

**GAC Advice – Comprehensive Report of NGPC Responses to GAC Advice re: the New gTLD Program  
(as of 7 October 2015)**

(Advice appears in the order listed in the [GAC Register of Advice](#))

	<b>GAC Register #</b>	<b>GAC Advice (Summary)</b>	<b>Response and Current Status</b>
<b>GAC Advice – New gTLDs (Beijing 2013 to Buenos Aires 2015)</b>			
1. Community Support	<a href="#">2013-04-11-CommunitySupport</a>	The GAC advises the Board that in those cases where a community, which is clearly impacted by a set of new gTLD applications in contention, has expressed a collective and clear opinion on those applications, such opinion should be duly taken into account, together with all other relevant information.	On 4 June 2013, the NGPC <a href="#">accepted</a> this advice in an iteration of the <a href="#">Scorecard</a> . The NGPC noted that Criterion 4 of the Community Priority Evaluation process takes into account "community support and/or opposition to the application" in determining whether to award priority to a community application in a contention set. (Note however that if a contention set is not resolved by the applicants or through a community priority evaluation then ICANN Will utilize an auction as the objective method for resolving contention).
2. gTLD Strings for further GAC consideration	<a href="#">2013-04-11-gTLDStrings</a>	<p>In addition to this safeguard advice, that GAC has identified certain gTLD strings where further GAC consideration may be warranted, including at the GAC meetings to be held in Durban.</p> <p>Consequently, the GAC advises the ICANN Board to: not proceed beyond Initial Evaluation with the following strings :            .shenzhen (IDN in Chinese), .persiangulf, .guangzhou (IDN in Chinese), .amazon (and IDNs in Japanese and Chinese), .patagonia, .date, .spa, .yun, .thai, .zulu, .wine, .vin</p>	<p>On 4 June 2013, the NGPC <a href="#">accepted</a> this advice in an iteration of the <a href="#">Scorecard</a>. The AGB provides that "GAC advice will not toll the processing of any applications (i.e. an application will not be suspended but will continue through the stages of the application process)" (AGB § 3.1). At that time, ICANN did not proceed beyond initial evaluation of these identified strings. In other words, ICANN allowed evaluation and dispute resolution processes to go forward, but did not enter into any registry agreements with the applicants for the identified strings at that time.</p> <p>(Note: community objections were filed with the International Centre for Expertise of the ICC against .PERSIANGULF, .AMAZON, and .PATAGONIA. The application for .ZULU was withdrawn.)</p>

	<b>GAC Register #</b>	<b>GAC Advice (Summary)</b>	<b>Response and Current Status</b>
3. Protections for IGOs	<a href="#">2013-04-11-IGO</a>	The GAC reiterates its advice to the ICANN Board that appropriate preventative initial protection for the IGO names and acronyms on the provided list be in place before any new gTLDs would launch.	<p>On 2 July 2013, the NGPC adopted a <a href="#">resolution</a> confirming that appropriate preventative initial protection for the IGO identifiers will continue to be provided as presented in the proposed New gTLD Registry Agreement while the GAC, NGPC, ICANN Staff and community continue to actively work through outstanding implementation issues.</p> <p>Additionally, the NGPC acknowledged that the GAC was “mindful of outstanding implementation issues and commit[ed] to actively working with IGOs, the Board, and ICANN Staff to find a workable and timely way forward.” To that end, the NGPC formally requested that the GAC and a small number of NGPC members and ICANN staff begin a dialogue on these issues.</p>

	<b>GAC Register #</b>	<b>GAC Advice (Summary)</b>	<b>Response and Current Status</b>
4. Protections for International Olympic Committee and Red Cross /Red Crescent	<a href="#">2013-04-11-IOCRC</a>	The GAC advises the ICANN Board to amend the provisions in the new gTLD Registry Agreement pertaining to the IOC/RCRC names to confirm that the protections will be made permanent prior to the delegation of any new gTLDs.	<p>On 4 June 2013, the NGPC accepted the GAC advice in an iteration of the <a href="#">Scorecard</a>. The New gTLD Registry Agreement adopted by the NGPC on 2 July 2013 included protection for an indefinite duration for IOC/RCRC names. Specification 5 of the approved Registry Agreement included a list of names (provided by the IOC and RCRC Movement) that “shall be withheld from registration or allocated to Registry Operator at the second level within the TLD.”</p> <p>This protection was added pursuant to a NGPC resolution to maintain these protections “until such time as a policy is adopted that may require further action” (<a href="#">2012.11.26.NG03</a>). The resolution recognized the GNSO’s initiation of an expedited PDP. The GNSO Council <a href="#">approved</a> recommendations from the expedited PDP on 20 November 2013, and forwarded them to the ICANN Board for further consideration. On <a href="#">30 April 2014</a>, the Board (i) adopted the policy recommendations GNSO Council's unanimous recommendations that are not inconsistent with the GAC's advice, (ii) requested additional time to consider the remaining recommendations, and (iii) decided to facilitate discussions among the relevant parties to reconcile any remaining differences between the policy recommendations and the GAC advice on the topic. These policy recommendations and the GAC advice are still under consideration.</p>

	<b>GAC Register #</b>	<b>GAC Advice (Summary)</b>	<b>Response and Current Status</b>
5. .AFRICA	<a href="#">2013-04-11-Obj-Africa</a>	<p>The GAC Advises the ICANN Board that the GAC has reached consensus on GAC Objection Advice according to Module 3.1 part I of the Applicant Guidebook on the following applications:</p> <p>The application for .africa (Application number 1-1165-42560)</p>	<p>On 4 June 2013, the NGPC accepted this advice in an iteration of the <a href="#">Scorecard</a>. At the NGPC's direction, staff advised the applicant, DotConnectAfrica Trust (DCA Trust), that its application for .africa would not be approved.</p> <p>On 19 June 2013, DCA Trust submitted a reconsideration request to the Board Governance Committee ("BGC") requesting that the NGPC's 4 June 2013 action regarding DCA Trust's New gTLD application be reconsidered. On 13 August 2013, the NGPC <a href="#">adopted</a> the BGC's recommendation to deny the reconsideration request because DCA Trust did not state proper grounds for reconsideration.</p> <p>DCA Trust filed an Independent Review Proceeding (IRP) in accordance with Article IV, section 3 of the ICANN Bylaws. On 9 July 2015, an independent review panel ("Panel") issued a final Declaration ("Declaration") in the IRP. The ICANN Board considered, and took <a href="#">action</a> on the Declaration on 16 July 2015. The Board will be provided with updates as the matter continues to progress.</p>

	<b>GAC Register #</b>	<b>GAC Advice (Summary)</b>	<b>Response and Current Status</b>
6. .GCC	<a href="#">2013-04-11-Obj-GCC</a>	The GAC advises the ICANN Board that the GAC has reached consensus on GAC Objection Advice according to Module 3.1 part I of the Applicant Guidebook on the following application: .gcc (application number: 1-1936-2101)	<p>On 4 June 2013, the NGPC accepted this advice in an iteration of the <a href="#">Scorecard</a>. The AGB provides that if “GAC advises ICANN that it is the consensus of the GAC that a particular application should not proceed. This will create a strong presumption for the ICANN Board that the application should not be approved.” (AGB § 3.1) At the NGPC’s direction, staff advised the applicant, GCCIX WLL, that its application for .gcc would not be approved.</p> <p>At this time, <a href="#">this matter</a> is the subject of an active Cooperative Engagement Process (CEP), which is a process voluntarily invoked by a complainant prior to the filing of an Independent Review Process (IRP) for the purpose of resolving or narrowing the issues that are contemplated to be brought to the IRP.</p>
7. Public Interest Commitments	<a href="#">2013-04-11-PICSPEC</a>	The GAC requests more information on the Public Interest Commitments Specifications on the basis of the questions listed in <a href="#">annex II</a> .	On 6 June 2013, the NGPC provided a written <a href="#">response</a> to the GAC to address the questions listed in Annex II about the Public Interest Commitments.
8. Singular/Plural Strings	<a href="#">2013-04-11-PluralStrings</a>	The GAC believes that singular and plural versions of the string as a TLD could lead to potential consumer confusion. Therefore the GAC advises the ICANN Board to reconsider its decision to allow singular and plural versions of the same strings.	The NGPC adopted a <a href="#">resolution</a> to accept this advice at its 4 June 2013 meeting, and to consider singular and plural versions of the same strings. At its 25 June 2013 meeting, the NGPC considered whether to allow singular and plural versions of the same string, and adopted a <a href="#">resolution</a> confirming that no changes were needed to the existing mechanisms in the Applicant Guidebook to address potential consumer confusion resulting from allowing singular and plural versions of the same string.

	GAC Register #	GAC Advice (Summary)	Response and Current Status
9. Religious Terms	<a href="#">2013-04-11-Religious Terms</a>	<p>The GAC Advises the ICANN Board that:</p> <p>With regard to Module 3.1 part II of the Applicant Guidebook:  The GAC recognizes that Religious terms are sensitive issues. Some GAC members have raised sensitivities on the applications that relate to Islamic terms, specifically .islam and .halal. The GAC members concerned have noted that the applications for .islam and .halal lack community involvement and support. It is the view of these GAC members that these applications should not proceed.</p>	<p>On 4 June 2013, the NGPC accepted this advice in an iteration of the <a href="#">Scorecard</a>. Pursuant to Section 3.1.ii of the AGB, the NGPC and some members of the GAC met during the ICANN 47 meeting in Durban to discuss the concerns about the applications.</p> <p>On 24 October 2013 decisions were posted in favor of the applicant on the community objections filed by the Telecommunications Regulatory Authority of the UAE.</p> <p>In a 4 November 2013 letter from the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC) to the GAC Chair, the OIC requested that its letter be considered an “official opposition of the Member States of the OIC towards probable authorization by the GAC allowing the use of [...] .ISLAM and .HALAL by any entity not representing the collective voice of the Muslim people.”</p> <p>In a 7 February 2014 <a href="#">letter</a>, ICANN noted to applicant that there seems to be a conflict between the commitments made in the applicant’s letters and the concerns raised in letters to ICANN urging ICANN not to delegate the strings. Given these circumstances, the NGPC stated that it would not address the applications further until such time as the noted conflicts have been resolved.</p> <p>At this time, <a href="#">this matter</a> is the subject of an active Cooperative Engagement Process (CEP), which is a process voluntarily invoked by a complainant prior to the filing of an Independent Review Process (IRP) for the purpose of resolving or narrowing the issues that are contemplated to be brought to the IRP.</p>

	<b>GAC Register #</b>	<b>GAC Advice (Summary)</b>	<b>Response and Current Status</b>
<p>10. Safeguards – All New gTLDs</p>	<p><a href="#">2013-04-11-Safeguards-1</a></p>	<p>The GAC Advises that the following six safeguards should apply to all new gTLDs and be subject to contractual oversight.</p> <p>1. WHOIS verification and checks —Registry operators will conduct checks on a statistically significant basis to identify registrations in its gTLD with deliberately false, inaccurate or incomplete WHOIS data at least twice a year. Registry operators will weight the sample towards registrars with the highest percentages 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, triggering the registrar’s obligation to solicit accurate and complete information from the registrant.</p>	<p>On 25 June 2013, the NGPC took <a href="#">action</a> to adopt accepting a <a href="#">proposal</a> for implementation of the GAC safeguards applicable to all new gTLDs.</p> <p>With respect to WHOIS verification and checks, the NGPC reported that ICANN concluded its development of a WHOIS tool that gives it the ability to check false, incomplete or inaccurate WHOIS data as the Board previously directed staff in Board Resolutions <a href="#">2012.11.08.01 - 2012.11.08.02</a> to begin to “proactively identify potentially inaccurate gTLD data registration in gTLD registry and registrar services, explore using automated tools, and forward potentially inaccurate records to gTLD registrars for action; and 2) publicly report on the resulting actions to encourage improved accuracy. Given these ongoing activities, the NGPC noted that ICANN (instead of Registry Operators) was well positioned to implement the GAC’s advice that checks identifying registrations in a gTLD with deliberately false, inaccurate or incomplete WHOIS data be conducted at least twice a year. To achieve this, ICANN is performing a periodic sampling of WHOIS data across registries in an effort to identify potentially inaccurate records. ICANN will also maintain statistical reports that identify the number of inaccurate WHOIS records identified.</p>

	<b>GAC Register #</b>	<b>GAC Advice (Summary)</b>	<b>Response and Current Status</b>
11. Safeguards – All New gTLDs	<a href="#">2013-04-11-Safeguards-2</a>	<p>The GAC Advises that the following six safeguards should apply to all new gTLDs and be subject to contractual oversight.</p> <p>2. Mitigating abusive activity—Registry operators will ensure that terms of use for registrants include prohibitions against the distribution of malware, operation of botnets, phishing, piracy, trademark or copyright infringement, fraudulent or deceptive practices, counterfeiting or otherwise engaging in activity contrary to applicable law.</p>	<p>On 25 June 2013, the NGPC took <a href="#">action</a> to adopt accepting a <a href="#">proposal</a> for implementation of the GAC safeguards applicable to all new gTLDs.</p> <p>With respect to mitigating abusive activity, the NGPC included some changes to the New gTLD Registry Agreement approved by the NGPC on 2 July 2013 to implement the safeguard advice. The changes are reflected in the Public Interest Commitments (PICs) in Specification 11. The new PIC requires the Registry Operator to “include a provision in its Registry-Registrar Agreement that requires Registrars to include in their Registration Agreements a provision prohibiting Registered Name Holders from distributing malware, abusively operating botnets, phishing, piracy, trademark or copyright infringement, fraudulent or deceptive practices, counterfeiting or otherwise engaging in activity contrary to applicable law, and providing (consistent with applicable law and any related procedures) consequences for such activities including suspension of the domain name.”</p>



	<b>GAC Register #</b>	<b>GAC Advice (Summary)</b>	<b>Response and Current Status</b>
<p>12. Safeguards – All New gTLDs</p>	<p><a href="#">2013-04-11-Safeguards-3</a></p>	<p>The GAC Advises that the following six safeguards should apply to all new gTLDs and be subject to contractual oversight.</p> <p>3. Security checks— While respecting privacy and confidentiality, Registry operators will periodically conduct a technical analysis to assess whether domains in its gTLD are being used to perpetrate security threats, such as pharming, phishing, malware, and botnets. If Registry operator identifies security risks that pose an actual risk of harm, Registry operator will notify the relevant registrar and, if the registrar does not take immediate action, suspend the domain name until the matter is resolved.</p>	<p>On 25 June 2013, the NGPC took <a href="#">action</a> to adopt accepting a <a href="#">proposal</a> for implementation of the GAC safeguards applicable to all new gTLDs.</p> <p>With respect to security checks, the NGPC included some changes to the New gTLD Registry Agreement approved by the NGPC on 2 July 2013 to implement the safeguard advice. The changes are reflected in the Public Interest Commitments (PICs) in Specification 11. The new PIC requires the Registry Operator to “periodically conduct a technical analysis to assess whether domains in the TLD are being used to perpetrate security threats, such as pharming, phishing, malware, and botnets. Registry Operator will maintain statistical reports on the number of security threats identified and the actions taken as a result of the periodic security checks. Registry Operator will maintain these reports for the term of the Agreement unless a shorter period is required by law or approved by ICANN, and will provide them to ICANN upon request.”</p> <p>Because there are multiple ways for a Registry Operator to implement the security checks, ICANN solicited community input to develop a framework for Registry Operators to respond to identified risks. Community work, including participation by the GAC, to <a href="#">develop the framework</a> is ongoing.</p>

	<b>GAC Register #</b>	<b>GAC Advice (Summary)</b>	<b>Response and Current Status</b>
13. Safeguards – All New gTLDs	<a href="#">2013-04-11-Safeguards-4</a>	<p>The GAC Advises that the following six safeguards should apply to all new gTLDs and be subject to contractual oversight.</p> <p>4. Documentation—Registry operators will maintain statistical reports that provide the number of inaccurate WHOIS records or security threats identified and actions taken as a result of its periodic WHOIS and security checks. Registry operators will maintain these reports for the agreed contracted period and provide them to ICANN upon request in connection with contractual obligations.</p>	<p>On 25 June 2013, the NGPC took <a href="#">action</a> to adopt accepting a <a href="#">proposal</a> for implementation of the GAC safeguards applicable to all new gTLDs.</p> <p>With respect to documentation, as detailed in #10 above, ICANN will maintain statistical reports that identify the number of inaccurate WHOIS records identified as part of the checks to identify registrations with deliberately false, inaccurate or incomplete WHOIS data. Also, as detailed in #12 above, Registry Operators are required to maintain statistical reports on the number of security threats identified and the actions taken as a result of the periodic security checks. Registry Operators will maintain these reports for the agreed contracted period and provide them to ICANN upon request. The contents of the reports will be publically available as appropriate.</p>

	<b>GAC Register #</b>	<b>GAC Advice (Summary)</b>	<b>Response and Current Status</b>
14. Safeguards – All New gTLDs	<a href="#">2013-04-11-Safeguards-5</a>	<p>The GAC Advises that the following six safeguards should apply to all new gTLDs and be subject to contractual oversight.</p> <p>5. Making and Handling Complaints – Registry operators will ensure that there is a mechanism for making complaints to the registry operator that the WHOIS information is inaccurate or that the domain name registration is being used to facilitate or promote malware, operation of botnets, phishing, piracy, trademark or copyright infringement, fraudulent or deceptive practices, counterfeiting or otherwise engaging in activity contrary to applicable law.</p>	<p>On 25 June 2013, the NGPC took <a href="#">action</a> to adopt accepting a <a href="#">proposal</a> for implementation of the GAC safeguards applicable to all new gTLDs.</p> <p>With respect to making and handling complaints, Registry Operators are required to ensure that there is a mechanism for making complaints to the Registry Operator regarding malicious conduct in the TLD. Section 4.1 of Specification 6 of the 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 mailing address as well as a primary contact for handling inquiries related to malicious conduct in the TLD, and will provide ICANN with prompt notice of any changes to such contact details.” Also, Section 2.8 of the proposed New gTLD Registry Agreement provides that a, “Registry Operator shall take reasonable steps to investigate and respond to any reports from law enforcement and governmental and quasi-governmental agencies of illegal conduct in connection with the use of the TLD.”</p>

	<b>GAC Register #</b>	<b>GAC Advice (Summary)</b>	<b>Response and Current Status</b>
15. Safeguards – All New gTLDs	<a href="#">2013-04-11-Safeguards-6</a>	<p>The GAC Advises that the following six safeguards should apply to all new gTLDs and be subject to contractual oversight.</p> <p>6. Consequences – Consistent with applicable law and any related procedures, registry operators shall ensure that there are real and immediate consequences for the demonstrated provision of false WHOIS information and violations of the requirement that the domain name should not be used in breach of applicable law; these consequences should include suspension of the domain name.</p>	<p>On 25 June 2013, the NGPC took <a href="#">action</a> to adopt accepting a <a href="#">proposal</a> for implementation of the GAC safeguards applicable to all new gTLDs.</p> <p>With respect to consequences, the NGPC included a provision in the New gTLD Registry Agreement (as a mandatory Public Interest Commitment in Specification 11) obligating Registry Operators to include a provision in their Registry-Registrar Agreements that requires Registrars to include in their Registration Agreements a provision prohibiting Registered Name Holders from distributing malware, abusively operating botnets, phishing, piracy, trademark or copyright infringement, fraudulent or deceptive practices, counterfeiting or otherwise engaging in activity contrary to applicable law, and providing (consistent with applicable law and any related procedures) consequences for such activities including suspension of the domain name.</p> <p>Consequences for the demonstrated provision of false WHOIS information are set forth in Section 3.7.7.2 of the <a href="#">2013 RAA</a>.</p>

	<b>GAC Register #</b>	<b>GAC Advice (Summary)</b>	<b>Response and Current Status</b>
16. Category 1 Safeguards	<a href="#">2013-04-11-Safeguards-Categories-1</a>	Strings that are linked to regulated or professional sectors should operate in a way that is consistent with applicable laws. These strings are likely to invoke a level of implied trust from consumers, and carry higher levels of risk associated with consumer harm. In the current round the GAC has identified a non-exhaustive list of strings that the safeguards should apply to. (Refer to the GAC Register of Advice for the full text of each Category 1 Safeguard.)	On 5 February 2014, the NGPC <a href="#">accepted</a> this advice in an iteration of the <a href="#">Scorecard</a> . The NGPC adopted the implementation framework attached as <a href="#">Annex 2</a> to the Scorecard to implement the advice, and directed the ICANN President and CEO, or his designee, to implement the Category 1 Safeguard advice consistent with the implementation framework. As described in the scorecard, the NGPC also accepted the advice to re-categorize the string .doctor as falling within Category 1 safeguard advice addressing highly regulated sectors.

	<b>GAC Register #</b>	<b>GAC Advice (Summary)</b>	<b>Response and Current Status</b>
<p>17. Category 2 Safeguards</p>	<p><a href="#">2013-04-11-Safeguards-Categories-2</a></p>	<p>The GAC advises the ICANN Board:</p> <p>1. Restricted Access</p> <p>As an exception to the general rule that the gTLD domain name space is operated in an open manner registration may be restricted, in particular for strings mentioned under category 1 above. In these cases, the registration restrictions should be appropriate for the types of risks associated with the TLD. The registry operator should administer access in these kinds of registries in a transparent way that does not give an undue preference to any registrars or registrants, including itself, and shall not subject registrars or registrants to an undue disadvantage.</p> <p>2. Exclusive Access</p> <p>For strings representing generic terms, exclusive registry access should serve a public interest goal. In the current round, the GAC has identified a non-exhaustive list of strings that it considers to be generic terms, where the applicant is currently proposing to provide exclusive registry access.</p>	<p>On 25 June 2013, the NGPC <a href="#">accepted</a> the advice regarding Category 2 – Restricted Access. To implement the advice, the NGPC revised Specification 11 – Public Interest Commitments in the New gTLD Registry Agreement. The PIC Spec requires that “Registry Operator will operate the TLD in a transparent manner consistent with general principles of openness and non-discrimination by establishing, publishing and adhering to clear registration policies.”</p> <p>On 21 June 2015, the NGPC concluded its deliberations on the advice regarding Category 2 – Exclusive Access, and adopted a <a href="#">resolution</a> to address the advice. The NGPC requested that the GNSO include this issue as part of the policy work it is planning to initiate on subsequent rounds of the New gTLD Program. Additionally, the NGPC directed the CEO to proceed as follows:</p> <p>1. For the remaining applicants in this round of the New gTLD Program who propose to provide exclusive registry access for a generic string ("Exclusive Generic Applicants"), proceed with initiating other New gTLD Program processes, and</p> <p>2. Advise Exclusive Generic Applicants for non-contended strings, or Exclusive Generic Applicants prevailing in contention resolution that they must elect within a reasonably limited time to either: (i) submit a change request to no longer be an exclusive generic TLD; (ii) maintain their plan to operate an exclusive generic TLD, and as a result, be deferred to the next round of the Program; or (iii) withdraw.</p>

	<b>GAC Register #</b>	<b>GAC Advice (Summary)</b>	<b>Response and Current Status</b>
18. Category 1 Safeguards	<a href="#">2013-07-18-Category 1</a>	The GAC has met with the NGPC to discuss the Committee's response to GAC advice contained in the Beijing Communiqué on safeguards that should apply to Category 1 new gTLDs. The GAC advises the ICANN Board that the GAC will continue the dialogue with the NGPC on this issue.	On 10 September 2013, the NGPC <a href="#">accepted</a> this advice in an iteration of the <a href="#">Scorecard</a> . The NGPC informed the GAC that it looked forward to continuing the dialogue with the GAC on this issue.
19. Community Applications	<a href="#">2013-07-18-Community Applications</a>	<p>The GAC reiterates its advice from the Beijing Communiqué regarding preferential treatment for all applications which have demonstrable community support, while noting community concerns over the high costs for pursuing a Community Objection process as well as over the high threshold for passing Community Priority Evaluation.</p> <p>Therefore the GAC advises the ICANN Board to consider to take better account of community views, and improve outcomes for communities, within the existing framework, independent of whether those communities have utilized ICANN's formal community processes to date.</p>	<p>On 10 September 2013, the NGPC <a href="#">accepted</a> this advice in an iteration of the <a href="#">Scorecard</a>. The NGPC stated that it would consider taking better account of community views and improving outcomes for communities, within the existing framework, independent of whether those communities have utilized ICANN's formal community processes to date. The NGPC noted that in general it may not be possible to improve any outcomes for communities beyond what may result from the utilization of the AGB's community processes while at the same time remaining within the existing framework.</p> <p>In the Scorecard, the NGPC also reiterated its <a href="#">previous consideration</a> of the GAC's advice in the Beijing Communiqué regarding community applications.</p>

	<b>GAC Register #</b>	<b>GAC Advice (Summary)</b>	<b>Response and Current Status</b>
20. .DATE and .PERSIANGULF	<a href="#">2013-07-18-date and persiangulf</a>	The GAC has finalised its consideration of the following strings, and does not object to them proceeding: i. .date (application number 1-1247-30301) ii. .persiangulf (application number 1-2128-55439)	On 10 September 2013, the NGPC <a href="#">accepted</a> this advice in an iteration of the <a href="#">Scorecard</a> . The NGPC reported that ICANN would continue to process the application in accordance with the established procedures in the AGB.  At this time, <a href="#">this matter</a> is the subject of an active Cooperative Engagement Process (CEP), which is a process voluntarily invoked by a complainant prior to the filing of an Independent Review Process (IRP) for the purpose of resolving or narrowing the issues that are contemplated to be brought to the IRP.
21. Geographic Names	<a href="#">2013-07-18-GeoNames</a>	The GAC recommends that ICANN collaborate with the GAC in refining, for future rounds, the Applicant Guidebook with regard to the protection of terms with national, cultural, geographic and religious significance, in accordance with the 2007 GAC Principles on New gTLDs.	On 10 September 2013, the NGPC <a href="#">accepted</a> this advice in an iteration of the <a href="#">Scorecard</a> . The NGPC noted that it stood ready to hear from the GAC regarding possible refinements, for 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.



	<b>GAC Register #</b>	<b>GAC Advice (Summary)</b>	<b>Response and Current Status</b>
22. .GUANGZHOU, .SHENZHEN, .SPA, .YUN	<a href="#">2013-07-18-gTLDStrings</a>	<p>The GAC agrees to leave the applications below for further consideration and advises the ICANN Board:</p> <p>i. Not to proceed beyond initial evaluation until the agreements between the relevant parties are reached.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The applications for .spa (application number 1-1309-12524 and 1-1619-92115)</li> <li>2. The application for .yun (application number 1-1318-12524)</li> <li>3. The application for .guangzhou (IDN in Chinese - application number 1-1121-22691)</li> <li>4. The application for .shenzhen (IDN in Chinese - application number 1-1121-82863)</li> </ol>	<p>On 10 September 2013, the NGPC <a href="#">accepted</a> this advice in an iteration of the <a href="#">Scorecard</a>. The AGB provides that "GAC advice will not toll the processing of any application (i.e., an application will not be suspended but will continue through the stages of the application process)" (AGB § 3.1). At that time, the NGPC reported that ICANN would not proceed beyond initial evaluation of the identified strings. ICANN would allow evaluation and dispute resolution processes to go forward, but would not enter into registry agreements with applicants for the identified strings, subject to the parties having reached agreement or the GAC issuing final advice prior to the close of the ICANN Public meeting in Buenos Aires (November 2013).</p>

	<b>GAC Register #</b>	<b>GAC Advice (Summary)</b>	<b>Response and Current Status</b>
23. Protections for IGO Acronyms	<a href="#">2013-07-18-IGO Acronyms</a>	<p>The GAC advises the ICANN Board that:</p> <p>i. The GAC is interested to work with the IGOs and the NGPC on a complementary cost-neutral mechanism that would:</p> <p>a. provide notification to an IGO if a potential registrant seeks to register a domain name matching the acronym of an IGO at the second level, giving the IGO a reasonable opportunity to express concerns, if any; and</p> <p>b. allow for an independent third party to review any such registration request, in the event of a disagreement between an IGO and potential registrant.</p> <p>c. The initial protections for IGO acronyms confirmed by the NGPC at its meeting of 2 July 2013 should remain in place until the dialogue between the GAC, NGPC, and IGO representatives ensuring the implementation of preventative protection for IGO acronyms at the second level is completed.</p>	<p>This item of advice from the GAC remains as an open issue. Certain GNSO consensus policy recommendations re: protections for IGOs in all gTLDs <a href="#">differ</a> from advice from the GAC to the Board on protections for IGOs for new gTLDs. The Board and NGPC continue to work through how to reconcile the differing advice received. The key issue relates to protections for IGO acronyms. The GNSO policy would permit eligible IGO acronyms to be added to the Trademark Clearinghouse for 90-day claims notification, and the GNSO initiated a PDP to look at the issue of curative rights for IGOs. The GAC advice calls for permanent claims notification and a final and binding 3<sup>rd</sup> party review for disputes about second-level registrations.</p> <p>The IGO names and acronyms at issue in the advice are temporarily protected (on the reserved names list in the New gTLD Registry Agreement) until final resolution is reached on the matter.</p>
24. .INDIANS, .RAM	<a href="#">2013-07-18-indians and ram</a>	<p>The GAC advises the ICANN Board that the GAC has noted the concerns expressed by the Government of India not to proceed with the applications for .indians and .ram.</p>	<p>On 10 September 2013, the NGPC <a href="#">adopted</a> an iteration of the <a href="#">Scorecard</a>, in which it took note of the concerns expressed in this advice.</p>

	<b>GAC Register #</b>	<b>GAC Advice (Summary)</b>	<b>Response and Current Status</b>
25. .AMAZON	<a href="#">2013-07-18-Obj-Amazon</a>	<p>The GAC advises the ICANN Board that:</p> <p>i The GAC has reached consensus on GAC Objection Advice according to Module 3.1 part I of the Applicant Guidebook on the following applications :</p> <p>The application for .amazon (application number 1-1315-58086) and related IDNs in Japanese (application number 1-1318-83995) and Chinese (application number 1-1318-5591)</p>	<p>On 14 May 2015, the NGPC <a href="#">accepted</a> this advice and directed the President and CEO that the applications for .AMAZON (application number 1-1315-58086) and related IDNs in Japanese (application number 1-1318-83995) and Chinese (application number 1-1318-5581) filed by Amazon EU S.à r.l. should not proceed. By adopting the GAC advice, the NGPC noted that the decision was without prejudice to the continuing efforts by Amazon EU S.à r.l. and members of the GAC to pursue dialogue on the relevant issues.</p> <p>At this time, <a href="#">this matter</a> is the subject of an active Cooperative Engagement Process (CEP), which is a process voluntarily invoked by a complainant prior to the filing of an Independent Review Process (IRP) for the purpose of resolving or narrowing the issues that are contemplated to be brought to the IRP.</p>
26. .THAI	<a href="#">2013-07-18-Obj-Thai</a>	<p>The GAC advises the ICANN Board that:</p> <p>i The GAC has reached consensus on GAC Objection Advice according to Module 3.1 part I of the Applicant Guidebook on the following applications :</p> <p>2. The application for .thai (application number 1-2112-4478)</p>	<p>On 10 September 2013, the NGPC <a href="#">accepted</a> this advice in an iteration of the <a href="#">Scorecard</a>. The AGB provides that if "GAC advises ICANN that it is the consensus of the GAC that a particular application should not proceed. This will create a strong presumption for the ICANN Board that the application should not be approved." (AGB § 3.1) At the NGPC's direction, staff advised the applicant that its application for .THAI would not be approved.</p>

	<b>GAC Register #</b>	<b>GAC Advice (Summary)</b>	<b>Response and Current Status</b>
27. Red Cross Acronyms	<a href="#">2013-07-18-Red Cross Acronyms</a>	The GAC advises the ICANN Board that the same complementary cost neutral mechanisms to be worked out for the protection of acronyms of IGOs be used to also protect the acronyms of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC/CICR) and the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC/FICR).	On 8 September 2014, the NGPC <a href="#">accepted</a> this advice in an iteration of the <a href="#">Scorecard</a> . The mechanism to be developed to protect acronyms of IGOs will also be used to protect the acronyms of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC/CICR) and the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC/FICR).
28. Conflicts with National Laws	<a href="#">2013-07-18-Registry/Registrar Agreements</a>	It was noted that there are provisions in the Registry Agreement and Registrar Accreditation Agreement that may conflict with applicable law in certain countries, in particular privacy and data retention, collection and processing law. The importance of having adequate procedures to avoid these conflicts was highlighted.	On 10 September 2013, the NGPC <a href="#">addressed</a> this concern in an iteration of the <a href="#">Scorecard</a> . The NGPC acknowledged the GAC's highlighting of the importance of having adequate procedures to avoid conflicts between provisions in the Registry Agreement and the Registrar Accreditation Agreement and applicable law in certain countries, in particular privacy and data retention, collection and processing law. First, ICANN's Registry Agreements and Registrar Accreditation Agreements already require contracted parties to abide by applicable law; ICANN cannot and will not require any of its contracted parties to violate laws. Through its contract development, ICANN has already demonstrated its understanding of the import of allowing contracted parties to obtain waivers of provisions that would conflict with laws, such as through the inclusion of a provision in the Registrar Accreditation Agreement to address conflicts of laws related to data retention. ICANN is also working with the GNSO and community on possible modifications of the existing ICANN Procedure for Handling Whois Conflicts with Privacy Law, including seeking input from the GAC on modifications.

	<b>GAC Register #</b>	<b>GAC Advice (Summary)</b>	<b>Response and Current Status</b>
29. Dotless Domains	<a href="#">2013-07-18-Security and Stability</a>	The GAC advises the ICANN Board to as a matter of urgency consider the recommendations contained in the SSAC Report on Dotless Domains (SAC053) and Internal Name Certificates (SAC057).	<p>On 10 September 2013, the NGPC <a href="#">accepted</a> this advice in an iteration of the <a href="#">Scorecard</a>. The NGPC reported that at its <a href="#">13 August 2013</a> meeting, the NGPC <a href="#">affirmed</a> that dotless domains are prohibited.</p> <p>Additionally, on 5 August, ICANN opened a <a href="#">public comment forum</a> on staff proposed efforts to mitigate potential impact resulting from name collisions as New gTLDs are delegated into the root zone. After additional analysis, research and community consultation, on 30 July 2014 the NGPC <a href="#">adopted</a> the final <a href="#">Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework</a> to continue to manage the occurrence of collisions between new gTLDs and existing private uses of the same strings. The NGPC also directed staff to (1) provide information to, and work with the GNSO to consider whether policy work on developing a long-term plan to manage gTLD name collision issues should be undertaken; and (2) continue to provide briefings and share information and best practices with ccTLD managers concerning name collision issues in light of the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework.</p>
30. .WINE/ .VIN	<a href="#">2013-07-18-wine and vin</a>	The GAC advises the ICANN Board that the GAC considered the two strings .vin and .wine and due to the complexity of the matter was unable to conclude at this meeting. As a result the GAC agreed to take thirty days additional time with a view to conclude on the matter.	On 10 September 2013, the NGPC <a href="#">accepted</a> this advice in an iteration of the <a href="#">Scorecard</a> . The NGPC noted that it stood ready to hear from the GAC regarding its conclusion on applications for .vin and .wine.

	GAC Register #	GAC Advice (Summary)	Response and Current Status
31. .WINE/ .VIN	<a href="#">2013-09-09-wine and vin</a>	<p>The GAC set a deadline of 30 days for its consideration of possible additional safeguard advice for .wine and .vin. With reference to Module 3.1.1 of the Applicant Guidebook and the Durban Communiqué 2.a regarding .wine and .vin., the GAC advises the ICANN Board that the GAC has finalized its consideration of the strings .wine and .vin and further advises that the applications should proceed through the normal evaluation process.</p> <p>While there is no GAC consensus advice on specific safeguards, it deserves to be noted that the crux of the matter relates to the handling of geographical indications, for which there is a range of views among the GAC membership. Some members support referencing geographical indications while others are opposed. There is no international agreement among governments about how to treat geographical indications and, as a consequence, no basis for an agreement in the GAC on safeguards that would offer additional protections.</p> <p>The GAC or its members may communicate further details to the Board as to the nature of the differences in views.</p>	<p>On 4 June 2013, the NGPC passed a resolution stating that ICANN will not proceed beyond initial evaluation of the applications for .wine and .vin.</p> <p>On 9 September 2013, the NGPC received a <a href="#">letter</a> from the GAC Chair re: .wine and .vin. The letter noted that there is no GAC consensus advice on additional specific safeguards, and that the GAC or its members may communicate further details to the Board as to the nature of the differences in views.</p> <p>In its 28 September 2013 iteration of the <a href="#">Scorecard</a>, the NGPC noted that it stood ready to hear from GAC members as to the nature of the differences in views expressed in the advice while the NGPC is analyzing the community input received on this advice. Additionally, the NGPC directed staff to analyze the GAC advice and other community input received on this issue, and prepare an analysis and recommendation for decision at the NGPC meeting in Buenos Aires.</p>

	GAC Register #	GAC Advice (Summary)	Response and Current Status
32. Category 1/ Category 2 Safeguards	<a href="#">2013-11-20-Cat1-Cat2</a>	<p>The GAC highlights the importance of its Beijing advice on 'Restricted Access' registries, particularly with regard to the need to avoid undue preference and/or undue disadvantage.</p> <p>a) The GAC requests a briefing on whether the Board considers that the existing PIC specifications (including 3c) fully implements this advice.</p> <p>b) The GAC requests a briefing on the public policy implications of holding auctions to resolve string contention (including community applications).</p> <p>c) The GAC considers that new gTLD registry operators should be made aware of the importance of protecting children and their rights consistent with the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child.</p> <p>d) The GAC advises the ICANN Board to re-categorize the string .doctor as falling within Category 1 safeguard advice addressing highly regulated sectors, therefore ascribing these domains exclusively to legitimate medical practitioners. The GAC notes the strong implications for consumer protection and consumer trust, and the need for proper medical ethical standards, demanded by the medical field online to be fully respected.</p> <p>e) The GAC welcomes the Board's communication with applicants with regard to open and closed gTLDs, but seeks written clarification of how strings are identified as being generic.</p>	<p>The NGPC accepted this advice.</p> <p>a) On 10 February 2014, the NGPC provided a <a href="#">written briefing</a> (see Attachment B) on whether the Board considers that the existing PIC specifications (including 3c) fully implements this advice.</p> <p>b) On 10 February 2014, the NGPC provided a <a href="#">written briefing</a> (see Attachment D) on the public policy implications of holding auctions to resolve string contention (including community applications).</p> <p>c) On 5 February 2014, the NGPC <a href="#">adopted</a> another iteration of the <a href="#">Scorecard</a> and acknowledged the GAC's view concerning protections for children. The NGPC committed to contacting all new gTLD registry operators to make them aware of the importance of protecting children and their rights consistent with the UN Convention on the Rights of Children. This information is included to registry operators during their onboarding process.</p> <p>d) On 5 February 2014, the NGPC <a href="#">adopted</a> another iteration of the <a href="#">Scorecard</a>. The NGPC re-categorized the string .doctor as falling within Category 1 safeguard advice addressing highly regulated sectors.</p> <p>e) On 10 February 2014, the NGPC provided <a href="#">written clarification</a> (see Attachment A) about how strings are identified as being generic.</p>

	<b>GAC Register #</b>	<b>GAC Advice (Summary)</b>	<b>Response and Current Status</b>
33. Geo TLDs	<a href="#">2013-11-20-GeoTLDs</a>	<p>Special Launch Program for Geographic and Community TLDs</p> <p>The GAC recognizes the importance of the priority inclusion of government and locally relevant name strings for the successful launch and continued administration of community and geographic TLDs.</p> <p>The GAC appreciates that the Trademark Clearing House (TMCH) is an important rights protection mechanism applicable across all the new gTLDs and has an invaluable role to fulfill across the new gTLD spectrum as a basic safety net for the protection of trademark rights.</p> <p>The GAC Advises the ICANN Board that ICANN provide clarity on the proposed launch program for special cases as a matter of urgency.</p>	<p>On 5 February 2014, the NGPC <a href="#">adopted</a> another iteration of the <a href="#">Scorecard</a> and accepted this advice. ICANN published <a href="#">materials</a> in December 2013 to provide clarity to the community on the proposed launch program for special cases. Additionally, the NGPC provided a briefing to the GAC on this issue (see 10 February 2014 <a href="#">letter</a>, Attachment C).</p>
34. .GUANGZ HOU	<a href="#">2013-11-20-guangzhou</a>	<p>The GAC advises the ICANN Board not to proceed beyond initial evaluation until the agreements between the relevant parties are reached: the application for .guangzhou (IDN in Chinese – application number 1-1121-22691)</p>	<p>On 5 February 2014, the NGPC <a href="#">adopted</a> another iteration of the <a href="#">Scorecard</a> and accepted this advice. The NGPC noted that ICANN received notice on 6 December 2013 that the applicants for .GUANGZHOU and .SHENZHEN are withdrawing their applications for consideration from the New gTLD Program.</p>



	<b>GAC Register #</b>	<b>GAC Advice (Summary)</b>	<b>Response and Current Status</b>
35. IGO Protections	<a href="#">2013-11-20-IGO</a>	<p>The GAC advises the ICANN Board that the GAC, together with IGOs, remains committed to continuing the dialogue with NGPC on finalising the modalities for permanent protection of IGO acronyms at the second level, by putting in place a mechanism which would:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. provide for a permanent system of notifications to both the potential registrant and the relevant IGO as to a possible conflict if a potential registrant seeks to register a domain name matching the acronym of that IGO;</li> <li>2. allow the IGO a timely opportunity to effectively prevent potential misuse and confusion;</li> <li>3. allow for a final and binding determination by an independent third party in order to resolve any disagreement between an IGO and a potential registrant; and</li> <li>4. be at no cost or of a nominal cost only to the IGO.</li> </ol> <p>The GAC looks forward to receiving the alternative NGPC proposal adequately addressing this advice. The initial protections for IGO acronyms should remain in place until the dialogue between the NGPC, the IGOs and the GAC ensuring the implementation of this protection is completed.</p>	<p>This is an open item of advice. The GNSO Council <a href="#">approved</a> recommendations from the expedited PDP on 20 November 2013 regarding protections for IGOs and INGOs. The GNSO forwarded its policy recommendations to the ICANN Board for further consideration. On <a href="#">7 February 2014</a>, the Board (i) adopted the policy recommendations GNSO Council's unanimous recommendations that are not inconsistent with the GAC's advice, (ii) requested additional time to consider the remaining recommendations, and (iii) decided to facilitate discussions among the relevant parties to reconcile any remaining differences between the policy recommendations and the GAC advice on the topic. These policy recommendations and the GAC advice are still under consideration.</p>

	<b>GAC Register #</b>	<b>GAC Advice (Summary)</b>	<b>Response and Current Status</b>
36. Red Cross/ Red Crescent Protections	<a href="#">2013-11-20-IOC-RCRC</a>	The GAC advises the ICANN Board 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 at the top and second levels with specific regard to national Red Cross and Red Crescent entities; and that it will provide further advice to the Board on this.	On 5 February 2014, the NGPC <a href="#">adopted</a> another iteration of the <a href="#">Scorecard</a> and accepted this advice.
37. .ISLAM and .HALAL	<a href="#">2013-11-20-islam-halal</a>	The GAC took note of letters sent by the OIC and the ICANN Chairman in relation to the strings .islam and .halal. The GAC has previously provided advice in its Beijing Communiqué, when it concluded its discussions on these strings. The GAC Chair will respond to the OIC correspondence accordingly, noting the OIC’s plans to hold a meeting in early December. The GAC chair will also respond to the ICANN Chair's correspondence in similar terms.	<p>In a 11 November 2013 letter to the GAC Chair, the NGPC indicated that before it takes action on the strings .HALAL and .ISLAM, it would wait for any additional GAC input during the Buenos Aires meeting or resulting GAC Communiqué. The Buenos Aires Communiqué took note of the letters sent by the OIC, but did not offer any additional advice to the Board. The OIC also adopted a resolution in December 2013 communicating its official objection to the use of the applied-for .ISLAM and .HALAL TLDs.</p> <p>The NGPC took note of the significant concerns expressed during the dialogue, and additional opposition raised, including by the OIC, which represents 1.6 billion members of the Muslim community. The NGPC sent a letter to the applicant, which is available here:  <a href="http://www.icann.org/en/news/correspondence/crocker-to-abbasnia-07feb14-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/news/correspondence/crocker-to-abbasnia-07feb14-en.pdf</a>.</p>

	<b>GAC Register #</b>	<b>GAC Advice (Summary)</b>	<b>Response and Current Status</b>
38. .SHENZH EN	<a href="#">2013-11-20-shenzhen</a>	<p>The GAC advises the ICANN Board not to proceed beyond initial evaluation until the agreements between the relevant parties are reached.</p> <p>The application for .shenzhen (IDN in Chinese – 1-1121-82863)</p>	<p>On 5 February 2014, the NGPC <a href="#">adopted</a> another iteration of the <a href="#">Scorecard</a> and accepted this advice. The NGPC noted that ICANN received notice on 6 December 2013 that the applicants for .GUANGZHOU and .SHENZHEN are withdrawing their applications for consideration from the New gTLD Program.</p>
39. .SPA	<a href="#">2013-11-20-spa</a>	<p>The GAC advises the ICANN Board not to proceed beyond initial evaluation until the agreements between the relevant parties are reached.</p> <p>The applications for .spa (application number 1-1309-12524 and 1-1619-92115)</p>	<p>On 5 February 2014, the NGPC <a href="#">adopted</a> another iteration of the <a href="#">Scorecard</a> and accepted this advice. The NGPC noted that ICANN would not enter into registry agreements with applicants for the identified string at this time. The NGPC noted concern about concluding the discussions with the applicants and will request the GAC to (1) provide a timeline for final consideration of the string, and (2) identify the “interested parties” noted in the GAC advice.</p>
40. .WINE/ .VIN	<a href="#">2013-11-20-wine-vin</a>	<p>The Board may wish to seek a clear understanding of the legally complex and politically sensitive background on this matter in order to consider the appropriate next steps of delegating the two strings. GAC members may wish to write to the Board to further elaborate their views.”</p>	<p>On 28 September 2013, the NGPC noted that it stood ready to hear from GAC members as to the nature of the differences in views expressed in the advice while the NGPC analyzed. In Buenos Aires, ICANN facilitated a dialogue between the applicant for .VIN and the affected non-governmental parties.</p> <p>In response to the GAC’s suggestion in the Buenos Aires Communiqué, the NGPC commissioned an analysis of the legally complex and politically sensitive background on this matter in the context of the GAC advice in order to consider the appropriate next steps of delegating .WINE and .VIN. The analysis was considered by the NGPC during its meeting at the ICANN Meeting in Singapore 2014.</p>

	<b>GAC Register #</b>	<b>GAC Advice (Summary)</b>	<b>Response and Current Status</b>
41. .AMAZON	<a href="#">2014-03-27 - amazon</a>	The GAC expresses its concerns with the time the Board is taking in evaluating the GAC Objection Advice on the application of the domain name .amazon, as stated in the GAC communiqué, approved in Durban, last July. Therefore the GAC urges the ICANN Board to settle as a high priority its decision according to Module 3.1 part I of the Applicant Guidebook.	On 7 April 2014, the NGPC <a href="#">responded</a> to the GAC Chair to provide a status update on addressing the GAC's advice concerning .AMAZON. At that time, the NGPC reported that ICANN commissioned an independent, third-party expert to provide additional advice on the specific issues of application of law at issue. The NGPC provided the analysis to the relevant parties to keep them informed. The NGPC noted that it welcomed any additional information that the parties believe is relevant to the NGPC in making its final decision on the GAC's advice concerning .AMAZON.
42. Community Applications	<a href="#">2014-03-27 Community Applications</a>	<p>The GAC reiterates its advice from the Beijing and Durban Communiqués regarding preferential treatment for all applications which have demonstrable community support.</p> <p>The GAC advises ICANN to continue to protect the public interest and improve outcomes for communities, and to work with the applicants in an open and transparent manner in an effort to assist those communities. The GAC further notes that a range of issues relating to community applications will need to be dealt with in future rounds.</p>	On 14 May 2014, the NGPC <a href="#">adopted</a> another iteration of the <a href="#">Scorecard</a> and accepted the GAC's reiteration of its earlier advice regarding community applications. The NGPC noted that it would continue to protect the public interest and improve outcomes for communities, and to work with the applicants in an open and transparent manner in an effort to assist those communities within the existing framework.

	<b>GAC Register #</b>	<b>GAC Advice (Summary)</b>	<b>Response and Current Status</b>
43. IGO Protections	<a href="#">2014-03-27-IGO</a>	The GAC recalls its previous public policy advice from the Toronto, Beijing, Durban and Buenos Aires Communiqués regarding protection for IGO names and acronyms at the top and second levels and awaits the Board’s response regarding implementation of the GAC advice.	<p>On 14 May 2014, the NGPC <a href="#">adopted</a> another iteration of the <a href="#">Scorecard</a> and provided the following response:</p> <p>On 7 February 2014, the Board directed the NGPC to: (1) consider the policy recommendations from the GNSO as the NGPC continues to actively develop an approach to respond to the GAC advice on protections for IGOs, and (2) develop a comprehensive proposal to address the GAC advice and the GNSO policy recommendations for consideration by the Board at a subsequent meeting.</p> <p>On 13 March 2014, the NGPC forwarded to the GAC for information a draft proposal for implementing the GAC advice on IGO acronym protections at the second level.</p> <p>On 30 April 2014, the Board took action to adopt the GNSO policy recommendations that are not inconsistent with GAC Advice received by the Board on the topic of IGO protections. With respect to the GNSO policy recommendations that differ from the GAC Advice (including this item of GAC Advice) the Board requested additional time to consider them, and will facilitate discussions among the relevant parties to reconcile any remaining differences between the policy recommendations and the GAC advice on the topic. These policy recommendations and the GAC advice are still under consideration.</p>

	<b>GAC Register #</b>	<b>GAC Advice (Summary)</b>	<b>Response and Current Status</b>
44. Singular/ Plural Strings	<a href="#">2014-03-27-Plural-Strings</a>	The GAC reiterates the Beijing advice that allowing singular and plural versions of the same strings could lead to consumer harm. Permitting this practice risks confusing internet users and could making users more vulnerable to deceptive practices that exploit this confusion.	On 14 May 2014, the NGPC <a href="#">adopted</a> another iteration of the <a href="#">Scorecard</a> to address this advice. The NGPC acknowledged the GAC's reiteration of its advice in the Beijing Communiqué, which advised the Board to reconsider its decision to allow singular and plural versions of the same strings. The NGPC adopted a resolution to accept this advice at its 4 June 2013 meeting, and on 25 June 2013, the NGPC considered whether to allow singular and plural versions of the same string. The NGPC adopted a <a href="#">resolution</a> resolving that no changes were needed to the existing mechanisms in the Applicant Guidebook to address potential consumer confusion resulting from allowing singular and plural versions of the same string. The NGPC noted that this topic may be of further discussion by the community is it considers future rounds of the New gTLD Program, and specifically asked the GNSO to consider this issue in a <a href="#">letter</a> dated 24 November 2014. This issue is noted in the Preliminary Issue Report created in response to the GNSO Council request to analyze subjects that may lead to changes or adjustments for subsequent New gTLD Procedures.

	GAC Register #	GAC Advice (Summary)	Response and Current Status
45. .RAM/ .INDIANS	<a href="#">2014-03-27-ram-indians</a>	<p>Further to its Durban Communiqué, the GAC advises the ICANN Board that:</p> <p>a. The GAC recognizes that religious terms are sensitive issues. The application for .ram is a matter of extreme sensitivity for the Government of India on political and religious considerations. The GAC notes that the Government of India has requested that the application not be proceeded with; and</p> <p>b. as noted in the Durban communiqué, the Government of India has requested that the application for .indians not proceed</p>	<p>In response to the GAC’s advice in the Durban Communiqué concerning .RAM and .INDIANS, on 10 September 2013, the NGPC adopted an iteration of the <a href="#">Scorecard</a> taking note of the concerns expressed in the GAC’s advice.</p> <p>a) With respect to .RAM, in the 14 May 2014 iteration of the <a href="#">Scorecard</a>, the NGPC took note of the concerns expressed in the GAC’s Singapore advice that “the application for .ram is a matter of extreme sensitivity for the Government of India on political and religious considerations.” The NGPC also noted the applicant response to the Board from Chrysler Group LLC (“Chrysler”) concerning this advice, in which Chrysler indicated that it “remains hopeful that an accommodation can be reached that addresses the Government’s concerns, yet allows Chrysler to register and operate .RAM as a restricted, exclusively-controlled gTLD. Chrysler representatives are willing to meet with the Government of India to discuss the resolution of this matter at any time that is convenient for the Government.” At this time, the NGPC continues to deliberate on this item of GAC advice and encourages the impacted parties to continue the noted discussions.</p> <p>b) With respect to .INDIANS, the NGPC notes that on 26 August 2014, the applicant for .INDIANS notified ICANN that it was withdrawing its application from the New gTLD Program.</p>

	GAC Register #	GAC Advice (Summary)	Response and Current Status
46. Red Cross/ Red Crescent Protections	<a href="#">2014-03-27-RCRC</a>	<p>Referring to the previous advice that the GAC gave to the board to permanently protect from unauthorised use the terms associated with the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement – terms that are protected in international legal instruments and, to a large extent, in legislation in countries throughout the world. The GAC advises that, for clarity, this should also include:</p> <p>a. the 189 National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, in English and the official languages of their respective states of origin.</p> <p>b. The full names of the International Committee of the Red Cross and International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies in the six (6) United Nations Language</p>	<p>This is an open item of advice. The GNSO Council <a href="#">approved</a> recommendations from the expedited PDP on 20 November 2013 regarding protections for IGOs and INGOs, which included protections for certain identifiers associated with the Red Cross/Red Crescent. The GNSO forwarded its policy recommendations to the ICANN Board for further consideration. On 30 April 2014, the Board <a href="#">took action</a> to adopt the GNSO policy recommendations that are not inconsistent with GAC Advice received by the Board on the topic of protections for certain identifiers of the Red Cross/Red Crescent. With respect to the GNSO policy recommendations that <a href="#">differ from the GAC Advice</a> (including this item of GAC Advice) the Board requested additional time to consider them, and continues to facilitate discussions among the relevant parties to reconcile any remaining differences between the policy recommendations and the GAC advice on the topic. (To note, the GNSO policy recommends that instead of reserving the RCRC national society names as advised by the GAC, the names should be bulk added to the Trademark Clearinghouse.)</p>
47. .SPA		<p>Regarding the applications for .spa, the GAC understands that the relevant parties in these discussions are the city of Spa and the applicants. The GAC has finalised its consideration of the .spa string and welcomes the report that an agreement has been reached between the city of Spa and one of the applicants.</p>	<p>On 14 May 2014, the NGPC <a href="#">adopted</a> another iteration of the <a href="#">Scorecard</a> to accept this advice and acknowledge that the GAC finalized its consideration of the .SPA string and the report that an agreement has been reached between the City of Spa and one of the applicants. At that time, the NGPC noted that there was no GAC advice pursuant to Module 3.1 of the Applicant Guidebook, and as a result, the applications would proceed through the normal process.</p>



	GAC Register #	GAC Advice (Summary)	Response and Current Status
48. .WINE/ .VIN	<a href="#">2014-03-27-wine-vin</a>	<p>The GAC notes the NGPC Resolution 2014.03.22.NG01 concerning .wine and .vin as well as its rationale. In the final deliberation of the Board there appears to be at least one process violation and procedural error, including in relation to Bylaws Article XI-A, Section 1 subsection 6 which states: “6. Opportunity to Comment. The Governmental Advisory Committee, in addition to the Supporting Organizations and other Advisory Committees, shall have an opportunity to comment upon any external advice received prior to any decision by the Board.”</p> <p>The GAC therefore advises that the Board reconsider the matter before delegating these strings. The GAC needs to consider the above elements more fully. In the meantime concerned GAC members believe the applicants and interested parties should be encouraged to continue their negotiations with a view to reach an agreement on the matter.</p>	<p>On 4 April 2014, the NGPC <a href="#">adopted resolutions</a> in response to the GAC’s advice in the Singapore Communiqué concerning the applications for .WINE and .VIN. In its action, the NGPC: (1) accepted the GAC advice identified in the Singapore Communiqué as it relates to the applications for .WINE and .VIN; (2) considered whether there may have been a process violation or procedural error, and concluded that there has been no process violation or procedural error under the Bylaws; and (3) directed the President and CEO to not commence the contracting process for the applications for .WINE and .VIN for 60 days (from the date the resolutions are posted) in order to provide additional time for the relevant impacted parties to negotiate, which they were encouraged to do.</p> <p>The NGPC also recommended that the full Board consider the larger implications of legally complex and politically sensitive issues such as those raised by GAC members, including whether ICANN is the proper venue in which to resolve these issues, or whether there are venues or forums better suited to address concerns such as those raised by GAC members in relation to the .WINE and .VIN applications.</p>

	GAC Register #	GAC Advice (Summary)	Response and Current Status
49. .AFRICA	<a href="#">2014-06-25</a> <a href="#">.africa</a>	<p>Consistent with the new gTLD applicant guidebook, the GAC provided consensus advice articulated in the April 11 2013 communiqué that the Dot Connect Africa (DCA) application number 1-1165-42560 for dot Africa should not proceed. The GAC welcomes the June 2013 decision by the New gTLD Program Committee to accept GAC advice on this application. The GAC notes the recent action taken to put on hold the ZACR African Union Commission endorsed application due to the Independent Review Panel (IRP) mandated by ICANN Bylaws.</p> <p>The GAC advises:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The ICANN Board to provide timely communication to the affected parties, in particular to provide clarity on the process and possible timelines</li> <li>2. The ICANN Board that, following the release of the IRP recommendation, the Board should act expeditiously in prioritising their deliberations and delegate .africa pursuant of the registry agreement signed between ICANN and ZACR.</li> </ol>	<p>On 8 September 2014, the NGPC <a href="#">adopted</a> another iteration of the <a href="#">Scorecard</a> to accept this advice. The NGPC agreed to continue to provide timely communication to the affected parties concerning the .AFRICA application.</p> <p>With respect to the release of the IRP recommendation, the ICANN Bylaws require that “[w]here feasible, the Board shall consider the IRP Panel declaration at the Board’s next meeting.” (Article IV, Sec. 3)</p>

	<b>GAC Register #</b>	<b>GAC Advice (Summary)</b>	<b>Response and Current Status</b>
50. .SPA	<a href="#">2014-06-25 .spa</a>	The GAC welcomes the NGPC's acceptance of the GAC advice on .spa. The GAC reiterates its advice ( <a href="https://gacweb.icann.org/display/GACADV/2014-03-27-spa">https://gacweb.icann.org/display/GACADV/2014-03-27-spa</a> ) on the issue that "the relevant parties in these discussions are the city of Spa and the applicants." The GAC therefore seeks NGPC's clarification on whether its explanation that "the applications will proceed through the normal process" means it will follow the Applicant Guidebook taking into consideration the GAC advice.	On 8 September 2014, the NGPC <a href="#">adopted</a> another iteration of the <a href="#">Scorecard</a> to address this advice. The NGPC responded that ICANN would follow the Applicant Guidebook taking into consideration the GAC advice. Because neither of the .SPA applications were the subject of GAC advice pursuant to Module 3.1 of the Applicant Guidebook, both applications for .SPA remain active and will continue to be processed pursuant to the procedures of the AGB. Because there is more than one application for the .SPA TLD, the applicants will need to resolve the contention set pursuant to the procedures established in Module 4 of the Applicant Guidebook before ICANN will enter into a Registry Agreement with the prevailing applicant.
51. .WINE/.VIN	<a href="#">2014-06-25 .wine/.vin</a>	There was further discussion on the issue of .wine/.vin, but no agreement was reached because of the sensitive nature of the matter. The matter of .wine and .vin was raised at the High Level Governmental Meeting, where some members expressed concerns in terms of ICANN's accountability and public policy. These concerns are not shared by all members.	On 8 September 2014, the NGPC <a href="#">adopted</a> another iteration of the <a href="#">Scorecard</a> to address this advice. The NGPC thanked the GAC for its update on the .WINE/.VIN applications.

	<b>GAC Register #</b>	<b>GAC Advice (Summary)</b>	<b>Response and Current Status</b>
52. Safeguards – Category 1 and Category 2	<a href="#">2014-06-25 - Cat 1- Cat 2</a>	<p>The GAC advises the Board to call on the NGPC to provide the GAC with a comprehensive and satisfactory response to the legitimate concerns raised in the Beijing and Singapore Communiqués. The GAC considers that the current responses offered to the GAC fail to address a number of important concerns, including: 1) the process for verification of WHOIS information; 2) the proactive verification of credentials for registrants of domain names in regulated and highly regulated industries (the relevant Category 1 strings); 3) the proactive security checks by registries; 4) the Public Interest Commitments Dispute Resolution Process PICDRP, which is not defined as to length of procedure or outcome; and 5) discrimination in restricted TLDs. (See Annex to London Communiqué).</p> <p>The GAC advises that the Board to provide its responses to GAC advice at least four weeks prior to ICANN meetings in order to give sufficient time to the GAC to assess and provide feedback on these complicated matters.</p>	In a <a href="#">letter</a> dated 2 September 2014, the NGPC provided the GAC with revised responses to the GAC’s questions from the Beijing and Singapore Communiqués. At the GAC’s request, the NGPC submitted the responses for the GAC’s consideration more than five weeks in advance of the ICANN 51 meeting.
53. Geographic Names	<a href="#">2014-06-25 Geographic Names</a>	The GAC provided a briefing, led by the subgroup on geographic names of the working group on future gTLD issues, to the community on protection of geographic names in future new gTLD application rounds. Further work will be done on this matter and new updates will be provided at the next ICANN meeting.	On 8 September 2014, the NGPC <a href="#">adopted</a> another iteration of the <a href="#">Scorecard</a> to address this advice. The NGPC acknowledged the GAC’s work on the topic of protection of geographic names for future rounds of the New gTLD Program, and noted that it looked forward to additional updates from the GAC on this topic.

	<b>GAC Register #</b>	<b>GAC Advice (Summary)</b>	<b>Response and Current Status</b>
54. IGO Protections	<a href="#">2014-06-25 IGO Names and Acronyms</a>	The GAC reaffirms its advice from the Toronto, Beijing, Durban, Buenos Aires and Singapore Communiqués regarding protection for IGO names and acronyms at the top and second levels, as implementation of such protection is in the public interest given that IGOs, as created by governments under international law are objectively different rights holders; notes the NGPC's letter of 16 June 2014 to the GNSO concerning further steps under the GNSO Policy Development Process while expressing concerns that the process of implementing GAC advice has been so protracted; welcomes the NGPC's assurance that interim protections remain in place pending any such process; and confirms its willingness to work with the GNSO on outcomes that meet the GAC's concerns.	<p>On 8 September 2014, the NGPC <a href="#">adopted</a> another iteration of the <a href="#">Scorecard</a> to address this advice. At that time, the NGPC reported that it was considering available options to reconcile the differences between the GAC advice and the GNSO policy recommendations concerning protections for IGO acronyms.</p> <p>On 16 June 2014, the NGPC sent a letter to the GNSO Council highlighting the previously noted concerns and providing an opportunity for the GNSO to consider modifying its policy recommendations at issue in accordance with Section 16 of the GNSO's PDP Manual. (Section 16 of the GNSO's PDP Manual permits modification to approved GNSO Council policies at any time prior to final approval by the Board.) At that time, NGPC was awaiting a response from the GNSO. The NGPC agreed to continue to provide updates to the GAC, the GNSO, and the broader ICANN community about its progress to address this matter, and noted that the temporary protections afforded to IGOs remain in place while the parties continue discussions. This matter remains under consideration.</p>

	<b>GAC Register #</b>	<b>GAC Advice (Summary)</b>	<b>Response and Current Status</b>
55. Protection of Children	<a href="#">2014-06-25 Protection of Children</a>	The GAC reiterates its advice in the Buenos Aires Communiqué that new gTLD registry operators should be made aware of the importance of protecting children and their rights consistent with the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child.	On 8 September 2014, the NGPC <a href="#">adopted</a> another iteration of the <a href="#">Scorecard</a> to accept this advice. In the Scorecard, the NGPC noted that in the 5 February 2014 iteration of the Scorecard, the NGPC acknowledged the GAC’s view, and directed ICANN to contact all new gTLD registry operators to make them aware of the importance of protecting children and their rights consistent with the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. To implement this, ICANN includes a notice in the materials provided to all registry operators after executing the Registry Agreement notifying them of the importance of protecting children and their rights consistent with the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. ICANN continues to provide this notice to all new registry operators.

	GAC Register #	GAC Advice (Summary)	Response and Current Status
56. Red Cross/ Red Crescent	<a href="#">2014-06-25 RCRC</a>	<p>The GAC refers to its previous advice to the Board to protect permanently the terms and names associated with the Red Cross and Red Crescent, including those relating to the 189 national Red Cross and Red Crescent societies, and recalls that the protections afforded to the Red Cross and Red Cross designations and names stem from universally agreed norms of international law and from the national legislation in force in multiple jurisdictions.</p> <p>Accordingly, the GAC now advises, that:</p> <p>I. the Red Cross and Red Crescent terms and names should not be equated with trademarks or trade names and that their protection could not therefore be adequately treated or addressed under ICANN's curative mechanisms for trademark protection;</p> <p>II. the protections due to the Red Cross and Red Crescent terms and names should not be subjected to, or conditioned upon, a policy development process;</p> <p>III. the permanent protection of these terms and names should be confirmed and implemented as a matter of priority, including in particular the names of the international and national Red Cross and Red Crescent organisations.</p>	<p>On <a href="#">3 November 2014</a>, the Board notified the GAC that it had some concerns about the advice in the London Communiqué because it appeared to be inconsistent with the framework established in the Bylaws granting the GNSO authority to recommend consensus policies to the Board, and the Board to appropriately act upon policies developed through the bottom-up consensus policy developed by the GNSO.</p> <p>On <a href="#">25 November 2014</a>, the GAC responded to the Board's letter. The GAC noted that it had carefully considered the Board's letter as well as the relevant section in the London Communiqué. The GAC noted that its intention was to emphasize the urgency of providing protection for Red Cross/Red Crescent names and to state the GAC's view that a solution should not be further delayed pending the outcome of a GNSO PDP. The GAC further recognized that the urgency aspect had since been addressed, as stated in the GAC Los Angeles Communiqué: "The GAC welcomes the decision of the New gTLD Program Committee (Resolution 2014.10.12.NG05) to provide temporary protections for the names of the International Committee of the Red Cross and International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, and the 189 National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. The GAC requests the ICANN Board and all relevant parties to work quickly to resolve the longer term issues still outstanding."</p>

	<b>GAC Register #</b>	<b>GAC Advice (Summary)</b>	<b>Response and Current Status</b>
57. Human Rights	<a href="#">2014-06-25 Safeguards - Human Rights</a>	GAC noted the written analysis on ICANN's procedures and policies in the light of human rights, fundamental freedoms and democratic values, prepared by experts of the Council of Europe. The GAC noted that there is a developing interest in the ICANN community to include human rights issues in future discussions.	<b>[THIS MATTER SHOULD NOT BE LISTED UNDER ADVICE RE: THE CURRENT ROUND OF THE NEW GTLD PROGRAM.]</b>



	<b>GAC Register #</b>	<b>GAC Advice (Summary)</b>	<b>Response and Current Status</b>
58. Community Priority Evaluation	<a href="#">2014-10-16-Community Priority Evaluation Process</a>	<p>The GAC has concerns about the consistency of the Community Priority Evaluation Process, following the rejection of a number of applications. There is a need to ensure that criteria for community priority treatment are applied consistently across the various applications.</p> <p>The GAC requests the ICANN Board to look into this matter and urges the Board to examine the feasibility of implementing an appeal mechanism in the current round in case an applicant contests the decision of a community priority evaluation panel.</p>	<p>In a 28 April 2015 letter, the NGPC <a href="#">responded</a> to the GAC's advice concerning community priority evaluations. The NGPC noted that at its 12 -14 October meeting, it took action to address perceived inconsistent and unreasonable Expert Determinations resulting from the New gTLD Program String Confusion Objections process. As part its rationale, the NGPC also considered whether it was appropriate to expand the scope of a proposed review mechanism to include other Expert Determinations, which could include the Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) Expert Determinations. The NGPC determined that to promote the goals of predictability and fairness, establishing a review mechanism more broadly may be more appropriate as part of future community discussions about subsequent rounds of the New gTLD Program. Applicants have already taken action in reliance on many of the Expert Determinations, including signing Registry Agreements, transitioning to delegation, withdrawing their applications, and requesting refunds. Allowing these actions to be undone now would not only delay consideration of all applications, but would raise issues of unfairness for those that have already acted in reliance on the Applicant Guidebook. The NGPC recommended that the development of rules and processes for future rounds of the New gTLD Program (to be developed through the multistakeholder process) should explore whether there is a need for a formal review process with respect to Expert Determinations more broadly, including CPE determinations.</p>

	<b>GAC Register #</b>	<b>GAC Advice (Summary)</b>	<b>Response and Current Status</b>
59. Human Rights, International Law	<a href="#">2014-10-16-Human Rights, International Law and ICANN</a>	<p>The GAC continued its discussions from the London meeting concerning possible application of human rights and international law to ICANN activities.</p> <p>The GAC will work inter-sessionally to assess a range of issues including legal considerations and the possible role of human rights considerations.</p>	<b>[THIS MATTER SHOULD NOT BE LISTED UNDER ADVICE RE: THE CURRENT ROUND OF THE NEW GTLD PROGRAM.]</b>
60. Geo Names	<a href="#">2014-10-16-Protection of Geographic Names in New gTLDs</a>	<p>The GAC again convened a community session, led by the sub-group on geographic names of the working group on future gTLD issues, on protection of geographic names in future new gTLD application rounds.</p> <p>Community input is being sought, via the GAC website, until 31 October 2014. The GAC looks forward to working with the community on ways to coordinate efforts on this issue, including a community session to be held during the ICANN 52 meeting.</p>	<b>[THIS MATTER SHOULD NOT BE LISTED UNDER ADVICE RE: THE CURRENT ROUND OF THE NEW GTLD PROGRAM.]</b>

	<b>GAC Register #</b>	<b>GAC Advice (Summary)</b>	<b>Response and Current Status</b>
61. IGO Protections	<a href="#">2014-10-16-Protection of Inter-Governmental Organisation (IGO) Names and Acronyms</a>	The GAC advises the ICANN Board that the UDRP should not be amended; welcomes the NGPC's continued assurance that interim protections remain in place pending the resolution of discussions concerning preventative protection of IGO names and acronyms; and supports continued dialogue between the GAC (including IGOs), the ICANN Board (NGPC) and the GNSO to develop concrete solutions to implement long-standing GAC advice.	This is an open item of advice. The GNSO Council <a href="#">approved</a> recommendations from the expedited PDP on 20 November 2013 regarding protections for IGOs and INGOs. The GNSO forwarded its policy recommendations to the ICANN Board for further consideration. On <a href="#">7 February 2014</a> , the Board (i) adopted the policy recommendations GNSO Council's unanimous recommendations that are not inconsistent with the GAC's advice, (ii) requested additional time to consider the remaining recommendations, and (iii) decided to facilitate discussions among the relevant parties to reconcile any remaining differences between the policy recommendations and the GAC advice on the topic. These policy recommendations and the GAC advice are still under consideration.

	GAC Register #	GAC Advice (Summary)	Response and Current Status
62. Protection of Red Cross/Red Crescent Names	<a href="#">2014-10-16-Protection of Red Cross/Red Crescent Names</a>	<p>The GAC welcomes the decision of the New gTLD Program Committee (<a href="#">Resolution 2014.10.12.NG05</a>) to provide temporary protections for the names of the International Committee of the Red Cross and International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, and the 189 National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies.</p> <p>The GAC requests the ICANN Board and all relevant parties to work quickly to resolve the longer term issues still outstanding.</p>	<p>As noted in the GAC's advice the NGPC took action to provide temporary protections for the names of the International Committee of the Red Cross and International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, and the 189 National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. The matter of permanent protections is an open item of advice. The GNSO Council <a href="#">approved</a> recommendations from the expedited PDP on 20 November 2013 regarding protections for IGOs and INGOs, which included protections for certain identifiers associated with the Red Cross/Red Crescent. The GNSO forwarded its policy recommendations to the ICANN Board for further consideration. On 30 April 2014, the Board <a href="#">took action</a> to adopt the GNSO policy recommendations that are not inconsistent with GAC Advice received by the Board on the topic of protections for certain identifiers of the Red Cross/Red Crescent. With respect to the GNSO policy recommendations that <a href="#">differ from the GAC Advice</a> (including this item of GAC Advice) the Board requested additional time to consider them, and continues to facilitate discussions among the relevant parties to reconcile any remaining differences between the policy recommendations and the GAC advice on the topic. (To note, the GNSO policy recommends that instead of reserving the RCRC national society names as advised by the GAC, the names should be bulk added to the Trademark Clearinghouse.)</p>

	GAC Register #	GAC Advice (Summary)	Response and Current Status
63. Two-Character Labels	<a href="#">2014-10-16-Release of 2-Character Names at the Second Level</a>	<p>The GAC notes that new gTLD registry operators have submitted RSEP (Registry Service Evaluation Process) requests to ICANN in order to use two-character labels at the second level of their TLD. The GAC recognized that two-character second level domain names are in wide use across existing TLDs, and have not been the cause of any security, stability, technical or competition concerns. The GAC is not in a position to offer consensus advice on the use of two-character second level domains names in new gTLD registry operations, including those combinations of letters that are also on the ISO 3166-1 alpha 2 list.</p> <p>In considering these RSEP requests, and consistent with the Applicant Guidebook, the GAC considers that the public comment period is an important transparency mechanism, and in addition asks that relevant governments be alerted by ICANN about these requests as they arise.</p> <p>The GAC will review the use of country and territory names at the second level and advise the ICANN Board in due course.</p>	<p><b>[THIS MATTER WAS CONSIDERED BY THE FULL BOARD.]</b></p>

	GAC Register #	GAC Advice (Summary)	Response and Current Status
64. New gTLDs – Next Round	<a href="#">2014-10-16-Reviews of First Round of New gTLDs and Preparation for Subsequent Rounds</a>	<p>The GAC advises the ICANN Board that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The review processes should be conducted and finalised before policy for the further gTLD rounds is developed and should include community-wide engagement on the issues of communication to and access by developing countries and regions, and all aspects of the framework for community-based gTLDs.</li> <li>ii. Appropriate and realistic timeframes should be applied to the review processes to ensure that all lessons of the most recent round are captured, and to avoid further stressing the capacity of both ICANN and the community to do the necessary work.</li> </ul>	<b>[THIS MATTER WAS CONSIDERED BY THE FULL BOARD.]</b>
65. Safeguards	<a href="#">2014-10-16-Safeguard Advice Applicable to all new gTLDs and Category 1 and Category 2 strings</a>	<p>The GAC strongly advises the ICANN Board to focus its attention on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Implementation of WHOIS Related-Safeguards</li> <li>ii. Security Risks</li> <li>iii. Public Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Process</li> <li>iv. Verification and Validation of Credentials for Category 1 Strings Associated with Market Sectors with Clear and/or Regulated Entry Requirements</li> </ul>	<p>This GAC advice was the subject of an exchange between some members of the GAC and the NGPC. Following the exchange on 13 January 2014, the NGPC provided the GAC with responses in a 22 January 2105 <a href="#">letter</a> to some of the GAC advice items raised in its Los Angeles Communiqué and discussed on the conference call regarding implementation of WHOIS-related safeguards; security risks safeguard advice; the Public Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Process; and the WHOIS roadmap.</p>

	<b>GAC Register #</b>	<b>GAC Advice (Summary)</b>	<b>Response and Current Status</b>
66. Framework of Interpretation	<a href="#">2015-02-11-Framework of Interpretation Working Group (FOIWG) Report</a>	The GAC notes the work of the ccNSO FOIWG, and its efforts to provide interpretive clarity to RFC1591. The GAC welcomes the FOIWG's recognition that, consistent with the GAC's 2005 Principles, the ultimate authority on public policy issues relating to ccTLDs is the relevant government. As such, nothing in the FOIWG report should be read to limit or constrain applicable law and governmental decisions, or the IANA operator's ability to act in line with a request made by the relevant government.	<b>[THIS MATTER WAS CONSIDERED BY THE FULL BOARD]</b>
67. International Law and Human Rights	<a href="#">2015-02-11-International Law, Human Rights and ICANN</a>	The GAC decided to establish a Working Group on Human Rights Issues and the Application of International Law as these matters relate to ICANN activities. The GAC will also monitor community developments and consider how any GAC initiatives can complement any such developments.	<b>[THIS MATTER SHOULD NOT BE LISTED UNDER ADVICE RE: THE CURRENT ROUND OF THE NEW GTLD PROGRAM.]</b>
68. IGO Protections	<a href="#">2015-02-11-Protection of Names and Acronyms for Inter-Governmental Organisations (IGOs)</a>	The GAC will continue to work with interested parties to reach agreement on appropriate permanent protections for names and acronyms for Inter-Governmental Organisations. This will include working with the GNSO PDP Working Group on IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms; and with IGOs and the NGPC.	This is an open item of advice. The GNSO Council <a href="#">approved</a> recommendations from the expedited PDP on 20 November 2013 regarding protections for IGOs and INGOs. The GNSO forwarded its policy recommendations to the ICANN Board for further consideration. On <a href="#">7 February 2014</a> , the Board (i) adopted the policy recommendations GNSO Council's unanimous recommendations that are not inconsistent with the GAC's advice, (ii) requested additional time to consider the remaining recommendations, and (iii) decided to facilitate discussions among the relevant parties to reconcile any remaining differences between the policy recommendations and the GAC advice on the topic. These policy recommendations and the GAC advice are still under consideration.

	<b>GAC Register #</b>	<b>GAC Advice (Summary)</b>	<b>Response and Current Status</b>
69. Red Cross/ Red Crescent Protections	<a href="#">2015-02-11-Protection of Names and Acronyms Red Cross/Red Crescent</a>	The GAC welcomes the steps taken to implement the NGPC resolution adopted in Los Angeles on 12 October 2014. The GAC reiterates its advice to the Board to pursue its consultations in order to confirm permanent protection of the Red Cross and Red Crescent terms and names in the current and future new gTLD rounds.	As noted in the GAC’s advice the NGPC took action to provide temporary protections for the names of the International Committee of the Red Cross and International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, and the 189 National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. The matter of permanent protections is an open item of advice. The GNSO Council <a href="#">approved</a> recommendations from the expedited PDP on 20 November 2013 regarding protections for IGOs and INGOs, which included protections for certain identifiers associated with the Red Cross/Red Crescent. The GNSO forwarded its policy recommendations to the ICANN Board for further consideration. On 30 April 2014, the Board <a href="#">took action</a> to adopt the GNSO policy recommendations that are not inconsistent with GAC Advice received by the Board on the topic of protections for certain identifiers of the Red Cross/Red Crescent. With respect to the GNSO policy recommendations that <a href="#">differ from the GAC Advice</a> (including this item of GAC Advice) the Board requested additional time to consider them, and continues to facilitate discussions among the relevant parties to reconcile any remaining differences between the policy recommendations and the GAC advice on the topic. (To note, the GNSO policy recommends that instead of reserving the RCRC national society names as advised by the GAC, the names should be bulk added to the Trademark Clearinghouse.)
70. Public Safety	<a href="#">2015-02-11-Public Safety and Law Enforcement</a>	The GAC agreed to establish a Working Group on Public Safety and Law Enforcement.	<b>[THIS MATTER SHOULD NOT BE LISTED UNDER ADVICE RE: THE CURRENT ROUND OF THE NEW GTLD PROGRAM.]</b>



	GAC Register #	GAC Advice (Summary)	Response and Current Status
71. Safeguards	<a href="#">2015-02-11 - Safeguards Advice Applicable to all new gTLDs and Category 1 and Category 2 strings</a>	<p>a. The GAC urges the NGPC to publicly recognize these commitments as setting a best practices standard that all Registries involved with such strings should strive to meet.</p> <p>b. The GAC recommends that ICANN suggest to those Registries for which such commitments have not yet been taken and for which contracts have already been signed with ICANN, that they review means and ways of introducing such provisions in view of the public policy concerns. This could also help to raise confidence in Internet-based commerce.</p> <p>c. The GAC urges the NGPC to consider refining the PICDRP and/or to consider developing a “fast track” process for regulatory authorities, government agencies, and law enforcement to work with ICANN contract compliance to effectively respond to issues involving serious risks of harm to the public.</p> <p>d. Finally, with regard to the GAC’s Beijing Category 2 advice, the GAC urges the NGPC to provide greater clarity as to the mechanisms for redress in the event registrants believe they have been unduly discriminated against.</p>	<p>On 28 April 2015, the NGPC provided a <a href="#">response</a> to the GAC regarding its advice about verification and validation of strings representing highly regulated sectors. As noted in the response, the NGPC informed the GAC that discussions are taking place within the ICANN community regarding the possible establishment of a “Trust Mark” that would provide consumers with certification that the credentials or licenses of a registrant in a highly regulated sector have been validated and verified. It would: (a) reward those who engage in “best practices” by verifying and validating credentials; and (b) help consumers differentiate between those websites for which credentials have been verified and validated and those for which they have not.</p> <p>With respect to developing a “fast track” PICDRP for regulatory authorities, government agencies, and law enforcement, in the 28 April 2015 correspondence noted above, ICANN committed that it will acknowledge complaints submitted by governments and consumer protection agencies within two business days. ICANN further committed that complaints that appear to be well-founded will be handled expediently, regardless of the source of the complaint, and will commit to expedite processing of complaints based on factors such as the severity of the alleged breach and the harm that may result.</p> <p>With respect to the request to provide greater clarity regarding the mechanisms for redress in the event registrants believe they have been unduly discriminated against, the NGPC provided written clarification to the GAC in a 11 June 2015 <a href="#">letter</a>.</p>

	<b>GAC Register #</b>	<b>GAC Advice (Summary)</b>	<b>Response and Current Status</b>
72. Community Priority Evaluation	<a href="#">2015-06-24 Community Priority Evaluation</a>	The GAC continues to keep under review the community application process for new gTLDs, noting that it does not appear to have met applicant expectations. The GAC looks forward to seeing the report of the ICANN Ombudsman on this matter following his current inquiry and will review the situation at its meeting in Dublin.	This item of advice has not yet been considered by the NGPC.

	<b>GAC Register #</b>	<b>GAC Advice (Summary)</b>	<b>Response and Current Status</b>
73. Safeguards	<a href="#">2015-06-24 gTLD Safeguards</a>	<p>The GAC recommends that the NGPC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Create a list of commended public interest commitment (PIC) examples related to verification and validation of credentials for domains in highly regulated sectors to serve as a model. These public interest commitments could demonstrate a best practice for other gTLD registry operators. For example the PIC for .bank appears to have taken steps to provide confidence to consumers that they can rely on the bona fide of the Registrants listed. Relevant stakeholders should be identified and encouraged to devise a set of PICs that work well for the protection of public interests in each of the new gTLDs related to highly regulated sectors.</li> <li>b. The GAC additionally recommends: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. that the ICANN community creates a harmonised methodology to assess the number of abusive domain names within the current exercise of assessment of the new gTLD program.</li> <li>ii. that the NGPC clarifies its acceptance or rejection of Safeguard advice. It would be useful to develop a straightforward scorecard on all elements of GAC Safeguard advice since the Beijing 2013 GAC Communiqué in order to clarify what elements of GAC advice have been implemented, what remains a work in progress, and what has not been accepted for Implementation. In any instances of complete or partial rejection of the Advice, the GAC urges the NGPC to clarify the milestones intended to be followed in order to seek a potentially “mutually acceptable solution” as mandated by ICANN’s Bylaws.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	This item of advice has not yet been considered by the NGPC.

	<b>GAC Register #</b>	<b>GAC Advice (Summary)</b>	<b>Response and Current Status</b>
74. Protection for IGOs	<a href="#">2015-06-24 Protection for Inter-Governmental Organisations (IGOs)</a>	Consistent with previous GAC advice in previous Communiqués regarding protection for IGO names and acronyms at the top and second levels, the GAC takes note of the progress made by the informal “small group” towards developing mechanisms in line with previous GAC advice, and calls upon the small group to meet in the near term with a view towards developing a concrete proposal for these mechanisms before the next ICANN meetings in Dublin; and welcomes the preventative protections that remain in place until the implementation of permanent mechanisms for protection of IGO names and acronyms at the top and second levels.	This item of advice has not yet been considered by the NGPC.