



Phase	Title	Links
1 - Issue Identification	GNSO Council Action Items [refer to list on wiki]	<a href="#">LINK</a>
2 - Issue Scoping	- none -	
3 - Initiation	- none -	
4 - Working Group	WHOIS Procedure Implementation Advisory Group – (WPIAG)	<a href="#">LINK</a>
4 - Working Group	PDP: Protection of International Organization Names in All gTLDs – Reconvened WG (IGO-RCRC)	<a href="#">LINK</a>
4 - Working Group	Cross Community Working Group on New gTLD Auction Proceeds (CWG-Auction)	<a href="#">LINK</a>
4 - Working Group	Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability (WS2)	<a href="#">LINK</a>
4 - Working Group	PDP: Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms in All gTLDs (RPM)	<a href="#">LINK</a>
4 - Working Group	PDP: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP (Sub-Pro)	<a href="#">LINK</a>
4 - Working Group	PDP: Next-Generation gTLD Registration Directory Services (RDS) to replace WHOIS (RDS)	<a href="#">LINK</a>
4 - Working Group	PDP: Curative Rights Protections for IGO/INGOs (IGO-INGO-CRP)	<a href="#">LINK</a>
4 - Working Group	Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance (CWG-IG)	<a href="#">LINK</a>
5 – Council Deliberations	- none -	
6 – Board Vote	GNSO Rights & Obligations under Revised ICANN Bylaws Drafting Team (RODT)	<a href="#">LINK</a>
6 – Board Vote	PDP: Protection of International Organization Names in All gTLDs (IGO-INGO)	<a href="#">LINK</a>
6 – Board Vote	Geo Regions Review (GEO)	<a href="#">LINK</a>
7 – Implementation	GNSO Review Working Group (GRWG)	<a href="#">LINK</a>
7 – Implementation	PDP: Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues (PPSAI)	<a href="#">LINK</a>
7 – Implementation	PDP: Translation & Transliteration of gTLD Registration Data (T&T)	<a href="#">LINK</a>
7 – Implementation	PDP: Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part C (IRTP-C)	<a href="#">LINK</a>
7 – Implementation	PDP: ‘Thick’ WHOIS (THICK-WHOIS)	<a href="#">LINK</a>
Other	GNSO Standing Committee on Budget and Operations (SCBO)	<a href="#">LINK</a>
Other	GNSO Standing Selection Committee (SSC)	<a href="#">LINK</a>

Phase	Title	Links
Other	Consumer Choice Competition and Trust Review Team (CCT-RT)	<a href="#">LINK</a>
Other	Expired Registration Recovery Policy – Policy Review (ERRP-PR)	<a href="#">LINK</a>
Other	Transfer Emergency Action Contact – Policy Review (TEAC-PR)	<a href="#">LINK</a>
Other	Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy – Policy Review (IRTP-PR)	<a href="#">LINK</a>
Other	Policy & Implementation Recommendations Review (Pollmp – RR)	<a href="#">LINK</a>

Last updated: 6 March 2018

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 - <a href="#">LINK</a>	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
<p><b>WHOIS Procedure Implementation Advisory Group (WPIAG)</b>                      Chair: TBC                      Council Liaison: Keith Drazek                      Staff: TBC</p> <p>The ICANN Procedure For Handling WHOIS Conflicts with Privacy Law Implementation Advisory Group (WHOIS Procedure IAG) is tasked to provide the GNSO Council with recommendations on how to address the comments and input that have been received in response to the public comment forum on the Revised ICANN Procedure for Handling WHOIS Conflicts with Privacy Law: Process and Next Steps.</p>	2018-Feb-22	Ongoing	Staff	The GNSO Council adopted the charter for the ICANN Procedure For Handling WHOIS Conflicts with Privacy Law Implementation Advisory Group (WHOIS Procedure IAG) during its meeting on 22 February. The WHOIS Procedure IAG is tasked to provide the GNSO Council with recommendations on how to address the comments and input that have been received in response to the public comment forum on the Revised ICANN Procedure for Handling WHOIS Conflicts with Privacy Law: Process and Next Steps. Per the Council's instructions, staff will circulate the call for volunteers on or after June 1, 2018 to the GNSO Stakeholder Groups with the request for each Stakeholder Group to appoint up to 3 members to the IAG. Further, staff will to circulate through the normal communication channels a call to the wider ICANN community for volunteers for interested participants and observers to join the IAG.
<p><b><a href="#">Protection of International Organization Names in All gTLDs PDP (Reconvened WG)</a></b>                      Chair: Thomas Rickert                      Council liaison (interim): Heather Forrest                      Staff: M. Wong, B. Cobb</p> <p>This reconvened WG is tasked with providing the GNSO Council with policy recommendation changes, if any, as it pertains to the protection of the Red Cross National Society and International Movement designations that are inconsistent with GAC Advice.</p>	2017-May-03	2018-Jun-30	Reconvened WG (for Red Cross names only)	<p>At ICANN57 (Nov. 2016) in Hyderabad, the Board proposed that the GAC and GNSO enter into a facilitated dialogue to try to resolve the outstanding issues from the original PDP. Facilitated discussions took place at ICANN58 (Mar. 2017) in Copenhagen and were moderated by former Board member Bruce Tonkin based on a set of Problem Statements and Briefing Papers reviewed by the parties. Following the facilitated discussions, the GNSO passed a <a href="#">resolution</a> in May 2017 requesting that the original PDP WG be reconvened using the GNSO's policy amendment process concerning a limited set of Red Cross names.</p> <p>The reconvened WG has reached preliminary agreement on the international law basis for protecting Red Cross National Society names and awaits the RCRC representatives' completion of the definitive list of the 192 Red Cross Society's identifiers to be protected, with a target date of 30 April 2018. The WG's recommendations will be published for public comment before a final report is submitted to the GNSO Council with a target date of 30 Jun 2018.</p>

### 4 – Working Group

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p><a href="#">New gTLD Auction Proceeds Cross-Community Working Group (CCWG)</a>                      Co-Chairs: Ching Chiao (ccNSO); Erika Mann (GNSO)                      Staff: M. Konings (GNSO), J. Braeken (ccNSO)</p> <p>This CCWG is tasked with developing a proposal(s) for consideration by its Chartering Organizations on the mechanism that should be developed in order to allocate the new gTLD Auction Proceeds. As part of this proposal, the CCWG is also expected to consider the scope of fund allocation, due diligence requirements that preserve ICANN’s tax status as well as how to deal with directly related matters such as potential or actual conflicts of interest. The CCWG will not make any recommendations or determinations with regards to specific funding decisions (i.e. which specific organizations or projects are to be funded or not).</p>	2016-Mar-10	Ongoing	CCWG	<p>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 has been distributed to all the Chartering Organizations. The CCWG completed its initial 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 has completed stage 2 of its work plan. The CCWG commenced its work on stage 3 – compiling a list of possible mechanisms that could be considered by CCWG during its F2F meeting at ICANN60 (November 2017). The CCWG has reached out to external experts with a set of questions in relation to the different mechanisms that have been identified, to help inform deliberations. Review of responses received is expected to commence during its meeting on 10 March 2018 at ICANN61. To review the status of deliberation on the different charter questions as well as preliminary agreements reached to date, see <a href="https://community.icann.org/x/PNrRAw">https://community.icann.org/x/PNrRAw</a>.</p>
<p><a href="#">Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability</a>                      Co-Chairs: Jordan Carter (ccNSO), Thomas Rickert (GNSO), Tijani Ben Jemaa (ALAC)                      Staff: B. Turcotte</p> <p>This CCWG is expected to deliver proposals that would enhance ICANN’s accountability towards all stakeholders. In Work Stream 1, it identified those mechanisms that must be in place or committed to before the IANA Stewardship Transition occurs. Currently, in Work Stream 2 it</p>	2016-Jun-26	June 2018	CCWG	<p>The CCWG-WS2 commenced work on Work Stream 2 (WS2) at ICANN56 (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). In May 2017, the GNSO Council validated the CCWG leadership’s request to its chartering organizations for an extension of the CCWG’s mandate and budget to continue its work into FY18 as it was not possible to deliver its Final Report as originally planned by the end of FY17. The CCWG is working towards final readings across all the sub-work streams, although it is anticipated some issues around Jurisdiction may continue into FY19. The CCWG will host a face to face in San Juan (9 March 2018) to continue its deliberations.</p>

### 4 – Working Group

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
is considering those mechanisms for which a timeline for implementation extends beyond the IANA Stewardship Transition.				
<p><a href="#">Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) in All gTLDs PDP</a>                      Co-Chair(s): Philip Corwin, J. Scott Evans, Kathy Kleiman                      Council Liaison: Paul McGrady                      Community Liaisons (to/from the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG): Robin Gross, Susan Payne                      Staff: M. Wong, J. Hedlund, A. Liang</p> <p>This WG 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 will be necessary, including to clarify and unify the policy goals.</p>	2011-Feb-03	Ongoing	WG	<p>On 28 February 2016, the GNSO Council voted to <a href="#">initiate</a> this Policy Development Process (PDP) and adopted a revised Working Group Charter in March (<a href="https://community.icann.org/x/2CWAaw">https://community.icann.org/x/2CWAaw</a>). 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 WG has completed an initial review of the Trademark Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution Procedure (TM-PDDRP), and much of the TMCH structure and operations. For the Sunrise and Trademark Claims RPMs, the GNSO Council approved an extensive data request in the form prescribed by the 2015 Data &amp; Metrics for Policy Making Working Group at its 20 September 2017 meeting. The WG has also agreed on a set of review questions concerning additional voluntary RPMs offered by some registry operators. The Request for Proposal for the Sunrise and Claims surveys was published on 29 January 2018 and is expected to close on 9 March 2018. Staff has begun compiling quantitative data on Sunrise registrations, Trademark Claims and Uniform Rapid Suspension filings to complement the surveys.</p> <p>In the interim, the WG has begun to review the Uniform Rapid Suspension procedure (URS) and has formed three additional Sub Teams to take on various aspects of this work.</p> <p>As a result of the time required to complete the full data collection effort, the WG is likely to be working on Phase 1 through early 2019.</p>
<p><a href="#">New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP</a>                      Co-Chair(s): Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Jeff Neuman                      Council Liaison: Paul McGrady                      Community Liaisons (to/from the RPM Review</p>	2014-Jun-25	Ongoing	WG	<p>The WG was chartered by the GNSO Council in January 2016 (<a href="https://community.icann.org/x/KAp1Aw">https://community.icann.org/x/KAp1Aw</a>). It has completed preliminary deliberations on a set of overarching topics. The WG has considered input received from the community on the overarching issues through Community Comment 1 and is developing proposals for further refinement and inclusion</p>



### 4 – Working Group

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p>PDP WG): Robin Gross, Susan Payne Community Liaison (to/from CCT-RT): Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez Staff: S. Chan, J. Hedlund, E. Barabas</p> <p>This WG is tasked with calling upon the community's collective experiences from the 2012 New gTLD Program round to determine what, if any changes may need to be made to the existing 2007 Introduction of New Generic Top-Level Domains policy recommendations. Those policy recommendations will remain in place for subsequent rounds unless modified via a PDP. The work of this WG follows the efforts of the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Discussion Group (DG), which identified a set of issues for a future PDP-WG to consider in their deliberations.</p>				<p>in the Initial Report. In addition, the WG's five Work Track (WT) Sub Teams continue to work to address the other 30+ topics identified in the WG's charter. The WG is nearing the end of a phase of work devoted to developing preliminary recommendations and/or options at the WT level, which will be integrated into the WG's Initial Report. The WG's goal is to complete its Initial Report and publish it for public comment in April 2018. This Report will focus on overarching subjects and topics covered by Work Tracks 1-4. Work Track 5, which addresses geographic names at the top level, was formed later than the other Work Tracks and recently began substantive deliberations. The Initial Report for Work Track 5 is planned for August 2018.</p>
<p><a href="#">PDP on the next generation gTLD Registration Directory Service to replace WHOIS</a> Chair: Chuck Gomes Vice-Chairs: David Cake, Michele Neylon, Alex Deacon, Marc Anderson Council liaison: Stephanie Perrin Staff: M. Konings, L. Phifer, C. Tubergen</p> <p>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</p>	2012-Nov-8	Ongoing	WG	<p>The PDP Working Group was chartered in November 2015 (<a href="https://community.icann.org/x/E4xlAw">https://community.icann.org/x/E4xlAw</a>) and first convened at the end of January 2016. The WG continues to refine its Work Plan (see <a href="https://community.icann.org/x/olxlAw">https://community.icann.org/x/olxlAw</a>). 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 <a href="#">the list of possible requirements</a> commenced at ICANN57 (Nov 2016). However, the WG decided to first focus on a number of <a href="#">key concepts</a> which are intended to facilitate the deliberations on the list of possible requirements. For ICANN61 (Mar 2018), the WG focused on purposes for which it formed seven drafting teams to</p>

### 4 – Working Group

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
these requirements?				further develop the purposes identified in the EWG Final Report. The WG is now continuing its deliberations on these purposes and related data elements. The WG tentative agreements achieved to date can be found here: <a href="https://community.icann.org/x/p4xlAw">https://community.icann.org/x/p4xlAw</a> , and an updated PDP WG newsletter has been published, and can be found here: <a href="https://community.icann.org/x/_RmOAw">https://community.icann.org/x/_RmOAw</a> .
<p><b><a href="#">Curative Rights Protections for IGO/INGOs PDP</a></b>                      Co-Chair(s): Philip Corwin, Petter Rindforth                      Council Liaison: Susan Kawaguchi                      Staff: M. Wong, S. Chan</p> <p>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.</p>	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 ( <a href="https://community.icann.org/x/77rhAg">https://community.icann.org/x/77rhAg</a> ). 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's preliminary recommendations and its Initial Report were published for public comment on 20 January 2017 (see <a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/igo-ingo-crp-access-initial-2017-01-20-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/igo-ingo-crp-access-initial-2017-01-20-en</a> ). The WG modified certain initial recommendations as a result of the comments received. It is currently considering a remaining recommendation to deal with IGO jurisdictional immunity and registrants' rights to file court proceedings. Based on concerns raised by several WG members, the group is also discussing appropriate methods to determine consensus on this final issue. The WG will seek to finalize its recommendations and Final Report as soon as possible.
<p><b><a href="#">Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance (CCWG-IG)</a></b>                      Co-Chairs: Rafik Dammak (GNSO), Young-Eum Lee (ccNSO), Olivier Crepin-Leblond (ALAC)                      GNSO Council Liaison: Tatiana Tropina                      Staff: N. Hickson (GSE)</p> <p>This CCWG was established by the participating</p>	2014-Oct-15	Ongoing	CCWG	The GNSO Council adopted the charter ( <a href="https://community.icann.org/x/lQlnAw">https://community.icann.org/x/lQlnAw</a> ) for this CCWG in October 2014. The Council confirmed a subsequent question from the CCWG on interpretation of its charter at its May 2015 meeting. At ICANN57 (Nov. 2016) in Hyderabad, the Council decided to request that the CCWG propose refinements to its Charter before ICANN58 (Mar. 2017), including consideration of alternative mechanisms to a CCWG for continuing its work. The CCWG provided an update and a revised Charter just prior to ICANN58 (Mar. 2018). The Council

### 4 – Working Group

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p>SO/ACs to coordinate, facilitate, and increase the participation of the ICANN community in discussions and processes pertaining to Internet Governance.</p>				<p>discussed the CCWG’s report at a number of meetings, and met with the Board’s Working Group on Internet Governance at ICANN59 (Jun. 2017) in Johannesburg to more fully understand the need for, appropriate scope of, and best mechanism for continuing Internet governance discussions in an ICANN context. Having previously deferred voting on whether or not to continue as a Chartering Organization for the CCWG, possibly under a revised Charter, the Council resolved, at its meeting on 24 August 2017, to request that the CCWG develop a revised framework that will address the Council’s concerns more directly by the Council’s February 2018 meeting. In the expectation that a replacement structure will be ready for Council adoption by ICANN61 (Mar. 2018), the Council also resolved to withdraw as a chartering organization for the CCWG at the conclusion of the ICANN61 (Mar. 2018) meeting. The CCWG-IG submitted a proposal for an Internet Governance Engagement Group for review and discussion for its 22 February 2018 meeting. The Council is expected to further discuss the proposed charter for the engagement group during its meeting on 14 March 2018 at ICANN61.</p>

5 – Council Deliberation				
Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
- None -				

### 6 – Board Vote

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p><a href="#">GNSO Rights &amp; Obligations under Revised ICANN Bylaws Drafting Team (DT) Recommendations</a></p> <p>Chair: Steve DelBianco Staff: M. Wong, J. Hedlund, M. Konings</p> <p>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.</p>	2016-Jun-30	June 2018	Board	On 30 January 2018, the GNSO Council adopted the revised GNSO Operating Procedures and recommended to the ICANN Board the modification of the ICANN Bylaws to include a set of additional GNSO voting thresholds in relation to the post-transition roles and responsibilities of the GNSO as a member of the Empowered Community. These proposed changes to the ICANN Bylaws will need to be posted for public comment prior to ICANN Board consideration. The ICANN Board is expected to consider during its meeting on 15 March 2018 at ICANN61 to direct staff to post the proposed additions to the ICANN Bylaws for public comment.
<p><a href="#">Protection of International Organization Names in All gTLDs PDP</a></p> <p>Chair: Thomas Rickert Council liaison: Keith Drazek Staff: M. Wong, S. Chan, B. Cobb</p> <p>This WG was tasked 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).</p>	2012-Apr-12	Ongoing	Board/ Council	<p>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 (<a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-30apr14-en.htm#2.a">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-30apr14-en.htm#2.a</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).</p> <p>For those policy recommendations that are inconsistent with GAC advice, the Board passed a number of resolutions in 2013 and 2014 (see e.g. <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2013-07-17-en#1.a">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2013-07-17-en#1.a</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.</p> <p>At ICANN57 (Nov. 2016) in Hyderabad, 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 ICANN58 (Mar. 2017) in Copenhagen and were moderated by former Board member Bruce Tonkin based on a set of</p>

### 6 – Board Vote

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
				<p>Problem Statements and Briefing Papers reviewed by the parties.</p> <p><b>Next steps on IGO acronyms protections:</b> Further discussions relating to possible next steps for protecting IGO acronyms may take place following receipt by the Council of the final recommendations from the IGO-INGO Curative Rights PDP.</p> <p><b>Next steps on Red Cross names</b> See above (under Section 4: Working Group) for updates on the reconvened PDP on this topic.</p>
<p><a href="#">Geo Regions Review Community-wide Working Group</a> Chair: Cheryl Langdon-Orr (ccNSO/APRALO) Staff: M. Wong</p> <p>This Board-chartered cross community WG has consulted with ICANN stakeholders regarding the definition and applications of ICANN’s Geographic Regions.</p>	2008-Aug-07	TBC	Board	<p>A community Public Comment opportunity has been established for this matter (see <a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/geo-regions-2015-12-23-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/geo-regions-2015-12-23-en</a>. The comment period closed on 24 April 2016 and 7 submissions were received. The staff report of public comments was published (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-geo-regions-13may16-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-geo-regions-13may16-en.pdf</a>) and the Board is now expected to review the comments received and consider next steps.</p>

### 7 – Implementation

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p><b>GNSO Review Working Group</b>                      Chair: Jennifer Wolfe                      Vice-Chair: Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen                      Council Liaison: Rafik Dammak                      Staff: J. Hedlund, E. Barabas</p> <p>This WG was tasked to develop an implementation plan for the GNSO Review recommendations (<a href="http://gns0.icann.org/en/drafts/review-feasibility-prioritization-25feb16-en.pdf">http://gns0.icann.org/en/drafts/review-feasibility-prioritization-25feb16-en.pdf</a>) which have been <u>adopted</u> by the ICANN Board.</p>	2016-Jul-21	Ongoing	WG	The GNSO Council adopted the WG Charter ( <a href="http://gns0.icann.org/en/drafts/gns0-review-charter-11jul16-en.pdf">http://gns0.icann.org/en/drafts/gns0-review-charter-11jul16-en.pdf</a> ) 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 ( <a href="https://gns0.icann.org/en/drafts/review-implementation-recommendations-plan-21nov16-en.pdf">https://gns0.icann.org/en/drafts/review-implementation-recommendations-plan-21nov16-en.pdf</a> ). On 15 December the GNSO Council unanimously approved the proposed plan. The Board's Organizational Effectiveness Committee (OEC) reviewed the plan and recommended it to the Board for adoption. The Board accepted the recommendations at its 3 February 2017 meeting, and requested that the Working Group provide updates to the OEC every six months through implementation. The Working Group submitted an update on its implementation progress to the OEC of the ICANN Board and to the GNSO Council at ICANN60 (Oct. 2017) in which it agreed by full consensus that all recommendations for Phase 1 and Phase 2 have been implemented. The Working Group is meeting bi-weekly and has begun work on Phase 3 recommendations. In addition, the WG responded to the OEC concerning questions relating to its implementation progress report. The Working Group has provided a written update to the GNSO Council prior to ICANN61 (Mar. 2017).
<p><b><u><a href="#">Privacy &amp; Proxy Services Accreditation Issues PDP Recommendations</a></u></b>                      Council Liaison: Darcy Southwell                      IRT Support Staff: Amy Bivins (GDD)</p> <p>The <i>Registrar Accreditation Agreement</i> (RAA), the contract governing the relationship between ICANN and accredited registrars, has been in place since 2001. 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</p>	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 ( <a href="https://gns0.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#201601">https://gns0.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#201601</a> ). 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 ( <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-08-09-en#2.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-08-09-en#2.e</a> ). An IRT was formed and is being led by Amy Bivins of GDD.

### 7 – Implementation

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p>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 &amp; proxy services and their accreditation, were examined in a PDP. This IRT was formed to implement the PDP recommendations approved by the ICANN Board.</p>				<p>The IRT 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 IRT is completing its review of the draft accreditation agreement, application, and de-accreditation process, with the option to post these materials for public comment shortly after ICANN61.</p> <p>Per the GNSO Council’s motion of 30 November 2017, the PPSAI IRT will consider the issue of privacy/proxy registrations and IRTP Part C as outlined in the annex to the GNSO Council letter (see <a href="https://gnso.icann.org/en/correspondence/bladel-to-crocker-01dec16-en.pdf">https://gnso.icann.org/en/correspondence/bladel-to-crocker-01dec16-en.pdf</a>) and put forward recommendations for implementation that are consistent with the IRTP Part C policy recommendations as well as the PPSAI policy recommendations.</p> <p>The PPSAI IRT will undertake this work only after the upcoming PPSAI IRT comment period, and if it appears as though this will cause any significant or unreasonable delay in implementation of privacy/proxy service accreditation implementation, the GNSO Council Liaison will alert the Council.</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>Translation/Transliteration of Internationalized Registration Data PDP Recommendations</u></a>            Council Liaison: Rubens Kuhl            IRT Support Staff: Brian Aitchison (GDD)</p> <p>The PDP addressed two primary issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whether it is desirable to translate contact information to a single common language or transliterate contact information to a single common script; and</li> </ol>	2012-Oct-17	Ongoing	Staff/IRT	<p>On 28 September 2015 the ICANN Board approved the adoption of all seven recommendations contained in the Final Report from the PDP Working Group (<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2015-09-28-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2015-09-28-en</a>). An Implementation Review Team (IRT) was formed and a draft implementation plan shared with the IRT, which met for its first meeting on 19 July 2016.</p> <p>As of November 2016, the IRT is engaged in discussions around language and script tags, which appear to be a minimum requirement to meet the standards set by the PDP recommendations.</p> <p>The IRT held its 12th call on 8 June 2017. The team continues to discuss the details of implementing language and script tags. The team discussed the</p>



### 7 – Implementation

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p>2. Who should bear the burden translating contact information to a single common language or transliterating contact information to a single common script?</p> <p>This IRT was formed to implement the final PDP recommendations as approved by the ICANN Board.</p>				<p>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 questions focus on whether the T/T recommendations mandate that ALL new registration data be tagged with the languages and scripts in use by a registrant, how the implementation should ultimately be carried out (eg: Should the implementation date be coordinated with the operationalization of RDAP? Should it be "pilot tested" along with RDAP? Should it be referred to the Next Gen RDS PDP?). Once the above questions are answered, a policy language document will be developed for IRT review and eventually public comment.</p> <p>The timeline for the implementation of the T/T Recommendations is now indeterminate due to the indeterminate nature of the RDAP roll-out, which is the minimum requirement to implement the T/T policy recommendations.</p>
<p><b>Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) Part C Recommendations</b></p> <p>Council Liaison: Rubens Kuhl IRT Support Staff: Caitlin Tubergen (GDD)</p> <p>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.</p>	17 Oct 2012	Ongoing	Board / Staff	<p>The ICANN Board adopted the IRTP Part C recommendations at its meeting in December 2012 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-20dec12-en.htm#2.a">https://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-20dec12-en.htm#2.a</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 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2-2015-09-24-en">https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2-2015-09-24-en</a>). Following community feedback, an updated version of the Transfer Policy was announced on 1 June 2016 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2016-06-01-en">https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2016-06-01-en</a>). The updated version of the Transfer Policy was effective 1 December 2016.</p> <p>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</p>

### 7 – Implementation

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
				<p>referred to the PPSAI IRT for consideration before the Policy effective date (<a href="https://gns0.icann.org/en/correspondence/bladel-to-crocker-01dec16-en.pdf">https://gns0.icann.org/en/correspondence/bladel-to-crocker-01dec16-en.pdf</a>). 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 (<a href="https://gns0.icann.org/en/correspondence/crocker-to-bladel-21dec16-en.pdf">https://gns0.icann.org/en/correspondence/crocker-to-bladel-21dec16-en.pdf</a>). 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. A motion to refer the matter to the PPSAI IRT has been submitted for Council consideration at its 30 November meeting.</p> <p>The PPSAI IRT, per the GNSO Council’s motion of 30 November 2017, will review the outstanding IRTP-C issue after the upcoming PPSAI IRT comment period.</p>
<p><b>Thick WHOIS PDP Recommendations</b>                      Council Liaison: Susan Kawaguchi                      IRT Support Staff: Dennis Chang (GDD)</p> <p>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.</p>	2012-Mar-14	2019-Feb-01	IRT / Staff / Council	<p>The ICANN Board approved the GNSO recommendations on Thick Whois at its meeting on 7 February 2014 (<a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-07feb14-en.htm">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-07feb14-en.htm</a>). 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.</p> <p>The work streams have resulted in two policies and <a href="#">published</a> on 1 February 2017: 1) <a href="#">Thick Whois Consensus Policy Requiring Consistent Labeling and Display of RDDS (WHOIS) Output for All gTLDs</a> and 2) <a href="#">the Proposed Implementation of GNSO Thick RDDS (WHOIS) Transition Policy for .COM, .NET and .JOBS</a>.</p> <p>The Consistent Labelling and Display of RDDS Output for All gTLDs policy has</p>

### 7 – Implementation

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
				<p>completed implementation with the policy effective date of 1 August 2017.</p> <p>The transition from Thin to Thick for .JOBS continues as planned.</p> <p>For .COM and .NET, Verisign, the registry operator, has proposed changes to its Registry-Registrar Agreement (RRA) to accept Thick WHOIS data. However, Verisign and RrSG hit an impasse when they could not agree on RRA proposed by Verisign. During its meeting on 29 October 2017 the ICANN Board adopted a resolution to defer enforcement of the policy (see <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-10-29-en#2.b">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-10-29-en#2.b</a>). This effectively allows additional 180 days for implementation before enforcement takes effect.</p>

Other				
Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p><b>GNSO Standing Committee on ICANN Budget and Operating Plan (SCBO)</b>                      Chair: Ayden Ferdeline                      Council Liaison: Heather Forrest                      Staff: M. Konings, S. Chan, B. Cobb</p> <p>The SCBO is tasked to assist the GNSO with providing information and possible comments to ICANN's Budget and Strategic Operating Plan.</p>	2017-09-12	Ongoing	SCBO	The SCBO's interim charter was adopted by the GNSO Council at the December 2017 GNSO Council meeting. The standing committee has reviewed the ICANN FY19 Draft Budget and Operating Plan that is now available for <a href="#">public comment</a> . The SCBO has a working draft that was sent to the Council for their consideration and eventual submission to the comment forum on March 8 <sup>th</sup> . After which, the SCBO and Council will review the Council comment and effort and suggest changes to the charter should the standing committee be continued.
<p><b><a href="#">GNSO Standing Selection Committee (SSC)</a></b>                      Chair: Susan Kawaguchi                      Vice-Chair: Maxim Alzoba                      Staff: M. Konings, E. Barabas</p> <p>The SSC is tasked to assist with the selection of GNSO representatives to future Review Teams, including for the various reviews mandated by the ICANN Bylaws, and other ICANN structures for which the GNSO will need to appoint, nominate or endorse candidates.</p>	2017-Mar-15	Ongoing	SSC	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 (Mar. 2017). The SSC is currently conducting a review of its charter and 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. The SSC recently completed a selection process to fill a vacancy on the Second Security, Stability, and Resiliency of the DNS Review Team (SSR2-RT). The GNSO Council confirmed the selection and nominated the candidate during its meeting on 22 February 2018.
<p><b><a href="#">Consumer Choice Competition and Trust Review Team</a></b>                      Chair: Jonathan Zuck                      Staff: Eleeza Agopian, Brian Aitchison (GDD)</p> <p>This Review Team was formed in Nov. 2015 to examine the extent to which the introduction or expansion of gTLDs has promoted</p>	2015-Feb-12	2018-Mar-31	Review Team	Under its <a href="#">bylaws</a> , 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

Other				
Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
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.				<p>consumer choice, as well as the effectiveness of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The application and evaluation process</li> <li>• Safeguards put in place to mitigate issues involved in the introduction or expansion</li> </ul> <p>The CCT-RT is currently developing its final report for delivery to the ICANN Board. The updated report will contain additional sections including results from a new generic top-level domain (gTLD) <a href="#">cost impact survey</a> and the <a href="#">Statistical Analysis of Domain Name System (DNS) Abuse in gTLDs Final Report</a>. The CCT-RT has produced its <a href="#">Report of Public comments</a> on new sections and revised recommendations. It is now working towards its final report.</p>
<p><b>Expired Registration Recovery Policy – Policy Review (ERRP-PR)</b> Staff: M. Konings</p>	FY18	TBD	Staff	<p>The ERRP Consensus Policy became effective 31 Aug 2013 as a result of <a href="#">adopted</a> recommendations produced from the GNSO’s <a href="#">Post Expiration Domain Name Recovery (PEDNR)</a> 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. <a href="#">One recommendation</a> from the WG requested monitoring and follow-up:</p> <p><a href="#">Recommendation #18</a>: 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 post expiration related matters or in the form of audits that assess if the policy has been implemented as intended.</p> <p>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.</p>
<b>Transfer Emergency Action Contact – Policy</b>	FY18	TBD	Staff	The TEAC became a part of the IRTP Consensus Policy on 1 Jun 2012 as a

Other				
Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p><b>Review (TEAC-PR)</b> Staff: M. Konings</p>				<p>result of <a href="#">adopted</a> recommendations produced from the GNSO's <a href="#">Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy – Part B (IRTP-B) PDP WG</a>. That WG produced a series of recommendations based on issues around domain hijacking, urgent returns of inappropriately transferred names and lock status. As a part of the WG's <a href="#">first recommendation</a>, it requested an follow-up review of the TEAC:</p> <p>“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.”</p> <p>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.</p>
<p><b>Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP-PR)</b> Staff: M. Konings</p>	FY18-FY19	TBD	GNSO Council	<p>Final modifications to the <a href="#">Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy</a> were implemented 1 Dec 2016 as a result of the final PDP WG, IRTP-D, which were <a href="#">adopted</a> by the GNSO Council. That WG produced a series of recommendations after deliberating on issues on the use of the EPP AuthInfo Code, FOAs, and penalties for policy violations. The WG’s <a href="#">final two recommendations</a> suggest that data be collected and an eventual review of the entire IRTP be conducted:</p> <p>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</p>

Other				
Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
				<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The GNSO Council received <a href="#">a letter</a> from Jennifer Gore, GDD Staff, with proposed next steps to commence the review. The Council is expected to consider the proposed approach in further detail during its meeting on 14 March 2018.</p>
<p><b>Policy &amp; Implementation Recommendations Review (Pollmp-RR)</b> Staff: M. Konings</p>	FY20	TBD	GNSO Council	<p>The GNSO Council adopted the Pollmp WG’s recommendations in June of 2015 with the Board approving the necessary changes to Bylaws Article X, section 3-9 and to Annex A for the newly defined procedures. The results of this effort can be found in the <a href="#">GNSO Operating Procedures</a>. As part of the Council’s resolution a review is to take place:</p> <p><i>“The GNSO Council recommends that a review of these recommendations is carried out at the latest five years following their implementation to assess whether the recommendations have achieved what they set out to do and/or whether any further enhancements or changes are needed.”</i></p>