



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	Cros 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 PDP (THICK-WHOIS)	LINK
7 - Implementation	PDP: Protection of International Organization Names in All gTLDs (IGO-INGO)	LINK

Phase	Title	Links
Other	Consumer Choice Competition and Trust Review Team (CCT-RT)	LINK

Last updated: 9 February 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
<p>New gTLD Auction Proceeds Cross-Community Working Group (CCWG) Co-Chairs: Ching Chiao (ccNSO); Jonathan Robinson (GNSO) Staff: M. Konings, 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 new gTLD Program established ICANN auctions of last resort as a mechanism to resolve string contention. Most string contentions (approximately 90% of sets scheduled for ICANN auction) have been resolved through other means before reaching an auction conducted by ICANN's authorized auction service provider, Power Auctions LLC. However, it was recognized from the outset that significant funds could accrue as a result of several auctions. As such, these auction proceeds have been reserved and earmarked until the Board authorizes a plan for the appropriate use of the funds. Board, staff, and community are expected to be working together in designing and participating in the next steps addressing the use of new gTLD auction proceeds. The GNSO, ccNSO, ASO, RSSAC, SSAC, GAC and ALAC have now all adopted the Charter (https://community.icann.org/x/DJjDAw). The CCWG held its first meeting on 26 January 2017 and agreed to meet every two weeks. The CCWG will now focus on the development of its work plan as well as an assessment of the skills and expertise that it expects to need to complete its work.</p> <p>Jonathan Robinson has informed the GNSO Council Leadership Team that he will be stepping down from Chairing this group and a search is now underway for a new GNSO Co-Chair.</p>
<p>Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability Co-Chairs: Mathieu Weill (ccNSO), Thomas Rickert (GNSO), Leon Sanchez (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 2017	CCWG	<p>The CCWG-WS2 commenced work on Work Stream 2 (WS2) at ICANN56 in June 2016. It will address 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).</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>Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) in All gTLDs PDP</p> <p>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</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	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). Sub Teams were formed concurrently to perform data gathering and to clarify the Charter questions for the WG's review of the Trademark Clearing House (TMCH). The WG wrapped up its initial review of the TM-PDDRP at ICANN57. It is currently reviewing the TMCH and may use Sub Teams to scope out and refine the Charter questions for its upcoming review of the Sunrise and Claims services offered through the TMCH. The WG expects to be working on Phase 1 through late/end 2017.

4 – Working Group

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p>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</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>	2014-Jun-25	2015-Dec	WG	<p>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 WG and WTs are working to develop a second Community Comment related to the WTs topics, with a target of distributing CC2 prior to ICANN58.</p> <p>On 25 October 2016, the GNSO Council sent a Council response (https://gns0.icann.org/en/correspondence/gns0-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://gns0.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.</p>
<p>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</p> <p>The WG is tasked to provide the GNSO Council with recommendations on the following two</p>	2012-Nov-8	Ongoing	WG	<p>The PDP Working Group was chartered in November 2015 (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/olxlAw). Most recently, 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</p>

4 – Working Group				
Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p>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?</p>				<p>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. At the same time, the WG has compiled a RDS statement of purpose, which it may need to review at a later point in time depending on the outcome of the deliberations.</p>
<p>Curative Rights Protections for IGO/INGOs PDP 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	<p>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 has been reviewed and incorporated into its preliminary recommendations by the WG.</p> <p>The WG has also reviewed the IGO Small Group Proposal (see https://gns0.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), with the public comment period set to close on 1 March 2017.</p>
<p>Cross-Community Working Group to develop a framework for the use of Country and Territory names as TLDs (CWG-UCTN) GNSO Council Co-Chairs: Heather Forrest, Carlos Gutierrez</p>	2014-Mar-26	Ongoing	CCWG	<p>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 proposal on 3-character codes was presented and discussed during ICANN55 in Marrakech in March 2016 (https://community.icann.org/x/4xXxAg). At</p>

4 – Working Group

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p>ccNSO Council Co-Chairs: Paul Szyndler, Annabeth Lange Council liaison: Heather Forrest Staff: B. Boswinkel, J. Braeken, S. Chan, E. Barabas</p> <p>The objective of the CCWG is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 				<p>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 is being further revised based on feedback received in Hyderabad and will be published for public comment once completed. Communication channels with the GAC remain open regarding potentially overlapping work efforts.</p>
<p><u>Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance (CCWG-IG)</u> Co-Chairs: Rafik Dammak (GNSO), Jordan Carter (ccNSO), Olivier Crepin-Leblond (ALAC) GNSO Council Liaison: Carlos Gutierrez Staff: A-R Inne, N. Hickson, R. Dewulf</p> <p>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 Internet Governance.</p>	2014-Oct-15	Ongoing	CCWG	<p>The GNSO Council adopted the charter (https://community.icann.org/x/IQlnAw) 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://gns0.icann.org/en/meetings/minutes-council-21may15-en.htm). The CCWG co-chairs provided an update to the ccNSO and GNSO Councils at ICANN55 and ICANN56. 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 2018, including consideration of alternative mechanisms to a CCWG for continuing its work.</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>Protection of International Organization Names in All gTLDs PDP Chair: Thomas Rickert Council liaison: Keith Drazek Staff: M. Wong, S. Chan, B. Cobb</p> <p>This WG was tasked to 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	2014-Dec-11	Board/ Council/IRT	<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 (http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-30apr14-en.htm#2.a). An Implementation Review Team (IRT) has been 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). The IRT is currently meeting regularly to finalize proposed text for a Consensus Policy on these adopted recommendations.</p> <p>As requested by the Board, in March 2014 the Board’s New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC) developed a proposal for dealing with the remaining recommendations, taking into account the GNSO’s recommendations and GAC advice. On 16 June 2014 the NGPC sent a letter to the GNSO Council requesting that the GNSO contemplate initiating a process to consider possible modifications to its remaining recommendations, per the PDP Manual (https://gns0.icann.org/en/correspondence/chalaby-to-robinson-16jun14-en.pdf). Following a discussion with Chris Disspain, the Council sent a letter (http://gns0.icann.org/en/correspondence/robinson-to-chalaby-disspain-07oct14-en.pdf) on 7 Oct 2014 to the NGPC seeking confirmation and input about the most appropriate forms of protection for IGO acronyms and Red Cross names. Through various resolutions passed in 2013 and 2014 (see e.g. https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2013-07-17-en#1.a), the Board resolved 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 until the differences between the GNSO recommendations and the GAC advice have been reconciled.</p> <p>The NGPC responded to the Council on 15 January 2015 noting that discussions are ongoing regarding the remaining recommendations (https://gns0.icann.org/en/correspondence/chalaby-to-robinson-15jan15-en.pdf).</p>

6 – Board Vote

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
				<p>Regarding IGO protections, a small group of IGO, GAC and NGPC representatives was formed in late 2014 to develop a final proposal on IGO acronyms for the GAC's and GNSO's consideration. The IGO Small Group Proposal was forwarded by the Board to the Council on 6 October 2016 (see https://gns0.icann.org/en/correspondence/crocker-icann-board-to-council-chairs-04oct16-en.pdf) with a request that the GNSO Council consider the proposal.</p> <p>Regarding the Red Cross, representatives from the Red Cross provided a briefing to the Council during the Council's April 2016 meeting. On 31 May, the Council sent a further letter to the Board requesting updated Board input on the remaining Red Cross names and IGO acronyms (see https://gns0.icann.org/en/correspondence/council-chairs-to-crocker-icann-board-06jun16-en.pdf). It also discussed the matter of Red Cross and IGO acronyms protection with Board members during ICANN56 in Helsinki in June.</p> <p>On 27 October 2016 a call (see http://tinyurl.com/hubz9qo) was held among Board, GAC and GNSO representatives on this topic, to discuss next steps. Further discussions took place at Hyderabad in November, where the Board proposed that the GAC and GNSO enter into a facilitated dialogue to try to resolve the outstanding issues. An initial organizational call was held with Bruce Tonkin, the designated facilitator, attended by GAC and GNSO leadership. The first facilitated dialogue on the Red Cross issue is expected to occur in late February, with further discussions (including on IGO acronyms) to occur at ICANN58. Both the GAC and GNSO have nominated representatives to take part in these discussions, which will be based on a set of Problem Statements and Briefing Papers to be agreed among the parties.</p>
<p>Geo Regions Review Community-wide Working Group Chair: Cheryl Langdon-Orr (ccNSO/APRALO) GNSO Council Reps:</p>	2008-Aug-07	TBC	Board	<p>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</p>

6 – Board Vote

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p>Staff: R. Hoggarth</p> <p>This Board-chartered cross community WG has consulted with ICANN stakeholders regarding the definition and applications of ICANN’s Geographic Regions.</p>				<p>(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.</p>

7 – Implementation

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p>GNSO Review Working Group Chair: Jennifer Wolfe Vice-Chair: Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen Council Liaison: Rafik Dammak Staff: J. Hedlund, M. Konings</p> <p>This WG was tasked to develop an implementation plan for the GNSO Review recommendations (http://gns0.icann.org/en/drafts/review-feasibility-prioritization-25feb16-en.pdf) which have been adopted by the ICANN Board.</p>	2016-Jul-21	ICANN57	Council	The GNSO Council adopted the WG Charter (http://gns0.icann.org/en/drafts/gns0-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://gns0.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.
<p><u>GNSO Rights & Obligations under Revised ICANN Bylaws Drafting Team (DT) Recommendations</u> Chair: Steve DelBianco Vice-Chair: Amr Elsadr 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	Late 2016	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://gns0.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://gns0.icann.org/en/drafts/bylaws-drafting-team-final-report-12oct16-en.pdf , with minority statements available at https://gns0.icann.org/en/drafts/bylaws-drafting-team-minority-report-10oct16-en.pdf). On 13 October, the GNSO Council agreed to defer consideration of the motion to approve the DT’s report to its meeting at ICANN57 in Hyderabad in November, where it agreed to further defer consideration to its meeting on 1 December 2016.

7 – Implementation

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
				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 is currently working on developing a proposal for implementation.
<p>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</p> <p>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.</p>	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.
<p>Recommendations from the GAC-GNSO Consultation Group (CG) on GAC Early Engagement in GNSO PDPs Co-Chairs: Jonathan Robinson (GNSO) and Manal Ismail (GAC) Staff: M. Konings, O. Nordling</p> <p>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</p>	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, 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

7 – Implementation

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
Development Process and to improve overall cooperation between the two bodies (for example, by exploring the option of a liaison).				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 a proposed implementation plan to the GNSO Council as well as GAC leadership team for review and input.
<p>Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues PDP Recommendations Council Liaison: Darcy Southwell IRT Support Staff: Amy Bivins</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 RAA was approved by the Board in June 2013, thereby signifying that the RAA negotiations were concluded. Per the Board’s 2011 request, the remaining issues, which were identified as those relating to privacy & proxy services and their accreditation, were examined in a PDP. This IRT was formed to implement the PDP recommendations approved by the ICANN Board.</p>	2009-May-21	Ongoing	Staff/IRT	<p>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://gns0.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.</p> <p>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 has been formed to review a proposed framework to be developed by the GAC’s Public Safety Working Group (PSWG) in relation to privacy and proxy services’ handling of law enforcement requests (the goal is to have a document ready to review before ICANN58 in March).</p>
<p>Translation/Transliteration of Internationalized Registration Data PDP Recommendations Council Liaison: Amr Elsadr</p>	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 (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2015-09-28-en). An Implementation Review Team (IRT) was formed and a draft implementation</p>

7 – Implementation

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p>IRT Support Staff: Brian Aitchison</p> <p>The PDP addressed two primary issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Whether it is desirable to translate contact information to a single common language or transliterate contact information to a single common script; and Who should bear the burden translating contact information to a single common language or transliterating contact information to a single common script? <p>This IRT was formed to implement the final PDP recommendations as approved by the ICANN Board.</p>				<p>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 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. However, this timeline is dependent on the roll-out of the new Registration Data Access Protocol (RDAP).</p>
<p>Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) Part C Recommendations</p> <p>Council Liaison: Rubens Kuhl IRT Support Staff: Caitlin Tubergen</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	1 Sept 2015	Board / Staff	<p>The ICANN Board adopted the IRTP Part C recommendations at its meeting in 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.</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
				referred to the PPSAI IRT for consideration before the Policy effective date (https://gns0.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://gns0.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.
<p>Thick WHOIS PDP Recommendations Council Liaison: Amr Elsadr IRT Support Staff: Dennis Chang</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	Ongoing	IRT / Staff / Council	<p>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.</p> <p>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 February 2017.</p> <p>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</p>

7 – Implementation

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
				<p>https://gns0.icann.org/en/correspondence/irt-to-gns0-council-15dec16-en.pdf. The Council discussed the IRT's letter at its meeting on 19 January 2017. A draft request to update the legal review to reflect the latest developments has been circulated to the Council mailing list for further discussion.</p>

7 – Implementation

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p>Protection of International Organization Names in All gTLDs Council Liaison: Keith Drazek IRT Support Staff: Dennis Chang</p> <p>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.</p>	2012-Apr-12	Ongoing	Staff/IRT	<p>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.</p> <p>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 IRT is continuing to discuss finalizing the draft Consensus Policy language.</p>

Other				
Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p>Consumer Choice Competition and Trust Review Team</p> <p>Chair: Jonathan Zuck Staff: Eleeza Agopian, Margie Milam, Brian Aitchison</p> <p>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.</p>	2015-Feb-12	2017-Dec-31	Review Team	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application and evaluation process • Safeguards put in place to mitigate issues involved in the introduction or expansion <p>The Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice (CCT-RT) was formed in November 2015. The CCT-RT expects to publish its first draft report mid-February and launch a public comment in April.</p>