ANNEX 1 to NGPC Resolution No. 2013.06.04.NG01

NGPC Scorecard of 1As Regarding Non-Safeguard Advice in the GAC Beijing Communiqué

4 June 2013

This document contains the NGPC's response to the GAC Beijing Communiqué issued 11 April 2013 <http://www.icann.org/en/news/correspondence/gac-to-board-11apr13-en> for the non-safeguard advice items in the GAC Register of Advice where the NGPC has adopted a score of "1A" to indicate that its position is consistent with the GAC advice as described in the Scorecard. Refer to the GAC Register of Advice for the full text of each item of advice in the GAC Beijing Communiqué <https://gacweb.icann.org/display/GACADV/GAC+Register+of+Advice>.

GAC Register #	Summary of GAC Advice		NGPC Response
1. 2013-04-11-Obj-Africa (Communiqué §1.a.i.1)	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**:** .africa (Application number 1-1165-42560)	1A	The NGPC accepts this advice. 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) The NGPC directs staff that pursuant to the GAC advice and Section 3.1 of the Applicant Guidebook, Application number 1-1165-42560 for .africa will not be approved. In accordance with the AGB the applicant may withdraw (pursuant to AGB § 1.5.1) or seek relief according to ICANN's accountability mechanisms (see ICANN Bylaws, Articles IV and V) subject to the appropriate standing and procedural requirements.
2. 2013-04-11-Obj-GCC (Communiqué §1.a.i.2)	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)	1A	The NGPC accepts this advice. 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) The NGPC directs staff that pursuant to the GAC advice and Section 3.1 of the Applicant Guidebook, Application number 1-1936-2101 for .gcc will not be approved. In accordance with the AGB the applicant may withdraw (pursuant to AGB § 1.5.1) or seek relief according to ICANN's accountability mechanisms (see ICANN Bylaws, Articles IV and V) subject to the appropriate standing and procedural requirements.

GAC Register #	Summary of GAC Advice		NGPC Response
3. 2103-04-11-Religious Terms (Communiqué §1.a.ii)	The GAC Advises the Board that 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.	1A	The NGPC accepts this advice. The AGB provides that if "GAC advises ICANN that there are concerns about a particular application 'dot-example,' the ICANN Board is expected to enter into dialogue with the GAC to understand the scope of concerns." Pursuant to Section 3.1.ii of the AGB, the NGPC stands ready to enter into dialogue with the GAC on this matter. We look forward to liaising with the GAC as to how such dialogue should be conducted. (Note a community objection has been filed with the International Centre for Expertise of the ICC against .ISLAM and .HALAL. Because formal objections have been filed, these applications cannot move to the contracting phase until the objections are resolved.)

GAC Register #	Summary of GAC Advice		NGPC Response
4. 2013-04-11-gTLDStrings (Communiqué §1.c)	In addition to this safeguard advice, the GAC has identified certain gTLD strings where further GAC consideration may be warranted, including at the GAC meetings to be held in Durban. 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	1A	The NGPC accepts this advice. 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 this time, ICANN will not proceed beyond initial evaluation of these identified strings. In other words, ICANN will allow evaluation and dispute resolution processes to go forward, but will not enter into registry agreements with applicants for the identified strings for now. (Note: community objections have been filed with the International Centre for Expertise of the ICC against .PERSIANGULF, .AMAZON, and .PATAGONIA. The application for .ZULU was withdrawn.)
5. 2013-04-11-CommunitySupport (Communiqué §1.e)	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.	1A	The NGPC accepts this advice. Criterion 4 for 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 the contention.)

GAC Register #	Summary of GAC Advice		NGPC Response
6. 2013-04-11-PluralStrings (Communiqué §1.f)	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 Board to reconsider its decision to allow singular and plural versions of the same strings.	1A	The NGPC accepts this advice and will consider whether to allow singular and plural versions of the same string.
7. 2013-04-11-RAA (Communiqué §2)	The GAC advises the ICANN Board that the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement should be finalized before any new gTLD contracts are approved.	1A	The NGPC accepts this advice. The final draft of the RAA was posted for public comment on 22 April 2013. The new gTLD Registry Agreement was posted for public comment on 29 April 2013, and it requires all new gTLD registries to only use 2013 RAA registrars. The public comment reply period for the 2013 RAA closes on 4 June 2013. The NGPC intends to consider the 2013 RAA shortly thereafter.
8. 2013-04-11-WHOIS (Communiqué §3)	The GAC urges the ICANN Board to ensure that the GAC Principles Regarding gTLD WHOIS Services, approved in 2007, are duly taken into account by the recently established Directory Services Expert Working Group.	1A	The NGPC accepts this advice. The NGPC notes that staff has confirmed that the GAC Principles have been shared with the Expert Working Group.

GAC Register #	Summary of GAC Advice		NGPC Response
9. 2013-04-11-IOCRC (Communiqué §4)	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.	1A	The NGPC accepts the GAC advice. The proposed final version of the Registry Agreement posted for public comment on 29 April 2013 includes protection for an indefinite duration for IOC/RCRC names. Specification 5 of this version of the Registry Agreement includes 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." 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" (204.11.26.NG03). The resolution recognized the GNSO's initiation of an expedited PDP. Until such time as the GNSO approves recommendations in the PDP and the Board adopts them, the NGPC's resolutions protecting IOC/RCRC names will remain in place. Should the GNSO submit any recommendations on this topic, the NGPC will confer with the GAC prior to taking action on any such recommendations.