



**Generic Names Supporting Organization Council**  
**Pending Projects List**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS** (click on the link below to go directly to the project in this list).  
Projects are listed in the order in which they were initiated.

<b>GNSO Working Groups / Work Teams / Drafting Teams</b>	<b>Abbreviation</b>
<a href="#">Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery PDP Working Group</a>	PEDNR
<a href="#">Policy Process Steering Committee</a>	PPSC
<a href="#">Policy Process Steering Committee Policy Development Process Work Team</a>	PDP-WT
<a href="#">Policy Process Steering Committee Working Group Work Team</a>	WG-WT
<a href="#">Operations Steering Committee</a>	OSC
<a href="#">Operations Steering Committee Council Ops Team</a>	GCOT
<a href="#">Operations Steering Committee Constituency and Stakeholder Ops Team</a>	CSG
<a href="#">Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part B PDP Working Group</a>	IRTP Part B
<a href="#">GNSO Improvements Standing Committee Drafting Team</a>	SC-DT

<b>Other GNSO Activities</b>	<b>Abbreviation</b>
<a href="#">WHOIS Studies</a>	WHO1
<a href="#">Synthesis of WHOIS Service Requirements</a>	WHO2
<a href="#">GNSO Toolkit of Services</a>	TK
<a href="#">Operations Steering Committee Community Communications Team</a>	CCT
<a href="#">GNSO Constituency “Reconfirmations” and Review of SG Charters</a>	GCR
<a href="#">GNSO Work Prioritization Project</a>	WP
<a href="#">Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy</a>	UDRP
<a href="#">Creation of non-binding best practices to help registrars and registries address the abusive registrations of domain names</a>	BP-RAP
<a href="#">Request to ICANN Compliance in relation to RAP Recommendations on WHOIS Access (recommendation #2) and Fake Renewal Notices (recommendation #1)</a>	
<a href="#">Board requested metrics for Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice</a>	CCTC

<b>Joint SO/AC Working Groups</b>	<b>Abbreviation</b>
<a href="#">Geo Regions Review Community-wide Working Group</a>	GEO
<a href="#">Joint ccNSO-GNSO Internationalized Domain Names Working Group (JIG)</a>	JIG
<a href="#">Registrar Accreditation Agreement</a>	RAA
<a href="#">SSAC-GNSO Internationalized Registration Data Working Group</a>	IRD
<a href="#">Joint Security and Stability Analysis Community Drafting Group (DNS Cert)</a>	DSSA
<a href="#">Joint SO/AC WG on New gTLD Applicant Support (JAS WG)</a>	JAS WG



**Generic Names Supporting Organization Council  
Pending Projects List**

---

<a href="#">New gTLD Recommendation 6 GNSO, GAC, ALAC Cross-Community WG</a>	Rec6
ccNSO Study Group on the Use of Names for Countries and Territories	

<b>Outstanding Recommendations for Council Action</b>	<b>Abbreviation</b>
<a href="#">Registration Abuse Policies Final Report Remaining Recommendations</a>	RAP-REC



**Generic Names Supporting Organization Council  
Pending Projects List**

Last updated: 10 March 2011

This list includes pending GNSO Council projects. It does not reflect the full granularity of each task, just current status and next scheduled action(s).

<b>GNSO Working Groups / Work Teams / Drafting Teams</b>				
<b>Description</b>	<b>Initiated</b>	<b>Target Date</b>	<b>Who holds Token</b>	<b>Pending action/status</b>
<p><a href="#">Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery</a> – PDP WG Chair: A. Greenberg Council Liaison: T. Ruiz Staff: M. Konings</p> <p>This WG is considering to what extent registrants should be able to reclaim domain names after they expire. At issue is whether the current policies of registrars on the renewal, transfer and deletion of expired names are adequate.</p>	2008 Nov-20	Ongoing	WG	The WG has published its proposed Final Report and opened a public comment forum, which will be open until 7 April (see <a href="http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-2-21feb11-en.htm">http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-2-21feb11-en.htm</a> ). The WG will organize a presentation of the proposed Final Report and its recommendations in San Francisco (see <a href="http://svsf40.icann.org/node/22107">http://svsf40.icann.org/node/22107</a> )
<p><b>GNSO Improvements</b> <a href="#">Policy Process Steering Committee</a> Chair: J. Neuman Staff: M. Konings</p> <p>The PPSC is responsible for reviewing and recommending processes used within the GNSO for developing policy and recommending any changes. The PPSC established two separate teams, one tasked with developing a proposal for a new WG model (WG Work Team) and the other a new policy development process (PDP Work Team).</p>	2009 Jan-29	Ongoing	Council	The PPSC finalized the proposed GNSO WG Guidelines and submitted these to the GNSO Council for consideration at its meeting in January 2011. At this meeting, the GNSO Council acknowledged receipt and instructed staff to open a public comment period for 21 days (see <a href="http://www.icann.org/en/public-comment/#gnsowgguidelines">http://www.icann.org/en/public-comment/#gnsowgguidelines</a> ). The public comment period closed on 8 February 2011 and 2 comments were received. The summary and analysis of these comments were submitted to the GNSO Council for its consideration. The GNSO Council decided at its meeting on 24 Feb to refer the comments back to the PPSC for its consideration. The PPSC reviewed the comments received, updated the GNSO Working Group Guidelines accordingly and submitted these to the GNSO Council for its consideration on 8 March.



**Generic Names Supporting Organization Council  
Pending Projects List**

<b>GNSO Working Groups / Work Teams / Drafting Teams</b>				
<b>Description</b>	<b>Initiated</b>	<b>Target Date</b>	<b>Who holds Token</b>	<b>Pending action/status</b>
<p><b>GNSO Improvements</b> <b><u><a href="#">PPSC – PDP Work Team</a></u></b> Chair: J. Neuman Staff: M. Konings</p> <p>This <u><a href="#">Work Team</a></u> seeks to improve the GNSO’s Policy Development Process (PDP). Policies have wide-ranging impact on how domain names function, so the method of developing policies matters. The team is considering questions such as, Who may introduce a new issue into the PDP? How much background data should participants have before deciding policy? When a PDP is completed, how can its effectiveness be measured?</p>	2009 Jan-29	ongoing	WT	The WT has published its proposed Final Report and opened a public comment forum which will be open until 1 April (see <a href="http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-3-21feb11-en.htm">http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-3-21feb11-en.htm</a> ). The WT will present the Report and proposed recommendations at the ICANN meeting in San Francisco (see <a href="http://svsf40.icann.org/node/22177">http://svsf40.icann.org/node/22177</a> ).
<p><b>GNSO Improvements</b> <b><u><a href="#">PPSC – Working Group Work Team</a></u></b> Chair: J. S. Evans Staff: M. Konings</p> <p>In the past, the GNSO reviewed policy mainly through small groups called “Task Forces.” Intentionally, it is moving to a more inclusive model where parties tackle an issue as a “Working Group,” then make recommendations to the GNSO Council. This Work Team is working to define a new Working Group model, including guidelines and other materials to assist in the process of creating, chartering and guiding a GNSO Working Group.</p>	2009 Jan-29	Ongoing	Council	The proposed GNSO Working Group Guidelines were submitted by the WG-WT to the PPSC for its consideration on 31 May. The WG WT received the feedback from the PPSC and reconvened at the end of September to determine whether further changes need to be made to the proposed GNSO Working Group Guidelines based on the comments received from the PPSC. The WG-WT reviewed all comments and submitted its responses as well as a revised version of the GNSO Working Group Guidelines to the PPSC on 1 November.



**Generic Names Supporting Organization Council  
Pending Projects List**

GNSO Working Groups / Work Teams / Drafting Teams				
Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p><b>GNSO Improvements</b> <a href="#">Operations Steering Committee</a> Chair: P. Sheppard Staff: J. Hedlund</p> <p>This group guides the efforts of the GCOT, CSG and previously the CCT.</p>	2009 Jan-29	Ongoing	OSC, Council	Met on 05 December in Cartagena and agreed on final changes to SOI procedures. Revised document was submitted to the GNSO Council on 04 Feb and the Council resolved on 24 Feb to publish the document for public comment for 30 days to 26 March. Also on 24 Feb, the Council resolved that the OSC’s Global Outreach recommendations should be published for public comment for 45 days to 10 April. A group of Councilors also is reviewing the proxy section in the Operational Procedures and is considering minor changes.
<p><b>GNSO Improvements</b> <a href="#">OSC – Council Ops Team</a> Chair: R. Fassett Staff: J. Hedlund</p> <p>The GNSO Council is changing its decision-making style from that of a legislative body into that of a “strategic manager of the policy process.” This <a href="#">Work Team</a> is chartered to define what that means, and with considering operational issues. Examples: How should Council members disclose any possible conflicts of interest? How should voting occur when Council members are absent?</p>	2009 Jan-29	Ongoing	OSC	The Work Team held several meetings in September and October to revise Section 5.0 of the GNSO Council Operational Procedures. Submitted revised procedures to the OSC on 18 October for review. The Work Team members agreed that they stand ready to address further changes to the GNSO Operating Procedures for absences and elections if directed to do so by the OSC.



**Generic Names Supporting Organization Council  
Pending Projects List**

GNSO Working Groups / Work Teams / Drafting Teams				
Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p><b>GNSO Improvements</b>  <a href="#">OSC – Constituency and Stakeholder Ops Team</a>            Chair: O. Cavalli            Vice chair: Michael Young            Staff: J. Hedlund</p> <p>At ICANN, the words “Constituency” and “Stakeholder Group” have specific definitions, referring to representative groups comprising the GNSO. This <a href="#">Work Team</a> focuses on enhancing the existing structure by developing outreach programs to broaden participation, developing well-founded participation guidelines, and recommending Staff services that will streamline and improve operations.</p>	2009 Jan-29	Ongoing	WT, Staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On 5 August the Council approved a framework for participation in any ICANN Constituency or Stakeholder Group and a database of all Constituency and Stakeholder Group members.</li> <li>Develop global outreach program: The Work Team submitted a revised version of the recommendations to the OSC on 21 January based on OSC comments received in Cartagena. The OSC submitted the revised Global Outreach recommendations to the Council, which resolved on 24 Feb to publish the document for public comment for 45 days to 10 April.</li> </ul>
<p><b><a href="#">IRTP B -- PDP WG</a></b>            Chair: M. Neylon            Council liaison: Tim Ruiz            Staff: M. Konings</p> <p>As part of a broader review of the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy, the first in a set of five separate policy development processes (PDPs) is complete and a second, IRTP Part B, has begun. The <a href="#">IRTP Part B Working Group</a> is addressing issues related to domain hijacking and “lock status”, and as specified further in their <a href="#">Charter</a>.</p>	2009 Apr-16	Ongoing	WG	<p>The WG published its Initial Report on 31 May. A <a href="#">public comment period</a> was opened on 5 July and closed on 8 August. The WG has now completed the review the comments received. The WG has finalized the proposed recommendations and published its proposed Final Report for public comment (see <a href="http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-21feb11-en.htm">http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-21feb11-en.htm</a>). The public comment forum will be open until 31 March. The WG will present the report and its recommendations in San Francisco (see <a href="http://svsf40.icann.org/node/22083">http://svsf40.icann.org/node/22083</a>)</p>



**Generic Names Supporting Organization Council  
Pending Projects List**

GNSO Working Groups / Work Teams / Drafting Teams				
Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p><b>GNSO Improvements Standing Committee Drafting Team</b>            Chair: Wolf-Ulrich Knoben            Staff: M. Konings (provisional - pending workload adjustment)</p> <p>The DT is tasked to draft a charter for a Standing Committee to track and coordinate implementation of those OSC, PPSC and work team recommendations already approved by the Council and adopted, as recommended by the Communications and Coordination Work Team in its final report of 9 April 2010.</p>	2010-Dec-08	Ongoing	DT	<p>Wolf-Ulrich Knoben was appointed by the Council on 3 February 2011 to serve as the Chair of the drafting team. The DT has started its deliberations on the proposed charter and a first draft has been prepared for discussion.</p>



**Generic Names Supporting Organization Council  
Pending Projects List**

Other GNSO Activities				
Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<b>STUDIES</b>				
<p><a href="#">WHOIS Studies</a> Staff : L. Gasster</p> <p>The GNSO Council is considering potential <a href="#">studies of WHOIS</a>. Topics include Misuse of WHOIS Data, Registrant Identification Information, Proxy and Privacy "Abuse" and Proxy and Privacy "Reveal".</p>	2007 Oct-31	Ongoing	Council	In September 2010 the Council decided to proceed with a study of the misuse of public WHOIS information. In October staff provided an analysis of a Proxy/Privacy Abuse Study to the Council. A Proxy/Privacy "Reveal" Study RFP was posted in September and staff provided an analysis to the GNSO Council on 11 February 2011. The Non-ASCII WHOIS data study is on hold pending work of SSAC-GNSO IRD WG, and staff analysis of a possible Registrant Identification Study was previously provided to the Council in March 2010. The Board approved FY 2011 budget contains at least the Council-recommended funding of \$400,000 for studies. The Council is considering further which additional studies should be done and is expected to discuss the matter in San Francisco.
<b>AWAITING COUNCIL ACTION</b>				
<p><a href="#">Synthesis of WHOIS Service Requirements</a> Staff: S. Sheng</p> <p>In May 2009 the GNSO Council requested that staff collect and organize a comprehensive list of potential WHOIS service requirements, based on current policies and previous policy discussions.</p>	2009 May-7	Study Complete	Council (pending WHOIS Studies & IRD-WG work)	<p>A Final WHOIS Service Requirements Report was completed on 29 July 2010. See: <a href="http://gns0.icann.org/issues/whois/whois-service-requirements-final-report-29jul10-en.pdf">http://gns0.icann.org/issues/whois/whois-service-requirements-final-report-29jul10-en.pdf</a></p> <p>Council to consider next steps.</p>
<p><a href="#">Board requested metrics for Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice</a> Lead: Rosemary Sinclair</p>	Dec. 2010	TBD, Board requested by SFO March 13-	Council	The Council has expressed concern about community and staff resource availability, and about the scope of the task, and is



**Generic Names Supporting Organization Council  
Pending Projects List**

<p>Staff: M. Milam (provisional – pending workload adjustment)</p> <p>In December 2010 the ICANN Board asked for advice from the ALAC, GAC, GNSO and ccNSO on establishing the definition, measures, and targets for competition, consumer trust and consumer choice in the context of the domain name system.</p>		18, 2011		<p>considering next steps. The Council is scheduled to discuss this matter with the Board on Sunday 12 March in San Francisco.</p>
<p><b>Staff Implementation</b></p>				
<p><b>GNSO Toolkit of Services</b> Staff: R. Hoggarth</p> <p>See - <a href="#">Toolkit Document Link</a> The “toolkit” refers to a list of basic services approved by the GNSO Council 17 Dec 2009 that will be made available to eligible GNSO organizations (e.g., stakeholder groups and constituencies).</p>	2009 Dec-17	15 February	Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies	<p>Staff <a href="#">Implementation Plan/Report</a> was discussed in Cartagena. Checklist to request services was circulated to community and Staff received completed checklists from the RrSG, RySG, NCSG, CBUC, NCUC. Staff reviewing and discussing requests and implications for FY11 and FY12. A number of support services have/are already been/being provided in FY11 (e.g., teleconferencing and election support). Staff expects to facilitate community calls after the SVSF meeting to clarify expectations for community web site and membership info support. FY 12 requests are being included in ICANN FY12 budget planning.</p>
<p><b>GNSO Improvements</b> <a href="#">OSC – Community Communications Team</a> Staff: R. Hoggarth</p> <p>This <a href="#">Work Team</a> was chartered to develop recommendations to (a) enhance the GNSO’s ability to solicit meaningful community feedback, (b) improve coordination with other ICANN structures, and (c) find ways to make the GNSO’s website more usable and effective. On 23 June the GNSO Council approved the</p>	2009 March	March 2011	Staff	<p>Since Cartagena, ICANN has received the vendor web code and verified that it fulfills all contractual requirements. ICANN staff is now populating the new design with GNSO site content, a sizable task. Due to the many demands on the communications team, content population is progressing but will not be completed by the original March meeting target. Communications Staff will be available to provide an in-person progress update to the Council/community in San</p>



**Generic Names Supporting Organization Council**  
**Pending Projects List**

recommendations of the CCT.				Francisco.
<p><b>GNSO Constituency “Reconfirmations” and Review of SG Charters</b> Staff: R. Hoggarth</p> <p>The restructured GNSO Council was seated in October 2009, but there are several remaining tasks for the GNSO Constituencies including charter modifications to reflect the new Stakeholder Group structure and to make them more transparent, and representative. The Council approved new GOP provisions in Aug 2010 and the community has been working to implement many of them.</p>	2009 November	Cartagena	SIC	Board Structural Improvements Comm (SIC) has taken lead in developing timetable and implementation plans for these actions. SIC Chair reported in Cartagena effort to develop more structured process for reviews of Constituencies (new and existing) and Stakeholder Groups by Board. Public Comment Forum (PCF) <a href="#">has been opened</a> through 4 March. CSG Permanent Charter PCF now closed –no community comments received. NCSG still in dialogue with SIC re its permanent charter. PCF anticipated soon. IPC has ratified and submitted revised Bylaws. ISPCP and RySG have shared revised draft charter language with Staff.
<p><b>GNSO Work Prioritization Project</b> Staff: L. Gasster</p> <p>Effort emerged from growing concern that the GNSO has a very active and growing workload and a limited supply of volunteers available. The Team developed a process to help the GNSO Council to prioritize GNSO policy work.</p>	2009 Oct. 29	Drafting Team work complete	Council	In June the Council approved Prioritization Value Ratings (see - <a href="http://gns0.icann.org/resolutions/#201006">http://gns0.icann.org/resolutions/#201006</a> ). Value Ratings are published: (see - <a href="http://gns0.icann.org/drafts/draft-work-prioritization-project-list-value-ratings-23jun10-en.pdf">http://gns0.icann.org/drafts/draft-work-prioritization-project-list-value-ratings-23jun10-en.pdf</a> ). In lieu of the possibility of not doing further prioritization exercises, the Council was asked to suggest criteria that could be used to make decisions about whether to initiate a project or not. Staff prepared updated workload report for Council on 8 March, see: <a href="http://gns0.icann.org/mailling-lists/archives/council/docOnzDbMRYEQ.doc">http://gns0.icann.org/mailling-lists/archives/council/docOnzDbMRYEQ.doc</a>
<p><b>Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy Issue Paper</b> Staff: M. Milam (provisional – pending workload adjustment)</p> <p>Request for an Issue Report on the current state of the UDRP</p>	2011-Feb-03	TBD	Staff	At its meeting on 3 February 2011, the GNSO Council resolved to request an Issues Report on the current state of the UDRP. This effort should consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How the UDRP has addressed the problem of cybersquatting</li> </ul>



**Generic Names Supporting Organization Council**  
**Pending Projects List**

				<p>to date, and any insufficiencies/inequalities associated with the process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whether the definition of cybersquatting inherent within the existing UDRP language needs to be reviewed or updated. The Issue Report should include suggestions for how a possible PDP on this issue might be managed.</li> </ul> <p>At the SF/SV Meeting, Staff to provide an overview of the UDRP Issue Report at the Council's Saturday Meeting.</p>
<p><b>Discussion Paper on the Creation of non-binding best practices to help registrars and registries address the abusive registrations of domain names</b>  Staff: S. Sheng, M. Konings  (provisional – pending workload adjustment)</p>	<p>2011-Feb-03</p>	<p>TBD</p>	<p>Staff</p>	<p>At its meeting on 3 February 2011, the GNSO Council resolved to request a discussion paper on the creation of non-binding best practices to help registrars and registries address the abusive registrations of domain names in accordance with the Registration Abuse Policies Working Group Final Report.</p> <p>This effort should consider (but not be limited the following subjects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Practices for identifying stolen credentials</li> <li>• Practices for identifying and investigating common forms of malicious use (such as malware and phishing)</li> <li>• Creating anti-abuse terms of service for possible inclusion in Registrar-Registrant agreements by registrars who adopt them, and for use by TLD operators who adopt them.</li> <li>• Identifying compromised/hacked domains versus domain registered by abusers'</li> <li>• Practices for suspending domain names</li> <li>• Account access security management</li> <li>• Security resources of use or</li> </ul>



**Generic Names Supporting Organization Council  
Pending Projects List**

				<p>interest to registrars and registries</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Survey registrars and registries to determine practices being used, and their adoption rates.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Request to ICANN Compliance in relation to RAP Recommendations on WHOIS Access (recommendation #2) and Fake Renewal Notices (recommendation #1)</b></p>	2011-Feb-03		Council	<p>At its meeting on 3 February 2011, the GNSO Council instructed ICANN Policy Staff to forward the two issues identified by the RAP IDT as having low resource requirements, WHOIS Access recommendation #2 and Fake Renewal Notices recommendation #1, to ICANN Compliance Staff for resolution. ICANN Policy Staff has forwarded this request to ICANN Compliance Staff and a response was received on 23 February (see <a href="http://gnso.icann.org/mailling-lists/archives/council/msg10766.html">http://gnso.icann.org/mailling-lists/archives/council/msg10766.html</a>). A discussion with ICANN Compliance Staff has been scheduled at the San Francisco meeting.</p>
<b>INACTIVE PROJECTS</b>				
(No report of inactive projects is included at this time)				

<b>Joint SO/AC Working Groups</b>				
<b>Description</b>	<b>Initiated</b>	<b>Target Date</b>	<b>Who holds Token</b>	<b>Pending action/status</b>
<p><b>Geo Regions Review Community-wide Working Group</b>            Chair: Dave Archbold            GNSO Council Reps: Olga Cavalli and Zahid Jamil            Staff: R. Hoggarth</p> <p><a href="#">Working Group Wiki Page Link</a></p> <p>Geographic diversity is fundamental to ICANN. This WG is consulting with all stakeholders regarding the current definition and applications of the ICANN</p>	2008 Aug-07	Silicon Valley/SF	Olga/Zahid	<p>PCF on Interim Report of Working Group closed 30 Jan. Staff Summary of comments posted. WG now in Final Report drafting mode. WG expects to hold another community workshop in San Francisco (see - <a href="http://svsf40.icann.org/node/22217">http://svsf40.icann.org/node/22217</a>) and is still targeting Final Report publication prior to June meeting.</p>

**Generic Names Supporting Organization Council  
Pending Projects List**

<b>Joint SO/AC Working Groups</b>				
<b>Description</b>	<b>Initiated</b>	<b>Target Date</b>	<b>Who holds Token</b>	<b>Pending action/status</b>
Geographic Regions. Changes in this area could have broad impact, so this WG has representatives from nearly all SOs and ACs.				
<p><b>Joint ccNSO-GNSO IDN Working Group (JIG)</b>            ccNSO Co-chair: J. Zhang            GNSO Co-chair: E. Chung            Staff: B. Boswinkel, S. Sheng</p> <p>This group is identifying IDN issues of common interest to the ccTLD and gTLD communities and proposing methodology to resolve them. Issues include aspects of variant management for the root zone, submission and publication of IDN tables and the updating of IDN Guidelines related to both ccTLD and gTLD implementation processes.</p>	2009 July-23	Ongoing	WG	<p>Group is discussing: 1) IDN TLD string length restrictions and single character IDN ccTLDs and gTLDs; 2) Variant management at the root; and 3) how to encourage universal acceptance of IDN TLDs. <a href="#">The WG is finalizing a report on the introduction of single character IDN TLDs and has resumed drafting of an initial report on IDN variant management.</a></p>
<p><b><u>RAA</u></b>            RAA Registrants Charter Chair: B. Brendler            RAA amendments Chair: S. Metalitz            Staff: M. Milam</p> <p>The <i>Registrar Accreditation Agreement</i> (RAA), the contract governing the relationship between ICANN and accredited registrars, has been in place since 2001. A first set of amendments, intended to provide clarity and certainty regarding the duties of registrars and the rights of registrants, was approved by the Board in May, 2009. A <a href="#">Working Group</a> was then convened to develop a “charter of registrants’ rights” and to consider other possible amendments to the RAA.</p>	2009 May-21	March 2011	Council	<p>The working group has published its Final Report. The Final Report is posted at: <a href="http://gnso.icann.org/issues/raa/raa-improvements-proposal-final-report-18oct01-en.pdf">http://gnso.icann.org/issues/raa/raa-improvements-proposal-final-report-18oct01-en.pdf</a></p> <p>Next Steps: The GNSO Council to vote on the next steps for the RAA amendment topics at the SF/SV Meeting.</p>



**Generic Names Supporting Organization Council**  
**Pending Projects List**

Joint SO/AC Working Groups				
Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p><a href="#"><u>SSAC-GNSO Internationalized Registration Data Working Group</u></a> SSAC Co-chair: J. Hitchcock GNSO Co-chair: E. Chung Staff: Julie Hedlund</p> <p>Convened by the Board to study the feasibility of introducing display specifications to deal with the internationalization of WHOIS registration data. Currently no standard format exists for elements of a domain name registration record, such as contact information, sponsoring registrar and domain name status.</p>	2009 June	Ongoing	WG	The WG presented a preliminary draft approach to displaying elements of internationalized data at a public session in Brussels on 24 June. The WG produced an Interim Report that was posted for Public Comment on 15 November. The WG presented the Interim Report for the GNSO Council and the Public at Cartagena. It is considering questions raised during these meetings as well as comments in the Forum, which has been extended to 14 March 2011 upon publication of 5 UN translations on 03 December 2010. The WG briefed the SSAC on 10 February and held two outreach webinars on 16 February. At the Silicon Valley meeting the WG will brief the GNSO Council and public on comments the public comments received on the Interim Report.
<p><b>Joint Security and Stability Analysis Community Working Group (DNS Cert)</b> Chairs: TBD Staff: B. Boswinkel, J. Hedlund</p>	2010 June	Ongoing	Working Group	Drafting Team approved by the GNSO Council on 23 June. The Drafting Team reviewed a draft strawman charter at its meeting on 27 October and submitted a final Draft Charter on 15 November. The GNSO Council, the ALAC, the ccNSO, and the NROs approved the draft charter. The process for inviting volunteers is complete. A first meeting will be held at the Silicon Valley meeting.



**Generic Names Supporting Organization Council  
Pending Projects List**

Joint SO/AC Working Groups				
Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p><a href="#">Joint SO/AC WG on New gTLD Applicant Support (JAS WG)</a>            Co-Chair: Rafik Dammak            Co-Chair: Carlton Samuels            Council Liaison: Rafik Dammak            Staff: K. Valente</p> <p>This WG was convened by the Board (Nairobi, Resolution # 20) to evaluate and propose recommendations regarding specific support to new gTLD applicants in justified cases. The WG expects to identify suitable criteria for provision of such support, to identify suitable support forms and to identify potential providers of such support.</p>	2010-March	Ongoing	WG	<p>On November 11 2010, the JAS WG posted an announcement with the Milestone Report + Addenda. The Addenda contains a Summary and Analysis on the previous public comment forum – “initial snapshot”. See announcement here: <a href="http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-11nov10-en.htm">http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-11nov10-en.htm</a> On November 18, a motion was made to renew the JAS Charter for consideration by each SO/AC, in light of the potential new gTLD Program launch in Q2 2010. ALAC and the GNSO approved the extension, however, there is a disagreement about the scope of the charter. Karla consulted with Legal and Policy team and an opinion was sent to WG. Issue has no precedent, not addressed by By-Laws. The WG is starting work on the elements both charters have in common while ALAC and the GNSO try to reach an agreement. Karla produced a summary of the public comments regarding the Milestone Report. WG will discuss analysis and only then the summary will be posted. The WG plans on having private meeting during the SF ICANN Meeting, but no public session. The WG plans on sending one or more observers to the GAC/Board in Brussels.</p>



**Generic Names Supporting Organization Council  
Pending Projects List**

<b>Joint SO/AC Working Groups</b>				
<b>Description</b>	<b>Initiated</b>	<b>Target Date</b>	<b>Who holds Token</b>	<b>Pending action/status</b>
<p><b>New gTLD Recommendation 6 GNSO, GAC, ALAC Cross-Community WG</b>            GNSO Co-Chair: C. Gomes            ALAC Co-Chair: C. Langdon-Orr            GAC Co-Chair: H. Dryden            Council Liaison: S. Van Gelder            Staff: M. Milam</p> <p>WG goal is to provide guidance to the new gTLD Implementation Team and the ICANN Board regarding the procedures for addressing culturally objectionable and/or sensitive strings.</p>	2010 June	March 2011	Staff	<p>WG published a Final Report <a href="http://gnsso.icann.org/issues/new-gtlds/report-rec6-cwg-21sep10-en.pdf">http://gnsso.icann.org/issues/new-gtlds/report-rec6-cwg-21sep10-en.pdf</a>. The CWG responded to the Board inquiry on 7 Jan 2011. The GNSO Council Cartagena resolution calls for SGs and Constituencies to provide feedback to the Council on the CWG Final Report.</p> <p>Council collected feedback on the CWG and forwarded to the Board for its review and consideration. Next Step: New gTLD Program Staff to update Applicant Guidebook materials related to Rec6.</p>
<p><b>ccNSO Study Group on the Use of Names for Countries and Territories</b>  <b>Chair:</b> Annebeth Lange, .no</p> <p>Representatives from the GNSO, GAC and ALAC are invited to join this group, which will consider potential issues related to applying the current and proposed policies and procedures for allocation to types and categories of current and proposed strings to be used as TLDs that are either associated with Countries and Territories (i.e., by inclusion on the ISO 3166-1 list) and/or are otherwise considered representations of Country or Territory names.</p>	8 Dec. 2010	ongoing		The GNSO Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies are identifying representatives to participate.

<b>Outstanding Recommendations for Council Action</b>		
<b>Description</b>	<b>Who holds Token</b>	<b>Pending action/status</b>



**Generic Names Supporting Organization Council**  
**Pending Projects List**

Outstanding Recommendations for Council Action		
Description	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<b>Registration Abuse Policies Final Report Remaining Recommendations<sup>1</sup></b>		
<p><b>WHOIS Access – Recommendation #1:</b> The GNSO should determine what additional research and processes may be needed to ensure that WHOIS data is accessible in an appropriately reliable, enforceable, and consistent fashion. The GNSO Council should consider how such might be related to other WHOIS efforts, such as the upcoming review of WHOIS policy and implementation required by ICANN’s new Affirmation of Commitments.</p>	Council	
<p><b>Uniformity of Contracts:</b> View A: The RAPWG recommends the creation of an Issues Report to evaluate whether a minimum baseline of registration abuse provisions should be created for all in-scope ICANN agreements, and if created, how such language would be structured to address the most common forms of registration abuse. View B: Opposed to the recommendation for an Issues Report as expressed in view A</p>	Council	
<p><b>Gripe Sites; Deceptive and/or Offensive Domain Names – Recommendation #1:</b> Rough Consensus: Make no recommendation. The majority of RAPWG members expressed that gripe site and offensive domain names that use trademarks should be addressed in the context of cybersquatting and the UDRP for purposes of establishing consistent registration abuse policies in this area, and that creating special procedures for special classes of domains, such as offensive domain names, may present problems. Alternate view: The URDP should be revisited to determine what substantive policy changes, if any, would be necessary to address any inconsistencies relating to decisions on “gripe” names and to provide for fast track substantive and procedural mechanisms in the event of the registration of deceptive domain names that mislead adults or children to objectionable sites.</p>	Council	

<sup>1</sup> Listed as ranked by the RAP-IDT, see letter <http://gns0.icann.org/correspondence/rap-idt-to-gns0-council-15nov10-en.pdf>

**Generic Names Supporting Organization Council**  
**Pending Projects List**

<b>Outstanding Recommendations for Council Action</b>		
<b>Description</b>	<b>Who holds Token</b>	<b>Pending action/status</b>
<p><b>Cybersquatting – Recommendation #2:</b>  View A: The RAPWG recommends the initiation of a Policy Development Process by requesting an Issues Report to investigate the appropriateness and effectiveness of how any Rights Protection Mechanisms that are developed elsewhere in the community (e.g. the New gTLD program) can be applied to the problem of cybersquatting in the current gTLD space.  View B: The initiation of such a process is premature; the effectiveness and consequences of the Rights Protection Mechanisms proposed for the new TLDs is unknown. Discussion of RPMs should continue via the New TLD program. Experience with them should be gained before considering their appropriate relation (if any) to the existing TLD space.</p>	Council	
<p><b>Fake Renewal Notices – Recommendation #2 – conditional on #1:</b> The following recommendation is conditional. The WG would like to learn the ICANN Compliance Department’s opinions regarding Recommendation #1 above, and the WG will further discuss Recommendation 2 looking forward to the WG’s Final Report.  The RAPWG recommends the initiation of a Policy Development Process by requesting an Issues Report to investigate fake renewal notices.</p>	Council	
<p><b>Meta Issue: Collection and Dissemination of Best Practices:</b>  The RAPWG recommends that the GNSO, and the larger ICANN community in general, create and support structured, funded mechanisms for the collection and maintenance of best practices.</p>	Council	
<p><b>Cross-TLD Registration Scam:</b> The RAPWG recommends the GNSO monitor for Cross-TLD registration scam abuse in the gTLD space and co-ordinate research with the community to determine the nature and extent of the problem. The WG believes this issue warrants review but notes there is not enough data at this time to warrant an Issues Report or PDP.</p>	Council	
<p><b>Meta Issue - Uniformity of Reporting:</b> The RAPWG recommends that the GNSO, and the larger ICANN community in general, create and support uniform reporting processes.</p>	Council	



**Generic Names Supporting Organization Council  
Pending Projects List**

Outstanding Recommendations for Council Action		
Description	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p><b>Gripe Sites; Deceptive and/or Offensive Domain Names – Recommendation #2:</b> View A: Turn down a proposed recommendation that registries develop best practices to restrict the registration of offensive strings. View B: Registries should consider developing internal best practice policies that would restrict the registration of offensive strings in order to mitigate the potential harm to consumers and children.</p>	Council	
<p><b>Domain Kiting / Tasting:</b> It is unclear to what extent domain kiting happens, and the RAPWG does not recommend policy development at this time. The RAPWG suggests that the Council monitor the issue (in conjunction with ongoing reviews of domain-tasting), and consider next steps if conditions warrant.</p>	Council	