18 OCTOBER 2015 NGPC MEETING
Reference Materials

TABLE OF CONTENTS – REFERENCE MATERIALS

Main Agenda

GAC Advice: Buenos Aires Communiqué (June 2015)

Annex A: Scorecard - GAC Advice – Buenos Aires Communiqué 24 June 2015: Actions and Updates
(as of 8 October 2015)

	GAC Register #	GAC Advice		Action/Update
GAC Advice (Buenos Aires Communiqué – June 2015)				
1. SAFEGUARDS (Part 1)	2015-06-24 gTLD Safeguards	The GAC recommends that the NGPC 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.		ICANN is in the process of creating a list of the Public Interest Commitments (PICs) included the Registry Agreements for the TLDs associated with "highly regulated" industries as identified in the NGPC's implementation framework of the GAC's Category 1 Safeguard advice. ICANN anticipates publishing this information on its website. Additionally, the NGPC acknowledges that various industry-led efforts are currently underway to establish a set of initiatives and best practices regarding registry standards of behaviour in online operations. Industry-led initiatives have focused on using a form of "trust mark" that signals to end-users that the website they are engaging with has been vetted by impartial, independent third party evaluators. The NGPC continues to monitor the progress being made in the community on these matters. With respect to identifying relevant stakeholders and encouraging them to devise a set of PICs that work well for the protection of public interests in new gTLDs related to "highly regulated" sectors, the NGPC notes that on 30 September 2015, the NGPC sent to the GNSO and the ALAC a proposal from a community member to establish a highly-regulated string PICs review committee. In that letter, the NGPC noted that consistent with ICANN's bottom-up multistakholder model, the proposal might be considered by the GNSO and the ALAC.

	GAC Register #	GAC Advice		Action/Update
2. SAFEGUARDS (Part 2)	2015-06-24 gTLD Safeguards	The GAC recommends 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.		The NGPC notes that the ICANN community is considering the issue of abusive domain names as part of the current exercise of assessing the New gTLD Program. Specifically, as part of its Affirmation of Commitments with the U.S. Department of Commerce, ICANN has committed to conducting a regular review of how the New gTLD Program has impacted competition, consumer choice and consumer trust in the Domain Name System. The Competition, Consumer Choice and Consumer Trust (CCT) Review is comprised of metrics recommended by an Implementation Advisory Group, and adopted by the Board. These metrics include, but are not limited to, the items below related to abusive domain names: • Number of reported data security breaches. • Quantity and relative incidence of Domain Takedowns. • Quantity and relative incidence of spam from domains in new gTLDs, which could be measured via specialized email addresses and methodologies. • Quantity and relative incidence of fraudulent transactions caused by phishing sites in new gTLDs. • Quantity and relative incidence of detected phishing sites using new gTLDs. • Quantity and relative incidence of detected botnets and malware distributed using new gTLDs. • Quantity and relative incidence of sites found to be dealing in or distributing identities and account information used in identity fraud. • Number of complaints to police agencies alleging fraud or misrepresentation based on – or traced to – domain names.

2

	GAC Register #	GAC Advice		Action/Update
3. SAFEGUARDS (Part 3)	2015-06-24 gTLD Safeguards	The GAC recommends 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.		The NGPC has prepared an overall summary scorecard outlining the elements of the GAC's safeguard advice since the April 2013 Beijing Communiqué, and the actions that the NGPC has taken to address the safeguard advice. The summary scorecard is provided here
4. COMMUNITY PRIORITY EVALUATION	2015-06-24 Community Priority Evaluation	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.		The NGPC acknowledges that the GAC continues to keep under review the community application process for new gTLDs. As alluded to by the GAC, at the 20 January 2015 meeting of the ICANN Board Governance Committee (BGC), the BGC authorized the Ombudsman to proceed with his "own motion" investigation regarding issues of fairness around the transparency of the Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) process and applicants' ability to provide materials to the panel conducting the CPE process. The NGPC awaits the final report from the Ombudsman. If the Ombudsman produces a report recommending actions be taken by the Board, NGPC, BGC or staff, such report would require consideration by the Board, NGPC, BGC or staff as appropriate.

	GAC Register #	GAC Advice		Action/Update
5. IGO PROTECTIONS	2015-06-24 Protection for Inter-Governmental Organisations (IGOs)	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.		On 16 July 2015, the "small group" of representatives of IGOs, the GAC and the NGPC met and outlined a draft proposal for dealing with the protection of IGO acronyms (the "Proposal"). The Proposal will be circulated to the GAC and the GNSO for review and consideration. As previously discussed, on 30 April 2014 the Board took action requesting additional time to consider certain GNSO consensus policy recommendations that differ from advice from the GAC to the Board with respect to protections for IGO names and acronyms, among other things. Subject to additional input received from the relevant parties about the Proposal, it is anticipated that the Board will need to consider whether or not to adopt the Proposal and to address any remaining open consensus policy recommendations from the GNSO on the topic.

Annex B: GAC Safeguard Advice re: the New gTLD Program
(as of 7 October 2015)

(Advice appears in the order listed in the GAC Register of Advice)

	GAC Register #	GAC Advice (Summary)		Response, Current Status and Implementation
		GAC Advice – New gTLDs (Beijing 2013 to Buenos Aires 2015)		
1. Safeguards – All New gTLDs	2013-04-11-Safeguards-1	The GAC Advises that the following six safeguards should apply to all new gTLDs and be subject to contractual oversight. 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.		On 25 June 2013, the NGPC took action to adopt accepting a proposal for implementation of the GAC safeguards applicable to all new gTLDs. 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 2012.11.08.01 - 2012.11.08.02 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. **Implementation**: Using the obligations of the Registrar Accreditation Agreements (RAA) to derive the syntax accuracy criteria, ICANN sought to determine whether the contact information of WHOIS records in gTLDs are

				meeting requirements for format and content. To do so, syntax validation was performed on a sample of WHOIS records from gTLDs. The Phase 1 (Syntax) was published on 24 August 2015. Using statistical methods, the report provides accuracy estimates with a 95% confidence interval for the population of domains in gTLDs as a whole, and for several subgroups of interest. The analysis finds, for example, that approximately 99% of email addresses, 85% of telephone numbers and 79% of postal addresses met all syntax requirements of the 2009 RAA. The Phase 1 report is available on the whois.icann.org site: http://whois.icann.org/en/whoisars-reporting. The data has also been provided to ICANN's Contractual Compliance department for follow up with the registrars of inaccurate records.
				In December, ICANN will publish the 1st of semi-annual Phase 2 Reports which will provide accuracy estimates of gTLD Contact Information in WHOIS records based on both syntax and operational requirements. At a high level, the operational tests assess if an email goes through to the recipient, the phone rings when dialed or if the postal address is deliverable.
				For more information about the WHOIS ARS, please see: http://whois.icann.org/en/whoisars
2. Safeguards – All New gTLDs	2013-04-11-Safeguards-2	The GAC Advises that the following six safeguards should apply to all new gTLDs and be subject to contractual oversight. 2. Mitigating abusive activity— Registry operators will ensure that terms of use for registrants include prohibitions against the distribution of malware, operation of botnets,		On 25 June 2013, the NGPC took action to adopt accepting a proposal for implementation of the GAC safeguards applicable to all new gTLDs. 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

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>phishing, piracy, trademark or copyright infringement, fraudulent or deceptive practices, counterfeiting or otherwise engaging in activity contrary to applicable law.</td>
<td>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."

Implementation: The GAC advice was implemented by including changes to the New gTLD Registry Agreement as described above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Safeguards – All New gTLDs</td>
<td>2013-04-11-Safeguards-3</td>
<td>The GAC Advises that the following six safeguards should apply to all new gTLDs and be subject to contractual oversight.

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.</td>
<td>On 25 June 2013, the NGPC took action to adopt accepting a proposal for implementation of the GAC safeguards applicable to all new gTLDs.

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."

Implementation: Because there are multiple ways for a Registry Operator to implement the security checks,</td>
</tr>
</table>

			ICANN solicited community input to develop a framework for Registry Operators to respond to identified risks. Community work to [develop the framework](#) is ongoing. Registries, Registrars and GAC representatives (including form the Public Safety Working Group) have been invited to join the drafting effort (see [Drafting Team](#)). The Framework is intended to become a set of non-binding standards to serve as a reference for self-regulation by New gTLD Registries and Registrars as well any other interested contracted party. The community may consider the Framework as a building block for future policy work. A Draft Framework will be submitted to the community for Public Comments. Input from the community will be considered by the Drafting Team to produce a finalized Framework for publication and implementation by interested parties. Once finalized, the initial Framework will become an evolutionary document, to be reviewed and revised regularly as circumstances require.

4

4. Safeguards – All New gTLDs	2013-04-11-Safeguards-4	The GAC Advises that the following six safeguards should apply to all new gTLDs and be subject to contractual oversight. 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.	On 25 June 2013, the NGPC took action to adopt accepting a proposal for implementation of the GAC safeguards applicable to all new gTLDs. **Implementation:** With respect to documentation, as detailed in #1 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 #3 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.

| 5. Safeguards – All New gTLDs | 2013-04-11-Safeguards-5 | The GAC Advises that the following six safeguards should apply to all new gTLDs and be subject to contractual oversight.

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. | On 25 June 2013, the NGPC took action to adopt accepting a proposal for implementation of the GAC safeguards applicable to all new gTLDs.

Implementation: With resect 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 inquires 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." |

| 6. Safeguards – All New gTLDs | 2013-04-11-Safeguards-6 | The GAC Advises that the following six safeguards should apply to all new gTLDs and be subject to contractual oversight.

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. | | On 25 June 2013, the NGPC took action to adopt accepting a proposal for implementation of the GAC safeguards applicable to all new gTLDs.

Implementation: 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.

Consequences for the demonstrated provision of false WHOIS information are set forth in Section 3.7.7.2 of the 2013 RAA. |
| 7. Category 1 Safeguards | 2013-04-11-Safeguards-Categories-1 | 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 accepted this advice in an iteration of the Scorecard.
Implementation: The NGPC adopted the implementation framework attached as Annex 2 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. |

| 8. Category 2 Safeguards | 2013-04-11-Safeguards-Categories-2 | The GAC advises the ICANN Board:

1. Restricted Access

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.

2. Exclusive Access

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. | On 25 June 2013, the NGPC accepted the advice regarding Category 2 – Restricted Access.

Implementation: 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."

On 21 June 2015, the NGPC concluded its deliberations on the advice regarding Category 2 – Exclusive Access, and adopted a resolution 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:

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

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. |

9. Category 1 Safeguards	2013-07-18-Category 1	T he 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 accepted this advice an in iteration of the Scorecard. The NGPC informed the GAC that it looked forward to continuing the dialogue with the GAC on this issue.
10. Category 1/ Category 2 Safeguards	2013-11-20-Cat1-Cat2	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.

a) The GAC requests a briefing on whether the Board considers that the existing PIC specifications (including 3c) fully implements this advice.
b) The GAC requests a briefing on the public policy implications of holding auctions to resolve string contention (including community applications).
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.
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 | | The NGPC accepted this advice.

Implementation:

a) On 10 February 2014, the NGPC provided a written briefing (see Attachment B) on whether the Board considers that the existing PIC specifications (including 3c) fully implements this advice.

b) On 10 February 2014, the NGPC provided a written briefing (see Attachment D) on the public policy implications of holding auctions to resolve string contention (including community applications).

c) On 5 February 2014, the NGPC adopted another iteration of the Scorecard 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.

d) On 5 February 2014, the NGPC adopted another iteration of the Scorecard. The NGPC re-categorized the string .doctor as falling within Category 1 safeguard advice addressing highly regulated sectors. |

		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. 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.		e) On 10 February 2014, the NGPC provided written clarification (see Attachment A) about how strings are identified as being generic.
11. Safeguards – Category 1 and Category 2	2014-06-25 - Cat 1- Cat 2	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		In a letter 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.

			Communiqué). 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.		
12.	Safeguards	2014-10-16-Safeguard Advice Applicable to all new gTLDs and Category 1 and Category 2 strings	The GAC strongly advises the ICANN Board to focus its attention on the following: i. Implementation of WHOIS Related-Safeguards ii. Security Risks iii. Public Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Process iv. Verification and Validation of Credentials for Category 1 Strings Associated with Market Sectors with Clear and/or Regulated Entry Requirements		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 letter 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.
13.	Safeguards	2015-02-11 - Safeguards Advice Applicable to all new gTLDs and Category 1 and Category 2 strings	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. 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.		On 28 April 2015, the NGPC provided a response 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.

		This could also help to raise confidence in Internet-based commerce. 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. 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.		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. 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 letter.
14.	Safeguards	2015-06-24 gTLD Safeguards	The GAC recommends that the NGPC: 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		This item of advice has not yet been considered by the NGPC.

| | | protection of public interests in each of the new gTLDs related to highly regulated sectors.

b.   The GAC additionally recommends:

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.

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. | |