

21 December 2018

**Submission of GNSO Council Review of Barcelona GAC Communiqué**

Keith Drazek, GNSO Chair

Pam Little, GNSO Council vice-chair

Rafik Dammak, GNSO Council vice-chair

To:

Cherine Chalaby, Chair of ICANN Board

CC:

Manal Ismail, Chair of the GAC

Dear Cherine and members of the ICANN Board,

On behalf of the GNSO Council, we are hereby transmitting to you the review by the GNSO Council of the Barcelona GAC Communiqué, which was unanimously adopted by the Council during its meeting on 20 December 2018.

The GNSO Council's review of each GAC Communiqué is an effort to provide feedback to you, in your capacity as members of the ICANN Board, as you consider issues referenced in the Communiqué that we believe relate to policies governing generic Top-Level Domains. Our intent is to inform you and the broader community of gTLD policy activities, either existing or planned, that may directly or indirectly relate to advice provided by the GAC. The GNSO Council hopes that the input provided through its review of the GAC Communiqué will enhance co-ordination and promote the sharing of information on gTLD related policy activities between the GAC, Board and the GNSO.

*On behalf of the GNSO Council*

*Keith Drazek*

*Pam Little*

*Rafik Dammak*

GNSO COUNCIL REVIEW OF THE [BARCELONA GAC COMMUNIQUE](#)<sup>1</sup>

GAC Advice – Topic	GAC Advice Details	Does the advice concern an issue that can be considered within the remit <sup>2</sup> of the GNSO (yes/no)	<i>If yes, is it subject to existing policy recommendations, implementation action or ongoing GNSO policy development work?</i>	<i>How has this issue been/is being/will be dealt with by the GNSO</i>
<b>1. Two-Character Country Codes at the Second Level</b>	a. The GAC advises the Board to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Explain in writing how and why it considers it is implementing GAC advice on the release of country codes at the second level and</li> <li>ii. Explain in writing whether its Resolution of 8 November 2016 and its change from the preexisting release process (indicated in specification 5. 2 of the Registry Agreement, sentence 1) to a new curative process (under sentence 2) are compatible with GAC advice on this topic, or whether it constitutes a rejection of GAC advice. The GAC advises the Board to set out its explanation</li> </ul>	yes	yes	This topic has been a subject of a number of GNSO Council Reviews of prior GAC Communiques: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dublin (December 2015): <a href="#">pp.9-11</a></li> <li>• Helsinki (July 2016): <a href="#">pp.5-6</a></li> <li>• Hyderabad (December 2016): <a href="#">p.3</a></li> <li>• Copenhagen (April 2017): <a href="#">pp.7-8</a></li> <li>• Panama (July 2018): <a href="#">pp.6-8</a></li> </ul> The GNSO Council is of the view that ICANN has fully implemented the GAC’s Advice

<sup>1</sup> Only of “Section V” of the “Communiqué: GAC Advice to the ICANN Board”.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

	<p>in writing by 31 December 2018. Previous GAC advice on this matter stands.</p> <p>iii. Ensure that its direction to the ICANN CEO to “engage with concerned governments to listen to their views and concerns and further explain the Board’s decision making process” (Board Resolution 2017.06.12.01) is fully implemented including direct engagement with those governments in order to fully address their concerns.</p> <p>RATIONALE This advice is adopted to support and oversee implementation by the Board of existing GAC Advice on the matter, including calling upon the Board to work towards resolution of countries concerns relating to the release of country codes as a result of the withdrawal of the release process in 2016.</p>			on this matter.
<b>2. IGO Protections</b>	<p>a. The GAC advises the Board to:</p> <p>i. facilitate a substantive, solutions-oriented dialogue between the GNSO and the GAC in an effort to resolve the</p>	yes	Yes, the PDP on IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms completed and delivered its Final Report to the GNSO Council on 9 July 2018 and	<p>This topic has been a subject of a number of GNSO Council Reviews of prior GAC Communiques:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Buenos Aires (July 2015): <a href="#">pp.4-5</a></li> </ul>

	<p>longstanding issue of IGO protections, on which it reaffirms its previous advice, notably with respect to the creation of a curative mechanism and maintenance of temporary protections.</p> <p>RATIONALE The GAC understands that the GNSO has decided at this stage to not vote on the final report for the PDP on IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms, which adopted recommendations in direct conflict with longstanding GAC advice. Noting the positive advancements achieved to bridge the gap between GNSO and GAC advice on identifiers for the Red Cross, the GAC remains optimistic that a substantive dialogue with the GSNO could help both sides better understand the issues at play and reach a lasting solution that can provide IGOs with GAC-advised protections for their acronyms while addressing the concerns of the GNSO.</p>		<p>the Council has accepted the Final Report at the Council meeting on 19 July 2018.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Dublin (December 2015): <a href="#">p.6</a></li> <li>● Helsinki (July 2016): <a href="#">pp.7-8</a></li> <li>● Hyderabad (December 2016): <a href="#">pp.4-6</a></li> <li>● Copenhagen (April 2017): <a href="#">pp.2-5</a></li> <li>● Johannesburg (July 2017): <a href="#">pp.1-4</a></li> <li>● Abu Dhabi (November 2017): <a href="#">pp.1-7</a></li> <li>● San Juan (May 2018): <a href="#">pp.7-8</a></li> <li>● Panama (July 2018): <a href="#">pp.3-5</a></li> </ul> <p>A special webinar (Q&amp;A) was held on 9 October 2018 when the GNSO Council also discussed the following questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What questions/topics was the Working Group chartered to consider?</li> <li>2. Did the Working Group consider those charter topics/questions, and did it do so in a</li> </ol>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>legitimate way?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Has the Working Group followed due process?</li> <li>4. What were the process issues (if any) encountered by the Working Group?</li> <li>5. Did the Working Group address GAC advice on this topic?</li> </ol> <p>During ICANN63 on 21 October 2018, a letter from the GAC was received by the GNSO Council asking the Council to consider a deferral of its decision on the working group's final recommendations "until a dialogue between GAC and GNSO Council has been conducted".</p> <p>During the GAC/Council session on 21 October 2018, the Council sought further details or specific concerns from IGOs/the GAC on the working group's</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>recommendations and, in response, WIPO provided some high level comments <a href="https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/council/2018-October/021933.html">https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/council/2018-October/021933.html</a>.</p> <p>In light of the various discussions that took place at ICANN63, the motion to approve the working group's Final Report at GNSO Council meeting on 24 October 2018 was withdrawn to enable the Council to continue discussions and consider options and appropriate next steps.</p>
--	--	--	--	--