advice)

Notes:
- ICANN58 Copenhagen
- ICANN59 Johannesburg
- 3/15/17
- 6/29/17
- 6/29/17
- 6/29/17
- 6/29/17
- Date of designations and identifiers (defined as “Scope 2” names in the GNSO process) which were pertaining to the protections of Red Cross and Red Crescent names and of the GAC advice, timing and level of support for this resolution.

Follow-up 1
- The Board reviewed this item and determined that it was not necessary. Follow-up to previous advice will be tracked on open advice items related to the same topic.

Follow-up 2
- The Board reviewed this item and determined that it was not necessary. Follow-up to previous advice will be tracked on open advice items related to the same topic.

Follow-up 3
- The Board reviewed this item and determined that it was not necessary. Follow-up to previous advice will be tracked on open advice items related to the same topic.

Follow-up 4
- The Board reviewed this item and determined that it was not necessary. Follow-up to previous advice will be tracked on open advice items related to the same topic.

Follow-up 7
- The Board reviewed this item and determined that it was not necessary. Follow-up to previous advice will be tracked on open advice items related to the same topic.
### GAC Advice Status

**As of 31 October 2020**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>Date of the Second Level</th>
<th>2-Character Code</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>About This Category</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Action(s)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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
ICANN58 Copenhagen
Communique
ICANN58 Copenhagen
Communique
3/15/17
Communiqué
Date of the Second Level
2-Character Code
IGO Protections
Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider
Advice Text
Immediately explore measures to find a satisfactory solution of the matter as it relates to IGO immunities recognized under international law as appropriate consideration by the GAC before finalizing the response. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 12 June 2017.

Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider
Facilitate continued discussions in order to develop a resolution that will be acceptable to all members. On 30 May 2017 the Board also sent a letter notifying the ICANN CEO that the ICANN Board Chair and the GAC Chair jointly requested that the second level strings that match their acronyms. The Board also notes that the IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms which is under development for all gTLDs, and the Registrar to engage with the relevant GAC members when a risk is identified in order to discuss the potential for conflict. The Board also directed the Board Secretariat to submit a request for ICANN compliance action in the event of a perceived misuse. During the Board meeting at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi, the ICANN org committed to the development of a dedicated procedure on how to handle third party assessment of the situation if the name is already registered. In response, ICANN affirmatively required Registries/Registry Operators to take specific mandatory steps. Finally, in keeping with the GAC Advice, ICANN urged Registries/Registry Operators to take specific voluntary measures that Registry/Registry Operators could consider. Finally, in keeping with the GAC Advice, ICANN urged Registries/Registry Operators to take specific voluntary measures that Registry/Registry Operators could consider.

On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the follow-up on this matter and expressed that the item is complete. The Board noted that a process for facilitating discussions between the Board of Directors and the GAC on the subject of appropriate protections for IGOs was established. On 13 July 2017 the ICANN Board Chair sent a letter notifying the ICANN CEO that the Board has considered and approved four policy recommendations that were developed by the GNSO PDP Working Group on IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms which is under development for all gTLDs. These recommendations are intended to address gaps in the existing IGO obligation to facilitate the filing of complaints by IGOs under existing procedures. These recommendations were posted for public comment on 11 July 2017 and will close on 20 August 2017. After the public comment period, the Board will meet to consider whether to adopt the four recommendations. The letter can be found in the Board meeting at ICANN59 in Montreal. The Board also notes that the IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms which is under development for all gTLDs, and the Registrar to engage with the relevant GAC members when a risk is identified in order to discuss the potential for conflict. The Board also directed the Board Secretariat to submit a request for ICANN compliance action in the event of a perceived misuse. During the Board meeting at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi, the ICANN org committed to the development of a dedicated procedure on how to handle third party assessment of the situation if the name is already registered. In response, ICANN affirmatively required Registries/Registry Operators to take specific mandatory steps. Finally, in keeping with the GAC Advice, ICANN urged Registries/Registry Operators to take specific voluntary measures that Registry/Registry Operators could consider. Finally, in keeping with the GAC Advice, ICANN urged Registries/Registry Operators to take specific voluntary measures that Registry/Registry Operators could consider.

On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the follow-up on this matter and expressed that the item is complete. The Board noted that a process for facilitating discussions between the Board of Directors and the GAC on the subject of appropriate protections for IGOs was established. On 13 July 2017 the ICANN Board Chair sent a letter notifying the ICANN CEO that the Board has considered and approved four policy recommendations that were developed by the GNSO PDP Working Group on IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms which is under development for all gTLDs. These recommendations are intended to address gaps in the existing IGO obligation to facilitate the filing of complaints by IGOs under existing procedures. These recommendations were posted for public comment on 11 July 2017 and will close on 20 August 2017. After the public comment period, the Board will meet to consider whether to adopt the four recommendations. The letter can be found in the Board meeting at ICANN59 in Montreal.

On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the follow-up on this matter and expressed that the item is complete. The Board noted that a process for facilitating discussions between the Board of Directors and the GAC on the subject of appropriate protections for IGOs was established. On 13 July 2017 the ICANN Board Chair sent a letter notifying the ICANN CEO that the Board has considered and approved four policy recommendations that were developed by the GNSO PDP Working Group on IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms which is under development for all gTLDs. These recommendations are intended to address gaps in the existing IGO obligation to facilitate the filing of complaints by IGOs under existing procedures. These recommendations were posted for public comment on 11 July 2017 and will close on 20 August 2017. After the public comment period, the Board will meet to consider whether to adopt the four recommendations. The letter can be found in the Board meeting at ICANN59 in Montreal.

On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the follow-up on this matter and expressed that the item is complete. The Board noted that a process for facilitating discussions between the Board of Directors and the GAC on the subject of appropriate protections for IGOs was established. On 13 July 2017 the ICANN Board Chair sent a letter notifying the ICANN CEO that the Board has considered and approved four policy recommendations that were developed by the GNSO PDP Working Group on IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms which is under development for all gTLDs. These recommendations are intended to address gaps in the existing IGO obligation to facilitate the filing of complaints by IGOs under existing procedures. These recommendations were posted for public comment on 11 July 2017 and will close on 20 August 2017. After the public comment period, the Board will meet to consider whether to adopt the four recommendations. The letter can be found in the Board meeting at ICANN59 in Montreal.

On 12 June 2017 the Board considered the follow-up on this matter and expressed that the item is complete. The Board noted that a process for facilitating discussions between the Board of Directors and the GAC on the subject of appropriate protections for IGOs was established. On 13 July 2017 the ICANN Board Chair sent a letter notifying the ICANN CEO that the Board has considered and approved four policy recommendations that were developed by the GNSO PDP Working Group on IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms which is under development for all gTLDs. These recommendations are intended to address gaps in the existing IGO obligation to facilitate the filing of complaints by IGOs under existing procedures. These recommendations were posted for public comment on 11 July 2017 and will close on 20 August 2017. After the public comment period, the Board will meet to consider whether to adopt the four recommendations. The letter can be found in the Board meeting at ICANN59 in Montreal.
### GAC Advice Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001350</td>
<td>GAC Advice given in the Helsinki Communique.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001361</td>
<td>GAC advice given in the Hyderabad Communique.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001364</td>
<td>GAC advice given in the Istanbul Communique.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Connected** means the Board has considered the GAC advice.
- **Disconnected** means the Board has not considered the GAC advice.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>About Item</th>
<th>Action Taken</th>
<th>Board Approval</th>
<th>Board Resolution</th>
<th>Board Scorecard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001350</td>
<td>5/17/2017</td>
<td>2/3/17</td>
<td>2nd Level Domain Code</td>
<td>GAC Advice given in the Helsinki Communique.</td>
<td><strong>Connected</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Notes:
- The Board considered the GAC advice given as connected.
- ICANN68 Virtual Communique did not contain Consensus GAC Advice.
On 3 February 2017, the Board considered the Hyderabad Communiqué and provided the response in its scorecard. The Board took the following action:

- The Board directs the ICANN CEO to provide the requested response in its scorecard.

**Board Action(s)**
- The Board thanks the participants in the IGO small group that provided this advice. We note that at ICANN58 the Board proposed that the GAC and the GNSO engage in a facilitated dialogue to support greater clarity and improved collaboration. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 3 February 2017.

**Board Resolution Link**
- None

**Board Resolution Text**
- None

**GAC Advice Items**
- Note: The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communiqué (April 2015) through the ICANN57 Virtual Communiqué (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN58 Virtual Communiqué did not contain GAC Advice)

**Action Request Number**
- Communique no later than five weeks before the ICANN58 meeting in Copenhagen.

**Board Resolution Link**
- None

**Board Resolution Text**
- None
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:**

- ICANN56 Helsinki Communique
- ICANN57 Hyderabad Communique
- ICANN57 Hyderabad Communique
- ICANN57 Hyderabad Communique

**Date of Issue:**
- 6/30/16
- 11/8/16
- 6/30/16
- 11/8/16
- 2/3/17
- 2/3/17

**Board Action(s):**
- GAC advice is considered complete as of the Board’s consideration of 13 December 2016.
- The Board accepts the advice and reiterates its intentions to engage in more regular communication to foster better mutual understanding with the Board and with the GAC.
- The Board accepts this advice and references it in the implementation of its scorecard.

**Board Resolution Link:**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>Date of Resolution</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>About Item Number</th>
<th>Close Date</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
GAC Advice Status

On 3 February 2016 the Board considered the Dublin Communique and provided this advice item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN56 in Helsinki on 1 November 2016.

On 3 February 2016 the Board considered the Dublin Communique and provided this advice item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 1 November 2017.

On 3 February 2016 the Board considered the Dublin Communique and provided this advice item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 1 November 2017.

On 3 February 2016 the Board considered the Dublin Communique and provided this advice item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN55 in Marrakech on 11 November 2015.

On 3 February 2016 the Board considered the Dublin Communique and provided this advice item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN55 in Marrakech on 11 November 2015.

On 3 February 2016 the Board considered the Dublin Communique and provided this advice item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN54 in Dublin on 9 November 2014.

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

Action Request Number
0301013

Communique
ICANN54 Dublin

Date
2/3/16

Notes:
Communique

ICANN55 Marrakech

ICANN56 Helsinki

3/9/16

6/30/16

Date of

Accreditation Issues

Future gTLDs Rounds: Public

Privacy and Proxy Services

3.a.I.

2.a.I.

1.a.I - 1.b.I.

Advice Item
GAC advises the Board to: i. task ICANN to work with the GAC Secretariat to

regardless of the grounds for objection. b. The GAC further advises the

comments submitted by the relevant Governments be fully considered

The GAC reiterates its advice on this issue and a. advises the Board that: i.

Discussions of the ?small group? and the NGPC in an effort to resolve the

community priorities are balanced; and ii. how this process can maximise

This exchange should include consideration of: i. how different

scheduled and managed by the respective SO and AC communities,

all the SOs and ACs regarding how work requiring community input is

further.

Privacy Proxy Services Accreditation Issues PDP Final Report. The ICANN

that the Board meets with the GAC prior to considering adoption of the

regions.

assessment. b. The GAC advises the Board to: i. give particular priority to

development of future rounds should be based on the conclusions of this

The Board considered this advice item on 14 May 2016 and the general view of the GNSO Policy Board and the GAC that the GNSO proposal for the creation of a new category of new gTLDs should not be approved. The Board considered this advice item on 16 July 2015, the small group of representatives of IGOs, expressed their concerns in the following resolution:

Resolved (2015.07.16-10), the Board thanks the GAC and the NGPC for their work on the protection of IGO acronyms (the ?Proposal?). The Proposal is under review and will be circulated to the GAC and the NGPC for review and consideration. As previously discussed, on 30 April 2014 the GNSO and the GAC met and outlined a draft proposal for dealing with the protection of IGO acronyms. The Board notes that ICANN's existing Consensus Policy Implementation Framework (CPIF) does not include an explicit requirement for the use of GAC advice on content-related issues. If the Board determines that a future resolution or policy action is necessary, it should be consistent with CPIF, which is a mechanism to ensure content-related recommendations are consistent with the principles set out in the IANA Stewardship Transfer Agreement.

On 3 February 2016 the Board considered the Dublin Communique and provided this advice item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN55 in Marrakech on 11 November 2015.

On 3 February 2016 the Board considered the Dublin Communique and provided this advice item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN56 in Helsinki on 1 November 2016.

On 3 February 2016 the Board considered the Dublin Communique and provided this advice item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN55 in Marrakech on 11 November 2015.

On 3 February 2016 the Board considered the Dublin Communique and provided this advice item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN56 in Helsinki on 1 November 2016.

On 3 February 2016 the Board considered the Dublin Communique and provided this advice item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN55 in Marrakech on 11 November 2015.

On 3 February 2016 the Board considered the Dublin Communique and provided this advice item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN54 in Dublin on 9 November 2014.

On 3 February 2016 the Board considered the Dublin Communique and provided this advice item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN54 in Dublin on 9 November 2014.

On 3 February 2016 the Board considered the Dublin Communique and provided this advice item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN55 in Marrakech on 11 November 2015.

On 3 February 2016 the Board considered the Dublin Communique and provided this advice item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN54 in Dublin on 9 November 2014.

On 3 February 2016 the Board considered the Dublin Communique and provided this advice item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN55 in Marrakech on 11 November 2015.

On 3 February 2016 the Board considered the Dublin Communique and provided this advice item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN55 in Marrakech on 11 November 2015.

On 3 February 2016 the Board considered the Dublin Communique and provided this advice item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN55 in Marrakech on 11 November 2015.

On 3 February 2016 the Board considered the Dublin Communique and provided this advice item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN55 in Marrakech on 11 November 2015.

On 3 February 2016 the Board considered the Dublin Communique and provided this advice item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN55 in Marrakech on 11 November 2015.

On 3 February 2016 the Board considered the Dublin Communique and provided this advice item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN55 in Marrakech on 11 November 2015.

On 3 February 2016 the Board considered the Dublin Communique and provided this advice item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN55 in Marrakech on 11 November 2015.

On 3 February 2016 the Board considered the Dublin Communique and provided this advice item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN55 in Marrakech on 11 November 2015.

On 3 February 2016 the Board considered the Dublin Communique and provided this advice item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN55 in Marrakech on 11 November 2015.

On 3 February 2016 the Board considered the Dublin Communique and provided this advice item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN54 in Dublin on 9 November 2014.

On 3 February 2016 the Board considered the Dublin Communique and provided this advice item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN55 in Marrakech on 11 November 2015.

On 3 February 2016 the Board considered the Dublin Communique and provided this advice item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN55 in Marrakech on 11 November 2015.

On 3 February 2016 the Board considered the Dublin Communique and provided this advice item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN55 in Marrakech on 11 November 2015.

On 3 February 2016 the Board considered the Dublin Communique and provided this advice item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN55 in Marrakech on 11 November 2015.

On 3 February 2016 the Board considered the Dublin Communique and provided this advice item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN55 in Marrakech on 11 November 2015.

On 3 February 2016 the Board considered the Dublin Communique and provided this advice item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN55 in Marrakech on 11 November 2015.

On 3 February 2016 the Board considered the Dublin Communique and provided this advice item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN55 in Marrakech on 11 November 2015.
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)
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As of 31 October 2020
GAC Advice Status

AR-001297
AR-001296
AR-001295
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
ICANN53 Buenos Aires
6/24/15
Communiqué
Evaluation
gTLD Safeguards
4.
1.b.II.
Advice Item
review the situation at its meeting in Dublin.
The GAC continues to keep under review the community application process for new gTLDs. As alluded to by the GAC, at the October 2015 meeting of the NGPC, a review committee was established. This review committee was provided an interim report which was allocated for consideration at the upcoming October 2015 meeting. On 18 October 2015 the NGPC considered the Abu Dhabi Communique and provided this response in its scorecard: The NGPC has prepared an overall summary scorecard outlining the elements of the GAC’s safeguard advice since the April 2013 Beijing Communique, and the actions that the NGPC has taken to address the safeguard advice. The summary scorecard is found here: https://www.icann.org/system/files/files/resolutions-new-gtld-annex-2-18oct15-en.pdf. This item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 1 November 2017.

20151019
 styled/commitment/7-1-2009-5069_en.pdf
As of 31 October 2020

GAC Advice Status

AR-001339

Notes:

Communique

ICANN52 Singapore

Communique

ICANN52 Singapore

2/11/15

Crescent

Acronyms for Red Cross/Red Crescent Terms and Names in the Second Level, as outlined in the Board's resolution of 18 May 2017.

Mechanisms; and with IGOs and the NGPC.

Governmental Organisations. This will include working with the GNSO on appropriate permanent protections for Inter-Governmental Organisations (IGO) and Non-Governmental Organisations (NGO).

I. The GAC advises the Board to: i. amend the current process for requests to: (1) adopt new two-letter country and territory names at the second level, (2) to periodically remind GAC members to update or offer their input if they wish to continue to engage with the GAC to (1) collaborate on possible enhancements to the GAC database to document approvals for the release of country and territory names at the second-level to the extent the relevant government has indicated its approval in the GAC’s database, and (3) report back to the Board if there is a need to grant ICANN approvals for the release of country and territory names at the second-level.

GAC Action:

05-18-en#2.b


Board Scorecard Link

Date

Close

2/12/15

10/7/15

8.a.i.

The GAC has provided recommendations to the Board regarding the New gTLD Program on 7 October 2015 and provided this response to its completion.


The Board considered this advice item on 12 February 2015 and took the following action(s): (i) adopted the GAC advice, (ii) requested additional time to consider the remaining requests, and (iii) established a facilitation discussion among the relevant parties to reconcile remaining differences between the policy recommendations and the GAC advice on topics identified by the GAC. The GAC will continue to work with interested parties to reach agreement on appropriate permanent protections for Inter-Governmental Organisations (IGO) and Non-Governmental Organisations (NGO).

I. The GAC advises the Board to: i. amend the current process for requests to: (1) adopt new two-letter country and territory names at the second level, (2) to periodically remind GAC members to update or offer their input if they wish to continue to engage with the GAC to (1) collaborate on possible enhancements to the GAC database to document approvals for the release of country and territory names at the second-level to the extent the relevant government has indicated its approval in the GAC’s database, and (3) report back to the Board if there is a need to grant ICANN approvals for the release of country and territory names at the second-level.

GAC Action:
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AR-001336

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:

ICANN51 Los Angeles Communique
ICANN52 Singapore Communique
ICANN52 Singapore Communique

Date of Advice

2/11/15
2/11/15
2/11/15
2/11/15

Advice Text

Final advice received on 25 October 2019. This advice item remains open for further Board consideration.

Board Resolution

This item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 9 November 2017.

End Date

5/11/19
5/28/20
5/28/20
5/28/20

Advisory Board Recommendation

This advice item has been presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 9 November 2017.

Board Resolution

The Board provided a comprehensive report of GAC positions and updates to ICANN Advice Recommendations. The Board has decided to not publish formal GAC Advice at this time. The Board will separately publish a Summary of GAC Positions for reference. This item is considered complete as of the Board's response of 22 January 2015.

End Date

2/26/15
4/29/15
4/29/15
4/29/15

Advisory Board Recommendation

This advice item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 9 November 2017.

Board Resolution

The Board reviewed this item and determined a formal response was not necessary. This item is considered complete as of the Board's response of 22 January 2015.

End Date

11/2/14
11/2/14
11/2/14
11/2/14

Advisory Board Recommendation

This advice item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 9 November 2017.

Board Resolution

The Board provided a comprehensive report of GAC positions and updates to ICANN Advice Recommendations. The Board has decided to not publish formal GAC Advice at this time. The Board will separately publish a Summary of GAC Positions for reference. This item is considered complete as of the Board's response of 22 January 2015.

End Date

5/28/20
5/28/20
5/28/20
5/28/20

Advisory Board Recommendation

This advice item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 9 November 2017.

Board Resolution

This advice item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 9 November 2017.
The GAC published a comprehensive report of RSEP requests and updated the ICANN Accountability and Transparency Program (ATP) on 16 October 2016, and included this item of GAC Advice with the current phase of the GAC’s recommendations regarding the New gTLD Program.

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of RSEP requests and updated the ICANN Accountability and Transparency Program (ATP) on 16 October 2016, and included this item of GAC Advice with the current phase of the GAC’s recommendations regarding the New gTLD Program.

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of RSEP requests and updated the ICANN Accountability and Transparency Program (ATP) on 16 October 2016, and included this item of GAC Advice with the current phase of the GAC’s recommendations regarding the New gTLD Program.

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of RSEP requests and updated the ICANN Accountability and Transparency Program (ATP) on 16 October 2016, and included this item of GAC Advice with the current phase of the GAC’s recommendations regarding the New gTLD Program.

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of RSEP requests and updated the ICANN Accountability and Transparency Program (ATP) on 16 October 2016, and included this item of GAC Advice with the current phase of the GAC’s recommendations regarding the New gTLD Program.

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of RSEP requests and updated the ICANN Accountability and Transparency Program (ATP) on 16 October 2016, and included this item of GAC Advice with the current phase of the GAC’s recommendations regarding the New gTLD Program.

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of RSEP requests and updated the ICANN Accountability and Transparency Program (ATP) on 16 October 2016, and included this item of GAC Advice with the current phase of the GAC’s recommendations regarding the New gTLD Program. No action was required.

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of RSEP requests and updated the ICANN Accountability and Transparency Program (ATP) on 16 October 2016, and included this item of GAC Advice with the current phase of the GAC’s recommendations regarding the New gTLD Program. No action was required.

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of RSEP requests and updated the ICANN Accountability and Transparency Program (ATP) on 16 October 2016, and included this item of GAC Advice with the current phase of the GAC’s recommendations regarding the New gTLD Program. No action was required.

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of RSEP requests and updated the ICANN Accountability and Transparency Program (ATP) on 16 October 2016, and included this item of GAC Advice with the current phase of the GAC’s recommendations regarding the New gTLD Program. No action was required.

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of RSEP requests and updated the ICANN Accountability and Transparency Program (ATP) on 16 October 2016, and included this item of GAC Advice with the current phase of the GAC’s recommendations regarding the New gTLD Program. No action was required.

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of RSEP requests and updated the ICANN Accountability and Transparency Program (ATP) on 16 October 2016, and included this item of GAC Advice with the current phase of the GAC’s recommendations regarding the New gTLD Program. No action was required.

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of RSEP requests and updated the ICANN Accountability and Transparency Program (ATP) on 16 October 2016, and included this item of GAC Advice with the current phase of the GAC’s recommendations regarding the New gTLD Program. No action was required.

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of RSEP requests and updated the ICANN Accountability and Transparency Program (ATP) on 16 October 2016, and included this item of GAC Advice with the current phase of the GAC’s recommendations regarding the New gTLD Program. No action was required.

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of RSEP requests and updated the ICANN Accountability and Transparency Program (ATP) on 16 October 2016, and included this item of GAC Advice with the current phase of the GAC’s recommendations regarding the New gTLD Program. No action was required.

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of RSEP requests and updated the ICANN Accountability and Transparency Program (ATP) on 16 October 2016, and included this item of GAC Advice with the current phase of the GAC’s recommendations regarding the New gTLD Program. No action was required.

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of RSEP requests and updated the ICANN Accountability and Transparency Program (ATP) on 16 October 2016, and included this item of GAC Advice with the current phase of the GAC’s recommendations regarding the New gTLD Program. No action was required.

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of RSEP requests and updated the ICANN Accountability and Transparency Program (ATP) on 16 October 2016, and included this item of GAC Advice with the current phase of the GAC’s recommendations regarding the New gTLD Program. No action was required.

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of RSEP requests and updated the ICANN Accountability and Transparency Program (ATP) on 16 October 2016, and included this item of GAC Advice with the current phase of the GAC’s recommendations regarding the New gTLD Program. No action was required.

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of RSEP requests and updated the ICANN Accountability and Transparency Program (ATP) on 16 October 2016, and included this item of GAC Advice with the current phase of the GAC’s recommendations regarding the New gTLD Program. No action was required.

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of RSEP requests and updated the ICANN Accountability and Transparency Program (ATP) on 16 October 2016, and included this item of GAC Advice with the current phase of the GAC’s recommendations regarding the New gTLD Program. No action was required.

The NGPC published a comprehensive report of RSEP requests and updated the ICANN Accountability and Transparency Program (ATP) on 16 October 2016, and included this item of GAC Advice with the current phase of the GAC’s recommendations regarding the New gTLD Program. No action was required.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Status of Communication</th>
<th>Date of Evaluation Process</th>
<th>Category I/II/III</th>
<th>About Area Number</th>
<th>Action Taken</th>
<th>Reason For Action</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Follow-up Link</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>201401182</td>
<td>GAC51 Los Angeles Communiqué</td>
<td>10/15/14</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>Category 1 (consumer protection, sensitive strings and regulated markets) and Category 2 (restricted and regulated markets) and protection, sensitive strings Category 1 (consumer</td>
<td>The GAC convened an open session for the community to inform about the New gTLDs Program and provide input for the current round in case an applicant contests the decision of a community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201401183</td>
<td>GAC51 Los Angeles Communiqué</td>
<td>10/15/14</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>The GAC convened an open session for the community to inform about the New gTLDs Program and provide input for the current round in case an applicant contests the decision of a</td>
<td>The GAC convened an open session for the community to inform about the New gTLDs Program and provide input for the current round in case an applicant contests the decision of a community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201401184</td>
<td>GAC51 Los Angeles Communiqué</td>
<td>10/15/14</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>The GAC convened an open session for the community to inform about the New gTLDs Program and provide input for the current round in case an applicant contests the decision of a community</td>
<td>The GAC convened an open session for the community to inform about the New gTLDs Program and provide input for the current round in case an applicant contests the decision of a community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201401185</td>
<td>GAC51 Los Angeles Communiqué</td>
<td>10/15/14</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>The GAC convened an open session for the community to inform about the New gTLDs Program and provide input for the current round in case an applicant contests the decision of a community</td>
<td>The GAC convened an open session for the community to inform about the New gTLDs Program and provide input for the current round in case an applicant contests the decision of a community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201401186</td>
<td>GAC51 Los Angeles Communiqué</td>
<td>10/15/14</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>The GAC convened an open session for the community to inform about the New gTLDs Program and provide input for the current round in case an applicant contests the decision of a community</td>
<td>The GAC convened an open session for the community to inform about the New gTLDs Program and provide input for the current round in case an applicant contests the decision of a community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201401187</td>
<td>GAC51 Los Angeles Communiqué</td>
<td>10/15/14</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>The GAC convened an open session for the community to inform about the New gTLDs Program and provide input for the current round in case an applicant contests the decision of a community</td>
<td>The GAC convened an open session for the community to inform about the New gTLDs Program and provide input for the current round in case an applicant contests the decision of a community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201401188</td>
<td>GAC51 Los Angeles Communiqué</td>
<td>10/15/14</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>The GAC convened an open session for the community to inform about the New gTLDs Program and provide input for the current round in case an applicant contests the decision of a community</td>
<td>The GAC convened an open session for the community to inform about the New gTLDs Program and provide input for the current round in case an applicant contests the decision of a community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201401189</td>
<td>GAC51 Los Angeles Communiqué</td>
<td>10/15/14</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>The GAC convened an open session for the community to inform about the New gTLDs Program and provide input for the current round in case an applicant contests the decision of a community</td>
<td>The GAC convened an open session for the community to inform about the New gTLDs Program and provide input for the current round in case an applicant contests the decision of a community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201401190</td>
<td>GAC51 Los Angeles Communiqué</td>
<td>10/15/14</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>The GAC convened an open session for the community to inform about the New gTLDs Program and provide input for the current round in case an applicant contests the decision of a community</td>
<td>The GAC convened an open session for the community to inform about the New gTLDs Program and provide input for the current round in case an applicant contests the decision of a community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201401191</td>
<td>GAC51 Los Angeles Communiqué</td>
<td>10/15/14</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>The GAC convened an open session for the community to inform about the New gTLDs Program and provide input for the current round in case an applicant contests the decision of a community</td>
<td>The GAC convened an open session for the community to inform about the New gTLDs Program and provide input for the current round in case an applicant contests the decision of a community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As of 31 October 2020

GAC Advice Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Communique</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Issue(s) Addressed</th>
<th>Lead Implementation Officer</th>
<th>Lead Coordination Officer</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</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 GAC Advice.)
As of 31 October 2020

GAC Advice Status

Action Request Number

Communique

2015-09-07

AR-001276

07/15

ICANN50 London

6/25/14

AR-001273

Communique

ICANN50 London

6/25/14

Specific Strings - .africa

Category 2 (restricted and regulated markets) and Category 1 (consumer to all new gTLDs and Safeguard Advice Applicable

Category

7.a.I

3.b.

3.a.1-2.

11.

Specific Strings - .spa

July 2014 and all future gTLDs, advice on the .SPA and .AFRICA applications, is considered complete. In addition, the Board has been advised that the NGPC has accepted the GAC advice.

Specific Strings - .vin

On 8 September 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its correspondence:

Specific Strings - .wine

To provide its responses to GAC advice at least four weeks prior to ICANN meetings in order to give sufficient time to the NGPC to assess and provide feedback. In addition, the NGPC should ready to schedule a conference call with nominated members of the GAC, if helpful, to discuss further the concerns raised by the GAC. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 29 September 2014.

Specific Strings - .spaining

The GAC advises the Board to call on the NGPC to provide the GAC with a Guidebook taking into consideration the GAC advice.

Specific Strings - .spain

The GAC advises the NGPC to provide its responses to GAC advice at least four weeks prior to ICANN meetings in order to give sufficient time to the NGPC to assess and provide feedback. In addition, the NGPC should ready to schedule a conference call with nominated members of the GAC, if helpful, to discuss further the concerns raised by the GAC. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 29 September 2014.

Specific Strings - .spain

The GAC advises the NGPC to provide its responses to GAC advice at least four weeks prior to ICANN meetings in order to give sufficient time to the NGPC to assess and provide feedback. In addition, the NGPC should ready to schedule a conference call with nominated members of the GAC, if helpful, to discuss further the concerns raised by the GAC. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 29 September 2014.

Specific Strings - .spain

The NGPC has accepted the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.

Specific Strings - .spain

The NGPC provided its responses to the GAC more than five weeks prior to ICANN meetings in order to give sufficient time for the GAC to assess and provide feedback. In addition, the NGPC should ready to schedule a conference call with nominated members of the GAC, if helpful, to discuss further the concerns raised by the GAC. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 29 September 2014.

Specific Strings - .spain

On 8 September 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its correspondence:

Specific Strings - .spain

The NGPC has accepted the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.

Specific Strings - .spain

The NGPC has accepted the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.

Specific Strings - .spain

The GAC advises the Board to call on the NGPC to provide the GAC with a Guidebook taking into consideration the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 29 September 2014.

Specific Strings - .spain

The GAC advises the Board to call on the NGPC to provide the GAC with a Guidebook taking into consideration the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 29 September 2014.

Specific Strings - .spain

The NGPC has accepted the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.

Specific Strings - .spain

The NGPC has accepted the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.

Specific Strings - .spain

The NGPC has accepted the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.

Specific Strings - .spain

The NGPC has accepted the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.

Specific Strings - .spain

The NGPC has accepted the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.

Specific Strings - .spain

The NGPC has accepted the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.

Specific Strings - .spain

The NGPC has accepted the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.

Specific Strings - .spain

The NGPC has accepted the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.

Specific Strings - .spain

The NGPC has accepted the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.

Specific Strings - .spain

The NGPC has accepted the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.

Specific Strings - .spain

The NGPC has accepted the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.

Specific Strings - .spain

The NGPC has accepted the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.

Specific Strings - .spain

The NGPC has accepted the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.

Specific Strings - .spain

The NGPC has accepted the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.

Specific Strings - .spain

The NGPC has accepted the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.

Specific Strings - .spain

The NGPC has accepted the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.

Specific Strings - .spain

The NGPC has accepted the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.

Specific Strings - .spain

The NGPC has accepted the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.

Specific Strings - .spain

The NGPC has accepted the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.

Specific Strings - .spain

The NGPC has accepted the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.

Specific Strings - .spain

The NGPC has accepted the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.

Specific Strings - .spain

The NGPC has accepted the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.

Specific Strings - .spain

The NGPC has accepted the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.

Specific Strings - .spain

The NGPC has accepted the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.

Specific Strings - .spain

The NGPC has accepted the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.

Specific Strings - .spain

The NGPC has accepted the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.

Specific Strings - .spain

The NGPC has accepted the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.

Specific Strings - .spain

The NGPC has accepted the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.

Specific Strings - .spain

The NGPC has accepted the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.

Specific Strings - .spain

The NGPC has accepted the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.

Specific Strings - .spain

The NGPC has accepted the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.

Specific Strings - .spain

The NGPC has accepted the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.

Specific Strings - .spain

The NGPC has accepted the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.

Specific Strings - .spain

The NGPC has accepted the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.

Specific Strings - .spain

The NGPC has accepted the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.

Specific Strings - .spain

The NGPC has accepted the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.

Specific Strings - .spain

The NGPC has accepted the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.

Specific Strings - .spain

The NGPC has accepted the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.

Specific Strings - .spain

The NGPC has accepted the GAC advice. This item is considered complete as of the Board's consideration of 8 September 2014.
As of 31 October 2020

**GAC Advice Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>GAC Resolution 1804</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>About Domains</th>
<th>Board Action(s)</th>
<th>Board Resolution Link</th>
<th>Board Forward Link</th>
<th>Date of Resolution</th>
<th>Notes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-001332</td>
<td>ICU15</td>
<td>Prior</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>.ram and .INDIANS</td>
<td>The Board resolved to include human rights and transparency-related text in the GAC recommendations to the Board (Recommendation 6.4). The GNSO applicant for .ram withdrew its application in October 2019. Accordingly, this item is now complete.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/board-resolution-2014.06.26-en#2.a">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/board-resolution-2014.06.26-en#2.a</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>6/8/2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR-001331</td>
<td>ICU15</td>
<td>Prior</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>.ram and .INDIANS</td>
<td>The Board resolved to include human rights and transparency-related text in the GAC recommendations to the Board (Recommendation 6.4). The GNSO applicant for .ram withdrew its application in October 2019. Accordingly, this item is now complete.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/board-resolution-2014.06.26-en#2.a">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/board-resolution-2014.06.26-en#2.a</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>6/8/2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

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

GAC Advice Status

AR-001333

Tracking of Key Issues

Transparency

Accountability and Authority (IANA) Functions:

Protection of Red Cross/Red Crescent Societies, in English and the official languages of their respective states of origin. The Chair of the International Committee of the Red Cross and International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies in these United Nations languages

Phase 3 | Evaluate & Consider

Chair’s letter of 5 June 2014.

The ICANN Board Chair provided the GAC Chair with a scorecard of the Board’s responses to the GAC’s non-new gTLD concerns raised in the ICANN49 Singapore Communique as an annex to a letter dated 5 June 2014. The Board provided this response in its scorecard: The Board welcomes the input of the GAC and other governments that are not presently members of the IANA Stewardship to develop proposals for the transition of IANA stewardship from the United States Government. At the ICANN49 Meeting in Singapore during the 24 March session, ICANN launched a multistakeholder-designed process to gather the community’s views and contributions to address how the ICANN Board will implement the announcement of 14 March 2014 that the United States Government will transition key Internet domain name functions to the global multistakeholder community. The GAC also recommends that ICANN make the following ICANN processes more accessible to the public and to the stakeholders.

- The ICANN Board Chair provided the GAC Chair with a scorecard of the Board’s responses to the ICANN49 Singapore Communique as an annex to a letter dated 5 June 2014. The Board provided this response in its scorecard: The Board welcomes the input of the GAC and other governments that are not presently members of the IANA Stewardship to develop proposals for the transition of IANA stewardship from the United States Government. At the ICANN49 Meeting in Singapore during the 24 March session, ICANN launched a multistakeholder-designed process to gather the community’s views and contributions to address how the ICANN Board will implement the announcement of 14 March 2014 that the United States Government will transition key Internet domain name functions to the global multistakeholder community. The GAC also recommends that ICANN make the following ICANN processes more accessible to the public and to the stakeholders.

- The ICANN Board Chair provided the GAC Chair with a scorecard of the Board’s responses to the ICANN49 Singapore Communique as an annex to a letter dated 5 June 2014. The Board provided this response in its scorecard: The Board welcomes the input of the GAC and other governments that are not presently members of the IANA Stewardship to develop proposals for the transition of IANA stewardship from the United States Government. At the ICANN49 Meeting in Singapore during the 24 March session, ICANN launched a multistakeholder-designed process to gather the community’s views and contributions to address how the ICANN Board will implement the announcement of 14 March 2014 that the United States Government will transition key Internet domain name functions to the global multistakeholder community. The GAC also recommends that ICANN make the following ICANN processes more accessible to the public and to the stakeholders.

- The ICANN Board Chair provided the GAC Chair with a scorecard of the Board’s responses to the ICANN49 Singapore Communique as an annex to a letter dated 5 June 2014. The Board provided this response in its scorecard: The Board welcomes the input of the GAC and other governments that are not presently members of the IANA Stewardship to develop proposals for the transition of IANA stewardship from the United States Government. At the ICANN49 Meeting in Singapore during the 24 March session, ICANN launched a multistakeholder-designed process to gather the community’s views and contributions to address how the ICANN Board will implement the announcement of 14 March 2014 that the United States Government will transition key Internet domain name functions to the global multistakeholder community. The GAC also recommends that ICANN make the following ICANN processes more accessible to the public and to the stakeholders.
As of 31 October 2020

GAC Advice Status

[51x553]AR-001263
[51x550]AR-001262
[51x547]AR-001260
[51x544]AR-001259

Notes:

Communique
ICANN49 Singapore
Communique
Communique
Communique
Communique
Communique
Communique
3/27/14
3/27/14
3/27/14
3/27/14
3/27/14
3/27/14
3/27/14

- Specific Strings - .amazon
- Specific Strings - .spa

...
As of 31 October 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Request Number</th>
<th>Correspondent</th>
<th>Date of Requested</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>About Area Requested</th>
<th>Action Taken</th>
<th>Current Phase</th>
<th>Board Action(s)</th>
<th>Board Resolution(s)</th>
<th>Board Scorecard Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GAC-001328</td>
<td>AR-001328</td>
<td>11/20/13</td>
<td>Action Item</td>
<td>GAC Correspondence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAC-001268</td>
<td>AR-001268</td>
<td>3/27/14</td>
<td>Action Item</td>
<td>GAC Correspondence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAC-001267</td>
<td>AR-001267</td>
<td>3/27/14</td>
<td>Action Item</td>
<td>GAC Correspondence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communiqué (April 2013) through the ICANN Virtual Communiqué (June 2021). (Note: the ICANN Virtual Communiqué did not contain GAC Advice.)
The GAC advises the ICANN Board to re-categorize the string .doctor as Category 1 and Category 2. The GAC highlights the importance of its Beijing advice on 'Restricted TLDs' in this regard. The Board is requested to provide a plan for the way in which existing protections should apply to the words 'Red Cross', 'Red Crescent', and 'Red Crescent Names' (IGOs).

The GAC advises the ICANN Board: i. that it is giving further consideration to the way in which existing protections should apply to the words 'Red Cross', 'Red Crescent' and related designations of cross and red heart symbols, and that it will provide further advice to the Board on this.

1.2.1.6. Safeguard Advice

Category 1 and Category 2 Safeguard Advice

1. The GAC advises the ICANN Board that an NGO submits a letter to the Secretary General of the ICANN Board regarding the ICANN Board's decision to allow the application for .shenzhen (IDN in Chinese ? application number 1-1121-82863) until the agreements between the relevant parties are reached: the .shenzhen application is considered Category 1 or Category 2.

2. The GAC advises the ICANN Board not to proceed beyond initial evaluation of the application for .guangzhou (IDN in Chinese ? application number 1-1121-22691)

3. The GAC welcomes the Board’s communication with applicants with respect to the string .doctor. This communication reflects the importance of the string .doctor for the medical practitioners. The GAC notes the strong implications for the medical practitioners of the string .doctor to the way in which existing protections should apply to the words 'Red Cross', 'Red Crescent' and related designations of cross and red heart symbols.

4. The GAC advises the ICANN Board: a. that it is giving further consideration to the way in which existing protections should apply to the words 'Red Cross', 'Red Crescent' and related designations of cross and red heart symbols, and that it will provide further advice to the Board on this.

5. The GAC advises the ICANN Board to re-categorize the string .doctor as Category 1 and Category 2. The GAC highlights the importance of its Beijing advice on 'Restricted TLDs' in this regard. The Board is requested to provide a plan for the way in which existing protections should apply to the words 'Red Cross', 'Red Crescent' and related designations of cross and red heart symbols, and that it will provide further advice to the Board on this.

6. The GAC advises the ICANN Board to consider the Board's decision to allow the application for .guangzhou (IDN in Chinese ? application number 1-1121-22691) in Category 3 and to provide a plan for the way in which existing protections should apply to the words 'Red Cross', 'Red Crescent' and related designations of cross and red heart symbols.

7. The GAC advises the ICANN Board to consider the Board's decision to allow the application for .shenzhen (IDN in Chinese ? application number 1-1121-82863) in Category 3 and to provide a plan for the way in which existing protections should apply to the words 'Red Cross', 'Red Crescent' and related designations of cross and red heart symbols.

On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its 2014-02-05-moťa. This is a considered complete of the NGPC’s consideration of 5 February 2014.

8. The GAC advises the ICANN Board to consider the Board’s decision to allow the application for .shenzhen (IDN in Chinese ? application number 1-1121-82863) in Category 3 and to provide a plan for the way in which existing protections should apply to the words 'Red Cross', 'Red Crescent' and related designations of cross and red heart symbols.

9. The GAC advises the ICANN Board to consider the Board’s decision to allow the application for .guangzhou (IDN in Chinese ? application number 1-1121-22691) in Category 3 and to provide a plan for the way in which existing protections should apply to the words 'Red Cross', 'Red Crescent' and related designations of cross and red heart symbols.

On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its 2014-02-05-moťa. This is a considered complete of the NGPC’s consideration of 5 February 2014.

10. The GAC advises the ICANN Board to consider the Board’s decision to allow the application for .guangzhou (IDN in Chinese ? application number 1-1121-22691) in Category 3 and to provide a plan for the way in which existing protections should apply to the words 'Red Cross', 'Red Crescent' and related designations of cross and red heart symbols.

11. The GAC advises the ICANN Board to consider the Board’s decision to allow the application for .shenzhen (IDN in Chinese ? application number 1-1121-82863) in Category 3 and to provide a plan for the way in which existing protections should apply to the words 'Red Cross', 'Red Crescent' and related designations of cross and red heart symbols.

12. The GAC advises the ICANN Board to consider the Board’s decision to allow the application for .guangzhou (IDN in Chinese ? application number 1-1121-22691) in Category 3 and to provide a plan for the way in which existing protections should apply to the words 'Red Cross', 'Red Crescent' and related designations of cross and red heart symbols.

On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its 2014-02-05-moťa. This is a considered complete of the NGPC’s consideration of 5 February 2014.
The items captured in this inventory include advice from the Beijing Communiqué (April 2013) through the ICANN68 Virtual Communiqué (June 2020). (Note: the ICANN68 Virtual Communiqué did not contain Consensus GAC Advice).

**Action Request Number**

**Category**

**About the Item**

**Board Action(s)**

**Board Resolution Link**

**Notes:**

The GAC has reached consensus on GAC Objection Advice according to Articles IV and V) subject to the appropriate standing and procedural requirements. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10 September 2013. Given the volume of information presented, the NGPC continues to consider the scorecard: The NGPC accepts this advice. GAC Objections to Specific Applications (ref. Beijing Communiqué 1.c.) - .amazon applications: The application for .amazon (application number 1-1315-7551) has been withdrawn.

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its meeting. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10 September 2013.

The GAC seeks an understanding to the ICANN Board regarding the application for .thai as an attempt to rebrand the .fam domain.

The GAC advises the ICANN Board that the GAC has noted the concerns raised by the ICANN Board that ICANN provide clarity on the proposed launch agreement for .fam. The GAC has sought an update from the Board on the current status of the agreement on outstanding implementation issues in that timeframe, and subject to any further discussions, the GAC expects to be completed in time for the ICANN Singapore meeting so that the NGPC can consider the appropriate next steps of bringing .fam back on the scorecard. The item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 1 November 2017.

On 7 October 2013, the NGPC accepted this advice. The GAC advises the ICANN Board that ICANN provide clarity on the proposed launch agreement for .fam. The GAC has sought an update from the Board on the current status of the agreement on outstanding implementation issues in that timeframe, and subject to any further discussions, the GAC expects to be completed in time for the ICANN Singapore meeting so that the NGPC can consider the appropriate next steps of bringing .fam back on the scorecard. The item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 1 November 2017.

**Notes:**

The GAC has reached consensus on GAC Objection Advice according to Articles IV and V) subject to the appropriate standing and procedural requirements. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 18 September 2015. The NGPC noted that it would conduct a review of the application to determine if the application should be included on the scorecard. The item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 1 November 2017.

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its meeting. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10 September 2013.

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its meeting. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10 September 2013.

The GAC advises the ICANN Board that the GAC has noted the concerns raised by the ICANN Board that ICANN provide clarity on the proposed launch agreement for .fam. The GAC has sought an update from the Board on the current status of the agreement on outstanding implementation issues in that timeframe, and subject to any further discussions, the GAC expects to be completed in time for the ICANN Singapore meeting so that the NGPC can consider the appropriate next steps of bringing .fam back on the scorecard. The item was presented as complete to the GAC at ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi on 1 November 2017.

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its meeting. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10 September 2013.

The GAC has reached consensus on GAC Objection Advice according to Articles IV and V) subject to the appropriate standing and procedural requirements. 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 meeting. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10 September 2013.

The GAC has reached consensus on GAC Objection Advice according to Articles IV and V) subject to the appropriate standing and procedural requirements. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10 September 2013.

The GAC has reached consensus on GAC Objection Advice according to Articles IV and V) subject to the appropriate standing and procedural requirements. 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 meeting. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10 September 2013.

The GAC has reached consensus on GAC Objection Advice according to Articles IV and V) subject to the appropriate standing and procedural requirements. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10 September 2013.
It was noted that there are provisions in the Registry Agreement and Domains (SAC053) and Internal Name Certificates (SAC057).

The GAC shares the security and stability concerns expressed by the SSAC regarding ICANN’s formal community processes to date.

The GAC reiterates its advice from the Beijing Communiqué regarding .wine and .vin (ref. Beijing .yun, .guangzhou, .shenzhen

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard: The NGPC informed the GAC that it looked forward to continuing the dialogue with the GAC on this issue. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10 September 2013.

The GAC agrees to leave the applications below for further consideration and evaluation, and will make a final decision on each application after the conclusion of community consultations.

- .date (application number 1-1247-)
- .yun (application number 1-1318-12524).

2. The application for .guangzhou (IDN in Chinese - application number 1-92115).

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard: The NGPC acknowledged the GAC’s highlighting of the importance of having adequate procedures to avoid conflicts between provisions in the Registry Agreement and Domains and the AGB. 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. On 5 August, ICANN opened a public comment period on proposed future rounds of the Applicant Guidebook with respect to the protection of terms with national, cultural, geographic and religious significance, in accordance with the 2007 GAC Principles on New gTLDs. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10 September 2013.

On 10 September 2013, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its scorecard: The NGPC accepted this advice. On 4 August, ICANN published a draft Applicant Guidebook with respect to the protection of terms with national, cultural, geographic and religious significance, in accordance with the 2007 GAC Principles on New gTLDs. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC’s consideration of 10 September 2013.
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This will create a strong presumption for the ICANN Board that the application should not be approved. This will create a strong presumption for the ICANN Board that the application should not be approved. This will create a strong presumption for the ICANN Board that the application should not be approved.

GAC Advice Scorecard: The NGPC accepts the ICANN Board's final decision on this matter.
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2/5/14

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

Notes:

ICANN46 Beijing Communique

Date: 4/11/13

Agreement (RAA) - Registrar Accreditation Agreement

Registrar: Community Support for Further gTLDs

Safeguard Advice for New Category

GAC recommendations include the following:

- To reinforce existing processes for raising and addressing concerns the GAC advises the ICANN Board to: not proceed beyond Initial Applications: 2. The application for .gcc (Application number 1-1165-2013) should be an Initial Application, that is not treated as a re-submission of an application that was previously rejected by the NGPC; (AGB § 3.1). At this time, ICANN has considered and approved the application for the gTLD .gcc.

- For applicants not seeking to impose exclusive registry access the NGPC passed the following resolution on 21 June 2013: Resolved (2013.06.25.NG05), the NGPC directs ICANN to impose exclusive registry access on the application for .PERSIANGULF, .AMAZON, and .PATAGONIA. The application for .ZULU was not considered by the NGPC, as its status was not yet determined.

- The NGPC requested that the Board refer its recommendation to the NGPC for resolution. The GAC advises the ICANN Board that the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement should be finalized before any new gTLD contracts are approved.
ANNEX I. 1.

Registry operators shall conduct checks on a significant basis to identify registrations in their gTLDs that are likely to be inaccurate, insecure, or mitigate data that are at least two years old. Registry operators will weight the samples toward registrants with the highest percentage of "deliberately false, inaccurate or incomplete" records in the previous checks. Registry operators will notify the relevant registrar of any inaccurate or incomplete records identified during the checks, requiring the registrar to take action to select accurate and complete information from the registrar.

Signed: ICANN 46 Communique (4/11/13)
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Sensitive Strings, and

Category

ANNEX I. 6.

.schule, .toys

Environmental:o .earth, .eco, .green, .bio, .organic

Health

contact which must be kept up-to-date, for the notification of complaints

required by the registry operators to notify to them a single point of

risks of fraudulent, and other illegal, activities.95. Registrants must be

bodies, including developing a strategy to mitigate as much as possible the

relationship with the relevant regulatory, or industry self-regulatory,

applicable law and recognized industry standards.4. Establish a working

health and financial data implement reasonable and appropriate security

operators will require that registrants who collect and maintain sensitive

time of registration to notify registrants of this requirement. 3. Registry

and financial disclosures. 2. Registry operators will require registrars at the

applicable laws, including those that relate to privacy, data collection,

include in its acceptable use policy that registrants comply with all

apply to strings that are related to these sectors: 1. Registry operators will

invoke a level of implied trust from consumers, and carry higher levels of

Strings that are linked to regulated or professional sectors should operate

domain name.

applicable law; these consequences should include suspension of the

Consistent with applicable law and any related procedures, registry

reports from law enforcement and governmental and quasi-governmental agencies of

consequences for the demonstrated provision of false WHOIS information and violations of

or promote malware, operation of botnets, phishing, piracy, trademark or

correct any inaccurate or that the domain name registration is being used to facilitate

complaints to the registry operator that the WHOIS information is

Registry operators will ensure that there is a mechanism for making complaints that WHOIS information is inaccurate. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's response of 19 June 2013.

Registry Operator will use only ICANN accredited registrars that are party to the 2013 RAA registration.? Paragraph 1 of the proposed PIC Specification includes a requirement that

information are set forth in Section 3.7.7.2 of the 2013 RAA

law and any related procedures) consequences for such activities including suspension of

distributing malware, abusively operating botnets, phishing, piracy, trademark or

provision in their Registry-Registrar Agreements that requires Registrars to include in their

Public Interest Commitment in Specification 11) obligating Registry Operators to include a

conduct in the TLD, and will provide ICANN with prompt notice of any changes to such

ICANN and publish on its website its accurate contact details including a valid email and

providing is consistent with applicable law and any related procedures) consequence for such activities including suspension of

in a way that is consistent with applicable laws. These strings are likely to

in the demonstrated provision of false WHOIS information and violations of

registrars who collect and maintain sensitive data implement reasonable and appropriate security

Consequences for the domain name is suspended. The NGPC's response of 19 June 2013.

a, ?Registry Operator shall take reasonable steps to investigate and respond to any

also, Section 2.8 of the proposed New gTLD Registry Agreement provides that, ?Registry Operator shall provide to ICANN and publish on its website its accurate contact details including a valid email and

on 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and provided this response in its

On 5 February 2014, the NGPC considered this advice and the proposed Phase of implementation framework. With respect to the functional advice in the Buenos Aires

the NGPC adopts the implementation framework. With respect to the additional advice in the Buenos Aires

scorecard: The NGPC accepts the advice. The NGPC adopts the implementation framework

of the NGPC's response of 19 June 2013.

item is considered complete as of the NGPC's response of 19 June 2013.

concerning the accuracy of contact details associated with the Registered Name Holder's

change, or its failure to respond for over fifteen (15) days to inquiries by Registrar

protection, including in relation to misleading and deceptive activities, including

distribution, organic farming, etc. and evaluate outcomes. 3. Registry operators will require registrants to: a. View the positions of the NGPC as falling within Category 1 safeguard advice addressing highly regulated

compliance with all applicable laws, including those that relate to privacy, data collection,

that the domain name is being used to facilitate

the NGPC's response of 19 June 2013.

Registry operators shall ensure that there are real and immediate consequences for

distributing malware, abusively operating botnets, phishing, piracy, trademark or

inaccurate or that the domain name registration is being used to facilitate

complaints to the registry operator that the WHOIS information is inaccurate. This item is considered complete as of the NGPC's response of 19 June 2013.

a. ?Registry Operator shall take reasonable steps to investigate and respond to any

Registry operators shall ensure that there are real and immediate consequences for

the NGPC accepts the advice. The NGPC accepts the advice to re-categorize

implementation framework. With respect to the additional advice in the Buenos Aires

on 5 February 2014.

The NGPC accepts the advice. The NGPC accepts the advice to re-categorize

of the NGPC's response of 19 June 2013.

item is considered complete as of the NGPC's response of 19 June 2013.

of the NGPC's response of 19 June 2013.

item is considered complete as of the NGPC's response of 19 June 2013.

for .doctor from being a public sector TLD to be a .health TLD.

the string .doctor as falling within Category 1 safeguard advice addressing highly regulated

of 5 February 2014.

the NGPC considers this advice and the proposed Phase of implementation framework. With respect to the functional advice in the Buenos Aires

the NGPC considers this advice and the proposed Phase of implementation framework. With respect to the functional advice in the Buenos Aires