GNSO REVIEW OF THE DUBLIN GAC COMMUNIQUE[1]

GAC Advice - Topic	GAC Advice Details	Does the advice concern an issue that can be considered within the remit[2] of the GNSO (yes/no)	*If yes, is it subject to existing policy recommendations, implementation action or ongoing GNSO policy development work?*	*How has this issue been/is being/will be dealt with by the GNSO*
1. gTLD Safeguards: Current Rounds	Consistent with its Buenos Aires Communiqué, the GAC is seeking a clear record of the ICANN Board's acceptance or rejection of GAC Safeguard Advice. This would optimally be provided in the form of a scorecard that includes a) what elements of GAC advice have been implemented; b) what remains a work in progress; and c) what has not been accepted for implementation, with a clear rationale for not being accepted. The GAC reiterates its advice that the New gTLD Program	Yes Existing: new gTLD Policy (see http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/inactive/2007new-gtld-intro) New gTLD Subsequent Rounds Preliminary Issue Report (see http://gnso.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#20150624-4)	*Preliminary issue report on new gTLD Subsequent rounds was requested, as described in Buenos Aires report. A request to defer the final report until mid-November was approved at the September GNSO meeting.*	*GNSO expects to review the final issue report following its November meeting.*

1 Only of "Section V of the Communiqué: GAC Advice to the ICANN Board"

2 As per the ICANN Bylaws: 'There shall be a policy-development body known as the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO), which shall be responsible for developing and recommending to the ICANN Board substantive policies relating to generic top-level domains.

GAC Advice - Topic	GAC Advice Details	Does the advice concern an issue that can be considered within the remit[2] of the GNSO (yes/no)	*If yes, is it subject to existing policy recommendations, implementation action or ongoing GNSO policy development work?*	*How has this issue been/is being/will be dealt with by the GNSO*
	Committee 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 of best practices for gTLD registry operators. Such a compendium would also permit an assessment of the success of the PIC specifications for strings representing highly regulated sectors, and will also facilitate the incorporation of such safeguards into contracts in future new gTLD rounds.			

GAC Advice - Topic	GAC Advice Details	Does the advice concern an issue that can be considered within the remit[2] of the GNSO (yes/no)	*If yes, is it subject to existing policy recommendations, implementation action or ongoing GNSO policy development work?*	*How has this issue been/is being/will be dealt with by the GNSO*
	In light of the current and upcoming reviews of the New gTLD program, **The GAC advises and urges the Board to:** i. develop and adopt a harmonized methodology for reporting to the ICANN community the levels and persistence of abusive conduct (e.g., malware, botnets, phishing, pharming, piracy, trademark and/or copyright infringement, counterfeiting, fraudulent or deceptive practices and other illegal conduct) that have occurred in the rollout of the new gTLD program. The GAC was informed that independent studies presented during the ICANN 54 meeting on the review of the New gTLD round show a	Yes	There is ongoing work on metrics which might be useful in this respect.	The GNSO is monitoring metrics development.

GAC Advice - Topic	GAC Advice Details	Does the advice concern an issue that can be considered within the remit[2] of the GNSO (yes/no)	*If yes, is it subject to existing policy recommendations, implementation action or ongoing GNSO policy development work?*	*How has this issue been/is being/will be dealt with by the GNSO*
	relatively low level of trust in these gTLDs by consumers compared to existing TLDs.			
Future gTLD Rounds	**The GAC advises the Board that** i. before defining the modalities for future rounds, a rigorous assessment of all public policy related aspects of the current round should be undertaken, taking into account the advice given by the GAC on this subject since the beginning of the New gTLD process, including advice relating to community-wide engagement on the issues of communication to and access by developing	Yes	The GNSO anticipates dealing with these matters in the issue report expected in mid-November.	These matters will be addressed in the upcoming PDP.

GAC Advice - Topic	GAC Advice Details	Does the advice concern an issue that can be considered within the remit[2] of the GNSO (yes/no)	*If yes, is it subject to existing policy recommendations, implementation action or ongoing GNSO policy development work?*	*How has this issue been/is being/will be dealt with by the GNSO*
	countries and regions; and advice regarding past policy decisions taken by the Board to reserve the Red Cross and Red Crescent designations and names. In this regard, the GAC expects that those elements of the current framework for new gTLDs that are considered appropriate by the GAC will remain and that the elements that are not considered satisfactory will be improved for subsequent rounds.			

GAC Advice - Topic	GAC Advice Details	Does the advice concern an issue that can be considered within the remit[2] of the GNSO (yes/no)	*If yes, is it subject to existing policy recommendations, implementation action or ongoing GNSO policy development work?*	*How has this issue been/is being/will be dealt with by the GNSO*
3. Protection for IGOs	**The GAC advises the Board to** i. facilitate the timely conclusion of discussions of the "small group" and the NGPC in an effort to resolve the issue of IGO protections.	Protection of IGO and INGO Identifiers in All gTLDs Policy Development Process (see http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/igo-ingo) IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms Policy Development Process (http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/igo-ingo-crp-access)		
4. Community Priority Evaluation	**a. The GAC advises the Board that:** i. the GAC reiterates previously expressed concerns that the		To be noted in future policy development process	To be noted in future policy development process

GAC Advice - Topic	GAC Advice Details	Does the advice concern an issue that can be considered within the remit[2] of the GNSO (yes/no)	*If yes, is it subject to existing policy recommendations, implementation action or ongoing GNSO policy development work?*	*How has this issue been/is being/will be dealt with by the GNSO*
	Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) process has not met the expectations of applicants and notes that all the successful applications are currently the subject of dispute resolution procedures; ii. the GAC expects the current specific problems faced by individual applicants to be resolved without any unreasonable delay, and in a manner in which justified community interests are best served; iii. the GAC notes possibly unforeseen consequences for community applicants of recourse by competing applicants to other accountability			

GAC Advice - Topic	GAC Advice Details	Does the advice concern an issue that can be considered within the remit[2] of the GNSO (yes/no)	*If yes, is it subject to existing policy recommendations, implementation action or ongoing GNSO policy development work?*	*How has this issue been/is being/will be dealt with by the GNSO*
	mechanisms; and the specific challenges faced by some community applicants in auctions when in competition with commercial applicants; iv. the GAC will take into account the final report of the ICANN Ombudsman on this issue when preparing the GAC's input into the GNSO's review of issues for improving procedures relating to community-based applications in the next gTLD round; and the Competition, Trust and Consumer Choice Review (CCT) under the Affirmation of Commitments.			

GAC Advice - Topic	GAC Advice Details	Does the advice concern an issue that can be considered within the remit[2] of the GNSO (yes/no)	*If yes, is it subject to existing policy recommendations, implementation action or ongoing GNSO policy development work?*	*How has this issue been/is being/will be dealt with by the GNSO*
5. Use of 2-letter Country Codes and Country Names at the Second Level	The GAC notes that the process for considering comments for two-character letter/letter labels launched on the 6th October 2015 is not consistent with GAC advice which recommended that governments´ comments be fully considered. That advice was accepted by Board resolution 2015.02.12.16. GAC Members have now been asked to clarify which specific TLDs their comments pertain to, and to explain how the release of the two-letter label will cause confusion with their corresponding country code. The GAC reiterates its advice on this issue and	Yes	Duly noted	How does the GNSO wish to respond to this?

GAC Advice - Topic	GAC Advice Details	Does the advice concern an issue that can be considered within the remit[2] of the GNSO (yes/no)	*If yes, is it subject to existing policy recommendations, implementation action or ongoing GNSO policy development work?*	*How has this issue been/is being/will be dealt with by the GNSO*
	a. advises the Board that: i. comments submitted by the relevant Governments be fully considered regardless of the grounds for objection.	Yes	Duly noted	How does the GNSO wish to respond to this?
	b. The GAC further advises the Board to: i. be mindful of governments´ capacity limitations and asks the Board to facilitate simplification of the process for providing comments to address their concerns.	i. Yes	i. How does the GNSO wish to respond to this?	How does the GNSO wish to respond to this?

GAC Advice - Topic	GAC Advice Details	Does the advice concern an issue that can be considered within the remit[2] of the GNSO (yes/no)	*If yes, is it subject to existing policy recommendations, implementation action or ongoing GNSO policy development work?*	*How has this issue been/is being/will be dealt with by the GNSO*
	c. With respect to new requests for release, the GAC advises the Board to: i. task ICANN to work with the GAC Secretariat to address the technical issues with comment forms and in the interim ii. offer alternative means for comments.	Yes		
6. Visas	The GAC notes that a number of GAC Representatives had difficulties in obtaining visas for this meeting and some were unable to attend in person for this reason, thereby excluding some Representatives from the full range of GAC work. This has also been an issue at previous meetings. There are			

GAC Advice - Topic	GAC Advice Details	Does the advice concern an issue that can be considered within the remit[2] of the GNSO (yes/no)	*If yes, is it subject to existing policy recommendations, implementation action or ongoing GNSO policy development work?*	*How has this issue been/is being/will be dealt with by the GNSO*
	particular issues for government representatives in obtaining visas where a letter of invitation is from ICANN rather than an agency of the government of the country hosting the meeting.			
	a. The GAC advises the Board that: i. it should investigate options for optimising visa approval procedures, including appropriate liaison in advance with the national government of the country hosting the meeting; and that the GAC is available to assist in this regard.	No. However the GNSO would assure the GAC that its members have similar if not worse problems getting visas, and that this matter has been raised as a problem in our outreach to under-represented countries.	N/A	N/A