ICANN | GNSO

Generic Names Supporting Organization

Policy Briefing
ICANN59 Edition

The GNSO Background Briefings are produced by ICANN's Policy staff supporting the GNSO. These are drafted specifically in preparation for ICANN meetings to provide the Community with concise background information on all relevant GNSO policy efforts.

For more information on the GNSO @ ICANN59:

🌐 gnso.ICANN.org/ICANNmeeting   🐦 @ICANN_GNSO

Welcome to ICANN59 from the GNSO Chair

Dear Colleagues:

Welkom by Johannesburg!

On behalf of myself, the Vice Chairs, and the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) Council, I'd like to welcome you to ICANN59 in Johannesburg.

This meeting is the second Policy Forum, a shorter and more compact format when compared to other ICANN meetings, and one which is focused on the work supporting policy development. The Policy Forum also promotes cross-community discussion of topics that affect the broader ICANN Community, and supports outreach activities over a busy four-day period.

At this year's Policy Forum, the GNSO Community will use these focused face-to-face sessions to progress the work on several important ongoing Policy Development Processes (PDPs). The Next-Generation Registration Directory Service (RDS) PDP Working Group (WG) will continue deliberating on key concepts and possible requirements for charter questions about RDS users/purposes, data elements, and privacy for "thin data", as well as plan to expand to "thick data". The New Generic Top-Level Domain (gTLD) Subsequent Procedures PDP WG will use its working session at ICANN59 to examine issues related to new gTLD policy and program implementation. The International Governmental Organization (IGO)-International Non-Governmental Organization (INGO) Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms PDP WG is expected to present its draft Final Recommendations for community input, prior to completing its upcoming Final Report. Finally, the Review of Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) in All gTLDs PDP WG will use its working session to make progress on Phase One of the PDP, analyzing non-Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP) RPMs.

In addition to the PDP working sessions, several cross-community discussions will focus on topics that feed into to the work taking place in the GNSO. These meetings, previously known as "High Interest Topic Sessions," bring together the entire community around areas of shared interests. At ICANN59 these will include a cross-community discussion on the next-generation gTLD registration directory services policy requirements and the European General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), which will support deliberations in the Next-Generation RDS PDP WG. Cross-community discussions on the treatment of geographic names at the top level will help to progress work on this topic in the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG.

ICANN59 will see the first Community Forum to be convened under the revised ICANN Bylaws. In the Community Forum, the community will gather to discuss a proposal to amend one of ICANN's Fundamental Bylaws. After this session, each of the Decisional Participants in ICANN's Empowered Community – Address Supporting Organization (ASO), At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC), Country Code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO), Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO), and Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) – will consider whether they support the proposal. The GNSO also expects that by ICANN59 the revised GNSO Operating Procedures and ICANN Bylaws will be published for public comment which will include new processes and procedures to facilitate the GNSO to take on its role as a Decisional Participant in the Empowered Community. Furthermore, the GNSO Council expects to consider recommendations concerning the process and criteria for the permanent appointment of the GNSO Representative to the Empowered Community Administration.

The GNSO Council is also expected to discuss the first-ever use of the GNSO's process for amending policy recommendations previously adopted by the GNSO Council before they are considered by the ICANN Board. This exceptional move resulted from discussions between the Board, GAC, and GNSO at ICANN58 in Copenhagen on possible protections for Red Cross names. In the course of these conversations, several developments have occurred after the 2013 completion of the GNSO PDP on the Protection of IGO and INGO Identifiers in All gTLDs. In response to Board request, the GNSO Council voted to reconvene the PDP WG to consider whether two of the GNSO's previous policy recommendations merit review or modification.

For community members interested in policy development, ICANN59 provides a great occasion to engage with colleagues and tackle the many complex and challenging topics. The cross-community discussions throughout this meeting will be particularly valuable in promoting exchange of views on policy topics relevant to the work of the GNSO. I encourage everyone, whether attending in person or participating remotely, to step up to the microphone and add your voice to the discussion. As we hit our stride with the new meeting format, your participation will be essential to the success of the Policy Forum.

Safe travels and I look forward to seeing many of you in Johannesburg.

James Bladel
GNSO Chair

ICANN59 at a Glance

ICANN59 will be ICANN's second Policy Forum, taking place over the course of four days. As the name implies, this meeting centers around cross-community policy development activities with the lineup of sessions focused on policy work and outreach. The Policy Forum features a series of cross-community discussions designed to promote focused dialogue among community members from all Supporting Organizations (SOs) and Advisory Committees (ACs). Within the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO), highlights include face-to-face working sessions of Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Groups (WGs) and the GNSO Council Public Meeting.

The GNSO Policy Support Team has developed this Policy Briefing document to help meeting participants prepare for ICANN59. This Briefing reports the status of GNSO PDP WGs and explains the work these groups anticipate for ICANN59. It also provides background and resources for further reading on GNSO policy related activities, including GNSO co-chartered Cross Community Working Groups and PDP Implementation Review Teams. Since GNSO WGs unrelated to PDPs, such as the GNSO Review WG, are not holding sessions in this Policy Forum, you may learn about their work progress via the **Project List** on the GNSO website.

For those who are new to the GNSO's Policy Development Process and those who could use a refresher, we highly recommend you take the **Intro to the GNSO** online learn course. The course will help you navigate through the structure and content in this Policy Briefing. All are encouraged to enroll.

Please note that any reference to meeting times on this document is provisional – you are encouraged to consult the **ICANN meeting schedule** for the latest information. This resource is intended to help the community prepare for the meeting and support full and active participation by all attendees.

ICANN59 MEETING INFO
- Meeting page: **https://meetings.icann.org/en/johannesburg59**
- Schedule: **schedule.icann.org**
- Register for ICANN58: **registration.icann.org**
- Remote participation: **meetings.icann.org/en/remote-participation**
- Expected standard of behavior: **https://goo.gl/SzN9ic**

GNSO RELATED INFORMATION
- GNSO 1-stop-shop for ICANN59: **gnso.icann.org/en/icannmeeting**
- Project List: **gnso.icann.org/en/council/project**

If you have any questions about this Policy Briefing or GNSO policy activities, please contact us at **policy-staff@ICANN.org**. Safe travels to those traveling to Copenhagen and we look forward to a productive meeting.

Policy Development Process: Next-Generation Registration Directory Service to Replace WHOIS

WHAT CAN I EXPECT AT ICANN59 IN RELATION TO THIS TOPIC?

In addition to a **face-to-face** meeting of the Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group (WG) on Tuesday, 27 June (Day 2 of ICANN59), the WG will also hold a 3-hour **cross-community discussion** on Monday, 26 June (Day 1) to obtain community feedback on key concepts related to the purposes of generic top-level domain (gTLD) registration data and directory services, data elements required by those purposes, and related data protection and privacy requirements. The WG is currently deliberating on these concepts and hopes to solicit community feedback on these rough consensus agreements.

WHAT IS THIS ABOUT?

In April 2015, the ICANN Board reaffirmed 'its request for a Board-initiated GNSO policy development process to define the purpose of collecting, maintaining and providing access to generic top-level domain (gTLD) registration data, and consider safeguards for protecting data, using the recommendations in the Expert Working Group (EWG) Final Report as an input to, and, if appropriate, as the foundation for a new gTLD policy'.

Following the publication of the PDP Final Issue Report, the GNSO Council adopted the charter for the PDP WG, which commenced its deliberations at the end of January 2016. During the first phase its work, the WG has been tasked with providing the GNSO Council with recommendations on the following two questions: 1) What are the fundamental requirements for gTLD registration data? And 2) Is a new policy framework and next-generation registration directory services (RDS) needed to address these requirements?

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?

Comprehensive 'WHOIS' policy reform remains the source of long-running discussions within ICANN. Any discussion of the 'WHOIS' system for gTLD domain name registration data – hereafter called gTLD registration directory services (RDS) – typically includes topics such as purpose, accuracy, availability, privacy, data protection, cost, policing, intellectual property protection, security, and malicious use and abuse. ICANN's requirements for gTLD domain name registration data collection, maintenance, and provision have undergone some important changes. Nevertheless, after almost 15 years of GNSO task forces, working groups, workshops, surveys, and studies, the policy is still in need of comprehensive reforms that address the significant number of contentious issues attached to it.

WHAT IS THE CURRENT STATUS OF THIS PROJECT?

The WG for gTLD registration directory services has been working to answer this question: *What are the fundamental requirements for gTLD registration data and directory services?* Following initial deliberations on individual possible requirements, the WG concluded that it may be more productive and efficient if the WG first deliberates on key concepts to provide a common foundation.

Accordingly, the WG started identifying and continued to deliberate **on key concepts related to the WG's charter questions** concerning RDS users/purposes, data elements, privacy, and access, specifically on "thin data." The WG uses weekly calls and polls to facilitate development of tentative rough consensus conclusions on key concepts. While the WG plans to expand to "thick" data soon, it determined that it might be helpful to determine access to "thin" data elements before finishing deliberation on key concepts and requirements for "thick data." The WG is using principles on public and gated access from the Expert Working Group on gTLD Directory Services final report as a starting point of discussion.

As of the end of May 2017, 20 initial points of rough consensus have been reached during iterative and ongoing deliberation on RDS users/purposes, data elements, privacy, and access, all in a "thin data" context (see the **latest information on key concepts**). All initial agreements have been guided by an overall **statement of purpose**.

WHAT ARE THE EXPECTED NEXT STEPS?

After reaching rough consensus on principles for "thin data" access, the WG will revisit key concepts on users/purposes, data elements, and privacy considerations for collection and processing of "thin" and "thick" data. It will move on to also develop key concepts on data accuracy. These key concepts will be used to establish a foundation for completing deliberations on possible requirements, as required in Phase 1 of the PDP charter. The WG will systematically consider possible requirements with the goal of trying to reach as strong a consensus as possible. Due to interdependencies, WG deliberation will likely continue to be iterative, especially on fundamental questions pertaining to purpose, data, and privacy.

The WG aims to begin drafting the first of two initial reports planned for Phase 1 at ICANN60. That first initial report will include responses to the first five of eleven questions in Phase 1. Further formal and informal input opportunities will occur

throughout the WG's Phase 1 deliberations, as well as during Phases 2-3 should the GNSO decide a next-generation directory service is needed to meet Phase 1 requirements.

HOW CAN I GET INVOLVED?

Anyone interested can join this effort at any time. Complete the registration form at **goo.gl/forms/bb65iIznLv** or contact the GNSO Secretariat **gnso-secs@icann.org**.

MORE INFORMATION

━ PDP Webpage: **gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/rds**

━ WG Workspace: **community.icann.org/x/rjJ-Ag**

━ WG Charter: **gnso.icann.org/en/drafts/whois-ng-gtld-rds-charter-07oct15**

━ Final Issue Report: **goo.gl/0ZrpVK**

━ Board-GNSO Process Framework for this PDP: **goo.gl/zq3edI**

BACKGROUND

Pursuant to its Resolution on 8 November 2012, the ICANN Board directed the ICANN CEO to launch a new effort to redefine the purpose of collecting, maintaining and providing access to gTLD registration data, and consider safeguards for protecting data. This effort would serve as a foundation for new gTLD policy and contractual negotiations. Moreover, the Board directed the preparation of an Issue Report on the purpose of collecting and maintaining gTLD registration data, and on solutions to improve accuracy and access to gTLD registration data, as part of a Board-initiated GNSO PDP. The Board then went on to pass a resolution that led to the creation of the **EWG**. The Board referred to this as a 'two-pronged approach' that is based on 'broad and responsive action' in relation to the reform of gTLD Registration Data.

To enable effective consideration of the many significant and interdependent policy areas that the GNSO must address, the Board approved a Process Framework, collaboratively developed by GNSO Councilors and Board members, to structure this complex and challenging PDP for success. This phased process includes:
• Phase 1: Establishing requirements to determine if and why a next-generation RDS is needed to replace today's WHOIS system;
• Phase 2: If so, designing a new policy framework that details functions that must be provided by a next-generation RDS to support those requirements; and
• Phase 3: Providing guidance for how a next-generation RDS should implement those policies, coexisting with and eventually replacing the legacy WHOIS system.

Throughout this three-phase process, the many inter-related questions that must (at minimum) be addressed by the PDP include:

- Users/Purposes: Who should have access to gTLD registration data and why (i.e., for what purposes)?
- Gated Access: What steps should be taken to control data access for each user/purpose?
- Data Accuracy: What steps should be taken to improve data accuracy?
- Data Elements: What data should be collected, stored, and disclosed?
- Privacy: What steps are needed to protect data and privacy?
- Coexistence: What steps should be taken to enable next-generation RDS coexistence with and replacement of the legacy WHOIS system?
- Compliance: What steps are needed to enforce these policies?
- System Model: What system requirements must be satisfied by any next-generation RDS implementation?
- Cost: What costs will be incurred and how must they be covered?
- Benefits: What benefits will be achieved and how will they be measured?
- Risks: What risks do stakeholders face and how will they be reconciled?

STAFF RESPONSIBLE: Marika Konings, Lisa Phifer (consultant), Amr Elsadr

Policy Development Process: New Generic Top-Level Domain Subsequent Procedures

WHAT CAN I EXPECT AT ICANN59 IN RELATION TO THIS TOPIC?

The Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group (WG) is set to **meet** on Tuesday, 27 June (Day 2) at 8:30-12:00 for a face-to-face working session. It expects to make progress on a number of different topics currently under discussion within the WG's four sub teams, including reviewing feedback from the WG's public comment on **Community Comment 2** (CC2).

The WG leadership is also facilitating a set of cross-community discussions on the topic of geographic names at the top-level (**session 1** on Tuesday, 27 June (Day 2) at 17:00-18:30 and **session 2** on Thursday, 29 June (Day 4) at 15:15-18:30). While geographic names are one of the many topics within the PDP WG's charter, it is of wide community interest and divergent views, and subject to parallel community efforts that must be coordinated. The goal of these sessions is to help the ICANN community discuss, understand, and collaborate on the development of a consensus-driven compromise solution.

WHAT IS THIS ABOUT?

The PDP on New Generic Top-Level Domain (gTLD) Subsequent Procedures, initiated in December 2015 and chartered in January 2016, is intended to determine what, if any changes need to be made to the existing policy recommendations from the 2007 *Final Report on the Introduction of New Generic Top-Level Domains*, such as:
- Clarifying, amending, or overriding existing policy principles, recommendations, and implementation guidance;
- Developing new policy recommendations; and,
- Supplementing or developing new implementation guidance

It should be noted that the existing policy recommendations adopted by the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) Council and ICANN Board have "been designed to produce a systemized and ongoing mechanisms for applicants to propose new top-level domains." Essentially, this means that these recommendations would remain in place unless the PDP WG determines that changes are needed.

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?

The New gTLD Program marked a seminal moment in ICANN's history. In spite of great interest and over 1,000 successful TLD delegations, changes to existing policies and implementation guidance might be needed for subsequent procedures of new gTLD launches. Note, the **Final Issue Report** and the PDP WG **charter** identified a number of subjects that may require analysis and policy development.

WHAT IS THE CURRENT STATUS OF THIS PROJECT?

The PDP WG started its work on 22 February 2016 and began deliberations on a set of six subjects that are considered overarching or foundational in nature, and sought the community's input on these six subjects. The PDP WG has established three drafting teams focused on delivering proposals related to the overarching issues. The PDP WG has also established four separate Work Tracks that are addressing the remaining subjects identified in the WG's charter – these Work Track sub teams are meeting on a bi-weekly basis and have mostly completed their preliminary review on their respective topics. The PDP WG published its CC2 for public comment, which focused on the four Work Tracks' subjects. The sub teams will take into account the comments received while working to develop their set of recommendations and outcomes.

Specific to the top-level geographic names topic, the PDP WG has yet to address the issue in a substantive way. Instead, it is seeking to facilitate collaboration with the wider ICANN Community to understand the challenges, consider the various proposals within the community to address those challenges, and to eventually reach a consensus-driven compromise solution. The PDP WG hosted a set of **webinars** on 25 April 2017 on the topic, where a number of interested community members shared their inputs to the subject. The cross-community discussions at ICANN59 are a continuation from the webinars.

WHAT ARE THE EXPECTED NEXT STEPS?

The PDP WG will consider input and feedback received in response to CC2 and further comments received in ICANN59, continuing working toward developing a set of preliminary recommendations. The PDP WG will also take into account the work of other new gTLD related efforts within the community (e.g., the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team, Cross-Community Working Group on the Use of Country and Territory Names, etc.) and integrate dependencies into its work plan where applicable.

Regarding geographic names at the top-level, the PDP WG will consider the input received at ICANN59 on the proposals presented during the webinar. It will also seek to ensure that the community continues to work in a coordinated fashion on developing a solution that is able to address the divergent concerns in a reasonable manner for all interested parties.

HOW CAN I GET INVOLVED?

This PDP WG is open to all participants. If you are interested in joining the WG effort, please email **gnso-secs@ICANN.org**.

MORE INFORMATION

- PDP Webpage: **gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/new-gtld-subsequent-procedures**

- WG Workspace: **community.icann.org/x/RgV1Aw**

- WG Charter: **https://goo.gl/chgGSk**

- Final Issue Report: **goo.gl/yGRgAN**

- Geographic Names Webinar Materials: **https://community.icann.org/x/p77Raw**

BACKGROUND

While the application submission period for the initial new gTLD round closed in June 2012, the GNSO Council continues to play a role in evaluating the first round and proposing policy recommendations, if necessary, for changes to subsequent rounds. A **Discussion Group** was created to begin the evaluation process and possibly identify areas for future GNSO policy development. Upon considering the deliverables of the Discussion Group, the GNSO Council requested a Preliminary Issue Report to be delivered by ICANN staff. After incorporating Public Comment on its Preliminary Issue Report, staff prepared and delivered the Final Issue Report. Subsequently, the GNSO Council initiated the PDP and adopted the WG charter.

STAFF RESPONSIBLE: Steve Chan, Julie Hedlund and Emily Barabas

Policy Development Process: Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms in All Generic Top-Level Domains

WHAT CAN I EXPECT AT ICANN59 IN RELATION TO THIS TOPIC?

The Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group (WG) will be holding an open meeting on **Thursday, 29 June (Day 4) at 09:00-12:00**. All community members are welcome to attend this session. The WG is expected to continue its review of the Trademark Clearinghouse (TMCH) and the various rights protection mechanisms offered through TMCH, as part of Phase One of this two-phased PDP.

WHAT IS THIS PDP ABOUT?

This PDP is being conducted in two phases. Phase One covers all the Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) applicable to generic top-level domains (gTLDs) launched under the 2012 New gTLD Program, namely the Trademark Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution Procedure (TM-PDDRP), the TMCH, the Sunrise and Trademark Claims services that are offered through the TMCH, and the Uniform Rapid Suspension dispute resolution procedure (URS). Phase Two will focus on reviewing the Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP), which has been an ICANN Consensus Policy since 1999.

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?

Community feedback on the RPMs developed for the 2012 New gTLD Program indicated a need to certain aspects of their application and scope, especially if there is to be a further expansion of the gTLD space. The UDRP is a long-standing Consensus Policy that has never undergone any substantial review. Previous community feedback had indicated that, although in principle a functioning Policy, it might have some procedural and substantive shortcomings. By the conclusion of both phases of this PDP, the WG is expected to have considered the overarching issue as to whether all the RPMs collectively fulfill the purposes for which they were created, or whether additional policy recommendations are needed. The outcomes of this PDP are also intended to create a coherent and uniform mechanism for future reviews of all RPMs.

WHAT IS THE CURRENT STATUS OF THIS PROJECT?

The Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) Council initiated the PDP on 18 February 2016 and chartered the WG in March 2016. The WG began its Phase One work with reviewing the TM-PDDRP and gathering data for the TMCH review. It is currently wrapping up its initial review of the structure and scope of the TMCH, and preparing to start its review of the Sunrise and Trademark Claims services that are offered through the TMCH.

WHAT ARE THE EXPECTED NEXT STEPS?

Depending on its progress at ICANN59, the WG will aim to complete its review of all the RPMs developed for the 2012 New gTLD Program (i.e. Phase One of this PDP) by early 2018, at which point it will publish a Preliminary Report on its recommendations regarding these RPMs for Public Comment. In this regard, the WG will continue to coordinate its timelines and work with other related efforts, such as the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP, and the Competition, Consumer Choice and Consumer Trust Review.

HOW CAN I GET INVOLVED?

The WG is open to all. You may join as either a Member (with full posting rights to the mailing list and the ability to participate in all WG meetings) or as an Observer (with read-only status for the mailing list). Please email the GNSO Secretariat at **gnso-secs@ICANN.org** if you wish to join the group.

MORE INFORMATION

- PDP Webpage: **gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/rpm**

- WG Workspace: **community.icann.org/x/wCWAAw**

- WG Charter: **gnso.icann.org/en/drafts/rpm-charter-15mar16**

- Final Issue Report: **goo.gl/DwQY9w**

BACKGROUND

In October 2011, prior to the launch of the 2012 New gTLD Program, ICANN staff published a Final Issue Report on the current state of the UDRP. The recommended course of action at the time was for the GNSO Council to hold off from initiating a PDP until after the new URS had been in operation for at least 18 months. The GNSO Council followed this recommended course of action and staff published a new Preliminary Issue Report in September 2015 that covered all existing RPMs. The Final Issue Report that led to this current PDP was published in January 2016, and outlined the two-phased approach that was eventually adopted by the GNSO Council.

STAFF RESPONSIBLE: Mary Wong and Amr Elsadr

Policy Development Process: International Governmental Organization-International Non-Governmental Organization Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms

WHAT CAN I EXPECT AT ICANN59 IN RELATION TO THIS TOPIC?

The Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group (WG) will be holding an open meeting on **Tuesday, 27 June (Day 2) at 10:30-12:00**. At this session, the WG plans to discuss its likely final recommendations for this PDP with the community, prior to finalizing the text of these recommendations for its Final Report. All community members are welcome to attend this session, especially those with expertise on the topics covered by the WG's Initial Report.

WHAT IS THIS ABOUT?

This PDP was initiated in June 2014 by the GNSO Council to consider whether existing curative rights mechanisms – namely, the Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP) and Uniform Rapid Suspension (URS) procedure – should be modified to address the needs of International Governmental Organizations (IGOs) and International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGOs) in relation to protection for their names and acronyms at the second level of the domain name system, in both existing and new generic top-level domains (gTLDs).

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?

Protecting the names and acronyms of IGOs and INGOs at the top and second levels has been a long-standing issue over the course of the New gTLD Program. The GNSO had previously recommended certain protective measures to the ICANN Board. However, those recommendations that pertained to IGO acronyms and some specific names and acronyms of the Red Cross movement differed from the advice provided by the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) to the Board. In early 2014, the Board adopted those of the GNSO's recommendations that were consistent with GAC advice. Since then, work has continued in relation to reconciling the inconsistencies between GAC advice and GNSO-approved policy on IGO acronyms and specific Red Cross identifiers. A facilitated dialogue between representatives of the GAC and the GNSO took place at ICANN58 on these inconsistencies that touched on both preventative (i.e. before a third party registers a domain name) and curative ((i.e. following a third party's domain name registration) aspects of protection.

The scope of this current PDP is not dependent on the outcome of those discussions that focus on the issue of preventive rather than on curative protections. This

WG had published an Initial Report for public comment in January 2017, and has recently completed its review of all public comments received as well as taken into account relevant portions of the GAC-GNSO facilitated dialogue at ICANN58.

WHAT IS THE CURRENT STATUS OF THIS PROJECT?

The WG's charter directed the WG to consider: 1) whether the UDRP and URS should be amended to resolve the problems faced by IGOs and/or INGOs and if so in what way; or 2) if a separate, narrowly tailored dispute resolution procedure should be developed to apply only to IGOs and/or INGOs. The WG's preliminary recommendations, as published for Public Comment, essentially recommended that no changes be made to either the UDRP or URS and that no specific new process be developed for IGOs. The WG also developed some specific recommendations for IGOs, including the basis upon which an IGO may demonstrate standing to file a complaint under the UDRP and URS, and the issue of IGO jurisdictional immunity. Community feedback was received during the public comment period on all of the WG's preliminary recommendations.

WHAT ARE THE EXPECTED NEXT STEPS?

The WG will prepare its final recommendations and Final Report following the community discussions at ICANN59. It hopes to submit the Final Report to the GNSO Council for the Council's review and action by ICANN60.

HOW CAN I GET INVOLVED?

The open community session at ICANN59 is an excellent opportunity to contribute to shaping the final recommendations for this PDP. In addition, and although it is at a late stage in its work, the WG continues to be open to anyone; please contact the GNSO Secretariat at **gnso-secs@ICANN.org** to be added to the mailing list.

MORE INFORMATION

- WG Initial Report containing preliminary recommendations: **goo.gl/mg60wl**

- Public Comment of the WG Initial Report: **goo.gl/g5Hc0x**

- PDP Webpage: **gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/igo-ingo-crp-access**

- WG Workspace: **community.icann.org/x/37rhAg**

- WG Charter: **gnso.icann.org/en/drafts/igo-ingo-crp-access-charter-24jun14**

BACKGROUND

IGOs and INGOs face certain challenges in fully using the UDRP and URS for a number of reasons. IGOs see the Mutual Jurisdiction requirement for both processes as jeopardizing their jurisdictional immunity status. For both IGOs and INGOs, the fact that the UDRP and URS were designed as protective mechanisms for trademark owners means that they cannot use these procedures unless they also own trademarks in their names and/or acronyms. Both types of organizations are also concerned about the cost involved in using these procedures, which means diverting resources and funds from their primary missions. The GAC has issued advice on the topic which the WG continues to take into account in its deliberations.

STAFF RESPONSIBLE: Mary Wong and Steve Chan

Policy Amendment Process: Protections for Certain Red Cross Names in All Generic Top-Level Domains

WHAT CAN I EXPECT AT ICANN59 IN RELATION TO THIS TOPIC?

The Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) Council voted in May 2017 to initiate the GNSO process to consider amendments to previously completed Policy Development Process (PDP) recommendations, prior to their adoption by the ICANN Board. These recommendations are pertaining to certain names of the National Societies of the Red Cross and the International Red Cross Movement. The original PDP Working Group (WG), which completed its work in November 2013, has been reconvened for the purpose of this process. While the PDP WG will not be meeting at ICANN59, the GNSO Council is expected to receive a status update from the WG's chair during the GNSO Council's Public Meeting on Wednesday, 28 June (Day 3) at 13:00-15:00.

WHAT IS THIS ABOUT?

This section of the Policy Briefing should be read together with the following section entitled "Implementation Status: Protection of International Governmental Organization (IGO)-International Non-Governmental Organization (INGO) Identifiers in All Generic Top-Level Domains (gTLDs) Policy Recommendations".

The Protection of IGO-INGO Identifiers in All gTLDs PDP was completed in November 2013. Although the GNSO Council accepted all the PDP Working Group (WG) recommendations, the ICANN Board to date has approved only those recommendations that are consistent with the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) advice received on the subject. The remaining recommendations are still under Board consideration. They were the subject of a facilitated dialogue between the GAC and the GNSO at ICANN58 as part of an ongoing process to attempt to reconcile the GAC advice and the GNSO PDP recommendations.

Following that facilitated discussion, the ICANN Board requested that the GNSO Council consider initiating the GNSO policy amendment process in accordance with the GNSO's procedures. This policy amendment process pertains to the names of 190 Red Cross National Societies and two names identifying the International Red Cross Movement, as well as a limited, defined set of variants for these names. In May 2017, the GNSO Council voted to launch the policy amendment process. The process, as outlined in the GNSO's PDP Manual, involves reconvening the original PDP WG to consult with the GNSO Council on the scope of the proposed amendment.

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?

The ICANN Bylaws contain specific provisions that outline specific steps to be taken by the Board in cases where it disagrees with either GAC advice or GNSO PDP recommendations. In this case, the Board elected not to trigger either of these processes when it adopted only those GNSO PDP recommendations that were consistent with GAC advice in April 2014, and it requested additional time to consider the remaining, inconsistent recommendations.

The GNSO Council launched the PDP on the Protection of IGO-INGO Identifiers in All gTLDs in November 2012. The PDP considered what the appropriate form and scope of protections would be, at both the top and second level of the Domain Name System (DNS), for the Red Cross, the International Olympic Committee (IOC), and other IGOs and INGOs. All these organizations perform important public interest or humanitarian work. Cyber-squatting and related abuse of domain names identical or confusingly similar to their names and acronyms could significantly impact their missions and resources. The GNSO Council approved and the Board adopted part of the PDP outcomes, which included consensus recommendations that a limited list of Red Cross, IOC, IGO, and INGO identifiers be reserved. For the Red Cross, these are "Red Cross", "Red Crescent", "Red Crystal", and "Red Lion and Sun" at the top and second level. For IGOs, only their full organizational names will be reserved at the second level. The appropriate DNS protections for many of the other identifiers associated with the Red Cross and IGOs – i.e. Red Cross National Society names, the names and acronyms of the International Red Cross Movement, and IGO acronyms – have yet to be finalized. The facilitated dialogue that took place between representatives of the GAC and the GNSO at ICANN58 was an attempt to reconcile the remaining inconsistencies between GAC advice and the GNSO PDP recommendations.

The GNSO Council recently initiated the policy amendment process only related to the specific names associated with the Red Cross (i.e. Red Cross National Society and International Red Cross Movement names). Discussion over IGO acronyms remains ongoing.

WHAT IS THE CURRENT STATUS OF THIS PROJECT?

In accordance with an agreed timeline, the reconvened PDP WG is expected to continue meeting after ICANN59 to discuss the proposed amendment to its previous PDP recommendations on Red Cross names. GNSO Council has asked the PDP WG to consider the scope of the proposal based substantially on the Board's request from ICANN58.

WHAT ARE THE EXPECTED NEXT STEPS?

It is important to note that the GNSO's policy amendment process must take place before the Board acts on the PDP recommendations. Following the GNSO Council's consultation with the reconvened PDP WG, the process mandates that the proposed amendment be posted for public comment, following which the GNSO Council will consider whether to approve the amendment. The amendment will be considered approved only if a Supermajority of the GNSO Council votes to approve. The Board will then be expected to act in accordance with the ICANN Bylaws on the final results of this reconciliation process.

HOW CAN I GET INVOLVED?

You may follow the progress of the discussions by reviewing the background information on this project, observing the discussions, and looking out for any Public Comment forums that may be launched as part of the final reconciliation process.

MORE INFORMATION

- Protection of IGO-INGO Identifiers in All gTLDs PDP Webpage: **gnso.icann.org/e**

- ICANN Board resolution of April 2014 adopting the PDP recommendations consistent with GAC advice and requesting more time for the remaining recommendations: **http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-30apr14-en.htm - 2.a**

- GAC webpage listing GAC Communique advice relating to IGO protections: **https://gacweb.icann.org/display/GACADV/IGO+Names+and+Acronyms**

- Documents, meetings, and mailing list for GAC-GNSO facilitated dialogue: **https://community.icann.org/x/eoPRAw**

- ICANN Board resolution at ICANN58 requesting that the GNSO Council consider amending the adopted PDP recommendations pertaining to Red Cross names: **https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-03-16-**

- GNSO PDP Manual: **https://gnso.icann.org/en/council/annex-2-pdp-manual**

- GNSO Council resolution initiating the policy amendment process: **https://gnso.icann.org/en/council/resolutions - 20170503-071**

STAFF RESPONSIBLE: Mary Wong, Olof Nordling (GAC) and Nigel Hickson (GSE)

Implementation Status: Protection of International Governmental Organization-International Non-Governmental Organization Identifiers in All Generic Top-Level Domains Policy Recommendations

WHAT CAN I EXPECT AT ICANN59 IN RELATION TO THIS TOPIC?

The Implementation Review Team (IRT) plans to meet at ICANN59 to continue its work on the implementation and review public comments to prepare the summary analysis report (details to be published on the IRT mailing list when available).

WHAT IS THIS ABOUT?

The Policy Development Process (PDP) on the Protection of International Governmental Organization (IGO)-International Non-Governmental Organization (INGO) Identifiers in All Generic Top-Level Domains (gTLDs) was initiated to develop policy recommendations for the provision of protection for identifiers (e.g. names or acronyms) of certain IGOs and INGOs, including the Red Cross/Red Crescent Movement (RCRC) and the International Olympic Committee (IOC).

The PDP Working Group (WG) completed its work in November 2013 and all of its consensus recommendations were **approved** by the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) Council. In April 2014, the ICANN Board **adopted** those of the PDP recommendations that were consistent with GAC advice received on the topic, and requested more time to consider the remaining, inconsistent recommendations. The adopted recommendations relate to protection at the top and second level for specific RCRC, IOC and IGO full names (with an Exception Procedure to be designed for the affected organizations), and a 90-days Claims Notification process at the second level for certain INGO acronyms.

This project covers only the implementation status of the recommendations that were adopted by the ICANN Board in April 2014. It is not concerned with the ongoing resolution process for the remaining, inconsistent recommendations (including on IGO acronyms and remaining names of the RCRC) or the deliberations of the ongoing PDP Working Group (WG) on IGO-INGO Curative Rights Protections.

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?

Issues related to whether certain international organizations such as IGOs, the RCRC and the IOC should receive special protection for their names at the top level

and second level in the domain name system have been raised throughout the development of the 2012 New gTLD program. In the PDP launched by the GNSO Council, the scope of organizations was expanded to also consider INGOs (other than the RCRC and IOC). All these organizations perform important public interest or humanitarian work and have reported that cyber-squatting and related abuse of domain names identical or confusingly similar to their names and acronyms could significantly impact their missions and resources.

WHAT IS THE CURRENT STATUS OF THIS PROJECT?

Following the Board's adoption of the GNSO policy recommendations that were consistent with GAC advice, ICANN staff under the leadership of the Global Domains Division (GDD) began developing an Implementation Plan. An IRT comprising community members and led by GDD was formed and is meeting regularly to discuss and agree on timelines and steps for implementation. Most recently, the IRT discussed completion of the proposed process for updating the list of IGO and INGO names, as well as the needed features for the 90-days Claims Notification system that would apply to INGO identifiers (other than the RCRC and IOC). On 11 May 2017, the Proposed Implementation of the GNSO Consensus Policy Recommendation for the Protection of IGO and INGO Identifiers in All gTLDs has been published for public comment.

WHAT ARE THE EXPECTED NEXT STEPS?

Taking into account the public comments received, the GDD will finalize the consensus policy implementation plan, in coordination with the IRT. Once finalized, the consensus policy implementation will be published with the policy effective date.

HOW CAN I GET INVOLVED?

If you wish to join the IRT, please contact the GNSO Secretariat at **gnso-secs@icann.org**. You may also join the IRT meeting in ICANN59 to provide feedback on their work and to find out more about their progress.

MORE INFORMATION

- Public Comment period on the Proposed Implementation of GNSO Consensus Policy Recommendations for the Protection of IGO&INGO Identifier in All gTLDs: **https://www.icann.org/public-comments/igo-ingo-protection-2017-05-17-en**

- PDP Webpage: **http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/igo-ingo**

- IRT Workspace: **https://community.icann.org/x/RJFCAw**

STAFF RESPONSIBLE: Dennis Chang (GDD)

Implementation Status: Thick WHOIS Policy Recommendations

WHAT CAN I EXPECT AT ICANN59 IN RELATION TO THIS TOPIC?

Registries and registrars will discuss progress on the operational test and evaluation underway as the first steps in the implementation (details to be published on the Implementation Review Team (IRT) mailing list when available).

WHAT IS THIS ABOUT?

ICANN specifies WHOIS service requirements through Registry Agreements (RAs) and the Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA) for the gTLD registries. Registries have historically satisfied their WHOIS obligations under two different models. The two models are often characterized as "thin" and "thick" WHOIS registries. This distinction is based on how two distinct sets of data are maintained.

In a thin registration model the Registry only collects the information associated with the domain name from the Registrar. The Registry in turn publishes that information along with maintaining certain status information at the Registry level. Registrars maintain data associated with the registrant of the domain and provide it via their own WHOIS services, as required by Section 3.3 of the RAA for those domains they sponsor. In a thick registration model the Registry collects both sets of data (domain name and registrant) from the Registrar and in turn publishes that data via WHOIS.

The Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) Council initiated a Policy Development Process (PDP) to consider a possible requirement of "thick" WHOIS for all gTLDs. The PDP WG finalized its report and submitted it to the GNSO Council on 21 October 2013. The GNSO PDP WG concluded that requiring all gTLD registries to provide thick WHOIS services with a consistent labeling and display would improve stability of and access to WHOIS data as well as potentially reduce acquisition and processing cost for consumers of WHOIS data. The GNSO Council unanimously adopted the recommendation to require Thick WHOIS for all gTLD registries at its meeting on 31 October 2013. Following the Public Comment forum and the notification of the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC), the ICANN Board considered the recommendations and **adopted** these at its meeting on 7 February 2014.

WHAT IS THE CURRENT STATUS OF THIS PROJECT?

Following the ICANN Board approval of the GNSO recommendations on Thick WHOIS in February 2014, an IRT was formed. Various impact assessments and implementation

proposals have been discussed with the IRT in the two decoupled work streams: transition from thin to thick for .COM, .NET and .JOBS (Transition Policy); and the consistent labeling and display of WHOIS output for all gTLDs as per Specification 3 of the 2013 RAA (CL&D Policy). In June 2015, ICANN's General Counsel's Office released to the IRT a Legal Review Memorandum per the GNSO Council's recommendation. In December 2015, a Proposed Implementation of CL&D Policy was released for Public Comment. Following the Public Comment, the CL&D Policy was published on 26 July 2016. In August 2016, Registry Stakeholder Group (RySG) submitted a Request for Reconsideration regarding the CL&D Policy. In October 2016, the revised policy was published for another Public Comment to allow for additional comments. The Transition Policy was also released for Public Comment in the same time period. Following the Summary and Analysis Reports in January 2017, the implementations for both the CL&D Policy and the Transition Policy were published on 1 February 2017. CL&D Policy must be implemented by 1 August 2017. Thick WHOIS for new registration must be implemented by 1 May 2018 and the transition of thick registration data for existing registration must be implemented by 1 February 2019. Currently, implementation is underway with registries and registrars performing Operational Test and Evaluation.

MORE INFORMATION

- PDP Webpage: **http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/thick-whois**

- IRT Workspace: **https://community.icann.org/x/t77hAg**

- Public Comment period on CL&D Policy Proposal: **https://www.icann.org/public-comments/rdds-output-2015-12-03-en**

- Public Comment period on Transition from thin to thick for .COM, .NET and .JOBS **https://www.icann.org/public-comments/proposed-implementation-gnso-thick-rdds-whois-transition-2016-10-26-en**

- Thick WHOIS Transition Policy for .COM, .NET and .JOBS: **https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/thick-whois-transition-policy-2017-02-01-en**

- Registry Registration Data Directory Services Cl& D Policy: **https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/rdds-labeling-policy-2017-02-01-en**

STAFF RESPONSIBLE: Dennis Chang (GDD)

Implementation Status: Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Issues Policy Recommendations

WHAT CAN I EXPECT AT ICANN59 IN RELATION TO THIS TOPIC?

The Implementation Review Team (IRT) will not have a formal working meeting at ICANN59, but may potentially meet with the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC)'s Public Safety Working Group (PSWG) to discuss the PSWG's proposed law enforcement disclosure framework (details to be published on the **ICANN59 Final Schedule** webpage when available).

WHAT IS THIS ABOUT?

A privacy service allows domain name registration in the registrant's name, but all other contact details displayed in the publicly-accessible WHOIS system are those given by the privacy service provider, not by the registrant. A proxy service allows the registered name holder to license the use of the domain to a customer who actually uses the domain; the contact information displayed in the WHOIS system is that of the proxy service provider.

The ICANN organization is implementing a new Privacy and Proxy Service Provider Accreditation Program, pursuant to policy recommendations that were developed by the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Issues Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group (WG), adopted by the GNSO Council in January 2016, and adopted by the ICANN Board in August 2016.

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?

The 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA) contains a temporary specification that governs registrars' obligations in respect of privacy and proxy services. This specification will expire on 1 January 2018 or when ICANN implements a privacy and proxy accreditation program, whichever first occurs.

WHAT IS THE CURRENT STATUS OF THIS PROJECT?

An IRT of more than 40 community members has been formed under the direction of ICANN's Global Domains Division (GDD). The IRT commenced its meetings in October 2016. The IRT is currently discussing questions related to the PDP final recommendations and operational issues related to ICANN's design of

accreditation and de-accreditation processes for privacy and proxy service providers.

In January, the IRT elected to pursue an expedited timeline in light of the recently-announced 1 January 2018 expiration date of the 2013 RAA's interim Specification on Privacy and Proxy Registrations. The IRT will strive to complete its work, to the extent feasible, prior to the expiration of the interim RAA Specification, but the timeline could be impacted by unexpected developments. The project timeline will be revisited and updated quarterly on the ICANN.org **implementation status webpage**.

WHAT ARE THE EXPECTED NEXT STEPS?

The IRT is meeting weekly, and is currently discussing questions surrounding the draft Accreditation Policy and related questions.

The GAC's PSWG is working to develop a proposed law enforcement disclosure framework for Privacy and Proxy Service providers, to be refined within the IRT. It is expected that the PSWG will share this proposed framework with the IRT in early June.

The IRT will likely discuss this proposal with the PSWG members during the PSWG's meetings at ICANN59. This meeting has not yet been scheduled, but details will be posted on the ICANN59 **final schedule** webpage prior to the session.

HOW CAN I GET INVOLVED?

If you are a community member with experience and interest in this topic, and wish to join the IRT, send an email indicating your interest to the GNSO Secretariat at **gnso-secs@icann.org**.

MORE INFORMATION

- PDP Final Report: **http://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/raa/ppsai-final-07dec15**
- PDP Webpage: **http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/ppsa**
- IRT Workspace: **https://community.icann.org/x/VA2sAw**

STAFF RESPONSIBLE: Amy Bivins (GDD)

Implementation Status: Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information Recommendations

WHAT CAN I EXPECT AT ICANN59 IN RELATION TO THIS TOPIC?

The Implementation Review Team (IRT) will not meet during ICANN59 given the Meeting's policy development focus.

WHAT IS THIS ABOUT?

The continued internationalization of the domain name system (DNS) means registrations from registrants unfamiliar with Latin script are increasing. In October 2012 the GNSO Council requested an Issue Report to address whether it is desirable to translate or transliterate[1] contact information[2] into one common language or script. In December 2013, the GNSO T/T PDP Working Group (WG) was formed to provide an answer to this question as well as to who would carry the burden if mandatory translation or transliteration of contact information were recommended.

In its Final Report, the PDP WG does not recommend to mandate the translation or transliteration of contact information data. Instead, the WG recommends that registrants are able to submit contact data in any language and script supported by their registrar; ideally the registrant's native one. The WG expressed in its Final Report that data submitted in a script and language native to the registrant is most likely to be accurate and that the costs of translating and/or transliterating all contact Information data would be disproportionate to any potential benefits.

WHAT IS THE CURRENT STATUS OF THIS PROJECT AND WHAT ARE THE EXPECTED NEXT STEPS?

The ICANN Board **adopted** the recommendations of the PDP Working Group in September 2015.

As of June 2017, the IRT has been engaged in discussions around language and script tags for data entered into registration directory services. The team is discussing the necessity of such tags, and how to gather data to provision language and script information for those tags should they be deemed a necessity in terms of implementing the T/T PDP WG's recommendations. Discussions around the scope of the policy pertaining to these tags remains the subject of IRT meetings.

---

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

HOW CAN I GET INVOLVED?

The IRT is composed of members of the PDP Working Group. Newcomers and interested parties are welcome to join as observers. Send an email indicating your interest to the GNSO Secretariat at **gnso-secs@icann.org**.

MORE INFORMATION

- PDP WG Final Report: **https://goo.gl/MgZ42S**

- ICANN Board adopting the recommendations contained in the PDP WG Final Report: **https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2015-09**

- IRT Workspace: **https://community.icann.org/x/0SeOAw**

STAFF RESPONSIBLE: Brian Aitchison (Global Domain Division)

Cross Community Working Group: New Generic Top-Level Domains Auction Proceeds

WHAT IS THIS ABOUT?

The New Generic Top-Level Domain (gTLD) Program established auctions as a mechanism of last resort to resolve the competition sets between identical or similar terms (strings) for new gTLDs – known as string contention. Most string contentions (approximately 90% of sets scheduled for auction) have been resolved through other means before reaching an auction conducted using 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 successful auctions conducted by ICANN. Following the ICANN Board's commitment to do so, the auction proceeds derived from such auctions have been reserved and earmarked within ICANN until such time as the ICANN Board authorizes a plan for the appropriate use of the funds. These proceeds are to be considered as an exceptional, one-time source of revenue.

A CCWG has been chartered by the Address Supporting Organization (ASO), the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC), the Country Code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO), the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO), the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC), the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC), and the Root Server System Advisory Committee (RSSAC) to propose the mechanism that should be developed in order to allocate the new gTLD Auction Proceeds. Following approval of the proposal(s) by the Chartering Organizations, it will be submitted to the ICANN Board for its consideration.

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?

The new gTLD Auction Proceeds, derived from these last resort auctions, are distinct and ring-fenced funds. As such the Auction Proceeds are a single revenue source (derived from all new gTLD Auction Proceeds round 1). The proceeds, net of direct auction costs, are fully segregated in separate bank and investment accounts. The proceeds are invested conservatively and any interest accrues to the proceeds. 17 contention sets have been resolved via ICANN auction since June 2014. The total net proceeds to date are $233.5 million USD. Details of the proceeds can be found **here**. As of 11 February 2017, 16 contention sets remain to be resolved, but it is important to keep in mind that approximately 90% of

contention sets scheduled for auction are resolved prior to the auction. The total amount of funding resulting from auctions, will not be known until all relevant applications have resolved contention.

WHAT IS THE CURRENT STATUS OF THIS PROJECT AND EXPECTED NEXT STEPS?

The CCWG commenced its deliberations at the end of January 2017. The CCWG initially focused on assessing the **expertise** available within the CCWG as well as identifying potential external experts that may assist the CCWG in its deliberations. Furthermore, the CCWG deliberated its approach for dealing with the charter questions as well as the proposed timeline and agreed to the following phases:

1. Initial run-through of all charter questions to assess initial responses, identify possible gating questions, and determine potential order in which questions need to be dealt with.
2. Address any charter questions that have been identified requiring a further detailed response before commencing the next phase.
3. Compile list of possible mechanisms that could be considered by CCWG.
4. Determine which mechanism(s) demonstrates most potential to meet CCWG expectations as well as conform with legal and fiduciary constraints.
5. Answer charter questions (as organized per phase 1.) for mechanism(s) that demonstrate the most potential.
6. Publish Initial Report for public comment following consensus on mechanism and responses to charter questions that meet legal, fiduciary, and audit constraints.

The CCWG expects to complete its work on Phase 1 by ICANN59 so it is able to commence its work on Phase 2. The work products resulting from Phase 1 can be found **here**. See further details about the work plan and approach **here**.

HOW CAN I GET INVOLVED?

Anyone interested can join this effort at any time. Please complete the registration form at **https://goo.gl/forms/mL5pqhvTrtTgwOWM2** or contact the GNSO Secretariat **gnso-secs@icann.org**.

MORE INFORMATION

- CCWG Workspace: **https://community.icann.org/x/yJXDAw**

- CCWG Charter: **https://community.icann.org/x/DJjDAw**

BACKGROUND

Following a number of sessions on this topic during the ICANN53 in Buenos Aires (see **https://buenosaires53.icann.org/en/schedule/mon-soac-high-interest** and **https://buenosaires53.icann.org/en/schedule/wed-cwg-new-gtld-auction**), a **discussion paper** was published in September 2015 to solicit further community input on this topic as well as the proposal to proceed with a CCWG on this topic. As the feedback received on the discussion paper confirmed the support for moving forward with a CCWG, James Bladel, GNSO Chair, reached out to all the ICANN Supporting Organizations (SOs) and Advisory Committees (ACs) to ask for volunteers to participate in a Drafting Team (DT) to develop a charter for a CCWG on this topic. All ICANN SOs/ACs, apart from the ccNSO, responded to this request and have put forward volunteers to participate in the drafting team. The DT commenced its deliberations on Tuesday, 23 February 2016. A draft charter for community discussion was published in advance of ICANN56 and discussed during the **cross-community session** held at ICANN56. Following ICANN56, the DT **reviewed all the input received** and updated the proposed charter accordingly. On 13 September 2016, **this proposed charter** was shared with all ICANN SOs/ACs with the request to review it and identify any pertinent issues that would prevent adoption of the charter, if any. Subsequently, a webinar was held on 13 October 2016 to allow for some additional time and information to undertake this review. The final proposed charter was submitted to all ICANN SOs/ACs on 17 October 2016 following which each ICANN SO/AC confirmed the adoption of the charter. Subsequently, a **call for volunteers** was launched and the CCWG was formed.

STAFF RESPONSIBLE: Marika Konings and Joke Braeken (ccNSO)

Cross-Community Working Group: Use of Country and Territory Names as Top-Level Domains

WHAT IS THIS ABOUT?

Following in the footsteps of the Study Group on the Use of Names for Countries and Territories as top-level domains (TLDs), the purpose of this CWG is to further review the issues pertaining to the use of country and territory names as TLDs and develop a policy framework.

WHAT IS THIS IMPORTANT?

The treatment of country and territory names as TLDs is a topic that has been discussed by the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC), ccNSO, GNSO, Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC), and the ICANN Board for a number of years. Issues regarding the treatment of representations of country and territory names have arisen in a wide range of ICANN policy processes, including the Internationalized Domain Name (IDN) fast track, ccNSO IDN Policy Development Process (PDP), the development of the new gTLD Applicant Guidebook (AGB), and the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP. The CWG on Use of Country and Territory Names as TLDs (UCTN) was chartered to investigate the feasibility of a uniform policy framework on this important issue that could be applied across all TLDs. The creation of such a framework could be a helpful step forward in the continuous development of the domain name system (DNS).

WHAT IS THIS IMPORTANT?

The CWG produced an Interim Report that includes extensive background information on the issue area, a full summary of the group's activities and accomplishments, and a series of recommendations. The Report summarizes deliberations on 2-character and 3-character representations of country and territory names. It also explains why the group ultimately deemed that it is not

feasible within the CWG's limited mandate to develop a consistent and uniform framework defining rules guiding the use of country and territory names as top-level domains.

The Interim Report contains recommendations supported by a substantial majority of CWG members. The recommendations include closing the CWG, consolidating all policy efforts related to geographic names, and ensuring that future policy development work facilitates an all-inclusive dialogue to give all members of the community the opportunity to participate. The CWG did not reach consensus on how to organize future work.

The Interim Report was open to a public comment period following ICANN58. Taking into account comments received, the CWG is now finalizing the document, which will be submitted to its Chartering Organizations as the Final Report.

WHAT ARE THE EXPECTED NEXT STEPS?

The CWG will submit the Final Report to the ccNSO Council and the GNSO Council for discussion and adoption.

HOW CAN I GET INVOLVED?

To read the submitted public comments about the Interim Report, visit: **https://www.icann.org/public-comments/cwg-uctn-interim-paper-2017-02-24-en**.

MORE INFORMATION

- CWG Workspace: **https://community.icann.org/x/X7XhAg**

STAFF RESPONSIBLE: Emily Barabas, Steve Chan, Bart Boswinkel (ccNSO) and Joke Braeken (ccNSO)

GNSO Schedule in ICANN59 Johannesburg   26 June

Please confirm against **final schedule**, as changes may have occurred. For remote participation details, please check **this wiki page** created by the GNSO SO/AC Support Team. Live audio streaming, recording, and transcript will become available after meetings.

ICANN Community wide sessions
GNSO Council sessions
GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group (WG) sessions
GNSO outreach sessions
GNSO Stakeholder Group and Constituency sessions

DAY 1: MONDAY

TIME	BALLROOM 2	COMMITTEE 4
8:00 - 8:30	Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG) Outreach and Strategy Meeting	GSNO Outreach – GNSO Policy Briefing
8:30 - 9:00	Welcome and Multi-Stakeholder Ethos Award Presentation (Level 4 Foyer)	
9:00 - 10:15	Registry Stakeholder Group (RySG) Membership Meeting	GSNO Working Session
10:15 - 10:30	Coffee Break	
10:30 - 12:00	RySG Registry Service Provider (RSP) Discussion Group	GSNO Working Session
12:00 - 13:30	Intellectual Property Constituency (IPC) [Closed Meeting] (12:15-13:15)	Lunch Break
13:30 - 15:00	Registrar Stakeholder Group (RrSG) Policy Meeting	GSNO Working Session
15:00 - 15:15	Coffee Break	
15:15 - 16:45	Cross-Community Discussion on Next-Generation Registration Directory Services (RDS) Policy Requirements (Ballroom 1)	
16:45 - 17:00	Coffee Break	
17:00 - 18:30	Cross-Community Discussion on Next-Generation RDS Policy Requirements (Ballroom 1)	
18:30 - 19:30	GNSO / Country Code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO) Joint Council Meeting	

GNSO Schedule in ICANN59 Johannesburg   27 June

Please confirm against **final schedule**, as changes may have occurred. For remote participation details, please check **this wiki page** created by the GNSO SO/AC Support Team. Live audio streaming, recording, and transcript will become available after meetings.

DAY 2: TUESDAY

TIME	BALLROOM 2	COMMITTEE 4
8:00 - 8:30	Intellectual Property Constituency (IPC) Outreach Session [Closed Meeting]	GSNO Outreach – GNSO Policy Briefing
8:30 - 9:00		New Generic Top-Level Domain (gTLD) Subsequent Procedures PDP WG
9:00 - 10:15	Contracted Party House (CPH) Meeting	
10:15 - 10:30	Coffee Break	
10:30 - 12:00	International Governmental Organization (IGO)-International Non-Governmental Organization (INGO) Curative Rights Protections PDP WG	New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG
12:00 - 13:30	Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG) (12:30-13:30)	Lunch Break
13:30 - 15:00	New gTLD Auction Proceeds Cross Community Working Group (CCWG) Face-to-Face (F2F) Meeting (Ballroom 2)	NCSG Policy Committee Meeting
15:00 - 15:15	Coffee Break	
15:15 - 16:45	General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR): the Most Important Change in Data Privacy Regulation in Over 20 years (Ballroom 1)	Internet Service Providers and Connectivity Providers Constituency (ISPCP) Part I [Closed Meeting]
16:45 - 17:00	Coffee Break	
17:00 - 18:30	Cross Community Discussion – Geographic Names at the Top-Level Session I (Bill Gallagher Room)	
18:30 - 19:30	Informal GNSO Council Session [Closed Meeting]	

GNSO Schedule in ICANN59 Johannesburg   28 June

Please confirm against **final schedule**, as changes may have occurred. For remote participation details, please check **this wiki page** created by the GNSO SO/AC Support Team. Live audio streaming, recording, and transcript will become available after meetings.

DAY 3: WEDNESDAY

TIME	BALLROOM 2	COMMITTEE 4
8:00 - 8:30	NCSG Outreach and Strategy Meeting	GNSO Outreach – GNSO Policy Briefing
8:30 - 9:00	Next-Generation RDS to Replace WHOIS PDP WG F2F Meeting	
9:00 - 10:15		NCSG Executive Committee Meeting (ExCom) [Closed Meeting]
10:15 - 10:30	Coffee Break	
10:30 - 12:00	Next-Generation RDS to Replace WHOIS PDP WG F2F Meeting	Not-for-Profit Operational Concerns (NPOC) Constituency Day
12:00 - 13:30	Lunch Break	CPH ExCom [Closed Meeting] (12:00 - 13:00)
13:30 - 15:00	GNSO Council Public Meeting (13:00 - 15:00)	RySG Brand Registry Group (BRG) Membership Meeting
15:00 - 15:15	Coffee Break	
15:15 - 16:45	Operational side of ICANN's OPS Plan and Budget (Bill Gallagher Room)	NPOC ExCom Meeting [Closed Meeting]
16:45 - 17:00	Coffee Break	
17:00 - 18:30	Who sets ICANN's priorities? (Ballroom 1)	Non-Commercial Users Constituency (NCUC) Policy Session

GNSO Schedule in ICANN59 Johannesburg   29 June

Please confirm against **final schedule**, as changes may have occurred. For remote participation details, please check **this wiki page** created by the GNSO SO/AC Support Team. Live audio streaming, recording, and transcript will become available after meetings.

DAY 4: THURSDAY

TIME	BALLROOM 2	COMMITTEE 4
8:00 - 8:30	NCSG Outreach and Strategy Meeting	GNSO Outreach – GNSO Policy Briefing
8:30 - 9:00		
9:00 - 10:15	Review of Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) in All gTLDs PDP WG F2F Meeting	ISPCP Open Meeting
10:15 - 10:30	Coffee Break	
10:30 - 12:00	Review of RPMs in All gTLDs PDP WG F2F Meeting	NCSG Finance Committee Meeting
12:00 - 13:30	Commercial and Business Users Constituency (BC) Open Meeting (12:30-13:30)	ISPCP Part II [Closed Meeting] (12:30-13:30)
13:30 - 15:00	GNSO Council Wrap-Up Session	
15:00 - 15:15	Coffee Break	
15:15 - 16:45	Cross Community Discussion – Geographic Names at the Top-Level Session II (Ballroom 1)	
16:45 - 17:00	Coffee Break	
17:00 - 18:30	Cross Community Discussion – Geographic Names at the Top-Level Session II (Ballroom 1)	
18:30 - 20:00	ICANN59 Community Wrap-Up Cocktail (Level 4 Foyer)	

Acronym Helper

AC	Advisory Committee
AGB	Applicant Guide Book
ALAC	At-Large Advisory Committee
ASO	Address Supporting Organization
BC	Business Constituency
BRG	Brand Registry Group
C	Constituency
CC2	Community Comment 2
ccNSO	Country Code Names Supporting Organization
CCWG	Cross Community Working Group
CL&D Policy ...	consistent labeling and display of WHOIS output for all gTLDs
CPH	Contracted Party House
CSG	Commercial Stakeholder Group
CWG	Cross-Community Working Group
DNS	domain name system
DT	Drafting Team
EWG	Expert Working Group
ExCom	Executive Committee
GAC	Governmental Advisory Committee
GDD	Global Domains Division
GDPR	General Date Protection Regulation
GNSO	Generic Names Supporting Organization
gTLD	generic top-level domain
IANA	Internet Assigned Numbers Authority
IDN	Internationalized Domain Name
IGO	International Governmental Organizations
INGO	International Non-Governmental Organizations
IOC	International Olympic Committee
IPC	Intellectual Property Constituency
IRT	Implementation Review Team
ISPCP	Internet Service Providers and Connectivity Providers Constituency
NCSG	Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group
NCUC	Non-Commercial Users Constituency
NGPC	New gTLD Program Committee
NPOC	Not-for-Profit Operational Concerns Constituency
OEC	Organizational Effectiveness Committee
PDP	Policy Development Process
PSWG	Public Safety Working Group
RA	Registry Agreement
RAA	Registrar Accreditation Agreement
RCRC	Red Crescent Movement
RDS	registration directory services
RPM	Rights Protection Mechanism

Acronym Helper

RSP .... Registry Service Provider
RSSAC .... Root Server System Advisory Committee
RrSG .... Registrar Stakeholder Group
RySG .... Registry Stakeholder Group
SG .... Stakeholder Group
SO .... Supporting Organization
SSAC .... Security and Stability Advisory Committee
T/T .... Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information
TM-PDDRP ... Trademark Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution Procedures
TMCH .... Trademark Clearinghouse
UCTN .... Use of Country and Territory Names as TLDs
UDRP .... Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy
URS .... Uniform Rapid Suspension
WG .... Working Group

ICANN | GNSO

Generic Names Supporting Organization