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# Description of the document:

The Los Angeles GAC Communiqué is a document issued by the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) with regard to the committee’s meeting in Los Angeles, CA, USA during the week of the October 15, 2014.

# List of possible requirements from the document:

## Data Accuracy:

* The ICANN Board should provide the GAC with a comprehensive scorecard indicating steps and timelines regarding all streams of work related to the WHOIS accuracy safeguard. (Page 4)
* The ICANN Board should complete the Pilot study on WHOIS accuracy, including assessment of identity validation, and share the findings in a timely manner for review at the ICANN 52 meeting. (Page 4)
* The ICANN Board should initiate steps toward Phase 3 (identity verification) of WHOIS, including undertaking a cost-benefit analysis of implementation options. (Page 4)
* The ICANN Board should commit to defining the process to address and resolve inaccurate WHOIS records and respond to non-compliance reports. (Page 4)

## Privacy:

* Reconsider the NGPC’s determination not to require the verification and validation of credentials of registrants for the highly regulated Category 1 new gTLDs. (Page 5)
* Reconsider the requirement to consult with relevant authorities in case of doubt about the authenticity of credentials. (Page 5)
* Reconsider the requirement to conduct periodic post-registration checks to ensure that Registrants continue to possess valid credentials. (Page 5)
* Amend the PIC specification requirement for Category 2 new gTLDs to include a non-discriminatory requirement to provide registrants an avenue to seek redress for discriminatory policies. (Page 5)
* The GAC reaffirms its advice from the Toronto, Beijing, Durban, Buenos Aires, Singapore and London Communiqués regarding protection of IGO names and acronyms at the top and second levels, as implementation of such protection is in the public interest given that IGOs, as created by governments under international law, are objectively different right holders. (Page 6)
* Concerning preventative protection at the second level, the GAC reminds the ICANN Board that notice of a match to an IGO name or acronym to prospective registrants, as well as to the concerned IGO, should apply in perpetuity for the concerned name and acronym in two languages, and at no cost to IGOs. (Page 6)
* Concerning curative protection at the second level, and noting the ongoing GNSO PDP on access to curative Rights Protection Mechanisms, the GAC reminds the ICANN Board that any such mechanism should be at no or nominal cost to IGOs. (Page 6)