

**ANNEX 1 to Resolution 2014.06.06.NG02
GAC Advice (Singapore, Buenos Aires, Durban, Beijing): Actions and Updates
(6 June 2014)**

	GAC Register #	GAC Advice	Action/Update
New Items of GAC Advice (Singapore Communiqué)			
1. WRITTEN BRIEFING - SAFEGUARDS	https://gacweb.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=28278832	<p>The GAC requests clarification from the New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC) on a number of implementation issues. These relate to the implications of changes in WHOIS verification and checks for the accuracy of WHOIS generally and for law enforcement and end users; security checks to detect risks of harm (eg phishing, malware, botnets etc); complaint mechanisms; verification and validation of Category 1 registrants' credentials and the lack of binding nature of the public interest commitments; operation of the Public Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Procedure; and restricted registration policies (Category 2). These queries are set out in more detail in an Attachment to this communiqué.</p>	<p>The NGPC provides written clarification to the GAC on the requested implementation issues in Annex 2 <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-new-gtld-annex-2-06jun14-en.pdf>.</p>
Remaining Open Items of GAC Advice (Beijing, Durban, Buenos Aires, Singapore)			

	GAC Register #	GAC Advice	Action/Update
2. RAM/ INDIANS	2014-03-27-ram-indians	Further to its Durban Communiqué, the GAC advises the ICANN Board that: 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 b.) as noted in the Durban Communiqué, the Government of India has requested that the application for .indians not proceed.	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 Scorecard taking note of the concerns expressed in the GAC’s advice. a) With respect to .RAM, in the 14 May 2014 iteration of the Scorecard , 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.” The NGPC reported that it continued to deliberate on this item of GAC advice and encouraged the impacted parties to continue the noted discussions. b) With respect to .INDIANS, in the 14 May 2014 iteration of the Scorecard the NGPC took note of the GAC’s Singapore advice and reported that it continued to deliberate on this item of GAC advice.

	GAC Register #	GAC Advice	Action/Update
3. IGO PROTECTIONS	2014-03-27-IGO	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 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.</p>
4. IOC/RCRC PROTECTIONS	2013-07-18 – IOCRC (Durban Communiqué §5.a.i(sic))	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).	Refer to the update above regarding IGO Protections.

	GAC Register #	GAC Advice	Action/Update
5. RCRC NAMES	2014-03-27-RCRC	<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.</p> <p>The GAC advises that, for clarity, this should also include: (a) the 189 National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, in English and the official languages of their respective states of origin; and (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 Languages.</p>	<p>The NGPC adopted a resolution at its 4 June 2013 meeting to accept the previous advice issued in the Beijing Communiqué 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” The New gTLD Registry Agreement adopted by the NGPC on 2 July 2013 included protections 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” (2012.11.26.NG03). The resolution recognized the GNSO’s initiation of an expedited PDP. The Final Report with consensus policy recommendations was submitted to the Board for consideration on 7 February 2014. 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 protections for certain identifiers of the Red Cross/Red Crescent. 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. (To note, the GNSO policy recommends that instead of reserving the RCRC society names as advised by the GAC, the names should be bulk added to the Trademark Clearinghouse.)</p>

	GAC Register #	GAC Advice	Action/Update
6. CAT 2 SAFEGUARDS – EXCLUSIVE ACCESS	<p data-bbox="331 139 585 321">2013-04-11-Safeguards – Categories -2; 2013-11-20-Cat1-Cat2</p> <p data-bbox="331 363 585 621">(Beijing Communiqué Annex I, Category 2, Item 2; Buenos Aires Communiqué §1.e)</p>	<p data-bbox="611 139 1159 1089"><u>Beijing</u>: For strings representing generic terms, exclusive registry access should serve a public interest goal. In the current round, the GAC has identified the following non-exhaustive list of strings that it considers to be generic terms, where the applicant is currently proposing to provide exclusive registry access: .antivirus, .app, .autoinsurance, .baby, .beauty, .blog, .book, .broker, .carinsurance, .cars, .cloud, .courses, .cpa, .cruise, .data, .dvr, .financialaid, .flowers, .food, .game, .grocery, .hair, .hotel, .hotels, .insurance, .jewelry, .mail, .makeup, .map, .mobile, .motorcycles, .movie, .music, .news, .phone, .salon, .search, .shop, .show, .skin, .song, .store, .tennis, .theater, .theatre, .tires, .tunes, .video, .watches, .weather, .yachts, .クラウド [cloud], .ストア [store], .セール [sale], .ファッション [fashion], .家電 [consumer electronics], .手表 [watches], .書籍 [book], .珠宝 [jewelry], .通販 [online shopping], .食品 [food]</p> <p data-bbox="611 1131 1159 1313"><u>Buenos Aires</u>: 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 data-bbox="1268 139 2026 654">ICANN contacted the 186 applicants for strings identified in the GAC’s Category 2 safeguard advice. The applicants were asked to respond by a specified date indicating whether the applied-for TLD will be operated as an exclusive access registry. An overwhelming majority of the applicants (174) indicated that the TLD would not be operated as an exclusive access registry. The NGPC adopted a resolution directing staff to move forward with the contracting process for applicants for strings identified in the Category 2 Safeguards that were prepared to enter into the Registry Agreement as approved, since moving forward with these applicants was consistent with the GAC’s advice.</p> <p data-bbox="1268 696 2026 878">Twelve applicants responded that the TLD would be operated as an exclusive access registry. These 12 applicants have applied for the following strings: .BROKER, .CRUISE, .DATA, .DVR, .GROCERY, .MOBILE, .PHONE, .STORE, .THEATER, .THEATRE and .TIRES.</p> <p data-bbox="1268 920 2026 1102">The NGPC accepted the advice in the Buenos Aires Communiqué. As requested in in the Buenos Aires Communiqué, the NGPC has provided a written clarification to the GAC of how strings are identified as being generic.</p> <p data-bbox="1268 1144 2026 1252">The NGPC is preparing an approach and timeline as a path forward to address the remaining 12 applications.</p>