



(S)Status¹: ■ Active ■ Planned ■ On-Hold // (C)Condition²: ■ On Target ■ At Risk ■ In Trouble

Phase	Title	S	C	Links
1 - Issue Identification	GNSO Council Action Items [refer to list on wiki]	Active	On Target	LINK
2 - Issue Scoping	Transfer Policy – Policy Review (IRTP-PR)	Planned	On Target	LINK
3 - Initiation	WHOIS Procedure Implementation Advisory Group – (WPIAG)	On-Hold	Planned	LINK
4 - Working Group	Expedited Policy Development Process – Phase 2 – (EPDP-P2)	Active	On Target	LINK
4 - Working Group	Cross Community Working Group on New gTLD Auction Proceeds (CWG-Auction)	Active	Planned	LINK
4 - Working Group	PDP: Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms in All gTLDs (RPM)	Active	Planned	LINK
4 - Working Group	PDP: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP (Sub-Pro)	Active	Planned	LINK
5 - Council Deliberations	- none -			
6 - Board Vote	PDP: Curative Rights Protections for IGO/INGOs (IGO-INGO-CRP)	Active	On Target	LINK
6 - Board Vote	Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability (WS2)	Active	On Target	LINK
6 - Board Vote	PDP: Protection of International Organization Names in All gTLDs (IGO-INGO)	On-Hold	On-Hold	LINK
7 - Implementation	Expedited Policy Development Process on the Temporary Specification on gTLD Registration Data– (TempSpec)	Active	On Target	LINK
7 - Implementation	PDP: Protection of International Organization Names in All gTLDs – Reconvened WG (IGO-RCRC)	Active	On Target	LINK
7 - Implementation	GNSO PDP 3.0 (PDP3.0)	Active	On Target	LINK
7 - Implementation	Geo Regions Review (GEO)	Active	Planned	LINK
7 - Implementation	GNSO Rights & Obligations under Revised ICANN Bylaws Drafting Team (RODT)	Active	On Target	LINK
7 - Implementation	PDP: Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues (PPSAI)	On-Hold	Planned	LINK
7 - Implementation	PDP: Translation & Transliteration of gTLD Registration Data (T&T)	On-Hold	On-Hold	LINK
Other	GNSO Standing Committee on Budget and Operations (SCBO)	Active	On Target	LINK
Other	GNSO Standing Selection Committee (SSC)	Active	On Target	LINK
Other	Expired Registration Recovery Policy – Policy Review (ERRP-PR)	Planned	On Target	LINK
Other	Policy & Implementation Recommendations Review (Pollmp – RR)	Planned	On Target	LINK

¹ Status – project activity classification

² Condition – performance classification of milestone achievement against original plan or other identified issues that prevent an On Target assignment

Last updated: 11 July 2019

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

1 - Issue Identification

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
GNSO Council Action Items - LINK	NA	NA	NA	Refer to most recent action item list for latest status

2 - Issue Scoping

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p>Transfer Policy (IRTP-PR) Staff: B. Aitchison (GDD), C. Tubergen, M. Konings</p> <p><i>IRTP Part D Recommendation #17: The WG recommends that, once all IRTP recommendations are implemented (incl. IRTP-D, and remaining elements from IRTP-C), the GNSO Council, together with ICANN staff, should convene a panel to collect, discuss, and analyze relevant data to determine whether these enhancements have improved the IRTP process and dispute mechanisms, and identify possible remaining shortcomings.</i></p> <p><i>IRTP Part D Recommendation #18: The Working Group recommends that contracted parties and ICANN should start to gather data and other relevant information that will help inform a future IRTP review team in its efforts, especially with regard to those issues listed in the Observations (4.2.7.1) above.</i></p> <p><i>Transfer Emergency Action Contact (TEAC) “The Working Group recommends that the GNSO perform a follow-up review of the TEAC 12 to 24 months after the policy is implemented to identify any issues that may have arisen and propose modifications to address them. This review should specifically address whether the TEAC is working as intended (to establish contact between registrars in case of emergency), whether the TEAC is not abused</i></p>	2018-02-28	2019-July	ICANN Org/ GNSO Council	<p>GDD staff published on 14 November 2018, the IRTP Policy Status Report for public comment. IRTP Policy Status Report is organized to help assess the effectiveness of the IRTP in terms of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Portability: Can registrants easily transfer their names? Are the processes well-standardized and efficient for registrars? 2. Preventing Abuse: Does the Policy include effective protections against abuses such as fraud and domain name hijacking? 3. Information: Are there readily available educational sources about the transfer process and options? <p>Comments were due 24 December 2018.</p> <p>ICANN Org incorporated feedback from the public comment period and the survey responses into an updated version of the Report and distributed it to the Council on 22 April 2019. With the delivery of the updated Policy Status Report, the GNSO Council is still considering next steps in reference to a Transfer Policy review, including a potential EPDP.</p>

2 - Issue Scoping

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<i>(used for issues that are not considered an emergency) and whether the option to 'undo' a transfer in case of failure to respond to a TEAC should be made mandatory."</i>				

3 – Initiation

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p>WHOIS Procedure Implementation Advisory Group (WPIAG) Chair: TBC Council Liaison: Keith Drazek Staff: TBC</p> <p>The ICANN Procedure For Handling WHOIS Conflicts with Privacy Law Implementation Advisory Group (WHOIS Procedure IAG) is tasked to provide the GNSO Council with recommendations on how to address the comments and input that have been received in response to the public comment forum on the Revised ICANN Procedure for Handling WHOIS Conflicts with Privacy Law: Process and Next Steps.</p>	2018-Feb-22	2020-March On-Hold	GNSO Council	The GNSO Council adopted the charter for the ICANN Procedure For Handling WHOIS Conflicts with Privacy Law Implementation Advisory Group (WHOIS Procedure IAG) during its meeting on 22 February 2018. The IAG is tasked to provide the GNSO Council with recommendations on how to address the comments and input that have been received in response to the public comment forum on the Revised ICANN Procedure for Handling WHOIS Conflicts with Privacy Law: Process and Next Steps. Per the Council’s recent discussions, noting the current workload and activities that may impact the IAG’s work, staff is refraining from circulating the call for volunteers to the GNSO Stakeholder Groups until the EPDP Team completes certain milestones (e.g., delivery of its Final Report). Following discussion at the 13 March 2019 Council meeting, the Council agreed to defer further discussion of the WPIAG for 12 months but reserves the right to revisit the deferral period at any time.

4 – Working Group

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p>Expedited Policy Development Process – Phase 2</p> <p>Chair: Janis Karklins Council Liaison: Rafik Dammak Staff: M. Konings, C. Tubergen, B. Cobb</p> <p>Following the adoption by the ICANN Board of a temporary specification on gTLD Registration Data to enable contracted parties to continue to comply with existing ICANN contractual requirements and with community-developed policies as they relate to WHOIS, while also complying with the European Union’s General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), a one-year policy development process that created consensus recommendations to replace the temporary specification as consensus policy. This Phase 2 group addresses items carried over from Phase 1 as well as deliberate policy considerations on a standardized access model.</p>	2019-Mar-04	Ongoing	WG	<p>The GNSO Council adopted the EPDP Team’s Final Report during its Special Council meeting on 4 March 2019 and provided its non-objection to the commencement of Phase 2.</p> <p>The Team has now begun substantive discussion on a system for standardized access/disclosure to nonpublic registration data. In parallel, EPDP Leadership organized teleconferences and invited interested team members to discuss next steps for Priority 2 items (see https://community.icann.org/x/5oaGBg).</p> <p>During ICANN65, the EPDP Team met two times, for a total of 13 hours, and used these face-to-face meetings to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • discuss the format of a template to detail possible use cases for requestors of nonpublic gTLD registration data; • review example use cases for requestors of nonpublic gTLD registration data; • meet with ICANN org to discuss ICANN org’s future engagement with European Data Protection Agencies based on the work of the Technical Study Group; • review the new format and first iteration of the Phase 2 project plan and timeline. <p>The EPDP Team began its meeting by reviewing and agreeing to the overarching template for requestor use cases and the questions therein. Following this agreement, the EPDP Team comprehensively discussed the use case of an individual or entity requesting nonpublic registration data for the purpose of taking legal action against trademark infringement violations. The EPDP Team then reviewed a use case for a law enforcement investigation of criminal activity against a victim in the jurisdiction of the investigating EU LEA requesting data from a non-local data controller. The objective of these use cases is to better understand real life needs as well as related requirements so that these can eventually be translated into policy principles and recommendations.</p>

4 – Working Group

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
				Going forward, a subset of volunteers within the EPDP Team has volunteered to produce additional use cases for EPDP Team discussion. The EPDP Team is expected to review the use cases, or a subset thereof, in the coming weeks. EPDP Support Staff will then endeavor to review the completed use cases and synthesize commonalities and trends in order to produce a first draft of potential policy options or text for further discussion during the EPDP Team’s face-to-face meeting, which will be held in Los Angeles from 9 – 11 September 2019.
<p>New gTLD Auction Proceeds Cross-Community Working Group (CCWG) Co-Chairs: Ching Chiao (ccNSO); Erika Mann (GNSO) Staff: M. Konings (GNSO), E. Barabas (GNSO), J. Braeken (ccNSO)</p> <p>This CCWG is tasked with developing a proposal(s) for consideration by its Chartering Organizations on the mechanism that should be developed in order to allocate the new gTLD Auction Proceeds. As part of this proposal, the CCWG is also expected to consider the scope of fund allocation, due diligence requirements that preserve ICANN’s tax status as well as how to deal with directly related matters such as potential or actual conflicts of interest. The CCWG will not make any recommendations or determinations with regards to specific funding decisions (i.e. which specific organizations or projects are to be funded or not).</p>	2016-Mar-10	Ongoing	CCWG	The CCWG held its first meeting on 26 January 2017 and has met regularly since that time. The latest version of the work plan can be found here: https://community.icann.org/x/dUPwAw . The CCWG published its Initial Report for public comment on 8 October 2018. The public comment period closed on 11 December 2018. 37 community submissions were received (see https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-new-gtld-auction-proceeds-initial-17dec18-en.pdf). The CCWG has completed its review of public comments (see https://community.icann.org/x/zYMWBg) and is now making revisions to the proposed Final Report. Based on the updates made, the CCWG will consider whether the proposed Final Report will be published for another round of public comment or whether it will be submitted to the Chartering Organizations for consideration. The CCWG anticipates to complete its revisions to the proposed Final Report by early September 2019, which will require timely review by CCWG members and participants of the draft Final Report and agreeing on how to address outstanding issues.
Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) in All	2011-Feb-03	Ongoing	WG	By end-2017, the WG had completed an initial review of the Trademark Post-

4 – Working Group

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p>gTLDs PDP Co-Chair(s): Philip Corwin, Kathy Kleiman, Brian Beckham Council Liaison: Paul McGrady Community Liaisons (to/from the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG): Robin Gross, Susan Payne Staff: M. Wong, J. Hedlund, A. Liang</p> <p>This WG was chartered in March 2016 to review all the RPMs that have been developed by ICANN. The PDP is being conducted in two phases, beginning with the RPMs developed for the 2012 New gTLD Program, with the 1999 Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy to follow in Phase Two. By the end of its work, the WG will be expected to also have considered the overarching issue as to whether or not the RPMs collectively fulfil their purposes or whether additional policy recommendations will be necessary, including to clarify and unify the policy goals.</p>				<p>Delegation Dispute Resolution Procedure (TM-PDDRP), and much of the Trademark Clearinghouse (TMCH) structure and operations.</p> <p>As of October 2018 at ICANN63, the WG completed its initial review of the Uniform Rapid Suspension (URS) RPM. All proposals (including those drafted by the three URS sub teams as well as those submitted by individual WG members) will be included in the Phase One Initial Report (when that is prepared) for public comment.</p> <p>As of June 2019 at ICANN65, the Sunrise and Trademark Claims RPMs Sub Teams completed their reievw of: (1) the results of the professional surveys that were conducted by the Analysis Group (pursuant to the GNSO Council’s approval, in September 2017, of a funding request to ICANN Org); (2) additional data that was collected previously and initially reviewed by the full WG; (3) individual proposals submitted by WG members; and (4) preliminary recommendations. In early July 2019, the Sub Teams sent their recommendations to the full WG for review and possible inclusion in the Phase One Initial Report.</p> <p>During four meetings in July the full WG will review the Sub Teams’ recommendations, proposed answers to Charter questions, and questions for community input and will decide what will be included in the Phase One Initial Report. The WG will then consider the remaining open TMCH questions and, when completed, proceed to the development of its Phase One Initial Report.</p> <p>The WG has adjusted its Phase One timeline. As of ICANN64, it had anticipated working on Phase One into February 2020 and submitting a finalized Phase One report to the GNSO Council in the first quarter of 2020. As requested by the Council leadership, the WG co-chairs submitted an updated Phase One timeline on 25 April 2019 that now reflects a late/end April 2020 date for completion of Phase One. Due to the WG’s challenging Work Plan and Timeline that does not allow for any slippage, this project’s condition is marked as “at risk”.</p>

4 – Working Group

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
				Based on the Council’s April 2019 referral of recommendation 5 of the IGO/INGO Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms PDP to the RPMs PDP, the Council is beginning work on the revisions needed to integrate consideration of this recommendation into the RPMs PDP charter.
<p>New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Co-Chair(s): Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Jeff Neuman Council Liaison: Elsa Saade and Flip Petillion Community Liaisons (to/from the RPM Review PDP WG): Robin Gross, Susan Payne Community Liaison (to/from CCT-RT): Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez Staff: S. Chan, J. Hedlund, E. Barabas This WG is tasked with calling upon the community’s collective experiences from the 2012 New gTLD Program round to determine what, if any changes may need to be made to the existing 2007 Introduction of New Generic Top-Level Domains policy recommendations. Those policy recommendations will remain in place for subsequent rounds unless modified via a PDP. The work of this WG follows the efforts of the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Discussion Group (DG), which identified a set of issues for a future PDP-WG to consider in their deliberations.</p>	2014-Jun-25	Ongoing	WG	<p>The WG has completed its initial review of the public comments received to its Initial Report via three Sub Groups just prior to ICANN65. The full WG has also completed the initial review of public comments received to its Supplemental Initial Report on several additional topics that were not included in the Initial Report.</p> <p>The full WG is now in the midst of substantive deliberations on the public comments to its Initial Report and Supplemental Initial Report. The WG is assembling public comment summary documents to help it assess what elements should be integrated into its eventual recommendations. The WG is mostly reviewing its topics sequentially, having largely completed its review of summaries on Overarching Issues (e.g., Continuing Subsequent Procedures, Predictability, Clarity of Application Process, Applications Assessed in Rounds, Different TLD Types, Application Submission Limits, and RSP Pre-Approval), Foundational Issues (Global Public Interest, Applicant Freedom of Expression, and Universal Acceptance), and Pre-launch activities (Applicant Guidebook, Communications, Systems). At ICANN65, the WG continued this review process and also met with ICANN Org’s Global Domains Division (GDD) to discuss GDD’s draft assumptions for use in preliminary planning work for subsequent procedures of the New gTLD Program.</p> <p>Work Track 5 (WT5), solely focused on geographic names at the top level. WT5 has completed its initial review of public comments received to its Initial Report that was published for public comment on 05 December 2018. WT5 is meeting on a weekly basis and is concentrating on determining whether changes are needed to its set of preliminary recommendations.</p>

5 – Council Deliberation

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
- none -				

6 – Board Vote

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p>Curative Rights Protections for IGO/INGOs PDP</p> <p>Chair: Petter Rindforth Council Liaison: Darcy Southwell Staff: M. Wong, S. Chan</p> <p>This WG was chartered in June 2014 to provide the GNSO Council with recommendations as to whether to amend the UDRP and URS to allow access to and use of these mechanisms by IGOs and INGOs and, if so in what respects or whether a separate, narrowly-tailored dispute resolution procedure that takes into account the particular needs and specific circumstances of IGOs and INGOs should be developed.</p>	2014-Jun-05	Ongoing	Board	<p>The WG submitted its Final Report on 9 July 2018, with three minority statements incorporated into the Final Report on 13 July. At the Council’s July 2018 meeting, it acknowledged receipt of the report and resolved to consider it in a holistic fashion, taking into account the overall protections for IGOs.</p> <p>To more fully understand the Final Report and its recommendations, the Council conducted a question and answer webinar on 9 October 2018. A motion to consider the WG’s Final Report, submitted for the 24 October Council meeting, was withdrawn based on both substantive and procedural concerns raised by several Councilors. For the Council’s November 2018 meeting, staff prepared a procedural options paper to assist Council to determine next steps for moving forward. In January 2019, the Council sent a response to the GAC’s letter of October 2018, requesting further engagement on the topic. The Council and GAC leadership teams held two calls before ICANN64 and, at ICANN64, the GAC/INGOs indicated that they may be willing to participate in some form of reconstituted or expedited effort. The GNSO Council discussed several options, ranging from approving, adopting some, or rejecting all recommendations, with various paths available after this initial action. For the Council’s 18 April meeting, the Council leadership proposed a motion where recommendations 1-4 are adopted and recommendation 5 is referred to the RPMs PDP for their consideration. Just prior to the 18 April meeting, the Council received correspondence from the GAC, which expressed some concern about this proposed approach. At the 18 April Council Meeting, the Council adopted the motion as proposed with a Supermajority vote. The Council adopted the Recommendations Report for the ICANN Board at its May 2019 meeting and has briefly discussed revisions needed to integrate consideration of recommendation 5 into the RPMs PDP charter. The GNSO Council took part in a dialogue with the GAC at ICANN65 to discuss GAC early engagement on integrating recommendation 5 into the RPMs PDP Charter.</p> <p>The GNSO Council has convened a small team of Councilors to begin drafting the RPMs PDP Charter to integrate recommendation 5, which is expected to be done with some level of collaboration with the GAC.</p>

6 – Board Vote

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
				The ICANN Board has indicated that it will follow the Bylaws-mandated process of seeking public comments shortly on the GNSO Council’s recommendations. It also plans to form a Board Caucus Group to ensure that the Board fully understands the context and ramifications of this longstanding topic, prior to taking any formal action on the four recommendations approved by the GNSO Council. As of early July 2019, the Council and the GAC have not agreed to jointly request a Board-facilitated dialogue following the discussions at ICANN65.
<p>Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability Co-Chairs: Jordan Carter (ccNSO), Thomas Rickert (GNSO), Tijani Ben Jemaa (ALAC) Staff: B. Turcotte</p> <p>This CCWG is expected to deliver proposals that would enhance ICANN’s accountability towards all stakeholders. In Work Stream 1, it identified those mechanisms that must be in place or committed to before the IANA Stewardship Transition occurs. Currently, in Work Stream 2 it is considering those mechanisms for which a timeline for implementation extends beyond the IANA Stewardship Transition.</p>	2016-Jun-26	2019-Jul-31	Board	The Final Report has now been submitted to the ICANN Board and is under consideration.
<p>Protection of International Organization Names in All gTLDs PDP Chair: Thomas Rickert Council liaison: Keith Drazek Staff: M. Wong, S. Chan, B. Cobb</p> <p>This WG was tasked to provide the GNSO</p>	2012-Apr-12	Ongoing	Board / Council	In April 2014 the Board voted to adopt those of the GNSO’s recommendations, approved unanimously by the GNSO Council in November 2013, that are not inconsistent with GAC advice received on the topic. Following work by an Implementation Review Team (IRT), the finalized Consensus Policy was announced in January 2018, with an effective date of August 2018 for most aspects of the Policy.

6 – Board Vote

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p>Council with policy recommendations as to whether there is a need for special protections at the top and second level in all gTLDs for the names and acronyms of International Governmental Organizations (IGOs) and international non-governmental organizations (INGOs) receiving protections under treaties and statutes under multiple jurisdictions, specifically including the Red Cross/Red Crescent Movement (RCRC) and the International Olympic Committee (IOC).</p>				<p>For those policy recommendations that are inconsistent with GAC advice (protection of IGO acronyms and IFRC National society identifiers), the Board passed a number of resolutions in 2013 and 2014 to temporarily reserve the Red Cross National Society names at issue as well as the names and acronyms of the IGOs that appear on the list provided by the GAC to ICANN in March 2013. These interim protections remain in place until the differences between the GNSO recommendations and the GAC advice are reconciled.</p> <p>Next steps on IGO acronyms protections: Further discussions relating to possible next steps for protecting IGO acronyms are not expected to take place prior to the Board’s consideration of the Council’s recent approval of the first four recommendations from the IGO-INGO Curative Rights PDP.</p> <p>Next steps on Red Cross names The Reconvened WG IRT held its first meeting on 28 March 2019 and is targeting August 2019 to send a legal notice and announce the Policy Effective Date for August 2020.</p>

7 – Implementation

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p>Registration Data Policy for gTLDs (Expedited Policy Development Process on the Temporary Specification on gTLD Registration Data - Phase 1)</p> <p>Chair(s): N/A Council Liaison: Ruben Kuhl Staff: Dennis Chang, C. Tubergen, M. Konings</p> <p>This IRT was formed to work with ICANN staff on the implementation of the GNSO’s consensus policy recommendations for Registration Data Services, as approved by the ICANN Board.</p>	2019-05-15	2020-Feb-29 date set by the EPDP team rec.	Staff / IRT	<p>The ICANN Board adopted the GNSO’s EPDP Phase 1 recommendations on 15 May 2019 prior to the expiration of the Temporary Specification. ICANN staff is now formally directed to begin implementation. A pre-IRT was formed at the direction of ICANN Org’s CEO to implement the policy bridging mechanism until the consensus policy recommendation can be implemented by 29 Feb 2020.</p> <p>Immediately following the Board resolution and IRT was formed and held its first session 29 May 2019. The implementation team is in the process of analysing the 29 recommendation to derive the requirements for the consensus policy. The implementation plan to be created will identify the implementation scope and schedule for public comment.</p>
<p>Protection of International Organization Names in All gTLDs PDP (Reconvened WG-IRT)</p> <p>Chair: N/A Council liaison: Tatiana Tropina Staff: D. Chang, M. Wong, B. Cobb</p> <p>This IRT is tasked with reviewing the implementation for the GNSO’s consensus policy recommendations as it pertains to the protection of the Red Cross National Society and International Movement designations that are inconsistent with GAC Advice.</p>	2017-May-03	2020-Aug-31	Staff / IRT	<p>The Reconvened WG IRT held its first meeting on 28 March 2019 and has been meeting on a monthly basis. It is targeting August 2019 to send a legal notice and announce the Policy Effective Date. The implementation addressed here is one part of the deferred scope of IGO protections, due to inconsistency between GNSO-approved policy and GAC advice. The IGO acronyms issue is still under the Board consideration and is not authorized for implementation.</p> <p>On 27 January 2019, the Board adopted policy recommendations on Protections for Certain Red Cross and Red Crescent Names in All Generic Top-Level Domains and directed their implementation. This Consensus Policy will supplement the previously-adopted Protection of IGO and INGO Identifiers in All gTLDs Policy by which the specific terms Red Cross, Red Crescent, Red Lion & Sun and Red Crystal were withheld from registration. The IRT that is working on the implementation of the previously-adopted consensus policy plans has added these new recommendations to its scope and is currently working on an implementation plan in preparation for public comment. Please see IGO and INGO Policy IRT wiki page for details.</p>

7 – Implementation

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p>GNSO PDP 3.0 Chair: Rafik Dammak Staff: S. Chan, M. Konings</p> <p>How to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the GNSO Policy Development Process.</p>	2018-10-24	2019-Nov-07	Staff / Council	<p>The GNSO Council adopted the proposed GNSO PDP 3.0 Final Report on 24 October 2018 and formed a small team of Councilors to implement the recommendations contained in the PDP 3.0 implementation plan.</p> <p>The small team is continuing to review improvement drafts and has developed a revised work plan, targeting ICANN66 for completion of all work for this project. The small team has agreed to provide updates to the Council no less frequently than once a quarter, with the most recent update taking the form of a discussion topic on the GNSO’s working session agenda at ICANN65 and an item on the GNSO Council meeting agenda. In an effort to enhance progress, the group has agreed to meet on a weekly basis, assign staff/small team member leads to each item, and has made other changes to how it operates.</p>
<p>Geo Regions Review Community-wide Working Group Chair: Cheryl Langdon-Orr (ccNSO/APRALO) Staff: M. Wong</p> <p>This Board-chartered cross community WG has consulted with ICANN stakeholders regarding the definition and applications of ICANN’s Geographic Regions.</p>	2008-Aug-07	2019-Dec-31	Staff	<p>The Board adopted the Final Report during its meeting on 25 October 2018 and “directs the ICANN organization to implement those recommendations in a manner that aligns with the Board’s expectations as outlined in the mapping document”. ICANN Org staff expects to begin implementation planning as directed by the Board in the second half of 2019.</p>
<p>GNSO Rights & Obligations under Revised ICANN Bylaws Drafting Team (DT) Recommendations Chair: Heather Forrest Staff: M. Wong, J. Hedlund, M. Konings</p> <p>The GNSO Council decided on 29 November 2018 to relaunch the DT. The re-established DT will work with GNSO staff to develop proposed</p>	2016-Jun-30	2019-Oct-31	Staff / Council	<p>Staff had circulated a document on 17 May 2018 which outlines the additional proposed steps to be taken to ensure preparedness as well as facilitate the ability for the GNSO Council to act in relation to the new roles and responsibilities outlined in the post-transition Bylaws, such as development of templates and additional processes/procedures. In the meantime, staff developed templates for the DT to review, and has updated the gns0.icann.org website with the latest procedures and voting thresholds: See: https://gns0.icann.org/en/council/procedures.</p>

7 – Implementation

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p>guidance for the GNSO to complete a particular action(s) that fall within the GNSO’s existing processes and procedures, but where additional details and steps are deemed to be helpful, relating to the GNSO’s participation as a Decision Participant in the Empowered Community. The DT shall provide to the GNSO Council the proposed guidance, including any recommendations, if applicable, for changes to GNSO Operating Procedures to enable effective GNSO participation as a Decisional Participant, for its consideration. Any such new, or proposed modifications to existing procedures must be approved by the GNSO Council following the applicable process.</p>				<p>Staff provided a status update during the GNSO Council meeting on 29 November 2018 and at the direction of the GNSO Council launched a call for volunteers in December 2018 for a re-established DT to work on the outstanding items identified.</p> <p>The DT began work in January 2019 and is meeting bi-weekly to develop guidelines and templates. Since submitting its original timeline and work plan to the GNSO Council in March 2019, the DT has determined that the complexity of deriving guidelines based on actions described in the Bylaws, as well as the need for time to coordinate with the ccNSO on joint actions, required an extension of the timeline to complete the work. Originally, the DT had projected to complete all guidelines in July 2019. Per the revised timeline submitted to the GNSO Council leadership in June, the DT anticipates completing all templates and guidelines by October 2019.</p>
<p>Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues PDP Recommendations Council Liaison: Darcy Southwell IRT Support Staff: Amy Bivins (Legal)</p> <p>The <i>Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA)</i>, the contract governing the relationship between ICANN and accredited registrars, has been in place since 2001. The Board initiated negotiations for a new RAA in October 2011, and requested an Issue Report from the GNSO at the same time. The final version of the new RAA was approved by the Board in June 2013, thereby signifying that the RAA negotiations were concluded. Per the Board’s 2011 request, the remaining issues, which were identified as those relating to privacy & proxy services and their accreditation, were examined in a PDP. This IRT was formed to implement the PDP</p>	2009-May-21	On-Hold	Staff / IRT	<p>The Board adopted all the PDP recommendations in August 2016. An IRT was formed and is being led by GDD.</p> <p>In response to a request from the Registrars Stakeholder Group to consider pausing the IRT work in view of the impact of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), ICANN organization had initially proposed going ahead with the public comment proceeding as the IRT’s work was nearly complete. More recently, and in view of ongoing community discussions over GDPR compliance and the evolving legal landscape for data privacy, further IRT work has been slowed pending greater clarity from the community work.</p> <p>IRTP-C: Following concerns raised by the Registrars Stakeholder Group regarding the application of IRTP-C to privacy and proxy services and the GNSO Council’s proposal to refer the question to the PPSAI IRT, the Board confirmed that Compliance enforcement would be delayed and directed ICANN Org to work with the Registrars’ Stakeholder Group and other</p>

7 – Implementation

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
recommendations approved by the ICANN Board.				<p>interested parties to determine the appropriate path forward.</p> <p>On 30 November 2017, the GNSO Council requested that the PPSAI IRT consider the issue and put forward recommendations for implementation that are consistent with both the IRTP-C and PPSAI policy recommendations. The IRT is expected to undertake this work after conducting the public comment period on its initial documents.</p> <p>On 4 March 2019, Cyrus Namazi (GDD) wrote to Council leadership requesting feedback on any additional steps the Council believes ICANN Org should take with respect to the PPSAI IRT in light of the EPDP and on the IRTP-C issue. Council leadership responded to this letter on 30 April 2019 (see https://gnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/file/field-file-attach/drazek-et-al-to-namazi-30apr19-en.pdf).</p>
<p>Translation/Transliteration of Internationalized Registration Data PDP Recommendations</p> <p>Council Liaison: Rubens Kuhl IRT Support Staff: Brian Aitchison (GDD)</p> <p>The PDP addressed two primary issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Whether it is desirable to translate contact information to a single common language or transliterate contact information to a single common script; and Who should bear the burden translating contact information to a single common language or transliterating contact information to a single common script? <p>This IRT was formed to implement the final PDP recommendations as approved by the ICANN</p>	2012-Oct-17	On-Hold	Staff / IRT	<p>On 28 September 2015 the ICANN Board approved the adoption of all seven recommendations contained in the Final Report from the PDP Working Group (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2015-09-28-en). An Implementation Review Team (IRT) was formed and a draft implementation plan shared with the IRT, which met for its first meeting on 19 July 2016.</p> <p>As of November 2016, the IRT is engaged in discussions around language and script tags, which appear to be a minimum requirement to meet the standards set by the PDP recommendations.</p> <p>The IRT held its 12th call on 8 June 2017. The team continues to discuss the details of implementing language and script tags. The team discussed the merits of submitting a set of questions on the T/T Recommendations to the GNSO Council for clarification and input. After discussing, they came to the conclusion that it would be better to seek the input of those involved in the T/T PDP Working Group and potentially certain Stakeholder Groups on those questions before considering GNSO Council input. The</p>

7 – Implementation

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
Board.				<p>questions focus on whether the T/T recommendations mandate that ALL new registration data be tagged with the languages and scripts in use by a registrant, how the implementation should ultimately be carried out (eg: Should the implementation date be coordinated with the operationalization of RDAP? Should it be "pilot tested" along with RDAP? Should it be referred to the Next Gen RDS PDP?). Once the above questions are answered, a policy language document will be developed for IRT review and eventually public comment.</p> <p>With the RDAP roll-out now confirmed, the IRT is expected to reconvene shortly to determine next steps.</p>

Other				
Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p>GNSO Standing Committee on ICANN Budget and Operating Plan (SCBO) Chair: Ayden Ferdeline Council Liaison: Keith Drazek Staff: M. Konings, S. Chan, B. Cobb</p> <p>The SCBO is tasked to assist the GNSO with providing information and possible comments to ICANN's Budget and Strategic Operating Plan.</p>	2017-09-12	Ongoing	SCBO	<p>The SCBO will remain idle, with respect to its primary activity of reviewing the ICANN Budget and Operating Plan, until Sept. 2019 when it will engage Council leadership and PDP WG leadership to understand resource requirements for FY2020.</p> <p>The SCBO is working on a Council action item related to ICANN's 5-Year Strategic Planning process. See the Council action items page for status.</p>
<p>GNSO Standing Selection Committee (SSC) Chair: Susan Kawaguchi Vice-Chairs: Erica Varlese, Poncelet Ileleji Staff: M. Konings, E. Barabas</p> <p>The SSC is tasked to assist with the selection of GNSO representatives to future Review Teams, including for the various reviews mandated by the ICANN Bylaws, and other ICANN structures for which the GNSO will need to appoint, nominate or endorse candidates.</p>	2017-Mar-15	Ongoing	SSC	There are currently no selection processes assigned to the SSC.
<p>Expired Registration Recovery Policy – Policy Review (ERRP-PR) Staff: M. Konings</p>	FY19	To be Planned	Staff	<p>The ERRP Consensus Policy became effective 31 Aug 2013 as a result of adopted recommendations produced from the GNSO's Post Expiration Domain Name Recovery (PEDNR) PDP WG. That WG deliberated on issues related to the expiration of domain names and to what extent a Registrant should be able to recover domain names after they expire. One recommendation from the WG requested monitoring and follow-up: Recommendation #18: The Working Group recommends that ICANN Compliance be requested to provide updates to the GNSO Council on a regular basis in relation to the implementation and effectiveness of the proposed recommendations, either in the form of a report that details</p>

Other				
Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
				amongst others the number of complaints received in relation to renewal and/or post expiration related matters or in the form of audits that assess if the policy has been implemented as intended.
Policy & Implementation Recommendations Review (Pollmp-RR) Staff: B. Aitchison, M. Konings	FY20	To be Planned	GNSO Council	<p>As noted in Point H of the CPIF, which directs “ICANN staff [to] continually review the implementation framework and related materials to encapsulate additional best-practices or to adjust the steps as a result of lessons learned with previous Consensus Policy projects,” a cross-functional group of representatives from ICANN’s GDD and GNSO Policy Development Support teams have reviewed the Framework, and proposed a number of amendments to it for the consideration of the GNSO Council. Following review by the GNSO Council, this updated version has now been posted.</p> <p>The GNSO Council resolved in June 2015 that “a review of these recommendations is carried out at the latest five years following their implementation to assess whether the recommendations have achieved what they set out to do and/or whether any further enhancements or changes are needed”.</p>