



**Generic Names Supporting Organization Council  
Pending Projects List**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS** (click on the link below to go directly to the project in this list).  
Projects are listed in the order in which they were initiated.

<b>GNSO Working Groups / Work Teams / Drafting Teams</b>	<b>Abbreviation</b>
<a href="#">GNSO Improvements Standing Committee on Improvement Implementation</a>	SCI
<a href="#">Synthesis of WHOIS Service Requirements – Survey Working Group</a>	WHO2
<a href="#">Drafting Team on Cross-Community Working Groups</a>	CWG-DT
<a href="#">Outreach Task Force Drafting Team</a>	OTF-DT
<a href="#">Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part C PDP</a>	IRTP Part C
<a href="#">Working Group to develop metrics for Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice</a>	CCTC
<a href="#">Fake Renewal Notices Drafting Team</a>	FRN-DT
<a href="#">Locking of a domain name subject to UDRP proceedings</a>	
<a href="#">Protection of Red Cross/IOC names for the New gTLD Program</a>	RC-IOC

<b>Other GNSO Activities</b>	<b>Abbreviation</b>
<a href="#">WHOIS Studies</a>	WHO1
<a href="#">Web Design (from Community Communications Team)</a>	CCT
<a href="#">Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy (COMPLETED FOR NOW)</a>	UDRP
<a href="#">Creation of non-binding best practices to help registrars and registries address the abusive registrations of domain names</a>	BP-RAP
<a href="#">Registrar Accreditation Agreement</a>	RAA
<a href="#">‘Thick’ WHOIS Policy Development Process</a>	Thick WHOIS
<a href="#">Meta Issue – Uniformity of Reporting</a>	UoR
<a href="#">Uniformity of Contracts Issue Report</a>	UoC

<b>Joint SO/AC Working Groups</b>	<b>Abbreviation</b>
<a href="#">Geo Regions Review Community-wide Working Group</a>	GEO
<a href="#">Joint ccNSO-GNSO Internationalized Domain Names Working Group (JIG)</a>	JIG
<a href="#">SSAC-GNSO Internationalized Registration Data Working Group</a>	IRD



**Generic Names Supporting Organization Council  
Pending Projects List**

---

<a href="#">Joint Security and Stability Analysis Community Drafting Group (DNS Cert)</a>	DSSA
<a href="#">ccNSO Study Group on the Use of Names for Countries and Territories</a>	NCTSG

<b>Approved GNSO PDP Recommendations</b>	<b>Abbreviation</b>
<a href="#">IRTP Part B Adopted Recommendations</a>	IRTP Part B
<a href="#">PEDNR Adopted Recommendations</a>	PEDNR

<b>Outstanding Recommendations for Council Action</b>	<b>Abbreviation</b>
<a href="#">Registration Abuse Policies Final Report Remaining Recommendations</a>	RAP-REC



**Generic Names Supporting Organization Council  
Pending Projects List**

Last updated: 27 April 2012

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

<b>GNSO Working Groups / Work Teams / Drafting Teams</b>				
<b>Description</b>	<b>Initiated</b>	<b>Target Date</b>	<b>Who holds Token</b>	<b>Pending action/status</b>
<p><a href="#"><u>GNSO Standing Committee on Improvements Implementation (SCI)</u></a>            Chair: Wolf-Ulrich Knoben            Vice-Chair: Avri Doria            Staff: M. Konings</p> <p>The GNSO Standing Committee on Improvement Implementation (SCI) reviews and assesses the effective functioning of recommendations related to GNSO Improvements that have been approved by the Council.</p>	2011-Apr-07	Ongoing	SC	<p><a href="#"><u>The SCI is working on the following topics:</u></a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <a href="#"><u>WG Survey</u></a></li> <li>- <a href="#"><u>Consent Agenda</u></a></li> <li>- <a href="#"><u>Deferral of Motions</u></a></li> <li>- <a href="#"><u>Voting thresholds for delaying a PDP</u></a></li> <li>- <a href="#"><u>Proxy voting procedures</u></a></li> <li>- <a href="#"><u>Update of GNSO Council Voting Results Table</u></a></li> </ul> <p><a href="#"><u>The SCI is considering tackling these issues by using sub-teams and will discuss this in further detail at its next meeting on 3 May.</u></a></p>
<p><a href="#"><u>Synthesis of WHOIS Service Requirements – Survey Working Group</u></a>            Chair: Michael Young            Staff: B. Cobb            Liaison: Wendy Seltzer</p> <p>In May 2009 the GNSO Council asked staff to collect and organize a comprehensive list of potential WHOIS service requirements, based on current policies and previous policy discussions. See: <a href="http://gnso.icann.org/issues/whois/whois-service-requirements-final-report-29jul10-en.pdf"><u>http://gnso.icann.org/issues/whois/whois-service-requirements-final-report-29jul10-en.pdf</u></a> This report was completed in 2010 and in May 2011 the GNSO Council created a WG to develop a survey to estimate the level of agreement that the conclusions and assumptions in the Inventory Report have in the community.</p>	2009 May-7	ongoing	Working Group	<p>The WG is meeting every two weeks and is targeting May 2012 to submit a draft survey to the Council for review and to conduct a public comment period. October 2012 the WSWG intends to complete the final report. The WSWG is collaborating on version 9 of the survey and will <a href="#"><u>communicate to the Council the proposed Independent Review process as the WG nears the proposed final survey.</u></a></p>



## Generic Names Supporting Organization Council

### Pending Projects List

<p><a href="#"><u>Board requested metrics for Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice</u></a>  <b>Chair:</b> Rosemary Sinclair  <b>Staff:</b> B. Cobb, J. Hedlund  <b>Liaison:</b> John Berard</p> <p>In Dec. 2010 the Board asked for advice from the ALAC, GAC, GNSO and ccNSO on establishing the definitions, measures, and targets for competition, consumer trust and consumer choice in the context of the DNS.</p>	Dec. 2010	Ongoing	CCTC Working Group	<p>The WG established definitions for Consumer Trust, Choice, &amp; Competition with each having a set of measures and three year targets. The CCTC created a draft Advice Letter on Consumer metrics and opened a public comment period <a href="#"><u>which closed on 17 APR 2012 with the reply period closing on 8 May 2012.</u></a> Prior to submission of the final version of Advice Letter to the GNSO Council, the WG will review the public comments and the CR session feedback and incorporate into the final version of the Advice Letter. The WG expects to submit the final letter in June 2012.</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>Drafting Team on Cross-Community Working Groups</u></a>  Discussion leader: J. Robinson  Staff: J. Hedlund</p> <p>A drafting team was formed to develop an approach with respect to cross-community working groups.</p>	19 May 2011	6 Oct.	Council	<p>The CCWG began work in October 2011, and provided updates in Dakar. On 4 January, J. Robinson circulated the draft principles for Council review. On 14 March in Costa Rica the Council approved the principles and the Chair sent them to the other SO and AC chairs asking for their review and input in 60 days. <a href="#"><u>Consider any comments received and whether to send a reminder.</u></a></p>
<p><b>Outreach Task Force</b>  Next Steps  <b>Staff:</b> J. Hedlund</p> <p>A GNSO drafting team was formed to develop a Charter for an Outreach Task Force. A draft charter was prepared and later revised for consideration by the GNSO Council.</p>	23 June 2011	26 October	Council	<p>In Dakar the GNSO Council deferred motion to approve the draft charter, as revised, until 17 November. The motion failed. A new motion was offered for the Council meeting on 15 December was not seconded and thus was not considered. Staff provided an update at the Council meeting on 19 January. During its working session in Costa Rica the Council agreed to form a group <a href="#"><u>to discuss options for how to proceed on this issue and present - if possible - one option as a compromise proposal to the Council.</u></a></p>



**Generic Names Supporting Organization Council**  
**Pending Projects List**

<p><a href="#"><u>Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) Part C Policy Development Process (PDP)</u></a>  <b>Co-Chairs:</b> James Bladel, Avri Doria  <b>Council Liaison:</b> Zahid Jamil  <b>Staff:</b> M. Konings</p> <p>PDP will address 3 issues:  1) "Change of Control" function,  2) Whether provisions on time-limiting Form Of Authorization (FOA)s should be implemented to avoid fraudulent transfers out,3)  Whether the process should include a requirement that registries use IANA IDs for registrars vs. proprietary IDs.</p>	2011-Jun-22	ongoing	WG	<p>The WG held its first meeting on 8 November and is continuing its meetings on a weekly basis. <a href="#"><u>The WG has created two sub-teams, one on data-gathering and one on an ideal process for change of control.</u></a> The WGs workplan can be found here:  <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/gnsortppdpwg/2.+WG+Documents+Drafts+-+Published">https://community.icann.org/display/gnsortppdpwg/2.+WG+Documents+Drafts+-+Published</a>. The WG is planning to submit its Initial Report in time for the ICANN Meeting in Prague.</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>Fake Renewal Notices Drafting Team (FRN-DT)</u></a>  <b>Chair:</b> Mike O'Connor  <b>Staff:</b> M. Konings, B. Cobb</p> <p>The GNSO Council requested that a small group prepare a request for information concerning Fake Renewal Notices for the RrSG to help inform its deliberations on the RAP WG Recommendation on Fake Renewal Notices (#2).</p>	2011-Oct-06	May 2012	Council	<p>The drafting team submitted its <a href="#"><u>report</u></a> to the GNSO Council on 6 March. Following a presentation of the report to the GNSO Council at the ICANN Meeting in Costa Rica, the GNSO Council decided to put the report out for public comment. A public comment forum has been opened (see <a href="http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment/fake-renewal-notices-report-21mar12-en.htm">http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment/fake-renewal-notices-report-21mar12-en.htm</a>). <a href="#"><u>The reply period has now opened and reply comments may be submitted until 11 May.</u></a></p>
<p><a href="#"><u>Locking of a Domain Name subject to UDRP Proceedings PDP Working Group</u></a>  Chairs: <a href="#"><u>Michele Neylon (Interim Chair)</u></a>  Council Liaison: Joy Liddicoat  Staff: M. Konings</p> <p>The GNSO Council approved the charter for the PDP WG on the requirement to lock a domain name subject to UDRP proceedings at its meeting in Costa Rica. The WG is tasked to</p>	2011-Dec-15	Ongoing	WG	<p><a href="#"><u>The WG held its first meeting on 16 April and is planning to continue with weekly calls. The WG will start working on developing its work plan and discussing an approach for tackling the charter questions.</u></a></p>



**Generic Names Supporting Organization Council  
Pending Projects List**

address the locking of a domain name subject to Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP) proceedings.				
<p><b>Protection of Red Cross/IOC names in new gTLDs collaboration with the GAC</b>  <b>Discussion Leader:</b> Jeff Neuman  <b>Staff:</b> M. Milam, B. Peck</p> <p>In Singapore, Board resolution (2011.06.20.01) authorized ICANN to incorporate protection in the New gTLD Program for specific requested Red Cross and IOC names for the top level only during the initial application round, until the GNSO and GAC develop policy advice based on the global public interest. The GAC and GNSO Council are working collaboratively on this project.</p>	June 2012	Ongoing	<p>Council <a href="#">with regard to the instructions for Red Cross/IOC Drafting Team; Staff with regard to the IGO Issue Report.</a></p>	<p><a href="#">The ICANN Board decided against adopting the GNSO's recommendation for the first round of applications.</a> The Drafting Team is <a href="#">expected to debate whether to continue</a> its work to identify whether any protections should be granted to these names at the second level. A <a href="#">public comment forum</a> opened by the DT <a href="#">closed</a> on 14 April 2012, <a href="#">and is currently being summarized.</a></p> <p>On 11 March, the GAC and the GNSO Council received a request from the ICANN Board seeking advice on the registration and use of the names of intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) in the DNS. <a href="#">An Issue Report requested by the GNSO Council</a> on 12 April <a href="#">is targeted for publication prior to the Prague Meeting.</a></p>

<b>Other GNSO Activities</b>				
<b>Description</b>	<b>Initiated</b>	<b>Target Date</b>	<b>Who holds Token</b>	<b>Pending action/status</b>
<b>STUDIES</b>				
<p><a href="#">WHOIS Studies</a>  Staff: L. Gasster</p> <p>The GNSO Council has approved <a href="#">studies of WHOIS</a>. Topics include Misuse of WHOIS Data, Registrant Identification Information, Proxy and Privacy "Abuse" and Proxy and Privacy "Relay" and "Reveal". Budget has been approved by the ICANN Board for these studies.</p>	2007 Oct-31	Ongoing	staff	<p>Staff is overseeing four studies of WHOIS as requested by the GNSO:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A year-long study of misuse of public gTLD WHOIS data – study underway;</li> <li>2. A Registrant Identification Study –launched in October 2011</li> <li>3. A year-long Proxy/ Privacy "Abuse" Study, approved by Council on 28 April – contract has been finalized</li> </ol>



**Generic Names Supporting Organization Council**  
**Pending Projects List**

				and research entity will be announced shortly; 4. A pre-study “survey” on Proxy/Privacy “Relay” and “Reveal” – underway, initial results delayed until <a href="#">May</a> 2012.
<b>AWAITING COUNCIL ACTION</b>				
<p><b>Discussion Paper on the Creation of non-binding best practices to help registrars and registries address the abusive registrations of domain names</b> Staff: S. Sheng, M. Konings</p> <p>On 3 February 2011, the GNSO Council resolved to request a discussion paper on the creation of non-binding best practices to help registrars and registries address the abusive registrations of domain names in accordance with the Registration Abuse Policies Working Group Final Report.</p>	2011-Feb-03	Nov-2011	Council	<p>The discussion paper was submitted to the Council on 28 September 2011 (see <a href="http://gnso.icann.org/issues/rap/discussion-paper-rap-best-practices-28sep11-en.pdf">http://gnso.icann.org/issues/rap/discussion-paper-rap-best-practices-28sep11-en.pdf</a>). The Council had an initial discussion about the paper at its meeting on 6 October, its meeting in Dakar as well as its meeting in November and is now expected to consider next steps. The GNSO Council resolved at its meeting in 6 October to consider the RAP recommendation ‘Meta Issue: Collection and Dissemination of Best Practices’ in the context of the review and analysis of the Discussion Paper on best practices to help registrars and registries address the illicit use of domain names. <a href="#">A motion to form a working group to develop the charters for two WGs to address this issue was submitted and will be considered at the next GNSO Council meeting.</a></p>
<p><a href="#">RAA</a> Staff: M. Milam 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 approved a first set of amendments, intended to provide clarity and certainty regarding the duties of registrars</p>	2009 May-21	June 2012	Staff Report on the Closing of the Negotiations	<p>Board Resolution in Dakar calls for immediate commencement of negotiations and for an Issue Report on the RAA.</p> <p><a href="#">A Final Issue Report</a> was published prior to Costa Rica, recommending that the Board requested PDP not commence until after the negotiations were concluded, and the “remaining</p>



**Generic Names Supporting Organization Council**  
**Pending Projects List**

<p>and rights of registrants, in May, 2009. A <a href="#">Working Group</a> then developed a “charter of registrants’ rights” and a report of other possible RAA amendments, posted at: <a href="http://gnso.icann.org/issues/raa/raa-improvements-proposal-final-report-18oct01-en.pdf">http://gnso.icann.org/issues/raa/raa-improvements-proposal-final-report-18oct01-en.pdf</a></p>				<p>items” that remain unaddressed are identified. These remaining items would become the subject of one or more PDPs.</p> <p>To review status of the negotiations, please visit the community wiki at: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/RAA/Negotiations+Between+ICANN+and+Registrars+to+Ame nd+the+Registrar+Accreditation+Agreement">https://community.icann.org/display/RAA/Negotiations+Between+ICANN+and+Registrars+to+Ame nd+the+Registrar+Accreditation+Agreement</a></p> <p>RAA negotiations are underway. To review progress, see: <a href="https://community.icann.org/display/RAA/Negotiations+Between+ICANN+and+Registrars+to+Ame nd+the+Registrar+Accreditation+Agreement">https://community.icann.org/display/RAA/Negotiations+Between+ICANN+and+Registrars+to+Ame nd+the+Registrar+Accreditation+Agreement</a></p>
<p><b>RAPWG Recommendation on Cross-TLD Registration Scam:</b> The RAPWG recommends the GNSO monitor for Cross-TLD registration scam abuse in the gTLD space and co-ordinate research with the community to determine the nature and extent of the problem. The WG believes this issue warrants review but notes there is not enough data at this time to warrant an Issues Report or PDP</p>		Nov 2011	Council	<p>The GNSO Council resolved at its meeting on 6 October that the GNSO Council Chair shall communicate to the SSAC the findings of the RAP WG in this regard and request that the SSAC consider evaluating and/or monitoring this abuse. This communication was sent to the SSAC, but the SSAC has declined taking on this work. The topic was also discussed in the meeting with the ccNSO Council since this type of abuse also affects ccTLDs. Potential next steps were discussed at the November meeting of the GNSO Council and the Council agreed at its meeting in December to continue discussions on this topic with the ccNSO. An email was sent to the Chair of the ccNSO to this end.</p>
<p><a href="#">Meta Issue - Uniformity of Reporting</a></p>	2011-Oct-6	Q1 2012	Council	<p>At its meeting on 6 October, the GNSO Council requested the</p>



**Generic Names Supporting Organization Council**  
**Pending Projects List**

<p>To help inform its consideration of the RAPWG Recommendation on Uniformity of Reporting, the GNSO Council has requested information from the ICANN Compliance Department.</p>				<p>ICANN Compliance Department to report on existing systems to report and track violations and/or complaints; improvements made since the RAPWG Report or foreseen in the near future, and: identify gaps and any improvements that might be desirable but not foreseen at this stage. The ICANN Compliance Team submitted its <a href="#">report</a> on 18 March <a href="#">and presented it to the GNSO Council at its meeting on 12 April. The GNSO Council is now expected to consider next steps, if any.</a></p>
<b>Staff Implementation</b>				
<p><b>GNSO Improvements</b> <b>GNSO Web site improvements</b> <b><a href="#">(from the Community Communications Team)</a></b> <b>Staff: R. Hoggarth</b></p> <p>A <a href="#">Work Team</a> was chartered to develop recommendations to (a) enhance the GNSO's ability to solicit meaningful community feedback, (b) improve coordination with other ICANN structures, and (c) find ways to make the GNSO's website more usable and effective. On 23 June 2010 the GNSO Council approved the recommendations of the CCT. The remaining task is to implement a redesign of the GNSO website.</p>	<p>2009 March</p>	<p>June 2012</p>	<p>Staff</p>	<p><a href="#">Staff reported roll-out timetable for new GNSO web site to GNSO Council during 12 April Council call. Internal Staff review currently underway. Council review opportunities scheduled for early-to-mid May. Target for public debut of new site (Phase 1) is by end of May. A second phase will consist of content improvements and any other potential adjustments suggested by community and staff.</a></p> <p>Staff is also developing web presence options for eligible GNSO organizations, and through dialogue with designated community representatives, plans to refine those ideas into implementable goals. A Staff proposal is currently being vetted with the ICANN IT Team to assure consistency with ICANN's current IT infrastructure. That proposal has been dependent on completion of the GNSO site re-design. When approved, it will</p>



**Generic Names Supporting Organization Council  
Pending Projects List**

				be circulated and discussed with the community.
<p><b>Uniformity of Contracts Issue Report</b> Staff: R. Hoggarth</p> <p>Request for an Issue Report to evaluate whether a minimum baseline of registration abuse provisions should be created for all in-scope ICANN agreements, and if created, how such language would be structured to address the most common forms of registration abuse.</p>	2011-Oct-6	<a href="#">May</a> 2012	Staff	<p>This Issue Report stems from a recommendation in the RAP Final Report. Staff has conducted research and is drafting the document. Staff provided an update at the GNSO Council Working Session in Costa Rica. The document will include PDP history, research <a href="#">report</a>, successful industry initiatives, and other content relative to registration abuse provisions among agreements. Upon release of the Preliminary Issue Report, a public comment period will be opened. <a href="#">Target completion by end of May.</a></p>
<b>INACTIVE PROJECTS</b>				
<p><a href="#">‘Thick’ WHOIS Policy Development Process</a> Staff: <a href="#">M. Konings</a></p> <p><a href="#">As recommended by the IRTP Part B Working Group, the GNSO Council requested ICANN Staff to prepare an Issue Report on the requirement of ‘thick’ WHOIS for all incumbent gTLDs. At its meeting in Costa Rica, the GNSO Council initiated the PDP.</a></p>	<a href="#">2011-Sept-22</a>	<a href="#">First GNSO Council meeting after 30 November 2012</a>	<a href="#">Council</a>	<p><a href="#">Following review of the Final Issue Report prepared by Staff, the GNSO Council initiated the PDP at its meeting in Costa Rica. However, at its wrap-up session the GNSO Council discussed the possibility to delay the next steps of the PDP until the .com contract negotiations have been completed. A motion to formalize this delay was adopted during the Council meeting on 12 April stating that ‘the next step (creating a drafting team to develop a charter) of the ‘thick’ Whois PDP will be delayed until the first GNSO Council meeting after 30 November 2012’.</a></p>
<p><b>Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy Issue Report</b> Staff: M. Milam</p> <p>Request for an Issue Report on the current state of the UDRP.</p>	2011-Feb-03	Completed for now		<p>The GNSO Council deferred commencement of a PDP, except with regard to the lock issue. An Issue Report to be delivered eighteen months after the first delegation of new gTLDs.</p>



**Generic Names Supporting Organization Council  
Pending Projects List**

<b>Joint SO/AC Working Groups</b>				
<b>Description</b>	<b>Initiated</b>	<b>Target Date</b>	<b>Who holds Token</b>	<b>Pending action/status</b>
<p><b>Geo Regions Review Community-wide Working Group</b> Chair: Dave Archbold (ccNSO) GNSO Council Reps: Zahid Jamil and Ching Chiao Staff: R. Hoggarth</p> <p><a href="#">Working Group Wiki Page Link</a> This Board-chartered cross community WG is consulting with ICANN stakeholders regarding the definition and applications of ICANN's Geographic Regions. Changes could have broad impact, so this WG has representatives from most SOs and ACs.</p>	2008 Aug-07	<a href="#">June 2012</a>	Community	WG continues in Final Report drafting mode. The WG has published a DRAFT Final Report for community review and comment (see - <a href="http://www.icann.org/en/public-comment/geo-regions-draft-final-report-30sep11-en.htm">http://www.icann.org/en/public-comment/geo-regions-draft-final-report-30sep11-en.htm</a> ). The Public Comment opportunity closed on 19 December 2011 and a summary report of community comments has been published. The WG will be discussing the community comments and potential adjustments to the recommendations. The WG hosted a community workshop in Costa Rica to collect further community input.
<p><a href="#">Joint ccNSO-GNSO IDN Working Group (JIG)</a> ccNSO Co-chair: J. Zhang GNSO Co-chair: E. Chung Staff: B. Boswinkel, S. Sheng</p> <p>This group identified three IDN issues of common interest and is proposing ways to resolve them: 1) Single character IDN ccTLDs and gTLDs; 2) aspects of variant management in the root zone; and 3) universal acceptance of IDN TLDs. Both the ccNSO and GNSO have extended this charter to continue into 2012.</p>	2009 July-23	Ongoing	WG	<p><a href="#">Following are updates on each of the three key areas of work:</a></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">1. Single Character IDN ccTLDs and gTLDs.</a> The GNSO and ccNSO both approved a Final Report. In August the Board requested further advice from the SOs and ACs. New advice was offered by the SSAC, SAC 52, see, <a href="http://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/sac052.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/sac052.pdf</a>. The GNSO and ccNSO Councils have agreed on a response to the Board reiterating support for the introduction of single character IDN TLDs and asking clarifying questions.</li> <li><a href="#">2. Following a public comment period that closed in January, a final Integrated Variant Issue Report</a> was posted on Feb 20, <a href="http://www.icann.org/en/topics/idn/idn-vip-integrated-issues-final-clean-20feb12-en.pdf">http://www.icann.org/en/topics/idn/idn-vip-integrated-issues-final-clean-20feb12-en.pdf</a>. The JIG is</li> </ol>



**Generic Names Supporting Organization Council  
Pending Projects List**

Joint SO/AC Working Groups				
Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
				<a href="#">now preparing comments on the VIP Project Plan (deadline for replies 29 April).</a> 3. Universal acceptance. The JIG <a href="#">is continuing to review comments received on its</a> Initial Report on how to encourage universal acceptance of IDN TLDs (comment period <a href="#">closed</a> 13 April 2012) <a href="#">and to discuss next steps.</a>
<a href="#">SSAC-GNSO Internationalized Registration Data Working Group</a> SSAC Co-chair: J. Galvin GNSO Co-chair: E. Chung Staff: Julie Hedlund  Convened by the Board to study the feasibility of introducing display specifications to deal with the internationalization of WHOIS registration data. Currently no standard format exists for elements of a Whois registration record.	2009 June	Ongoing	WG	The WG's Interim Report (Cartagena) suggested four models or options for displaying elements of internationalized data. The WG considered questions arising in these meetings as well as 8 public comments (forum closed March 2011). The WG also briefed the SSAC, held two outreach webinars, and briefed the Council and public in San Francisco and in Singapore. The WG posted a draft Final Report for public comment for 45 days ending 17 November. On 06 March the IRD-WG submitted its final report to the GNSO Council and the SSAC for review and approval. <a href="#">The SSAC is revising the document and will send the revised version to the IRD-WG for review and approval. Subsequently, the IRD-WG will send the approved revised report to the GNSO Council for review.</a>

**Generic Names Supporting Organization Council**  
**Pending Projects List**

Joint SO/AC Working Groups				
Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p><a href="#">Joint Security and Stability Analysis Community Working Group (DNS Cert)</a> ccNSO Co-Chair: Jörg Schweiger, .de GNSO Co-Chair: M. O'Connor Staff: B. Boswinkel, J. Hedlund</p>	2010 June	Ongoing	Working Group	As of November 2010, the GNSO, ALAC, ccNSO, and NROs have all approved the WG charter. In Singapore a work plan was finalized, and the group is discussing the handling of confidential information, criteria to determine the level of SSR at any given time, threat assessments, and how to proceed. It met in Dakar to present its progress and held a discussion on current activities. WG continues to meet weekly. It has decided on a methodology for assessing threats and beginning to use that to analyze threats. The IRD-WG provided updates on its activities in Costa Rica to the SOs and ACs and in a public session. It is developing <a href="#">a report to publish</a> by the Prague meeting.
<p><a href="#">ccNSO Study Group on the Use of Names for Countries and Territories (ccNSO-NCTSG)</a> <b>Chair:</b> Paul Szyndler, .au <b>Staff:</b> B. Boswinkel</p> <p>This group of ccNSO, GNSO, GAC and ALAC representatives is considering policies and procedures to allocate TLD strings that are either associated with Countries and Territories (i.e. by inclusion in the ISO 3166-1 list) or are otherwise considered representations of Country or Territory names.</p>	8 Dec. 2010	ongoing	Study Group	The Study Group held two F2F meetings at the ICANN Meeting in Costa Rica. The focus is on devising typology and, if feasible, understanding what the impact of the diverse rules are. UNESCO has <a href="#">started with</a> a survey in which it will seek input from at least 20 countries regarding how their names are used – some of the categories initially proposed include official names, historical names and indigenous names. <a href="#">The WG will now continue with meetings every two weeks to follow the progress of the study and continue its deliberations.</a>



**Generic Names Supporting Organization Council**  
**Pending Projects List**

Approved GNSO PDP Recommendations - Status (For Information Only)				
Description	Adopted	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<b>IRTP Part B PDP Adopted Recommendations</b>				
<p><b>1.</b> Require Registrars to provide a Transfer Emergency Action Contact (TEAC).</p> <p><b>2.</b> Modify IRTP Section 3 to require that the Registrar of Record/Losing Registrar be required to notify the Registrant of the transfer out.</p> <p><b>3.</b> Modify Reason for Denial #6</p> <p><b>4.</b> Delete Reason for Denial #7 (Text of resolution: <a href="http://gns0.icann.org/resolutions/#201106">http://gns0.icann.org/resolutions/#201106</a>)</p>	22 June 2011		COMPLETED	This is a completed PDP. The GNSO Council Report was submitted to the Board (see <a href="http://gns0.icann.org/mailling-lists/archives/council/msg11883.html">http://gns0.icann.org/mailling-lists/archives/council/msg11883.html</a> ). The ICANN Board adopted the recommendations at its meeting on 25 August. Staff has implemented the recommendations and the effective date for registrars is 1 June 2012 (see <a href="http://www.icann.org/en/resources/registrars/transfers/policy-01jun12.htm">http://www.icann.org/en/resources/registrars/transfers/policy-01jun12.htm</a> for further details).
<p><b>5.</b> Promotion by ALAC and other ICANN structures of the measures outlined in a recent SSAC report: A Registrant's Guide to Protecting Domain Name Registration Accounts (SAC 044). (See <a href="http://gns0.icann.org/resolutions/#201106">http://gns0.icann.org/resolutions/#201106</a> for text of resolution)</p>	22 June 2011		SOs/ACs	Chair of the GNSO Council has sent messages to the Chairs of ALAC, SSAC, ccNSO, GAC, ASO (see <a href="http://gns0.icann.org/mailling-lists/archives/council/msg11736.html">http://gns0.icann.org/mailling-lists/archives/council/msg11736.html</a> ) to inform them about the recommendation and open discussions.
<p><b>IRTP Part B Recommendation #9 – part 2</b></p> <p>The GNSO Council resolved in Singapore that prior to consideration of the recommendation which states: "denial reason #7 should be replaced by adding a new provision in a different section of the IRTP on when and how domains may be locked or unlocked", the GNSO Council requests ICANN Staff to provide a proposal for such a new provision, taking into account the IRTP Part</p>	2011-Jun-22		Staff	The ICANN Board adopted the recommendation and staff proposal at its meeting in Costa Rica. ICANN Staff will now start working on the implementation of the recommendation.



**Generic Names Supporting Organization Council  
Pending Projects List**

<p>B WG deliberations in relation to this issue (see IRTP Part B Final Report - (Recommendation #9 - part 2). Upon review of the proposal, the Council will consider the recommendation.</p>				
<p><b>IRTP Part B Recommendation #8</b></p> <p>The GNSO Council resolved in Singapore that prior to considering a recommendation to standardize and clarify WHOIS status messages regarding Registrar Lock status, the GNSO Council asked staff to provide a proposal to ensure that it is technically feasible to implement this recommendation. Staff should take into account the IRTP Part B WG deliberations in relation to this issue (see IRTP Part B Final Report). (IRTP Part B Recommendation #8). The goal of these changes is to clarify why the Lock has been applied and how it can be changed. Upon review of the proposed plan, the Council will consider whether to approve the recommendation.</p>	<p>2011-Jun-22</p>	<p>May 2012</p>	<p>Board</p>	<p>Following review of the comments submitted by the IPC, ICANN staff submitted an updated proposal which was adopted by the GNSO Council at its meeting on 16 February. A public comment was opened prior to Board consideration, <a href="#">which has now closed (two comments received)</a>. The Recommendations Report to the Board was approved by the Council at its meeting in Costa Rica <a href="#">and submitted to the Board. The ICANN Board is expected to consider this recommendation at its next meeting.</a></p>
<p><b>PEDNR Adopted Recommendations</b></p>				
<p>The GNSO Council adopted all the recommendations proposed in the PEDNR Final Report at its meeting on 21 July 2011.</p> <p>(For complete language of the adopted recommendations, see <a href="http://gnso.icann.org/resolutions/#201107">http://gnso.icann.org/resolutions/#201107</a>).</p>	<p>21 July 2011</p>		<p>Staff</p>	<p>Following Council approval, a public comment period was conducted prior to ICANN Board consideration (see <a href="#">report of public comments</a>). The Board was also asked to solicit the GAC's opinion. The Board adopted the recommendations in Dakar. As recommended by the GNSO Council, a PEDNR Implementation Review Team has been formed. ICANN Staff is working on developing a proposed implementation plan and has reached out to the PEDNR Implementation Review Team to set up a first meeting.</p>



**Generic Names Supporting Organization Council  
Pending Projects List**

Outstanding Recommendations for Council Action		
Description	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<b>Registration Abuse Policies Final Report Remaining Recommendations</b>		
<p><b>WHOIS Access – Recommendation #1:</b> The GNSO should determine what additional research and processes may be needed to ensure that WHOIS data is accessible in an appropriately reliable, enforceable, and consistent fashion. The GNSO Council should consider how such might be related to other WHOIS efforts, such as the upcoming review of WHOIS policy and implementation required by ICANN’s new Affirmation of Commitments.</p>	Council	<p>The GNSO Council resolved at its meeting on 6 October to request the WHOIS Survey Drafting Team to consider including the issue of WHOIS Access as part of the survey it has been tasked to develop. If the WHOIS Survey Drafting Team is of the view that it is not appropriate or timely to include WHOIS ACCESS as part of the survey, it should inform the GNSO Council accordingly.</p> <p>The WSWG has agreed on the response to the GNSO council and submitted the final version to the GNSO Council on 10 Jan 2012. The WSWG response was discussed at the GNSO Council meeting on 19 January but no decision was taken on next steps yet. The suggestion was made at the GNSO Council meeting of 16 February to not take any further action on this issue, but some Council members did not agree with this approach and have proposed to come back with other suggestions.</p>