ICANN | GNSO
Generic Names Supporting Organization

Policy Briefing

Index

Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part D
Policy Development Process

What is this about?
The Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) Part D PDP Working Group was chartered by the GNSO Council to answer six questions in relation to the IRTP: 1) whether reporting requirements for registries and dispute providers should be developed; 2) whether to amend the Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy on how to handle disputes when multiple transfers have occurred; 3) whether dispute options for registrants should be developed; 4) whether registrars should be required to make information on transfer dispute resolution options available to registrants; 5) whether additional penalties for IRTP breaches should be introduced, and; 6) whether the universal adoption and implementation of EPP AuthInfo codes has eliminated the need for FOAs.

Why is this important?
ICANN's Compliance Department received a total of 6333 transfer-related complaints between August 2013 and August 2014 alone, making it one of the most common issues of community complaint. However, at the same time, the Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy (TDRP), explicitly designed to handle disputed inter-registrar transfers, is hardly ever invoked by registrars.

What is the current status of this project?
The GSNO Council unanimously adopted the Final Report on 15 October 2014. Following a public comment period, which is mandatory prior to ICANN Board consideration, the 18 recommendations contained in the Report have now been passed to the ICANN Board for its consideration during ICANN 52.

The Board is being presented with 18 Recommendations including[1]:

1) Reporting requirements be incorporated into the TDRP policy;
2) A domain name be returned to the original Registrar of Record if it is found through a TDRP procedure that a non-IRTP compliant domain name transfer has occurred;
3) The statute of limitation to launch a TDRP be extended from current 6 months to 12 months from the initial transfer;
4) If a request for enforcement is initiated under the TDRP the relevant domain be 'locked' against further transfers;
5) No dispute options for registrants be developed and implemented as part of the current TDRP;
6) The TDRP be modified to eliminate the First Level (Registry) layer of the TDRP;
7) The Form of Authorization (FOA) should not be abandoned, and;
8) Following the implementation of all IRTP recommendation, a future review of the IRTP and the TDRP should be initiated, based on relevant data points that the Registries and Registrars should starting collect as soon as possible.

[1] The full set of recommendations can be found in the Final Report

Expected next steps
If the Board approves the recommendations, the GNSO Council will create an Implementation Review Team (IRT) consisting of community members, which will work with ICANN staff to ensure that the recommendations are implemented conform the intent of the policy recommendations.

Background
The IRTP is a 2004 consensus policy developed through the GNSO's policy development process (PDP) and is currently under review by the GNSO through a series of PDPs. The IRTP provides a straightforward procedure for domain name holders to transfer domain names between registrars. On the recommendation of the IRTP Part C WG, the GNSO Council agreed to combine all the remaining IRTP issues into this final PDP, IRTP Part D, in addition to one issue that was raised by the IRTP Part C WG in its Final Report. The GNSO Council unanimously adopted the request for an Issue Report on IRTP Part D at its meeting on 17 October 2012. The Working Group started its deliberations on 25 February 2013 and submitted its Final Report to the GNSO Council on 15 September 2014.

How can I get involved?
If the Board adopts the recommendations, a call for volunteers to join the Implementation Review Team will be made. Volunteers are expected to be familiar with the policy recommendations and/or have relevant expertise to assist the implementation efforts.

Where can I find more information?
- GNSO Council Motion: http://gnso.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#20141015-1
- Final Report: http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/irtp-d
- Final Issue Report - http://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/issue-report-irtp-d-08jan13-en.pdf
- Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy - http://www.icann.org/en/resources/registrars/transfers/policy-01jun12.htm
- Working Group Community Wiki page: https://community.icann.org/x/B4JwAg

Staff responsible: Lars Hoffmann and Steve Chan

Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues Policy Development Process

What is this about?
The Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA) is the contract that governs ICANN's relationship with its accredited registrars. Revised periodically, the newest form of RAA was approved by the ICANN Board in June 2013. Registrars wishing to sell domain names in the new gTLD program will have to sign up for the new 2013 RAA, as will registrars operating under the older 2009 RAA who wish to renew their contracts with ICANN.

The 2013 RAA negotiations had dealt with a number of high priority topics previously identified by the ICANN community. One of these was the accreditation of providers of privacy and proxy services for domain name registrations. A *privacy service* is one in which a domain name is registered in the registrant's name, but other contact details displayed in the publicly-accessible Whois system are those given by the privacy service provider and not those of the registrant. A *proxy service* is one in which the registered name holder licenses use of the domain to the customer who actually uses the domain, and the contact information displayed in the Whois system is that of the registered name holder. The *Whois system* is a form of Internet data directory service, utilizing a protocol that permits public lookup of a domain name, including certain contact and technical information about the registrant and the domain.

The topic of privacy and proxy services accreditation was not addressed in the 2013 RAA negotiations. The 2013 RAA does, however, contain a temporary specification on the use of privacy and proxy services that will expire either on January 1, 2017 or the implementation by ICANN of a Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Program (whichever first occurs). ICANN has already committed to such an Accreditation Program. This PDP was initiated to examine the policy issues related to the provision and accreditation of privacy and proxy services, with a view toward assisting ICANN with its development of such a program.

What is the current status of this project?
- The PDP Working Group was chartered by the GNSO Council in October 2013 and is meeting on a weekly basis.
- The WG has developed a number of preliminary recommendations that it intends to finalize following the Singapore meeting. It will hold a public meeting at ICANN52 to seek community feedback on its proposed recommendations and remaining open issues.

Why is this important?
The 2013 RAA temporary specification that governs registrars' obligations in respect of privacy and proxy services. will expire either on 1 January 2017 or ICANN's implementation of a privacy and proxy accreditation program, whichever first occurs. The GNSO has also commissioned several studies on the Whois system, including one on privacy and proxy abuse, the results of which were finalized and published in March 2014. Finally, the issue of accrediting privacy and proxy services is being discussed in the broader context of ICANN's ongoing review of the Whois system, including within an Expert Working Group formed in December 2012 that was tasked to look at the fundamental purpose and possible redesign of gTLD registration data services.

This PDP represents an opportunity for the GNSO and other interested community members to assist ICANN with developing its Privacy and Proxy Accreditation Program and informing its broader work on Whois more generally.

Expected next steps
The Working Group is addressing the substantive questions posed to it by the GNSO Council in the WG charter. The questions span several categories, ranging from registration and termination to Relay and Reveal procedures. The WG aims to produce an Initial Report for public comment following the Singapore meeting.

Background
In October 2011, the ICANN Board initiated negotiations with the Registrars Stakeholder Group for a new form of RAA, and simultaneously requested an Issue Report from the GNSO on issues not covered by the negotiations and otherwise suited for a PDP. The Final Issue Report was published in March 2012, and recommended that the GNSO commence its PDP as soon as possible after receiving a report that the negotiations were concluded.

In June 2013, the ICANN Board formally approved the new 2013 RAA. In September 2013, ICANN staff published a paper for the GNSO reporting on the conclusion of the RAA negotiations and highlighting issues relating to privacy and proxy services, including their accreditation and Relay/Reveal procedures. Following a number of discussions on the topic, the GNSO Council formally approved the charter for the PDP WG at its meeting on 31 October 2013.

How can I get involved?
The Working Group is open to anyone interested in participating. If you want to join the WG please contact the GNSO Secretariat to be added to the mailing list (gnso.secretariat@gnso.icann.org). You can also attend the WG's meeting in Singapore on Wednesday morning, scheduled from 0930-1045 a.m. Singapore time (please see the final Meeting Schedule for confirmation).

Where can I find more information?
- WG webpage with links to background information: http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/ppsa
- WG collaborative wiki workspace: https://community.icann.org/x/9iCfAg
- 2013 RAA including Privacy & Proxy Specification: http://www.icann.org/en/resources/registrars/raa/approved-with-specs-27jun13-en.htm - privacy-proxy
- Open F2F meeting during ICANN meeting in Singapore: http://singapore52.icann.org/en/schedule/wed-ppsai

Staff responsible: Mary Wong and Marika Konings

Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information Policy Development Process

What is this about?
Following the recommendations listed in the Internationalized Registration Data Working Group (IRD-WG)'s Final Report, the GNSO Council requested an Issue Report on the translation and transliteration of contact information in October 2012 – posing the question whether it is desirable to translate or transliterate[2] contact information[3] into one common language or script. In December 2013 this GNSO PDP Working Group was inaugurated to provide an answer to this question as well as to who would carry the financial burden if mandatory translation or transliteration of contact information were recommended.

Why is this important?
The continued internationalization of the domain name system in general and specifically of registration data means that there is an urgent need to allow for standardized query of non-Latin script registration data and to assure its global functionality. The ongoing expansion of the gTLD space and the creation of a large number of internationalized domain names, combined with on going reforms of gTLD Directory Services, such as the Expert Working Group on New gTLD Directory Services, makes the need to establish GNSO policy for the potential translation or transliteration of contact information even more pressing.

What is the current status of this project?
The Working Group drew up a list of arguments supporting and opposing mandatory translation or transliteration of contact information that formed the basis of its deliberation. On 15 December 2014 the Working Group published its Initial Report in which it is recommending against mandatory translation or transliteration of contact information. The Report is out for public comment from 16 December 2014 until 1 February 2015. Also, the WG co-Chairs hosted a webinar on 16 January 2015 to explain to the Community in detail the Initial Report's findings.

Expected next steps
The public comment forum will close on 1 February 2015. Following the analysis of all comments received, the WG aims to submit its Final Report to the GNSO Council by the end of May 2015.

Background
At its meeting on 13 June 2013, the GNSO Council initiated a PDP on the translation and transliteration of contact information. The GNSO Council approved the Charter on 20 November 2013. The two main questions covered by the Charter are:

1. Whether it is desirable to translate contact information to a single common language or transliterate contact information to a single common script.

[2] 'Translation' is defined as the translation of a text into another language whereas 'transliteration' is the writing of a word using the closest corresponding letters of a different alphabet.
[3] Contact information' is a subset of Domain Name Registration Data and thus the information that enables someone using a Domain Name Registration Data Directory Service (such as WHOIS) to contact the domain name registration holder.

2. Who should decide who should bear the burden translating contact information to a single common language or transliterating contact information to a single common script.

The PDP WG has asked the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees to provide input on the following questions relating to the two issues identified in the PDP:

- Whether it is desirable to translate contact information to a single common language or transliterate contact information to a single common script.
- What exactly the benefits to the community are of translating or transliterating contact information, especially in light of the costs that may be connected to translation or transliteration?
- Should translation or transliteration of contact information be mandatory for all gTLDs?
- Should translation or transliteration of contact information be mandatory for all registrants or only those based in certain countries and/or using specific non-ASCII scripts?
- What impact will translation or transliteration of contact information have on the WHOIS validation as set out under the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement?
- When should any new policy relating to translation and transliteration of contact information come into effect?
- Who should decide who should bear the burden translating contact information to a single common language or transliterating contact information to a single common script?
- Who does your SG/C believe should bear the cost, bearing in mind, however, the limits in scope set in the Initial Report on this issue?

How can I get involved?
If you would like to join the WG as a member, please contact the GNSO Secretariat (gnso-secs@icann.org).

Where can I find more information?

- Initial Report - http://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/gtlds/transliteration-contact-initial-15dec14-en.pdf
- Public Comment - https://www.icann.org/public-comments/transliteration-contact-initial-2014-12-16-en
- Issue Report - Final Issue Report on Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information
- PDP Workspace - https://community.icann.org/x/FTR-Ag

Staff responsible: Julie Hedlund and Lars Hoffmann

IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms Policy Development Process

What is this about?
One of the consensus recommendations from the GNSO's PDP Working Group on IGO and INGO Protections in All gTLDs (IGO-INGO WG) was for the GNSO Council to request an Issue Report, as a preceding step to a possible PDP, on the access to and use by International Governmental Organizations (IGOs) and International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGOs) of existing curative rights protection mechanisms (namely, the Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP) and Uniform Rapid Suspension (URS) procedure), to protect their names and acronyms at the second level in both existing and new gTLDs. In June 2014 the GNSO Council approved the initiation of a PDP and chartered a new PDP Working Group to consider this issue.

Why is this important?
Protecting the names and acronyms of IGOs and INGOs at the top and second levels has been a long-standing issue over the course of the New gTLD Program. There are a number of differences between the GNSO's policy recommendations that were submitted to the Board in Feb 2014 and the Government Advisory Committee's (GAC) advice to the Board on this topic, notably in respect of protections for IGO acronyms. In February 2014, the Board tasked its New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC) to develop a proposal that would take into account both the GNSO's recommendations and GAC advice for the Board's further consideration at a subsequent Board meeting. The NGPC sent a proposal to the GAC in March. In April 2014 the Board resolved to adopt those of the GNSO's recommendations that are not inconsistent with GAC advice received on the topic, and requested additional time to consider the remaining recommendations. It also resolved to facilitate dialogue between the GAC and the GNSO to resolve the remaining differences. These largely pertain to the scope and duration of protection for certain names associated with the international Red Cross movement (an INGO) and for IGO acronyms, including the use of the Trademark Clearinghouse. The NGPC and the GNSO Council are currently discussing the possibility of the GNSO's amending its remaining recommendations so as to reconcile them with GAC advice, in accordance with the prescribed procedure in the GNSO's PDP Manual.

This new PDP is not dependent on the outcome of those discussions, as it concerns the issue of curative (i.e. occurring after a third party has registered a domain name) remedies for IGOs and INGOs that have already been identified as eligible for certain second level protections by the original IGO-INGO WG.

What is the current status of this project?
The WG is meeting weekly to discuss the issues raised in its Charter. The Charter directs the WG to consider whether the UDRP and URS should be amended to resolve the problems faced by IGOs and/or INGOs and if so in what way, or if a separate, narrowly tailored dispute resolution procedure should be developed to apply only to IGOs and/or INGOs.

The WG has preliminarily agreed that for various substantive reasons INGOs should not be considered any further in this PDP. It has also reached out to all the GNSO's stakeholder groups and constituencies, as well as all ICANN's SO/ACs (including the GAC) for input. Responses have been received from a few groups, including a small group of IGO representatives to whom the WG had sent specific questions for their feedback.

Expected next steps
The WG has reviewed and analyzed prior community and external work on these issues, and conducted preliminary research the scope of the problem for IGOs. It is currently discussing a possible alternative basis for standing to bring a curative rights claim (other than a nationally-registered trademark), and scoping out the issue of sovereign immunity for IGOs in relation to submission to the jurisdiction of national courts for purposes of an appeal from a dispute resolution process.

Background
In November 2013 the GNSO Council unanimously adopted all the consensus recommendations of the IGO-INGO WG, including calling for an Issue Report on allowing IGOs and INGOs access to and use of the curative rights protections afforded by the UDRP and URS. An Issue Report is the preceding step toward the possible initiation of a PDP by the GNSO Council.

IGOs and INGOs are currently unable to fully use either the UDRP or URS for a number of reasons. For IGOs, the requirement that a complainant submit to the jurisdiction of a national court may jeopardize an IGO's status as being immune from national jurisdiction. For both IGOs and INGOs, the fact that the UDRP and URS were designed as protective mechanisms for trademark owners currently means that they cannot utilize these procedures unless they also own trademarks in their names and/or acronyms. Both types of organizations are also concerned about the cost involved in using these procedures, which would mean diverting resources and funds from their primary missions.

How can I get involved?
The Working Group is open to anyone interested in participating. If you want to join the WG either as a Member or as an Observer please contact the GNSO Secretariat to be added to the mailing list (gnso.secretariat@gnso.icann.org).

Where can I find more information?
- IGO-INGO WG Final Report: http://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/igo-ingo-final-10nov13-en.pdf
- GNSO Council Recommendations Report to the ICANN Board: http://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/council-board-igo-ingo-23jan14-en.pdf
- Final Issue Report on IGO & INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms: http://gnso.icann.org/en/drafts/igo-ingo-crp-final-25may14-en.pdf
- IGO-INGO Curative Rights Protection WG collaborative wiki space: https://community.icann.org/x/37rhAg.

Staff responsible: Mary Wong and Steve Chan

Policy & Implementation

What is this about?
Mainly as a result of discussions stemming from implementation related issues of the new gTLD program, there is increased focus on which topics call for policy and which call for implementation work, including which processes should be used, at what time and how diverging opinions should be acted upon.

Following several discussions by the GNSO Council on this topic, the GNSO Council formed a Working Group which has been tasked to provide concrete recommendations on how to address some of these issues from a GNSO perspective.

Why is this important?
While developing a bright-line rule as to what is policy or implementation may not be possible, the hope is that by developing clear processes and identifying clear roles and responsibilities for the different stakeholders, it will become easier to deal with these issues going forward and allow for broad participation and involvement.

What is the current status of this project?
The Working Group has now published its Initial Report for public comment. In short, the WG is putting forward the following preliminary recommendations for community consideration:

- In response to charter question 1 (recommendations concerning a set of principles that would underpin any GNSO policy and implementation related discussions, taking into account existing GNSO Operating Procedures), the WG recommends adhering to the principles outlined in section 4 of the Initial Recommendations Report when policy or implementation related issues arise in the implementation phase (**Preliminary Recommendation #1**).
- The WG proposes three new standardized processes for GNSO deliberations (**Preliminary Recommendation #2**) regarding such issues as also outlined in the high level overview in Annex B (Recommendation #2), namely:

    - **GNSO Input Process (GIP)** – to be used for those instances for which the GNSO Council intends to provide non-binding advice, which is expected to typically concern topics that are not gTLD specific and for which no policy recommendations have been developed to date. "Non-binding advice" means advice that has no binding force on the party it is provided to. For example, this process could be used to provide input on the ICANN Strategic Plan or recommendations from an Accountability and Transparency Review Team. It is the expectation that such input would be treated in a similar manner as public comments are currently considered by the entity (e.g. Board, NPOC, or WG) to which the input is provided.

- **GNSO Guidance Process (GGP)** – to be used in those instances for which the GNSO Council intends to provide binding guidance to the ICANN Board, but which is not expected to result in new contractual obligations for contracted parties. "Binding guidance" means advice that has a binding force on the ICANN Board to consider the guidance and it can only be rejected by a vote of more than two-thirds (2/3) of the Board, if the Board determines that such guidance is not in the best interests of the ICANN community or ICANN. It is expected that this would typically involve clarification of, or advice on existing gTLD policy recommendations. This could be in response to a specific request from the ICANN Board but could also be at the initiative of the GNSO Council to an issue that has been identified. For example, such a process could have been used in relation to the request from the ICANN Board to provide input on the .brand registry agreement, specification 13.
- **GNSO Expedited Policy Development Process** – to be used in those instances in which the GNSO Council intends to develop recommendations that would result in new contractual obligations for contracted parties that meet the criteria for "consensus policies"[1] as well as the qualifying criteria to initiate an expedited PDP. Those qualifying criteria are (1) to address a narrowly defined policy issue that was identified and scoped after either the adoption of a GNSO policy recommendation by the ICANN Board or the implementation of such an adopted recommendation; or (2) to provide new or additional policy recommendations on a specific policy issue that had been substantially scoped previously, such that extensive, pertinent background information already exists, e.g. (a) in an Issue Report for a possible Policy Development Process (PDP) that was not initiated; (b) as part of a previous PDP that was not completed; or (c) through other projects such as a GGP.

The details of each of these processes can be found in Annex C (GNSO Input Process), Annex D (GNSO Guidance Process) and Annex E (GNSO Expedited Policy Development Process) of the Initial Recommendations Report. The WG recognizes that there may be certain elements that may need further consideration and as such requests input on a number of specific questions as outlined in section 5.

- In its deliberations on three implementation related charter questions, the WG reviewed the Consensus Policy Implementation Framework (CPIF) that has been developed by the ICANN Global Domains Division (GDD) to support predictability, accountability, transparency, and efficiency in the Consensus Policy implementation process (see Annex F of the Initial Recommendations Report) and identified a number of questions for further deliberation (see section 6). As a result of this, the WG recommends that the Policy Development Process Manual be modified to require the creation of an Implementation Review Team following the adoption of PDP recommendations by the ICANN Board, but allow the GNSO Council the flexibility to not create an IRT in exceptional circumstances (e.g. if another IRT is already in place that could deal with the PDP recommendations). (Preliminary Recommendation #3) and the adoption of the implementation review team principles as outlined in Annex H are followed as part of the creation as well as operation of IRTs (Preliminary Recommendation #4).

Expected next steps
Following its review of the public input received, the WG intends to finalize its report for submission to the GNSO Council for its consideration.

Background
Following several discussions by the GNSO on this topic, the GNSO Council formed a Working Group which has been tasked to provide concrete recommendations on how to address some of these issues from a GNSO perspective. The WG started its deliberations in August 2013 and has been tasked to provide the GNSO Council with recommendations on:

1. A set of principles that would underpin any GNSO policy and implementation related discussions, taking into account existing GNSO Operating Procedures.
2. A process for developing gTLD policy, perhaps in the form of "Policy Guidance", including criteria for when it would be appropriate to use such a process (for developing policy other than "Consensus Policy") instead of a GNSO Policy Development Process;
3. A framework for implementation related discussions associated with GNSO Policy Recommendations;
4. Criteria to be used to determine when an action should be addressed by a policy process and when it should be considered implementation, and;
5. Further guidance on how GNSO Implementation Review Teams, as defined in the PDP Manual, are expected to function and operate.

How can I get involved
The Working Group is open to anyone interested. If you want to join the Working Group please contact the GNSO Secretariat to be added to the mailing list (mailto:gnso.secretariat@gnso.icann.org). Furthermore, public input will be sought on the Initial Report in due time (see http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment).

Where can I find more information?

- Policy & Implementation Initial Recommendations Report - http://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/policy-implementation/pi-wg-initial-recommendations-19jan15-en.pdf
- Public Comment Forum: https://www.icann.org/public-comments/policy-implementation-2015-01-19-en
- Working Group workspace – https://community.icann.org/x/y1V-Ag
- Singapore WG F2F meeting session – scheduled for Wednesday 11 February 2015 from 15.30 – 17.00 local time (see http://singapore52.icann.org/en/schedule/wed-policy-implementation)

Staff responsible: Marika Konings, Mary Wong

Data & Metrics for Policy Making Working Group

What is this about?
The Working Group (WG) is exploring opportunities to review standard methodologies of reporting and metrics that could better inform fact-based policy development and decision making; including how the community can collaborate with Contracted Parties and other service providers in the sharing of metrics and data.

Why is this important?
The effort is expected to investigate more formal processes for requests of data, metrics and other reporting needs from the GNSO that may aid in GNSO policy development efforts. Areas the WG will explore:

- Evaluate previous PDP and non-PDP efforts and how metrics could have enhanced the WG process *(Complete)*
- Establish a baseline of current practices & capabilities to problem reporting *(Complete)*
- Review existing GNSO work product templates, like charters, issue reports, and final reports for possible enhancements to inform the PDP and non-PDP process *(Started)*
- Evaluate external data sources, such as abuse statistics or DNS industry related data from 3rd parties and/or Contracted Parties, that may benefit the policy process and define a possible framework in how it may be accessed *(Started)*

What is the current status of the project?
The WG is refining a framework/process flow for data and metrics requests from internal ICANN (e.g., contractual compliance, registrar services, etc.), Contracted Parties, and third parties that touches upon categories like costs, confidentiality, and discrimination. The WG will resume work on determining how to inject a data-driven approach to elements of the PDP and non-PDP process.

Expected next steps

- Resume WG sessions post ICANN 52 meeting
- Create Initial Report & Conduct Public Comment

Background Information on the Issue
The 2010 Registration Abuse Policies Working Group (RAPWG) identified the Meta Issue: Uniformity of Reporting which it described as "need for more uniformity in the mechanisms to initiate, track, and analyze policy-violation reports." The RAPWG recommended in its Final Report that "the GNSO and the larger ICANN community in general, create and support uniform problem-reporting and report-tracking processes."

The GNSO Council recommended the creation of an Issue Report to further research metrics and reporting needs in hopes to improve the policy development process. The report created by ICANN Staff outlined accomplishments regarding reporting and metrics by the Contractual Compliance function and it also reviewed other reporting sources that may be of relevance.

The GNSO Council subsequently adopted the recommendation to form this non-PDP Working Group tasked with exploring opportunities for developing reporting and metrics processes and/or appropriate standardized methodologies that could better inform fact-based policy development and decision making. The GNSO resolution states:

> Resolved,
> The GNSO Council does not initiate a Policy Development Process at this stage but will review at the completion of the ICANN Contractual Compliance three-year plan expected for 31 December 2013 whether additional action is required; *(Completed 4 Sep 2014, http://gnso.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#20140904-1)*
> The GNSO Council further approves the creation of a drafting team to develop a charter for a non-PDP Working Group to consider additional methods for collecting necessary metrics and reporting from Contracted Parties and other external resources to aid the investigation.

How can I get involved?
The Working Group is open to anyone interested. If you want to join the Working Group please contact the GNSO Secretariat to be added to the mailing list (mailto:gnso.secretariat@gnso.icann.org). Furthermore, public input will be sought on the Initial Report in due time (see http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment). You are also encouraged to join the face-to-face meeting in Los Angeles, taking place on Monday 13 October, 10:30am local time (17:30 UTC) in Enrico room; see http://la51.icann.org/en/schedule/mon-dmpm.

Further Information:
- Data & Metrics for Policy Making Web Page - http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/dmpm
- DMPM Charter - http://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/dmpm-charter-23jan14-en.pdf
- Uniformity of Reporting Final Issue Report - http://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/uofr-final-31mar13-en.pdf

Staff responsible: Steve Chan, Lars Hoffmann

Discussion Group: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures

What is this about?
This Discussion Group was created to begin evaluating the first round of the new gTLD program and to discuss and reflect upon experiences gained. The Discussion Group is expected to report its findings to the GNSO Council, which may include a list of recommended subjects for future GNSO issue reports that may lead to changes or adjustments for subsequent new gTLD application procedures.

Why is this important?
The Discussion Group plays an important role in identifying issues that arose from the first round of the new gTLD program. The findings of the group, which are expected to be presented to the GNSO Council in the form of a report, will likely include a number of points and concerns that in turn will be recommended to feed into future GNSO Issue Reports. The resultant actions from the GNSO Council review will be pivotal to the development of the subsequent procedures for the new gTLD program. As such the Discussion Group's outcome will mark the beginning of a process of substantive policy development work on the issue of subsequence new gTLD procedures.

What is the current status of the project?
The Discussion Group was created on 25 June 2014. The group has conducted several calls and met for a face-to-face session Los Angeles, where it set a baseline for issues identified by the group. The group has categorized the issues in order to facilitate and focus possible future policy development activities.

Expected next steps
The Discussion Group will seek to complete organizing the issues into logical categories, including, amongst others, further details for each issue such as scope, possible mechanisms for resolution, identifying affected parties, establishing priorities, and recognizing interdependencies with other issues.

Background Information on the Issue
In June 2008, the ICANN Board adopted the GNSO's policy recommendations for the introduction of new gTLDs and directed staff to develop an implementation plan for a new gTLD introduction process. In June 2011 the ICANN Board approved an Application Guidebook ("AGB") for new gTLDs and authorized the launch of the New gTLD Program. The AGB provided that it was intended to govern "the first round of what is to be an ongoing process for the introduction of new gTLDs" and that "ICANN's goal [was] to launch subsequent gTLD application rounds as quickly as possible" and promised to base the timing of the subsequent rounds on "experiences gained and changes required after this round is completed" with a "goal…for the new application round to begin within one year of the close of the application submission period for the initial round."

With the application submission period for the initial round closing in June 2012, the GNSO Council believes that it has a continuing interest and role to play in evaluating the experiences of the first round and proposing policy recommendations, if necessary, for changes to subsequent rounds. This Discussion Group was created to begin that evaluation process and possibly identify areas for future GNSO policy development.

The Discussion Group is to review the first round of the new gTLD program and discuss and reflect upon experiences gained. The Discussion Group is expected to report its findings to the GNSO Council, which may include a list of recommended subjects for future GNSO issue reports that may lead to changes or adjustments for subsequent new gTLD application procedures. Issue reports are a required first step in developing new policies.

How can I get involved?
The Discussion Group is open to anyone interested. If you want to join the Working Group please contact the GNSO Secretariat to be added to the mailing list (mailto:gnso.secretariat@gnso.icann.org).

Further Information:

- Discussion Group – New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Web page - http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/non-pdp-new-gtld
- Group Wiki - https://community.icann.org/display/DGNGSR/Discussion+Group+%28DG%29+-+New+gTLD+Subsequent+Rounds+Home
- Mailing List Archive - http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/gnso-newgtld-dg/

Staff responsible: Steve Chan, Lars Hoffmann

Next Generation Registration Directory Services Board-GNSO Process Working Group

What is this about?
Following the publication of the Expert Working Group's Final Report on Registration Directory Services (RDS), the ICANN Board and GNSO are now considering how to use this report as input to a GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP). As a result, a process working group (EP-WG) consisting of Board and GNSO representatives was formed to recommend how to best structure the PDP(s) for success.

Why is this important?
Comprehensive 'Whois' policy reform remains the source of long-running discussions within ICANN. Any discussion of 'Whois' – hereafter called gTLD registration directory services – typically includes topics such as purpose, accuracy, availability, privacy, anonymity, cost, policing, intellectual property protection, security and malicious use and abuse. Although ICANN's requirements for domain name registration data collection have undergone some important changes, after more than 12 years of GNSO task forces, working groups, workshops, surveys, and studies the policy is still in need of comprehensive reforms that address the significant number of contentious issues attached to it.

What is the current status of this project?
The EP-WG has been meeting on a monthly basis since the ICANN meeting in Los Angeles. Based on these deliberations, the EP-WG recommends a 3-Phase PDP WG approach which sequence and group principles of the EWG Final Report:

- Phase 1: Policy Requirements Definition (WHY)
- Phase 2: Policy Functional Design (WHAT)
- Phase 3: Implementation Guidance (HOW)

Expected next steps
The EP-WG expects to discuss this proposed approach with the GNSO on Saturday 7 February from 10.00 – 10.45 local time (http://singapore52.icann.org/en/schedule/sat-gnso-working) as well as during the All Things Whois Session which is scheduled for Monday 9 February from 14.00 – 15.15 local time (http://singapore52.icann.org/en/schedule/mon-whois). After having reviewed the input received, the next step in this process is expected to be the publication of a new Preliminary Issue Report which would include a draft PDP WG Charter for public comment.

Background
Pursuant to an ICANN Board Resolution during a Special Meeting on 8 November 2012, the Board directed the CEO to launch a new effort to redefine the purpose of collecting, maintaining and providing access to gTLD registration data, and consider safeguards for protecting data, as a foundation for new gTLD policy and contractual negotiations. Moreover, the Board directed the preparation of an Issue Report on the purpose of collecting and maintaining gTLD registration data, and on solutions to improve accuracy and access to gTLD registration data, as part of a Board-initiated GNSO policy development process. The Board then went on to pass a resolution

that led to the creation of the Expert Working Group; the Board referred to this as a 'two-pronged approach' that is based on 'broad and responsive action' in relation to the reform of gTLD Registration Data.

With regard to the PDP, the Board specifically called out two topics in its request: **purpose** and **accuracy**. With regard to purpose, at a minimum the most basic purpose, which is commonly accepted, is that gTLD registration data allows domain name holders to be contacted. However, who would be granted the right to access the data under what circumstances and contact the holder and by which means, is a set of difficult follow-up questions that need to be answered. In relation to accuracy, there are many data elements in the Whois database required under the Registry Agreements and the Registrar Accreditation Agreements; if only one of these data fields is incorrect, does that mean the Whois information is inaccurate? And how can the accuracy of data be verified and/or measured, especially considering that, if data is not accurate, the purpose of gathering the data might be questionable in the first place.

How can I get involved?
To provide input on the proposed approach, please attend one of these two sessions and provide your feedback: GNSO Working Session on Saturday 7 February from 10.00 – 10.45 local time (http://singapore52.icann.org/en/schedule/sat-gnso-working) and All Things Whois Session on Monday 9 February from 14.00 – 15.15 local time (http://singapore52.icann.org/en/schedule/mon-whois).

Where can I find more information?

- EP-WG wiki: https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=49359349
- EP-WG proposed approach: https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/49359624/RDS-PDP-Process-v8.pdf
- EWG Final Report: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/final-report-06jun14-en.pdf

Staff responsible: Marika Konings

Cross Community Working Group (CWG) to Develop an IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal on Naming Related Functions

What is this about?
The primary goal of the CWG is to produce a consolidated transition proposal for the elements of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) Functions relating to the Domain Name System.

Why is this important?
It was determined that Stewardship Transition proposals for each of the IANA functions should be developed by the directly affected communities, the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) and Internet Architecture Board (IAB) for IANA functions related to Internet Protocol Parameters; the Number Resource Organization (NRO), the Address Supporting Organization (ASO), and the Regional Internet Registries (RIRs) for functions related the management and distribution of numbering resources; and the GNSO and ccNSO for functions related to the Domain Name System. These efforts will inform the work of the IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group (ICG), whose responsibility is to develop an overall integrated transition proposal from these autonomously developed components.

Two of IANA's global directly affected communities, the addressing and Internet protocol parameter communities, have responded to the NTIA's announcement and the formation of the ICG, by establishing working groups to provide input on their specific needs and expectations with respect to the IANA Stewardship Transition.

This CWG was formed as an integral part of this transition process, and to develop a proposal for the elements of the IANA Stewardship Transition that directly affect the naming community.

What is the current status of this project?
The CWG published its draft transition proposal for public comment on 1 December 2014. Following the close of the public comment forum, the CWG conducted two surveys of the in order to get a high-level sense of the CWG's views regarding different suggestions made in the submissions from the public comment period. The surveys were based on suggestions arising from the public comment submissions, as well as additional, related questions. The results of the survey were used to guide the CWG in considering the public comments and continuing its work toward development of a final proposal for submission to the ICG.

Expected next steps
In striving to develop a consensus proposal, the CWG is considering and integrating the outcome of the weekend sessions as well as focusing on the critical next steps required. Key next steps include; obtaining legal advice on relevant elements of the proposal and further engagement with the CCWG-Accountability (see https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2015-01-26-en), as well as informing and preparing to seek support from the Chartering Organizations, all of which the CWG recognizes will affect the current timeline. The CWG is planning to publish a discussion document ahead of the ICANN meeting in Singapore to encourage community feedback and input on some of the remaining issues.

Background
The National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) has requested that ICANN "convene a multistakeholder process to develop a plan to transition the U.S. government stewardship role" with regard to the IANA Functions and related root zone management. In making its announcement, the NTIA specified that the transition proposal must have broad community support and meet the following principles:

- Support and enhance the multistakeholder model
- Maintain the security, stability, and resiliency of the Internet DNS
- Meet the needs and expectation of the global customers and partners of the IANA services
- Maintain the openness of the Internet.

NTIA also specified that it would not accept a proposal that replaces the NTIA role with a government-led or an intergovernmental organization solution.

On June 6 ICANN proposed the creation of an IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group (ICG) "responsible for preparing a transition proposal reflecting the differing needs of the various affected parties of the IANA functions."

The charter of the CWG has been adopted by the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC), the Country Code Supporting Organization (ccNSO), the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO), the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) and the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC).

How can I get involved?
Participation in the CWG is open to members and participants. In addition to members, who are appointed by the chartering organizations, anyone interested in the work of the CWG, can join as a participant. Participants may be from a chartering organization, from a stakeholder group or organization not represented in the CWG or currently active within ICANN, or self-appointed. Those interested in in joining should contact Grace Abuhamad (grace.abuhamad@icann.org), or the secretariats of your Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee.

Where can I find more information?
- Charter of Cross Community Working Group (CWG) to develop an IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal on Naming Related Functions
- CWG Wiki
- CWG Working Session on Wednesday 11 February from 17.15 – 19.15 local time - http://singapore52.icann.org/en/schedule/wed-cwg-stewardship
- CWG Q & A session on Thursday 12 February from 10.30 – 11.45 local time - http://singapore52.icann.org/en/schedule/thu-cwg-stewardship

Staff responsible: Grace Abuhamad (SI), Marika Konings (GNSO), Bart Boswinkel (ccNSO)

Cross Community Working Group (CCWG) on Enhancing ICANN Accountability

What is this about?
The CCWG-Accountability is expected to deliver proposals that would enhance ICANN's accountability towards all stakeholders. The goal is for the transition proposal regarding the IANA functions to be communicated to NTIA in a timeframe which is consistent with the expiration date of the current IANA Functions Contract, which is set at 30th September 2015. The CCWG-Accountability will therefore work as expeditiously as possible to identify those mechanisms that must be in place or committed to before the IANA Stewardship Transition in light of the changing historical contractual relationship with the U.S. Government (Work Stream 1) and those mechanisms for which a timeline for implementation may extend beyond the IANA Stewardship Transition (Work Stream 2).

In order to facilitate evaluation and adoption of its proposals, the CCWG-Accountability is expected to provide a detailed description on how its proposals would provide an adequate level of resistance to contingencies ("stress tests"), within the scope of each Work Stream.

Further, Work Stream 1 may identify issues that are important and relevant to the IANA stewardship transition but cannot be addressed within this time frame, in which case, there must be mechanisms or other guarantees that can ensure that the work would be completed in a timely manner as soon as possible after the transition.

Why is this important?
During discussions around the IANA Stewardship Transition process, the community raised the broader topic of the impact of the change on ICANN's accountability given its historical contractual relationship with the United States and NTIA. Accountability in this context is defined, according to the NETmundial multistakeholder statement, as the existence of mechanisms for independent checks and balances as well as for review and redress.

The concerns raised during these discussions around the transition process indicate that the existing ICANN accountability mechanisms do not yet meet stakeholder expectations. Recent statements made by various stakeholders suggest that current accountability mechanisms need to be reviewed and, if need be, improved, amended, replaced, or supplemented with new mechanisms (see for instance ATRT recommendations) in light of the changing historic contractual relationship with the U.S. Government. Considering that the NTIA has stressed that it is expecting community consensus regarding the transition, a failure to meet stakeholder expectations with regards to accountability may create a situation where NTIA does not accept the IANA transition proposal as meeting its conditions. Thus reviewing ICANN's accountability mechanisms was considered to be crucial for the transition process.

What is the current status of this project?
The scope of the Enhancing ICANN Accountability process is defined as ensuring that ICANN enhances its existing accountability in the absence of its historical contractual relationship with the U.S. Government.

The group's work is divided into two work streams:

- WS1 is focused on identifying mechanisms enhancing ICANN accountability that must be in place or committed to within the timeframe of the IANA Stewardship Transition.
- WS2 is focused on addressing accountability topics for which a timeline for developing solutions and full implementation may extend beyond the IANA Stewardship Transition.

The CCWG-Accountability expects to complete its work on Work Stream 1 within the same timeframe as the parallel, interrelated IANA Stewardship Transition process.

The CCWG held its first face-to-face meeting in Frankfurt, Germany on 19-20 January 2015. The Frankfurt meeting was attended by more than fifty members and participants with an additional 40 participants and observers who joined the meeting remotely. The meeting led to significant progress, including initial agreement on a problem statement, a list of "stress tests" and requirements for Work Stream 1. The basic themes were identified in a mind map, which will be a roadmap for the next phase of the group's work.

Expected next steps
The CCWG-Accountability will continue to progress in all work paths identified during the Frankfurt meeting. A series of sessions will be held at the upcoming ICANN 52 meeting in Singapore, including a community engagement session and two working sessions, with remote participation. In addition, the group will meet with the ICANN Board.

Background
The Charter of the CCWG-Accountability has been adopted by the Address Supporting Organization (ASO), At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC), Country Code Supporting Organization (ccNSO), Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) and Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO). The CCWG-Accountability consists of 161 people, organized as 25 members, appointed by and accountable to chartering organizations, 136 participants, who participate as individuals, and 38 mailing list observers. The group also includes one ICANN Board liaison, one ICANN staff representative, and one former ATRT member who serves as a liaison. In addition, there are 4 ICG members who participate in the CCWG-Accountability, including two who serve as liaisons between the two groups.

Six Advisors have also been appointed to contribute research and advice, and to bring perspectives on global best practices to enrich the CCWG-Accountability discussion. The Public Experts Group (PEG) continues its search for an Advisor who will bring expertise in International Law/Jurisprudence and will strive to select this Advisor as soon as possible.

How can I get involved?
The CCWG-Accountability is an open group: anyone interested in the work of the CCWG-Accountability, can join as a participant. Participants may be from a chartering organization, from a stakeholder group or organization not represented in the CCWG-Accountability or currently active within ICANN, or self-appointed. Anyone interested in participating in or following the work of the CCWG-Accountability can find information on the Wiki here.

Where can I find more information?

- CCWG Workspace - https://community.icann.org/x/ogDxAg
- CCWG Charter - https://community.icann.org/x/KYMHAw
- CCWG Working Sessions on Monday 9 February from 15.30 – 18.30 local time (http://singapore52.icann.org/en/schedule/mon-ccwg-accountability) and Thursday 12 February from 7.00 – 10.00 local time (http://singapore52.icann.org/en/schedule/thu-ccwg-accountability)
- CCWG Engagement Session on Wednesday 10 February from 9.45 – 11.15 local time (http://singapore52.icann.org/en/schedule/wed-ccwg-accountability)

Staff responsible: Adam Peake (SI), Bart Boswinkel (ccNSO), Marika Konings (GNSO)

Cross Community Working Groups on the Use of Country and Territory Names as TLDs

What is this about?
Following in the footsteps of the Study Group on the Use of Names for Countries and Territories as TLDs, the purpose of this CWG is to further review the issues pertaining to the use of country and territory names under different policies (new gTLD, IDN ccTLD, RFC 1591). If feasible the CWG will develop a definitional framework that could then be used across these. Furthermore, this CWG will 1) review the current status of representations of country and territory names, as they exist under current ICANN policies, guidelines and procedures; 2) provide advice regarding the feasibility of developing a consistent and uniform definitional framework that could be applicable across the respective SOs and ACs; and 3) should such a framework be deemed feasible, provide detailed advice as to its content.

Why is this important?
The treatment of country and territory names as Top Level Domains is a topic that has been discussed by the ccNSO, GAC, GNSO, ALAC and the ICANN Board for a number of years. Issues regarding the treatment of representations of country and territory names have arisen in a wide range of ICANN policy processes, including the IDN fast track, IDN ccPDP, and the development of the new gTLD Applicant guidebook. References to country and territory names and their use are also present in guidelines such as the GAC's 'Principles and Guidelines for the Delegation and Administration of Country Code Top Level Domains' and 'Principles regarding new gTLDs'. Similarly, references are made in foundation documents, such as RFC1591 and administrative procedures such as those followed by IANA in the delegation and redelegation of ccTLDs (in accordance with ISO3166---1).

What is the current status of this project?
The CWG held regular meetings since its inauguration on 10 June 2014 and met face to face during ICANN 50 and ICANN51. In December 2014, the Cross Community Working Group submitted a letter to the GAC's Subgroup on the Protection of Geographic Names in the new gTLD space, encouraging cooperating and proposing coordination of the two Groups' respective efforts. In addition, the Group members have started to discuss the issues that arose from the Study Group on the Use of Names for Countries and Territories as TLDs.

Expected next steps
Staff is preparing a straw man paper that will present options with regard to the issues brought forward by the Study Group on the Use of Names for Countries and Territories as TLDs. This will then form the base for discussions during the forthcoming CWG meetings. To advance its work, the Group will meet face to face in Singapore and also join a session held there by the GAC's subgroup on the protection of geographic names in the new gTLD process.

Background
The ccNSO Council established a Study Group on the use of Country and Territory Names on 8 December 2010. The Study Group was tasked with developing an overview of:

- How names of countries and territories are currently used within ICANN, be it in the form of policies, guidelines and/or procedures.
- The types of strings, relating to the names of countries and territories that currently used, or proposed to be used, as TLDs.
- The issues that arise (or may arise) when current policies, guidelines and procedures are applied to these representations of country and territory names.

The Study Group was comprised of representatives from across the ICANN stakeholder community and conducted its work between May 2011 and June 2013. The Study Group advised the ccNSO Council to set up a cross community working group, with participants from ALAC, ccNSO, GAC and GNSO to further review the current status of representations of country and territory names, and provide detailed advice on the feasibility and content of a consistent and uniform definitional framework that could be applied across the respective SO's and AC's.
The ccNSO Council was also advised to request the ICANN Board to extend the current rule in the new gTLD Applicant Guidebook regarding the exclusion of all country and territory names in all languages, for consecutive rounds of new gTLD applications, until such a time that the ccWG developed the framework.

How can I get involved?
If you are interested in joining the WG as a GNSO participant, please email the GNSO Secretariat at gnso.secretariat@icann.org to be added to the mailing list.

Where can I find more information?
- More information on the ccWG, including its charter can be found at: http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/ccwg-unct.htm and https://community.icann.org/x/X7XhAg
- The Working Group builds on the work of its predecessor, the Study Group on the Use of Names for Countries and Territories as TLDs; its Final Report is available at http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/unct-final-08sep12-en.pdf [PDF, 717 KB]
- CWG F2F meeting on Monday 9 February from 12.15 – 13.45 local time - http://singapore52.icann.org/en/schedule/mon-ccwg-ctn
- GAC discussion on Wednesday 11 February 10.30 - 11.30 local time - http://singapore52.icann.org/en/schedule/wed-0930-gac

Staff responsible: Lars Hoffmann (GNSO), Bart Boswinkel (ccNSO), Marika Konings (GNSO)

Cross Community Working Group (CWG) on Framework of Principles for Future Cross Community Working Groups

What is this about?
With the increasing reliance on Cross Community Working Group, the ICANN community has recognized that there is an increasing number of issues that cut across and affect more than one of ICANN's Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees. CWGs have been created previously (e.g. the Joint DNS Security & Stability Analysis Working Group (DSSA) involving At Large, ccNSO, GNSO, NRO, and SSAC, and the Joint IDN Working Group (JIG) involving the ccNSO and GNSO), but to date there have been no agreed guidelines on their use or outcomes. Many ICANN community members have highlighted the need for a set of uniform principles to guide the formation and operations of these cross-community working groups. This CWG has been chartered by the ccNSO and GNSO Councils to develop a framework of operating principles that would allow for the effective and efficient functioning of future CWGs.

Why is this important?
Each SO and AC within ICANN is responsible for different aspects of policy development and advice, and operates under different mandates and remits. There has, however, been an increase in the number of issues that affect or interest more than one SO/AC. Up to now, cross community working groups have been formed on a relatively ad-hoc basis, without a framework of consistent operating principles that take into account the differences between each SO/AC. In order to facilitate the successful functioning of CWGs, the ccNSO and GNSO believe that it would be beneficial to attempt to develop such a framework in collaboration with other SO/ACs.

What is the current status of this project?
The CWG's charter was approved by the ccNSO and GNSO Councils in March 2014. It has begun meeting to review past cross community efforts to generate "lessons learned" to aid in the development of a final proposed framework of principles.

Expected next steps
The CWG is expected to discuss a set of initial checklists or guidelines in Singapore, as part of a more comprehensive template for the formation, operation and termination of future CWGs.

Background
In March 2012 the GNSO Council approved an initial set of operating principles for CWGs that it sent to other SOs and ACs for feedback. Detailed comments and suggestions were received from the ccNSO suggesting additions and clarifications to the initial principles in June 2013. In October 2013, a Drafting Team to be co-chaired by the ccNSO and GNSO was approved by the GNSO Council. The DT was tasked to develop a charter for a WG that will take up the initial work already done, and develop a finalized framework governing the formation, chartering, operation, decision-making and termination of CWGs that would be workable across all SO/ACs. The charter was approved by the ccNSO and GNSO Councils at their respective Council meetings in Singapore, in March 2014.

How can I get involved?
If you are interested in joining the CWG, please email the GNSO Secretariat at gnso.secretariat@icann.org to be added to the mailing list. Membership limits per SO/AC are set out in the CWG charter (see https://community.icann.org/x/pgfPAQ). The CWG will also be holding a community session during the Singapore meeting, on Wednesday 11 February from 11.15-12.45 Singapore time (check the Meeting Schedule for confirmation).

Where can I find more information?

- Background information: http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/cross-community
- CWG Workspace: https://community.icann.org/x/rQbPAQ
- Open F2F CWG meeting during the ICANN meeting in Singapore on Wednesday 11 February from 11.15 – 12.45 local time - http://singapore52.icann.org/en/schedule/wed-framework-op-principles

Staff responsible: Mary Wong (GNSO), Steve Chan (GNSO) and Bart Boswinkel (ccNSO)

GAC-GNSO Consultation Group on GAC Early Engagement in GNSO Policy Development Processes

What is this about?
The Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) and the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) jointly established a consultation group to explore ways for the GAC to engage early in the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) and to improve overall cooperation between the two bodies (for example, by exploring the option of a liaison). The consultation group commenced its work in December 2013.

Why is this important?
The launch of this GAC-GNSO Consultation Group on Early Engagement is the result of discussions between the two entities at the ICANN meeting in Buenos Aires as well as previous ICANN meetings, reflecting a joint desire to explore and enhance ways of early engagement in relation to GNSO policy development activities. The issue was also specifically called-out by both Accountability and Transparency Review Teams (ATRT).

ICANN receives input from governments through the GAC. The GAC's key role is to provide advice to ICANN on issues of public policy, and especially where there may be an interaction between ICANN's activities or policies and national laws or international agreements. The GAC usually meets three times a year in conjunction with ICANN Public Meetings, where it discusses issues with the ICANN Board and other ICANN Supporting Organizations, Advisory Committees and other groups. The GAC may also discuss issues between times with the Board either through face-to-face meetings or by teleconference.

The GNSO is responsible for developing policies for generic Top-Level Domains (e.g., .com, .org, .biz). The GNSO strives to keep gTLDs operating in a fair, orderly fashion across one global Internet, while promoting innovation and competition. The GNSO uses the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) to develop policy recommendations which, following approval, are submitted to the ICANN Board for its consideration.

What is the current status of this project?
The Consultation Group comprises approximately equal numbers of representatives from each of the GAC and the GNSO to a total number of approximately 12 active members. The work is divided into two work streams, the first concentrating on Mechanisms for day to day co-operation and the second on the detail options for GAC engagement in the GNSO policy development process (PDP). The Consultation Group has been holding conference calls every two weeks. As a result of these conversations, a first pilot project is being implemented in the form of a GNSO Liaison to the GAC. Mason Cole was selected in this role, which formally commence during the ICANN meeting in Los Angeles. The CG has now developed a set of preliminary recommendations in relation to issue scoping, which includes amongst others, the formation of a GAC Quick Look Committee to provide an early indication of whether or not an issue subject to GNSO policy development is expected to raise public policy concerns.

Expected next steps
The CG intends to discuss these preliminary recommendations with the GAC and GNSO during its meetings in Singapore, including the joint GAC-GNSO Council meeting. Following that, the CG will review the input received and finalize its recommendations in relation to issue scoping for approval by the GAC and GNSO with the intention to implement these as a pilot. The CG is expected to continue its deliberations on early engagement opportunities for the other stages of the PDP as well as day-to-day co-operation.

How can I get involved?
You can follow review the conversations on the mailing list (see http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/gac-gnso-cg/) or review the materials on the wiki (see https://community.icann.org/x/phPRAg).

Where can I find more information?

- Consultation Group Wiki: https://community.icann.org/x/phPRAg
- Mailing List Archives: http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/gac-gnso-cg/)
- Consultation Group Charter: https://community.icann.org/x/PyLRAg
- Joint GNSO - GAC meeting during the ICANN meeting in Singapore on Sunday 8 February from 15.00 – 16.30 - http://singapore52.icann.org/en/schedule/sun-gac
- Open GAC-GNSO Consultation Group meeting during the ICANN meeting in Singapore on Monday 9 February from 12.30 – 14.00 in meeting room Indiana.

Staff responsible: Marika Konings (GNSO), Olof Nordling (GAC)