ICANN | GNSO
Generic Names Supporting Organization

PROJECT LIST

Phase	Title	Links
1 - Issue Identification	**GNSO Council Action Items** [refer to list on wiki]	LINK
2 - Issue Scoping	**- none -**	
3 - Initiation	**- none -**	
4 - Working Group	**GNSO Standing Selection Committee (**SSC**)**	LINK
4 - Working Group	**Cross Community Working Group on New gTLD Auction Proceeds** (CWG-Auction)	LINK
4 - Working Group	**Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability** (WS2)	LINK
4 - Working Group	**PDP: Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms in All gTLDs** (RPM)	LINK
4 - Working Group	**PDP: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP** (Sub-Pro)	LINK
4 - Working Group	**PDP: Next-Generation gTLD Registration Directory Services (RDS) to replace WHOIS** (RDS)	LINK
4 - Working Group	**PDP: Curative Rights Protections for IGO/INGOs** (IGO-INGO-CRP)	LINK
4 - Working Group	**Cross Community Working Group to develop a framework for the use of Country and Territory names as TLDs** (CWG-UCTN)	LINK
4 - Working Group	**Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance** (CWG-IG)	LINK
5 – Council Deliberations	**- none -**	
6 – Board Vote	**PDP: Protection of International Organization Names in All gTLDs** (IGO-INGO)	LINK
6 – Board Vote	**Geo Regions Review** (GEO)	LINK
7 – Implementation	**GNSO Review Working Group** (GRWG)	LINK
7 – Implementation	**GNSO Rights & Obligations under Revised ICANN Bylaws Drafting Team** (RODT)	LINK
7 – Implementation	**Cross Community Working Group for a Framework of Principles for Future CWGs (**CWG-Principles**)**	LINK
7 – Implementation	**GAC-GNSO Consultation Group on Early Engagement** (GAC-GNSO-CG)	LINK
7 – Implementation	**PDP: Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues** (PPSAI)	LINK
7 – Implementation	**PDP: Translation & Transliteration of gTLD Registration Data** (T&T)	LINK
7 – Implementation	**PDP: Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part C** (IRTP-C)	LINK
7 – Implementation	**PDP: 'Thick' WHOIS** (THICK-WHOIS)	LINK

Phase	Title	Links
7 – Implementation	**PDP: Protection of International Organization Names in All gTLDs** (IGO-INGO)	LINK
Other	**Consumer Choice Competition and Trust Review Team** (CCT-RT)	LINK
Other	**Expired Registration Recovery Policy – Policy Review** (ERRP-PR)	LINK
Other	**Transfer Emergency Action Contact – Policy Review** (TEAC-PR)	LINK
Other	**Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy** (IRTP-PR)	LINK

Last updated: 10 July 2017

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
- None -				

3 – Initiation				
Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
- None -				

4 – Working Group

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
GNSO Standing Selection Committee (SSC) Chair: Susan Kawaguchi Vice-Chairs: Julf Helsingius, Maxim Alzoba Staff: M. Konings, E. Barabas 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.	2017-Mar-15	Ongoing	Council	In order to deal with the different requests for nominations / endorsements of candidates for the different review teams as well as post-transition related structures, the GNSO Council adopted on an interim basis the proposed charter for a GNSO Standing Selection Committee during its meeting at ICANN58. Following the completion of two selection processes, SSC will report back to the GNSO Council with its assessment of whether the charter provides sufficient guidance and flexibility to carry out its work, and/or whether any modifications should be considered. As part of its latest assignment, the SSC developed the criteria and the process for the selection of the GNSO Representative to the Empowered Community Administration, which the GNSO Council approved in its meeting at ICANN59.
New gTLD Auction Proceeds Cross-Community Working Group (CCWG) Co-Chairs: Ching Chiao (ccNSO); Erika Mann (GNSO) Staff: M. Konings, J. Braeken (ccNSO) 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).	2016-Mar-10	Ongoing	CCWG	The CCWG held its first meeting on 26 January 2017 and agreed to meet every two weeks. The CCWG has developed of its work plan and proposed plan for dealing with the charter questions which was recently distributed to all the it Chartering Organizations. The CCWG has recently completed its intial run through of the different charter questions to gather initial thoughts, determine dependencies as well as identify expertise that may be needed to address the question (stage 1) and commenced on stage 2 of its work plan during its face-to-face meeting at ICANN59 in Johannesburg. Phase 2 will address the charter questions that were identified as part of stage 1 requiring a response before commencing the next phase which will consist of compiling a list of possible mechanisms that could be considered by CCWG.

4 – Working Group

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability Co-Chairs: Jordan Carter (ccNSO), Thomas Rickert (GNSO), Leon Sanchez (ALAC) Staff: B. Turcotte 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.	2016-Jun-26	June 2018	CCWG	The CCWG-WS2 commenced work on Work Stream 2 (WS2) at ICANN56 in June 2016. It is addressing the remaining nine issues that were deferred from WS1 (i.e. Diversity, Guidelines for Good Faith Conduct, Human Rights, Jurisdiction, Ombudsman, Reviewing the Cooperative Engagement Process (CEP), SO/AC Accountability, Staff Accountability, and Transparency). Mathieu Weill has stepped down and been replaced by Jordan Carter as the ccNSO appointed co-chair. The CCWG leadership has requested the chartering organizations to provide an extension of the CCWG's mandate and budget to allow for it to continue its work into FY18 as it has not been possible to deliver its Final Report as originally planned by the end of FY17.
Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) in All gTLDs PDP Co-Chair(s): Philip Corwin, J. Scott Evans, Kathy Kleiman Council Liaison: Heather Forrest Community Liaisons (to/from the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG): Robin Gross, Susan Payne Staff: M. Wong, Amr Elsadr This WG is tasked to review all the RPMs that have been developed by ICANN in a two-phased PDP. 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	2011-Feb-03	Ongoing	WG	On 28 February 2016, the GNSO Council voted to initiate this Policy Development Process (PDP) and adopted the Working Group Charter (updated from its draft form following work by several Council volunteers) in March (https://community.icann.org/x/2CWAAw). 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 2. The first WG meeting was held on 21 April 2016. The WG began its work with a review of the Trademark Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution Procedure (TM-PDDRP), which it wrapped up at ICANN57 in November 2016. The WG is completing its initial review of the TMCH. The two Sub Teams that were formed to refine the WG's charter questions on Sunrise Registrations and Trademark Claims and propose related data collection points have completed their work. The WG discussed the Sub Teams' proposals at ICANN 59 in Johannesburg, and is proceeding to finalize the scope of its review of Sunrise and Trademark Claims. A third Sub Team on Additional Marketplace RPMs has been formed, and held its first call on 14 June 2017. The WG has adjusted its Work Plan to accommodate the work of the three Sub Teams, and it expects to

4 – Working Group				
Description	**Initiated**	**Target Date**	**Who holds Token**	**Pending action/status**
will be necessary, including to clarify and unify the policy goals.				be working on Phase 1 through end 2017.
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Co-Chair(s): Avri Doria and Jeff Neuman Council Liaison: Paul McGrady Community Liasons (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.	2014-Jun-25	Ongoing	WG	The WG was chartered by the GNSO Council in January 2016 (https://community.icann.org/x/KAp1Aw). It has completed preliminary deliberations on a set of overarching topics, which formed the basis for a formal request for input that was sent to all SO/ACs and GNSO Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies (SG/Cs) ahead of ICANN56 in Helsinki in June. The WG has considered input received from the community on the overarching issues and is creating focused drafting teams on these issues to develop proposals for the WG's consideration. In addition, the WG's four Work Track (WT) Sub Teams continue to work to address the other 30+ topics identified in the WG's charter. The Working Group invited input from Supporting Organizations, Advisory Committees, Stakeholder Groups, Constituencies, and community members, including applicants for the 2012 round of new gTLDs through Community Comment (CC2), a series of questions focused on specific topic under consideration in the WTs (https://www.icann.org/public-comments/cc2-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-2017-03-22-en). The WG received 25 responses to CC2. Staff prepared and published the summary and analysis document and the WG will now begin carefully reviewing CC2 input. The WG has reviewed draft recommendations that have been developed by the Competition, Consumer Choice & Consumer Trust Review Team (CCT-RT) and submitted comments for the CCT-RT on recommendations directed at the PDP WG. The WG leadership team organized a series of Cross Community Discussions at ICANN59 in Johannesburg to address one of the more challenging topics included in its charter, the treatment of geographic names at the top level. The sessions were well attended and allowed the co-chairs to gather input from across the community on issues of substance and process. On 25 October 2016, the GNSO Council sent a Council response

4 – Working Group				
Description	**Initiated**	**Target Date**	**Who holds Token**	**Pending action/status**
				([https://gnso.icann.org/en/correspondence/gnso-council-to-icann-board-25oct16-en.pdf)](https://gnso.icann.org/en/correspondence/gnso-council-to-icann-board-25oct16-en.pdf) to an August 2016 letter from the ICANN Board concerning the question whether some of the WG's work could be prioritized (e.g., in work streams) or otherwise organized to facilitate the launch of a new application mechanism ([https://gnso.icann.org/en/correspondence/crocker-to-bladel-05aug16-en.pdf)](https://gnso.icann.org/en/correspondence/crocker-to-bladel-05aug16-en.pdf). The WG will keep this topic under consideration as it progresses its work, though it has not yet reached any new conclusions.
PDP on the next generation gTLD Registration Directory Service to replace WHOIS Chair: Chuck Gomes Vice-Chairs: David Cake, Michele Neylon, Susan Kawaguchi Council liaison: Stephanie Perrin Staff: M. Konings, Amr Elsadr The WG is tasked to provide the GNSO Council with recommendations on the following two questions as part of phase 1: What are the fundamental requirements for gTLD registration data and is a new policy framework and next-generation RDS needed to address these requirements?	2012-Nov-8	Ongoing	WG	The PDP Working Group was chartered in November 2015 ([https://community.icann.org/x/E4xlAw)](https://community.icann.org/x/E4xlAw) and first convened at the end of January 2016. The WG continues to refine its Work Plan (see [https://community.icann.org/x/oIxlAw)](https://community.icann.org/x/oIxlAw). The Working Group has compiled a list of possible requirements for gTLD registration directory services, providing a foundation upon which to recommend answers to these two questions: What are the fundamental requirements for gTLD registration data and directory services, and is a new policy framework and next-generation RDS needed to address these requirements? Triage on the list of possible requirements was completed and deliberations on the list of possible requirements commenced at ICANN57. However, the WG decided to first focus on a number of key concepts which are intended to facilitate the deliberations on the list of possible requirements. The WG is currently deliberating on principles regarding Public vs Gated Access to "thin" data (now being referred to as Minimum Public Data Set) developed by the EWG on gTLD Directory Services to assist in identification of those key concepts. The WG tentative agreements achieved to date can be found here: https://community.icann.org/x/p4xlAw. The WG initially compiled a RDS statement of purpose, which it had been reviewing in light of recent deliberations, including discussions held with privacy experts at ICANN 58. The WG held a cross-community discussion at ICANN 59, during which it solicited input from the broader community on tentative WG agreements reached so far in relation to the Minimum Public Data Set (MPDS). The WG will now commence its deliberations on thick data, focusing first on which data elements should be part of RDS. At a later stage, the WG will go back to the input collected at ICANN 59 in Johannesburg and determine what

4 – Working Group

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
				updates, if any, need to be made to the agreements reached to date concerning MPDS.
Curative Rights Protections for IGO/INGOs PDP Co-Chair(s): Philip Corwin, Petter Rindforth Council Liaison: Susan Kawaguchi Staff: M. Wong, S. Chan This WG is tasked with providing 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.	2014-Jun-05	Ongoing	WG	Based on the recommendation of the IGO-INGO PDP Working Group in 2013, the GNSO Council resolved to initiate a PDP on the specific topic of curative rights, and chartered the WG in June 2014 (https://community.icann.org/x/77rhAg). The PDP WG is tasked to explore possible amendments to the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP) and the Uniform Rapid Suspension procedure (URS) to address the specific needs of International Governmental Organizations (IGOs) and International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGOs). The WG focused on IGOs, having preliminarily determined that INGOs do not appear to require additional protections. At the WG's request, an external legal expert was engaged to provide a legal opinion on the state of international law on IGO jurisdictional immunity. The expert's final legal opinion was reviewed and incorporated into its preliminary recommendations by the WG. The WG also reviewed the IGO Small Group Proposal (see https://gnso.icann.org/en/correspondence/crocker-icann-board-to-council-chairs-04oct16-en.pdf), which was sent to the GNSO and the GAC on 6 October 2016. The WG's preliminary recommendations and its Initial Report was published for public comment on 20 January 2017 (see https://www.icann.org/public-comments/igo-ingo-crp-access-initial-2017-01-20-en), closing on 31 March 2017. The WG has completed its review of all comments received as part of its preparation of its final recommendations. It held an open community discussion on certain modifications it is considering to its initial recommendations at ICANN59 in Johannesburg. It hopes to complete its Final Report before ICANN60 in Abu Dhabi in October 2017.
Cross-Community Working Group to develop a framework for the use of Country and Territory names as TLDs (CWG-UCTN)	2014-Mar-26	Ongoing	CCWG	The CWG-UCTN used an Options Paper to drive its discussion and concluded its work on two-letter codes (https://community.icann.org/x/4xXxAg). Following a request for input to all SO/ACs and SG/Cs on 3-character codes, a straw person

4 – Working Group

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
GNSO Council Co-Chairs: Heather Forrest, Carlos Gutierrez ccNSO Council Co-Chairs: Paul Szyndler, Annabeth Lange Council liaison: Heather Forrest Staff: B. Boswinkel, J. Braeken, S. Chan, E. Barabas The objective of the CCWG is to: • Further review the current status of representations of country and territory names, as they exist under current ICANN policies, guidelines and procedures; • Provide advice regarding the feasibility of developing a consistent and uniform definitional framework that could be applicable across the respective SO's and AC's; and • Should such a framework be deemed feasible, provide detailed advice as to the content of the framework.				proposal on 3-character codes was presented and discussed during ICANN55 in Marrakech in March 2016 (https://community.icann.org/x/4xXxAg). At ICANN56 in Helsinki in June 2016, the CWG-UCTN provided a brief update and conducted a cross-community session. A draft status report and initial draft of the CWG-UCTN's Interim Paper were made available prior to ICANN57 (https://community.icann.org/x/4xXxAg). Discussions at ICANN57 in Hyderabad in November 2016 focused on these two documents, with a view towards winding up the CWG's work in favour of another effort with a broader charter and scope to rationalize the various current community efforts relating to geographic names. The draft Interim Paper was further revised based on feedback received in Hyderabad and was published for public comment (see https://www.icann.org/public-comments/cwg-uctn-interim-paper-2017-02-24-en). The public comment period closed on 21 April 2017. Staff prepared a summary report of the 15 comments received. The CWG has finalized the Final Report, which was submitted to the chartering organizations for their discussion and next steps; the outcome of those discussions are expected to be brought back into the Final Report.
Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance (CCWG-IG) Co-Chairs: Rafik Dammak (GNSO), Jordan Carter (ccNSO), Olivier Crepin-Leblond (ALAC) GNSO Council Liaison: Julf Helsingius Staff: A-R Inne, N. Hickson This CCWG was established by the participating SO/ACs to coordinate, facilitate, and increase the participation of the ICANN community in discussions and processes pertaining to	2014-Oct-15	Ongoing	CCWG	The GNSO Council adopted the charter (https://community.icann.org/x/lQInAw) for this CCWG during ICANN51 in October 2014. The CCWG subsequently requested confirmation from its Chartering Organizations regarding a question of interpretation of its charter, which the GNSO Council agreed to at its May 2015 meeting (https://gnso.icann.org/en/meetings/minutes-council-21may15-en.htm). At ICANN57 in Hyderabad in November 2016, a motion to withdraw GNSO support from the Charter was submitted for GNSO Council consideration. The Council decided to request that the CCWG propose refinements to its Charter before ICANN58 in March 2017, including consideration of alternative mechanisms to a CCWG for continuing its work. The CCWG provided an update

4 – Working Group

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
Internet Governance.				and a revised Charter just prior to ICANN58. The Council has discussed the report from the CCWG at a number of meetings, and met with the Board's Working Group on Internet Governane at ICANN59 in Johannesburg to more fully understand the need for, appropriate scope of, and best mechanism for continuing Internet governance discusions in an ICANN context. The GNSO Council will be considering whether or not to continue as a Chartering Organization for the CCWG, possibly under a revised Charter, at its next meeting on 13 July 2017.

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
Protection of International Organization Names in All gTLDs PDP Chair: Thomas Rickert Council liaison: Keith Drazek Staff: M. Wong, S. Chan, B. Cobb This WG was tasked to to provide the GNSO 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).	2012-Apr-12	Ongoing	Board/ Council/IRT	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 (http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-30apr14-en.htm#2.a). An Implementation Review Team (IRT) was formed, led by Dennis Chang of GDD, to implement those recommendations adopted by the Board (See below in the "7 – Implementation" section for more details). For those policy recommendations that are inconsistent with GAC advice, the Board passed a number of resolutions in 2013 and 2014 (see e.g. https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2013-07-17-en#1.a) 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. At ICANN58 in Hyderabad in November 2016, the Board proposed that the GAC and GNSO enter into a facilitated dialogue to try to resolve the outstanding issues. Facilitated discussions took place at ICANN59 in Copenhagen in March 2017, and were moderated by former Board member Bruce Tonkin based on a set of Problem Statements and Briefing Papers reviewed by the parties. **Next step on Red Cross National Society and International Movement protections:** Following the ICANN58 facilitated discussions, the Board passed a resolution requesting that the GNSO Council initiate its process for amending its policy on a limited set of Red Cross names (see https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/prelim-report-2017-03-16-en#2.e.i). The Council considered the Board's request at its meeting on 20 April 2017 and subsequently voted to initiate the GNSO's policy amendment process to take forward the Board's request. The original PDP Working Group was reconvened, as required by the GNSO policy amendment process, and held a first meeting on 14 June 2017.

6 – Board Vote				
Description	**Initiated**	**Target Date**	**Who holds Token**	**Pending action/status**
				Next step on IGO acronyms protections: Further discussions relating to possible next steps for protecting IGO acronyms are expected to take place among the Board, GAC and GNSO.
Geo Regions Review Community-wide Working Group Chair: Cheryl Langdon-Orr (ccNSO/APRALO) GNSO Council Reps: Staff: R. Hoggarth This Board-chartered cross community WG has consulted with ICANN stakeholders regarding the definition and applications of ICANN's Geographic Regions.	2008-Aug-07	TBC	Board	A community Public Comment opportunity has been established for this matter (see https://www.icann.org/public-comments/geo-regions-2015-12-23-en. The comment period closed on 24 April 2016 and 7 submissions were received. The staff report of public comments was published (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-geo-regions-13may16-en.pdf) and the Board will now review the comments received and consider next steps.

7 – Implementation

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
GNSO Review Working Group Chair: Jennifer Wolfe Vice-Chair: Wolf-Ulrich Knoben Council Liaison: Rafik Dammak Staff: J. Hedlund, A. Elsadr This WG was tasked to develop an implementation plan for the GNSO Review recommendations (http://gnso.icann.org/en/drafts/review-feasibility-prioritization-25feb16-en.pdf) which have been adopted by the ICANN Board.	2016-Jul-21	Ongoing	WG	The GNSO Council adopted the WG Charter (http://gnso.icann.org/en/drafts/gnso-review-charter-11jul16-en.pdf) during its meeting on 21 July 2016. The Working Group delivered its proposed implementation plan for the Board-adopted GNSO Review recommendations to the GNSO Council on 21 November (https://gnso.icann.org/en/drafts/review-implementation-recommendations-plan-21nov16-en.pdf) The GNSO Council deferred voting on the issue to its meeting on 15 December to allow more time for deliberation, and a webinar on the topic was held on 08 December. On 15 December the GNSO Council unanimously approved the proposed plan. The Board's Organizational Effectiveness Committee (OEC) has reviewed the plan and recommended it to the Board for adoption. The Board accepted the recommendations at its 3 February 2017 meeting, and has requested that the Working Group provide updates to the OEC every six months through implementation. The Working Group has begun its work on the Phase I recommendations and will shortly take up the Phase II recommendations. The Working Group is meeting bi-weekly and has agreed via full consensus that several implementation plans for recommendations have been completed. Its next meeting is on 13 July.
GNSO Rights & Obligations under Revised ICANN Bylaws Drafting Team (DT) **Recommendations** Chair: Steve DelBianco Vice-Chair: Ed Morris Staff: M. Wong, J. Hedlund, M. Konings This DT was created to work with ICANN staff to identify the GNSO's new rights and obligations under the revised ICANN Bylaws, and to prepare an implementation plan for the GNSO Council's consideration.	2016-Jun-30	June 2017	Staff/DT/Council	On 27 May 2016 the ICANN Board adopted a set of new ICANN Bylaws that reflect changes needed to implement the IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal. The revised Bylaws include new and additional rights and obligations for the GNSO. As changes to the GNSO's Operating Procedures and applicable Bylaws may be needed to accommodate these new roles, including the participation of the GNSO in the newly created Empowered Community, the GNSO Council created this DT on 30 June 2016 to identify the GNSO's new rights and obligations, and work with ICANN staff to prepare an implementation plan to address any needed changes by 30 September (http://gnso.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#201606). Following GNSO Council approval for an extension of time, the DT delivered its final report on 12 October 2016 (see https://gnso.icann.org/en/drafts/bylaws-drafting-team-final-report-12oct16-en.pdf, with minority statements available at https://gnso.icann.org/en/drafts/bylaws-drafting-team-minority-report-

7 – Implementation				
Description	**Initiated**	**Target Date**	**Who holds Token**	**Pending action/status**
				10oct16-en.pdf). At its 1 December meeting the GNSO Council voted unanimously to approve a motion to accept the report and directed staff to begin implementation. Staff shared its proposed implementation of the recommendations with the DT to obtain input on a number of questions as well as assumptions before publishing the proposed changes to the ICANN Bylaws / GNSO Operating Procedures for public comment. The DT held a meeting at ICANN58 in Copenhagen in March 2017 and met again on 06 April to continue discussion on proposed changes. The DT agreed to the proposed changes, and on 19 June 2017 staff published a revised version of the GNSO Operating Procedures for public comment, as well as proposed changes to the Bylaws. The public comment period closes on 10 August 2017.
Cross-Community Working Group- on a Framework of CWG Principles GNSO Council Co-Chair: John Berard ccNSO Council Co-Chair: Becky Burr Staff: M. Wong, B. Boswinkel, S. Chan This CCWG was chartered by the ccNSO and GNSO Councils to develop a set of uniform guidelines (based on earlier work by the GNSO, feedback from the ccNSO and community experience from past CCWGs) for the formation, operation and termination of future CCWGs. Its Final Framework, as approved by the ccNSO and GNSO Councils, is intended to serve as a guide to the community for all future CCWGs that are proposed.	2011-May-19	Completed	Staff	This CCWG was chartered by both the ccNSO and GNSO Councils in March 2014. It reviewed the processes and outcomes of selected prior CWGs, including mapping their charters to the typical WG life cycle (Initiation, Formation, Operation, Closure, Post-Closure), and published a draft framework for public comment on 22 February 2016. A final proposed framework based on public comments received was drafted and presented for community deliberation at ICANN56 in Helsinki in June 2016. Following review of the public and community comments received, the CCWG completed its Final Framework and sent it to both the Chartering Organizations for their review and action (https://community.icann.org/x/4CiOAw). The GNSO Council approved the Final Framework on 13 October 2016 and the ccNSO Council also approved it during its meeting at ICANN57 in November 2016. Staff will now forward the Framework to all other ICANN SO/ACs, with the recommendation that it be used to guide the community's discussions for all future CCWGs.
Recommendations from the GAC-GNSO Consultation Group (CG) on GAC Early	2014-Jan-07	ICANN58	Staff	The launch of this GAC-GNSO Consultation Group on Early Engagement was the result of discussions between the two entities at several ICANN meetings,

7 – Implementation

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
Engagement in GNSO PDPs Co-Chairs: Jonathan Robinson (GNSO) and Manal Ismail (GAC) Staff: M. Konings, O. Nordling The Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) and the GNSO jointly established a consultation group to explore ways for the GAC to engage early in the GNSO Policy Development Process and to improve overall cooperation between the two bodies (for example, by exploring the option of a liaison).				including in Buenos Aires in November 2013, reflecting a joint desire to explore and enhance ways of early engagement by the GAC in GNSO policy development activities. The issue was also specifically called-out by both Accountability and Transparency Review Teams (ATRT). The GNSO Council recently confirmed that the position of GNSO Liaison to the GAC, created as a result of the work of the CG on a pilot basis, should be made a permanent role. At ICANN56 in Helsinki in June, the CG shared the results of the survey which was held to obtain further input from the GNSO as well as GAC on the review of the Quick Look Mechanism as well as other opportunities for early engagement of the GAC in the GNSO PDP. The CG submitted its final status report and recommendations to the GNSO and GAC for their consideration at ICANN57 in Hyderabad in November. With the adoption of the recommendations, the CG considers its work complete. Staff recently circulated an updated implementation plan to the GNSO Council as well as GAC leadership team which captures the current state of implementation of the recommendations.
Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues PDP Recommendations Council Liaison: Darcy Southwell IRT Support Staff: Amy Bivins The *Registrar Accreditation Agreement* (RAA), 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	2009-May-21	Ongoing	Staff/IRT	The WG's Final Report was sent to the GNSO Council on 8 December 2015 and in January 2016, the GNSO Council voted unanimously to approve all the WG's final recommendations (https://gnso.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#201601). At its May 2016 meeting, at which the Board acknowledged receipt of the PDP recommendations and requested additional time to consider, to allow for possible timely GAC input. The GAC issued advice via its Helsinki Communique requesting that its concerns be addressed during implementation to the extent feasible. On 9 August 2016, the Board adopted the PDP recommendations (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-08-09-en#2.e). An IRT was formed and is being led by Amy Bivins of GDD. The IRT has agreed to adopt an accelerated timeline for the project and is meeting weekly for 90 minutes to review draft policy language. In addition, a subgroup was formed to review a draft framework developed by the GAC's Public Safety Working Group (PSWG) in relation to privacy and proxy services' handling of law enforcement requests. The full IRT will discussed the PSWG's

7 – Implementation				
Description	**Initiated**	**Target Date**	**Who holds Token**	**Pending action/status**
their accreditation, were examined in a PDP. This IRT was formed to implement the PDP recommendations approved by the ICANN Board.				draft framework at its meeting at ICANN59 in Johannesburg in June 2017 and will continue its discussion of the PSWG framework as well as the draft contract in its upcoming IRT calls.
Translation/Transliteration of Internationalized Registration Data PDP Recommendations Council Liaison: Rubens Kuhl IRT Support Staff: Brian Aitchison The PDP addressed two primary issues: 1. Whether it is desirable to translate contact information to a single common language or transliterate contact information to a single common script; and 2. Who should bear the burden translating contact information to a single common language or transliterating contact information to a single common script? This IRT was formed to implement the final PDP recommendations as approved by the ICANN Board.	2012-Oct-17	Ongoing	Staff/IRT	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. 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. 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 discussion of language and script tags will remain the focus of IRT meetings into Q2 2017 until the challenges of implementing these tags can be addressed fully before soliciting public comment. The timeline for the implementation of the PDP recommendations has been extended into 2018 as a result of emerging complexities relating to the implementation. A tentative implementation announcement is currently scheduled for August 2017—with a tentative policy effective date of 1 February 2018—pending further discussion with the IRT.
Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) Part C	17 Oct	Ongoing	Board /	The ICANN Board adopted the IRTP Part C recommendations at its meeting in

7 – Implementation				
Description	**Initiated**	**Target Date**	**Who holds Token**	**Pending action/status**
Recommendations Council Liaison: Rubens Kuhl IRT Support Staff: Caitlin Tubergen The Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) is a consensus policy adopted in 2004 to provide a straightforward procedure for domain name holders to transfer domain names between registrars. An overall review of this policy identified areas that require clarification or improvement. Because the initial review identified a wide range of issues related to transferring domain names, the issues were categorized into subsets. This project relates to implementation of the "Part C" issues.	2012		Staff	December 2012 (https://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-20dec12-en.htm#2.a). An IRT was formed and consulted on the Change of Registrant draft policy language. The draft policy was posted for public comment on 30 March 2015. Following IRT review of the comments received, the updated Transfer Policy was announced on 24 September 2015 (https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2-2015-09-24-en). Following community feedback, an updated version of the Transfer Policy was announced on 1 June 2016 (https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2016-06-01-en). The updated version of the Transfer Policy was effective 1 December 2016. At the request of the Registrars' Stakeholder Group, which raised a substantive concern regarding the application of IRTP-C to privacy and proxy services, the GNSO Council wrote to the ICANN Board to recommend that the matter be referred to the PPSAI IRT for consideration before the Policy effective date (https://gnso.icann.org/en/correspondence/bladel-to-crocker-01dec16-en.pdf). The Board responded on 21 December 2016 to note that it is reviewing the Council's request and in the interim directing that ICANN Compliance defer enforcement of the issue (https://gnso.icann.org/en/correspondence/crocker-to-bladel-21dec16-en.pdf). On 3 February 2017, the Board passed a resolution confirming its instructions regarding deferral of Compliance enforcement and declaring its intention of further discussing the concerns raised by the GNSO Council at a subsequent meeting. On 16 March 2017, the Board passed a resolution directing the ICANN CEO to instruct ICANN staff to work with the Registrars' Stakeholder Group and other interested parties to determine the appropriate path forward. ICANN Staff has reached out to the Registrars' Stakeholder Group with the suggestion to move the discussion to the PPSAI IRT.

7 – Implementation

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
Thick WHOIS PDP Recommendations Council Liaison: Susan Kawaguchi IRT Support Staff: Dennis Chang This IRT was formed to work with ICANN staff on the implementation of the GNSO's policy recommendation to require Thick Whois for all gTLD registries, as approved by the ICANN Board.	2012-Mar-14	2019-Feb-01	IRT / Staff / Council	The ICANN Board approved the GNSO recommendations on Thick Whois at its meeting on 7 February 2014 (http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-07feb14-en.htm). An IRT was formed and various impact assessments and implementation proposals have been discussed with the IRT in the two decoupled work streams, corresponding to the two expected outcomes in the PDP Recommendations: transition from thin to thick for .COM, .NET and .JOBS; and the consistent labeling and display of Whois output for all gTLDs as per Specification 3 of the 2013 RAA. Following the Summary and Analysis Reports in January 2017, both Thick Whois Consensus Policy Requiring Consistent Labeling and Display of RDDS (Whois) Output for All gTLDs and the Proposed Implementation of GNSO Thick RDDS (Whois) Transition Policy for .COM, .NET and .JOBS implementations have been published on 1 Febrary 2017. Regarding the transition from thin to thick for .COM, .NET and .JOBS, in June 2015, ICANN's General Counsel's Office, released to the IRT a Legal Review Memorandum per the GNSO Council's recommendation. ICANN staff is currently engaging with experts from affected parties to identify an implementation path. Additionally, the IRT recently raised concerns regarding privacy issues that were not anticipated by the PDP Working Group. On 15 December 2016, the IRT notified the GNSO Council of these issues (https://gnso.icann.org/en/correspondence/irt-to-gnso-council-15dec16-en.pdf). The Council discussed the IRT's letter at its meeting on 19 January 2017 and has subsequently decided that there will be no further action. ICANN organization approved Verisign's request for a 120-day extension of the 1 August 2017 date in the Thick WHOIS Transition Policy by which Verisign is required to deploy an Extensible Provisioning Protocol (EPP) mechanism and an alternative bulk transfer mechanism for .COM and .NET for registrars to migrate registration data for existing domain names. With this extension, the new date for Verisign's compliance with the requirement is 29 November 2017.

7 – Implementation

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
				Implementation activities continue with the following milestones: Operational Testing and Evaluation began on 1 May 2017. Consistent Labeling and Display of Whois for all gTLDs Effective date – 1 August 2017 Transition of .COM, .NET and .JOBS from Thin to Thick Whois Effective date for new registrations – 1 May 2018 Effective date for existing registrations – 1 February 2019
Protection of International Organization Names in All gTLDs Council Liaison: Keith Drazek IRT Support Staff: Dennis Chang This IRT was formed to work with ICANN staff to adopt those of the GNSO's recommendations to protect certain identifiers of IGO & INGO Organizations in all gTLD registries that were approved by the ICANN Board in April 2014.	2012-Apr-12	2018-Feb-01	Staff/IRT	In April 2014 the Board voted to adopt those of the GNSO's PDP recommendations that are not inconsistent with GAC advice received on the topic (http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-30apr14-en.htm#2.a). An IRT was formed to implement those recommendations adopted by the Board. To date, ICANN staff has been working on building comprehensive and actionable lists of all the identifiers to be protected as well as draft procedures for eventual implementation of relevant protections, i.e. reservations at the top and second levels and related exception procedures. Staff, in collaboration with the IRT, is progressively building a Draft Consensus Policy document. This document serves to support the continuing development of the implementation plan. The proposed implementation of GNSO Consensus Policy Recommendation for the Protection of IGO&INGO Identifier in All gTLDs was posted for public comment on 17 May 2017. The public comment period closes on 10 July 2017.

Other				
Description	**Initiated**	**Target Date**	**Who holds Token**	**Pending action/status**
Consumer Choice Competition and Trust Review Team Chair: Jonathan Zuck Staff: Eleeza Agopian, Brian Aitchison This Review Team was formed to examine the extent to which the introduction or expansion of gTLDs has promoted competition, consumer trust and consumer choice. It will also assess the effectiveness of the application and evaluation processes, as well as the safeguards put in place by ICANN to mitigate issues involved in the introduction or expansion of new gTLDs.	2015-Feb-12	2017-Dec-31	Review Team	Under the former Affirmation of Commitments (now ICANN bylaws), ICANN is committed to ensuring that, as it contemplates expanding the top-level domain space, the various issues that are involved will be adequately addressed prior to implementation. These include issues such as competition, consumer protection, security, stability and resiliency, malicious abuse issues, sovereignty concerns, and rights protection. The bylaws also requires ICANN to convene a community-driven review team to examine the extent to which the introduction or expansion of gTLDs has promoted competition, consumer trust and consumer choice, as well as the effectiveness of: • The application and evaluation process • Safeguards put in place to mitigate issues involved in the introduction or expansion The Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice (CCT-RT) was formed in November 2015. The CCT-RT published its first draft report for public comment on 7 March 2017, closing on 19 May 2017. The CCT-RT is currently finalizing its final report.
Expired Registration Recovery Policy – Policy Review (ERRP-PR) Staff: M. Konings	FY18	TBD	Staff	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 amongst others the number of complaints received in relation to renewal and/or postexpiration related matters or in the form of audits that assess if

Other

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
				the policy has been implemented as intended. Staff has started collecting initial data to conduct a review from a contractual compliance perspective as well as other sources. Once complete, a report will be delivered to the GNSO Council for their review.
Transfer Emergency Action Contact – Policy Review (TEAC-PR) Staff**:** M. Konings	FY18	TBD	Staff	The TEAC became a part of the IRTP Consensus Policy on 1 Jun 2012 as a result of adopted recommendations produced from the GNSO's Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy – Part B (IRTP-B) PDP WG. That WG produced a series of recommendations based on issues around domain hijacking, urget returns of inappropriately transferred names and lock status. As a part of the WG's first recommendation, it requested an follow-up review of the 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 (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." Since the policy effective date, ICANN's Contractual Compliance has processed several TEAC complaints over the years, and as part of its Audit Program, Registrars are asked to provide their TEAC information should it not match what is listed in RADAR. Further, compliance reports about this specific policy are posted on the compliance site.
Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP-PR) Staff**:** M. Konings	FY19-FY20	TBD	GNSO Council	Final modifications to the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy were implemented 1 Dec 2016 as a resut of the final PDP WG, IRTP-D, which were adopted by the GNSO Council. That WG produced a series of recommendations after deliberiating on issues on the use of the EPP AuthInfo Code, FOAs, and

Other

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
				penalties for policy violations. The WG's final two recommendations suggest that data be collected and an eventual review of the entire IRTP be conducted: 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. 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. Thus far, there has not been a discussion on what data should be collected to conduct a review, nor an optimal time with which to start.