



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

Last updated: 30 October 2016

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

1 - Issue Identification				
Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
GNSO Council Action Items - LINK	NA	NA	NA	Refer to most recent action item list for latest status

2 - Issue Scoping

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

3 – Initiation

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
New gTLD Auction Proceeds Drafting Team Chair: Jonathan Robinson Vice-Chair: Alan Greenberg Staff: M. Konings, D. Tait	2016-Mar-10	ICANN57	SO/ACs	The new gTLD Program established auctions as a mechanism of last resort to resolve string contention. Most string contentions (approximately 90% of sets scheduled for auction) have been resolved through other means before reaching an auction conducted by ICANN's authorized auction service provider, Power Auctions LLC. However, it was recognized from the outset that significant funds could accrue as a result of several auctions. As such, these auction proceeds have been reserved and earmarked until the Board authorizes a plan for the appropriate use of the funds. Board, staff, and community are expected to be working together in designing and participating in the next steps addressing the use of new gTLD auction proceeds. A drafting team composed of representatives of SO/ACs and the Board has been convened to prepare a draft Charter. This group met for the first time on 10 Mar 2016 in Marrakech and has produced a draft charter which was reviewed and discussed in a public session during ICANN56. The Drafting Team has prepared a revised charter which has been forwarded to the SO/ACs with the request to identify pertinent issues, if any, that would prevent adoption. At the request of the GNSO Council leadership team, a webinar has been scheduled for 13 October to provide an overview of the proposed charter and address any possible questions. With no pertinent issues having been raised, the DT has now submitted the proposed charter for considered by the different ICANN SO/ACs, with a possible target date of adoption at ICANN57 in Hyderabad 3-9 November.

4 – Working Group

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
GNSO Review Working Group Chair: Jennifer Wolfe Vice-Chair: Wolf-Ulrich Knoben Staff: J. Hedlund, M. Konings	2016-Jul-21	ICANN57	WG	The GNSO Council adopted the Charter of the GNSO Review Working Group (WG) during its meeting on 21 July 2016. This WG is tasked to develop an implementation plan for the GNSO Review recommendations which were recently adopted by the ICANN Board. The GNSO Review Working Group is expected to deliver the implementation plan to the GNSO Council for consideration at the November 2016 GNSO Council meeting at ICANN57 (3-9 November) at the latest in order to meet the Board set objective of ‘an implementation plan, containing a realistic timeline for the implementation, definition of desired outcomes and a way to measure current state as well as progress toward the desired outcome, shall be submitted to the Board as soon as possible, but no later than six (6) months after the adoption of this resolution’ ¹ i.e., December 2016. The WG has been meeting weekly and will meet at ICANN57 to finalize an implementation plan.
Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability Co-Chairs: Mathieu Weill (ccNSO), Thomas Rickert (GNSO), Leon Sanchez (ALAC) Staff support: B. Turcotte	2016-Jun-26	June 2017	CCWG	The CCWG-WS2 commenced work on WS2 at ICANN56 in June 2016. It will address the remaining nine issues that were deferred from WS1.
Rights Protection Mechanisms in All gTLDs PDP Chair(s): Philip Corwin, J. Scott Evans, Kathy Kleiman Council Liaison: Heather Forrest Community Liaisons (to/from the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG): Robin Gross, Susan Payne Staff: M. Wong, D. Tait	2011-Feb-03	Ongoing	WG	On 28 February 2016, the GNSO Council voted to initiate the PDP adopted the Working Group Charter (updated from its draft form following work by several Council volunteers) in March. The PDP is being conducted in two phases, beginning with the RPMs developed for the 2012 New gTLD Program, with the 1999 Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy to follow. The first WG meeting was held on 21 April 2016. The WG began its work with a review of the Trademark Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution Procedure (TM-PDDRP). Sub Teams have been formed to perform data gathering and to clarify the Charter questions for the WG’s forthcoming review of the TMCH, which will begin after the TM-PDDRP review is completed. Further provider and community feedback has been sought for the TM-PDDRP, which will be discussed at ICANN57. The WG

¹ The Board resolution was adopted on 25 June 2016

4 – Working Group

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
				hopes to wrap up its review of the TM-PDDRP at or shortly following ICANN57.
<p><u>New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP</u> Chair(s): Stephen Coates, Avri Doria, and Jeff Neuman Council Liaison: Paul McGrady Community Liasons (to/from the RPM Review PDP WG): Robin Gross, Susan Payne Staff: S. Chan, J. Hedlund, E. Barabas</p>	2014-Jun-25	2015-Dec	WG	The WG began its meetings on 22 February, and agreed to meet weekly for 90 minutes. The PDP WG has completed preliminary deliberations on a set of overarching topics, which are the basis for a formal request for input that was sent to the SO/AC/SG/Cs ahead of ICANN56 in Helsinki in June. The WG is now considering input received from the community on the overarching issues. In addition, the WG has created four Work Track Sub Teams, which have commenced their work. Both the Sub Teams and full PDP WG are meeting every two weeks. On 25 October 2016, the GNSO Council sent a Council response to a letter from the ICANN Board concerning whether some of the WG's work could be prioritize (e.g., workstreams) or otherwise organized to facilitate the launch of a new application mechanism.
<p><u>PDP on the next generation gTLD Registration Directory Service to replace WHOIS</u> Chair: Chuck Gomes Vice-Chairs: David Cake, Michele Neylon, Susan Kawaguchi Council liaison: Stephanie Perrin Staff: M. Konings The WG is tasked to provide the GNSO Council with recommendations on the following two questions as part of phase 1: What are the fundamental requirements for gTLD registration data and is a new policy framework and next-generation RDS needed to address these requirements?</p>	2012-Nov-8	Ongoing	WG	The PDP Working Group convened at the end of January 2016 (see https://community.icann.org/x/olxlAw for its work plan). Most recently, the Working Group has compiled a list of possible requirements for gTLD registration directory services, providing a foundation upon which to recommend answers to these two questions: What are the fundamental requirements for gTLD registration data and directory services, and is a new policy framework and next-generation RDS needed to address these requirements? Triage on the list of possible requirements has now been completed and deliberations on the list of possible requirements are expected to commence at ICANN57. At the same time, the WG is in the process of finalising its RDS statement of purpose, which it expects to complete shortly after ICANN57.
<p><u>Curative Rights Protections for IGO/INGOs PDP</u> Chair(s): Philip Corwin, Petter Rindforth Council Liaison: Susan Kawaguchi Staff: M. Wong, S. Chan</p>	2014-Jun-05	Ongoing	WG	Based on the recommendation of the IGO-INGO PDP Working Group, the GNSO Council resolved to initiate a PDP and chartered a WG in June 2014. The PDP WG is tasked to explore possible amendments to the Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP) and the Uniform Rapid Suspension procedure (URS) so as to enable International Governmental Organizations (IGOs) and

4 – Working Group

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
				<p>International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGOs) to access and use curative rights protection mechanisms. The WG is focusing on IGOs, as it has preliminarily determined that INGOs do not appear to require additional protections. At the WG's request, an external legal expert, Professor Edward Swaine from George Washington University, was engaged to provide a legal opinion on the state of international law on the topic of IGO jurisdictional immunity. Professor Swaine submitted his final legal opinion on 17 June 2016, which the WG has reviewed.</p> <p>The WG has also reviewed the IGO Small Group Proposal, which was sent to the GNSO and the GAC on 6 October 2016. The WG is currently wrapping up discussion on its preliminary recommendations, with a view toward completing an Initial Report for public comment shortly after ICANN57 in November. It plans to solicit community feedback on its likely preliminary recommendations at ICANN57.</p>
<p>Cross-Community Working Group- on a Framework of CWG Principles GNSO Council Co-Chair: John Berard ccNSO Council Co-Chair: Becky Burr Staff: M. Wong, B. Boswinkel, S. Chan</p> <p>The CCWG was chartered by the ccNSO and GNSO Councils to develop a set of uniform guidelines (based on earlier work by the GNSO, feedback from the ccNSO and community experience from past CCWGs) for the formation, operation and termination of future cross-community working groups.</p>	2011-May-19	Ongoing	CWG	<p>This Cross-Community Working Group was chartered by both the ccNSO and GNSO Councils in March 2014. The CCWG reviewed the processes and outcomes of selected prior CWGs, including mapping their charters to the typical WG life cycle (Initiation, Formation, Operation, Closure, Post-Closure). A draft framework was published for public comment on 22 February 2016. A final proposed framework based on public comments received was drafted and presented for community deliberation at ICANN56 at the end of June. Following review of the public and community comments received, the CCWG completed its Final Framework and sent it to both the Chartering Organizations for their review and action. The GNSO Council approved the Final Framework on 13 October and the ccNSO Council is expected to consider the matter at ICANN57 (3-9 November 2016). Following ccNSO Council approval, the Framework will be sent to all other ICANN SO/ACs, with the recommendation that it be used to guide the community's discussions for all future CCWGs.</p>
<p>Cross-Community Working Group to develop a framework for the use of Country and</p>	2014-Mar-26	Ongoing	CWG	<p>The CWG is using an Options Paper to drive forward its discussion and has concluded its work on two-letter codes. Following a request for input that was</p>

4 – Working Group

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p>Territory names as TLDs (CWG-UCTN) GNSO Council Co-Chairs: Heather Forrest, Carlos Gutierrez ccNSO Council Co-Chairs: Paul Szyndler, Annabeth Lange Council liaison: Heather Forrest Staff: B. Boswinkel, S. Chan, E. Barabas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The objective of the CWG is to: Further review the current status of representations of country and territory names, as they exist under current ICANN policies, guidelines and procedures; Provide advice regarding the feasibility of developing a consistent and uniform definitional framework that could be applicable across the respective SO's and AC's; and Should such a framework be deemed feasible, provide detailed advice as to the content of the framework. 				<p>sent to all SO/ACs and SG/Cs on 3-character codes, the co-Chairs requested that Staff draft a straw person proposal on 3-character codes that was presented and discussed during ICANN55. Communication channels with the GAC remain open regarding potentially overlapping work efforts, and the GAC invited the CWG-UCTN co-Chairs to meet during ICANN56 in Helsinki at the end of June. Also at ICANN56, the CWG-UCTN provided a brief update during the cross community session on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures and conducted its own cross community session as well. A status report is currently being drafted, which will summarize the CWG's accomplishments and provide recommendations for future work on geographic names. The CWG-UCTN is also in the process of drafting an Interim Paper, for which it will seek public comment. Drafts of both documents will be made available prior to ICANN57.</p>
<p>Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance (CCWG-IG) Co-Chairs: Rafik Dammak (GNSO), Jordan Carter (ccNSO), Olivier Crepin-Leblond (ALAC) GNSO Council Liaison: Carlos Gutierrez Staff: A-R Inne, N. Hickson, R. Dewulf</p> <p>The Internet Governance CWG has been established by the participating SO's and AC's to coordinate, facilitate, and increase the participation of the ICANN community in</p>	2014-Oct-15	Ongoing	CCWG	<p>The GNSO Council adopted the charter for this CCWG during ICANN51 in October 2014. The CCWG subsequently requested confirmation from its Chartering Organizations regarding a question of interpretation of its charter, which the GNSO Council agreed to at its May 2015 meeting. The CCWG co-chairs provided an update to the ccNSO and GNSO Councils at ICANN55 and ICANN56. The GNSO Council has been discussing the progress and status of this CCWG, with a view toward determining possible next steps for this CCWG at ICANN57 which takes place from 3-9 November, in Hyderabad. A motion to withdraw GNSO support from the Charter has been submitted for GNSO Council consideration at ICANN57.</p>

4 – Working Group

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
discussions and processes pertaining to Internet Governance.				

5 – Council Deliberation

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p>GNSO Rights & Obligations under Revised ICANN Bylaws Drafting Team Chair: Steve DelBianco Vice-Chair: Amr Elsadr Staff: M. Wong, J. Hedlund</p>	2016-Jun-30	Late 2016	Council	<p>On 27 May 2016 the ICANN Board adopted a set of new ICANN Bylaws that aim to reflect changes needed to implement the IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal. The revised Bylaws include new and additional rights and obligations for the GNSO. As changes to the GNSO’s Operating Procedures and applicable Bylaws may be needed to accommodate these new roles, including the participation of the GNSO in the newly created Empowered Community, the GNSO Council created a Drafting Team (DT) on 30 June 2016 to identify the GNSO’s new rights and obligations, and work with ICANN staff to prepare an implementation plan to address any needed changes by 30 September (see http://gns0.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#201606). A call for volunteers was issued and the DT is meeting weekly and reviewing a draft implementation plan. Steve DelBianco delivered an update during the GNSO Council call on 29 September and noted that although the DT had made significant progress it would benefit from an additional two weeks to provide more complete recommendations. The GNSO Council granted the request and the DT delivered its report in time for the 13 October Council meeting. However, at its meeting the GNSO Council agreed to defer consideration of the motion to approve the DT’s report to its meeting on 07 November at ICANN57.</p>
<p><u>GAC-GNSO Consultation Group on GAC Early Engagement in GNSO PDPs</u> Chairs: Jonathan Robinson (GNSO) and Manal Ismail (GAC) Staff: M. Konings, O. Nordling</p> <p>The Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) and the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) have jointly established a consultation group to explore ways for the GAC to engage early in the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) and to improve overall cooperation between the two bodies (for example, by exploring the option of a</p>	2014-Jan-07	Ongoing	Council	<p>The launch of this GAC-GNSO Consultation Group on Early Engagement is the result of discussions between the two entities at the ICANN meeting in Buenos Aires as well as previous ICANN meetings, reflecting a joint desire to explore and enhance ways of early engagement in relation to GNSO policy development activities. The issue was also specifically called-out by both Accountability and Transparency Review Teams (ATRT). The GNSO Council confirmed during its last meeting that the position of GNSO Liaison to the GAC should be made a permanent role. In Helsinki the Council adopted a motion to extend the term of the current liaison to run through the AGM in November, at which a new liaison is expected to be appointed. During ICANN56 in Helsinki, the CG shared the results of the survey which was held to obtain further input from the GNSO as well as GAC on the review of the Quick Look Mechanism as well as other opportunities for early engagement of the GAC in the GNSO PDP. The CG has most recently submitted its final status report and</p>

5 – Council Deliberation

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
liaison).				recommendations to the GNSO and GAC for their consideration. Upon the adoption of the recommendations, the CG considers its work complete.

6 – Board Vote

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p>Protection of International Organization Names in All gTLDs PDP</p> <p>Chair: Thomas Rickert Council liaison: Keith Drazek Staff: M. Wong, S. Chan, B. Cobb</p>	2012-Apr-12	2014-Dec-11	Board/ Council/IRT	<p>The GNSO Council unanimously approved the IGO-INGO WG’s consensus recommendations at its 20 Nov 2013 meeting. In April 2014 the Board voted to adopt those of the GNSO’s recommendations that are not inconsistent with GAC advice received on the topic. Staff has organized an Implementation Review Team (in line with the GNSO’s recommendation), led by Dennis Chang of GDD, to implement those recommendations adopted by the Board (See below in the “7 – Implementation” section for more details). A Call for Volunteers to the IRT was issued following the Buenos Aires meeting and the IRT held its first meeting in late September. It is currently meeting regularly to work on the implementation plan.</p> <p>As requested by the Board, the NGPC developed a proposal for dealing with the remaining recommendations, taking into account the GNSO’s recommendations and GAC advice in March 2014. On 18 June 2014 the NGPC sent a letter to the GNSO Council requesting that the GNSO contemplate initiating a process to consider possible modifications to its remaining recommendations, per the PDP Manual. Following a discussion with Chris Disspain, the Council sent a letter on 7 Oct 2014 to the NGPC seeking confirmation and input about the most appropriate forms of protection for IGO acronyms and Red Cross names. At ICANN51 the NGPC resolved to temporarily reserve the Red Cross National Society names at issue until the differences between the GNSO recommendations and the GAC advice have been reconciled. Staff is currently working on implementing this resolution, with assistance from the Red Cross. The NGPC responded to the Council’s letter on 15 January 2015 noting that discussions are ongoing. A small group of IGO, GAC and NGPC representatives was formed in late 2014 to develop a final proposal for the GAC’s and GNSO’s consideration. This was delivered to the Council on 6 October 2016 and is now under consideration by the Council.</p> <p>Representatives from the Red Cross provided a briefing to the Council during the Council’s April 2016 meeting. On 31 May, the Council sent a further letter to the Board requesting updated Board input on the remaining Red Cross names and IGO acronyms. It also discussed the matter of Red Cross and IGO</p>

6 – Board Vote

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
				<p>acronyms protection with Board members during ICANN56 in Helsinki at the end of June.</p> <p>On 27 October 2016 a call was held among Board, GAC and GNSO representatives on this topic, to discuss next steps. It is expected that further discussions will take place at Hyderabad in November.</p>
<p>Geo Regions Review Community-wide Working Group Chair: Cheryl Langdon-Orr (ccNSO/APRALO) GNSO Council Reps: Staff: R. Hoggarth This Board-chartered cross community WG has consulted with ICANN stakeholders regarding the definition and applications of ICANN’s Geographic Regions.</p>	2008-Aug-07	TBC	Board	<p>A community Public Comment opportunity has been established for this matter (see https://www.icann.org/public-comments/geo-regions-2015-12-23-en. The comment period closed on 24 April 2016 and 7 submissions were received. The staff report of public comments was published (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-geo-regions-13may16-en.pdf) and the Board will now review the comments received and consider next steps</p>

7 – Implementation

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p>Cross-Community Working Group- on a Framework of CWG Principles GNSO Council Co-Chair: John Berard ccNSO Council Co-Chair: Becky Burr Staff: M. Wong, B. Boswinkel, S. Chan</p> <p>The CCWG was chartered by the ccNSO and GNSO Councils to develop a set of uniform guidelines (based on earlier work by the GNSO, feedback from the ccNSO and community experience from past CCWGs) for the formation, operation and termination of future cross-community working groups.</p>	2011-May-19	Ongoing	Staff	<p>This Cross-Community Working Group was chartered by both the ccNSO and GNSO Councils in March 2014. The CCWG reviewed the processes and outcomes of selected prior CWGs, including mapping their charters to the typical WG life cycle (Initiation, Formation, Operation, Closure, Post-Closure). A draft framework was published for public comment on 22 February 2016. A final proposed framework based on public comments received was drafted and presented for community deliberation at ICANN56 at the end of June. Following review of the public and community comments received, the CCWG completed its Final Framework and sent it to both the Chartering Organizations for their review and action. The GNSO Council approved the Final Framework on 13 October and the ccNSO Council is expected to consider the matter at ICANN57 (3-9 November 2016). Following ccNSO Council approval, the Framework will be sent to all other ICANN SO/ACs, with the recommendation that it be used to guide the community’s discussions for all future CCWGs.</p>
<p>Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues PDP WG Chair(s): Don Blumenthal, Graeme Bunton, Steve Metalitz Council Liaison: James Bladel Staff: M. Wong, M. Konings</p> <p>The <i>Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA)</i>, the contract governing the relationship between ICANN and accredited registrars, has been in place since 2001. The Board initiated negotiations for a new RAA in October 2011, and requested an Issue Report from the GNSO at the same time. The final version of the new RAA was approved by the Board in June 2013, thereby signifying that the RAA negotiations were concluded. Per the Board’s 2011 request, the remaining issues, which were identified as</p>	2009-May-21	Ongoing	Board	<p>The WG’s Final Report was sent to the GNSO Council on 8 December 2015. In January 2016, the GNSO Council voted unanimously to approve all the WG’s final recommendations. A public comment forum was opened prior to Board action, as required by the ICANN Bylaws. As further required by the Bylaws, the Council approved a Recommendations Report for transmission to the ICANN Board at its 18 February meeting. This was forwarded to the Board in time for its its May 2016 meeting, at which the Board acknowledged receipt of the PDP recommendations and requested additional time to consider time, to allow for possible timely GAC input.</p> <p>The WG co-chairs met with representatives of the GAC’s Public Safety Working Group in March 2016 in Marrakech to discuss the GAC’s concerns with the final recommendations. In Helsinki, the GAC hosted a discussion at which the WG co-chairs participated. The GAC advice from Helsinki was for its concerns to be addressed during implementation to the extent feasible. On 9 August, the Board adopted the PDP recommendations.</p> <p>Staff is working to finalize a detailed implementation plan, including costs and</p>

7 – Implementation

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
those relating to privacy & proxy services and their accreditation, were to be examined in this PDP.				<p>development effort required for various models for implementation processes. The plan will be presented to the IRT and shared with the Board after the IRT meetings commence. GDD staff is meeting with Policy staff to coordinate a formal handoff.</p> <p>A call for volunteers to form the IRT was issued on 16 September 2016. The first IRT meeting was held on 18 October, and ICANN Staff presented the implementation plan to the IRT and requested feedback.</p>
Translation/Transliteration of Internationalized Registration Data PDP	2012-Oct-17	Ongoing	Staff	<p>On 28 September 2015 the ICANN Board passed the motion to adopt all seven recommendations contained in the Final Report. A draft implementation plan and a call for volunteers to joining the Implementation Review Team was sent out.</p> <p>The kick-off call with the IRT was held 19 July 2016. The second call was held on 2 August 2016. The implementation plan has been posted to the community wiki.</p> <p>As of August 2016, the IRT is currently engaged in discussions around language and script tags, which appear to be a minimum requirement to meet the standards set by the T/T Recommendations</p> <p>The project was on hold for most of Sept-Oct 2016 given the Registry Stakeholder Group's Request for Reconsideration (RFR) to require RDAP be implemented on the part of registries and registrars. Their RFR was in response to Provision 12 of the proposed "Consistent Labeling and Display" policy coming out of the Thick Whois policy implementation Project. Without RDAP and its ability to accept non-ASCII characters, the recommendations of the T/T Working Group cannot be implemented.</p>
IRTP Part C Recommendations The GNSO Council unanimously adopted the recommendations of the IRTP Part C PDP at its	17 Oct 2012	1 Sept 2015	Staff	<p>The ICANN Board adopted the IRTP Part C recommendations at its meeting in December 2012 (see https://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-20dec12-</p>

7 – Implementation

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p>meeting on 17 October 2012 (see http://gns0.icann.org/en/resolutions#20121017-4).</p>				<p>en.htm#2.a). As instructed by the GNSO Council, an Implementation Review Team was formed. Meetings of the IRT have recommenced and details of the proposed implementation plan have been shared with the IRT. Staff sought input from the IRT on the Change of Registrant draft policy language, and the draft policy was posted for public comment on 30 March 2015. Comments were due 16 May 2015, and the IRT reviewed the comments received. The updated Transfer Policy was announced on 24 September 2015 (see https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2-2015-09-24-en). Following community feedback, an updated version of the Transfer Policy was announced on 1 June 2016 (see https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2016-06-01-en). The updated version of the Transfer Policy will be effective 1 December 2016.</p>

7 – Implementation

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p>Thick WHOIS PDP Recommendations The GNSO Council adopted the recommendation to require Thick Whois for all gTLD registries at its meeting on 31 October 2013. Council Liaison: Amr Elsadr</p>	2012-Mar-14	Ongoing	Staff	<p>The ICANN Board approved the GNSO recommendations on Thick Whois at its meeting on 7 February 2014. (http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-07feb14-en.htm). An Implementation Review Team has been formed and various impact assessments and implementation proposals have been discussed with the IRT in the two decoupled work streams, corresponding to the two expected outcomes in the PDP Recommendations: transition from thin to thick for .COM, .NET and .JOBS; and the consistent labeling and display of Whois output for all gTLDs as per Specification 3 of the 2013 RAA. Further discussions of the proposals, issues, and risks are being planned in subsequent IRT sessions. Regarding the transition from thin to thick for .COM, .NET and .JOBS, in June 2015, ICANN’s General Counsel’s Office, released to the IRT a Legal Review Memorandum per the GNSO Council’s recommendation. ICANN Staff is currently engaging with experts from affected parties to identify an implementation path.</p> <p>Following IRT review and formal public comment, the first outcome was published as a Consensus Policy for Registry Registration Data Directory Services Consistent Labeling and Display Policy on 26 July 2016 with a required implementation date of 1 February 2017. However, due to a Request for Reconsideration related to the inclusion of a requirement in the Consensus Policy to implement RDAP, the policy was rescinded, modified to remove the RDAP requirement, then published for public comment. The policy effective date will be established in the first quarter of 2017.</p> <p>For the Thin to Thick transition, the implementation plan is being developed as a separate work track.</p> <p>One significant topic of discussion is the impact of the Request for Reconsideration (RfR) received from the RySG in August 2016 for the Registry Registration Data Directory Services Consistent Labeling and Display Policy (CL&D Policy) that was announced on 26 July 2016. The RfR objects to the inclusion of Registration Data Access Protocol (RDAP) in the CL&D Policy. RDAP</p>

7 – Implementation

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
				<p>a standardized operational protocol intended to replace WHOIS. The RySG’s objection to the inclusion of RDAP in the CL&D Policy has been discussed with the IRT. As a result, RDAP will be removed from the CL&D Policy and follow a separate implementation path. A public comment period on this change is expected to open shortly.</p> <p>The new Thick Whois Transition Policy for .COM, .NET and .JOBS also references RDAP, therefore the RfR issue may need to be resolved in order to not impede progress of the Transition Policy.</p> <p>Additionally, the IRT recently raised concerns regarding privacy issues that were not anticipated by the Policy Development Process Working Group. Per the approved Policy Recommendation, the IRT is expected to notify the GNSO Council of these issues so that appropriate action can be taken. Therefore, a member of the IRT has drafted a memo to the GNSO Council that is being discussed to reach agreement on substance and message. At present, there appears to be disagreement among the IRT regarding the memo. However, the IRT is continuing its implementation work in parallel to the discussion of the draft memo.</p>

7 – Implementation

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p>Protection of International Organization Names in All gTLDs</p> <p>The GNSO Council adopted the recommendation to protect certain identifiers of IGO & INGO Organizations in all gTLD registries at its meeting on 20 November 2013. Council liaison: Keith Drazek</p>	2012-Apr-12	Ongoing	Staff/IRT	<p>The GNSO Council unanimously approved the IGO-INGO WG’s consensus recommendations at its 20 Nov 2013 meeting. In April 2014 the Board voted to adopt those of the GNSO’s recommendations that are not inconsistent with GAC advice received on the topic. Staff has formed an Implementation Review Team (in line with the GNSO’s recommendation) to implement those recommendations adopted by the Board.</p> <p>To date, ICANN Staff has been working on building comprehensive and actionable lists of all the identifiers to be protected as well as draft procedures for eventual implementation of relevant protections: reservations at the top and second levels and related exception procedures. Staff, in collaboration with the IRT, is progressively building a Draft Consensus Policy document. This document serves to support the continuing development of the implementation plan. The IRT is continuing to discuss finalizing the draft Consensus Policy language.</p>
<p>IRTP Part D PDP WG</p> <p>The GNSO Council unanimously adopted the recommendations of the IRTP Part D PDP at its meeting on 15 October 2014 (see http://gns0.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#20141015-1).</p>	2012-Oct-17	Ongoing	Staff	<p>The ICANN Board approved the GNSO recommendations of IRTP D on 12 February 2015 (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2015-02-12-en#1.d). GDD staff has drafted an Implementation Plan and the Implementation Review Team (IRT) has been meeting on a biweekly basis since August. The draft Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy (TDRP) and draft Transfer Policy were posted for public comment on 10 November 2015. The comment period closes 21 December 2015. The IRT has reviewed all of the comments, and Staff is working on website and educational material updates per the public comments received. No comments were received regarding the draft TDRP and Transfer Policy. The updated version of the Transfer Policy and TDRP were announced on 1 June 2016 (https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2016-06-01-en). The updated Transfer Policy and TDRP will be effective 1 December 2016.</p>

Other				
Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p>Consumer Choice Competition and Trust Review Team</p> <p>Chair: Jonathan Zuck Staff: Eleeza Agopian, Margie Milam, Brian Aitchison</p>	2015-Feb-12	2017-Mar-31	Review Team	<p>Under the Affirmation of Commitments (AoC), ICANN is committed to ensuring that, as it contemplates expanding the top-level domain space, the various issues that are involved will be adequately addressed prior to implementation. These include issues such as competition, consumer protection, security, stability and resiliency, malicious abuse issues, sovereignty concerns, and rights protection. The AoC also requires ICANN to convene a community-driven review to examine the extent to which the introduction or expansion of gTLDs has promoted competition, consumer trust and consumer choice, as well as the effectiveness of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application and evaluation process • Safeguards put in place to mitigate issues involved in the introduction or expansion <p>The Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice (CCT Review Team) is examining the extent to which the introduction or expansion of gTLDs has promoted competition, consumer trust and consumer choice. It will also assess the effectiveness of the application and evaluation processes, as well as the safeguards put in place by ICANN to mitigate issues involved in the introduction or expansion of new gTLDs.</p>