



| Phase | Title | Links |
|---------------------------|---|----------------------|
| 1 - Issue Identification | GNSO Council Action Items [refer to list on wiki] | LINK |
| 2 - Issue Scoping | Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy – Policy Review (IRTP-PR) | LINK |
| 3 – Initiation | WHOIS Procedure Implementation Advisory Group – (WPIAG) | LINK |
| 4 - Working Group | Expedited Policy Development Process on the Temporary Specification on gTLD Registration Data– (TempSpec) | LINK |
| 4 - Working Group | Cross Community Working Group on New gTLD Auction Proceeds (CWG-Auction) | LINK |
| 4 - Working Group | PDP: Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms in All gTLDs (RPM) | LINK |
| 4 - Working Group | PDP: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP (Sub-Pro) | LINK |
| 5 – Council Deliberations | PDP: Curative Rights Protections for IGO/INGOs (IGO-INGO-CRP) | LINK |
| 6 – Board Vote | PDP: Protection of International Organization Names in All gTLDs – Reconvened WG (IGO-RCRC) | LINK |
| 6 – Board Vote | Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability (WS2) | LINK |
| 6 – Board Vote | GNSO Review Working Group (GRWG) | LINK |
| 6 – Board Vote | PDP: Protection of International Organization Names in All gTLDs (IGO-INGO) | LINK |
| 7 – Implementation | Geo Regions Review (GEO) | LINK |
| 7 – Implementation | GNSO Rights & Obligations under Revised ICANN Bylaws Drafting Team (RODT) | LINK |
| 7 – Implementation | PDP: Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues (PPSAI) | LINK |
| 7 – Implementation | PDP: Translation & Transliteration of gTLD Registration Data (T&T) | LINK |
| 7 – Implementation | PDP: ‘Thick’ WHOIS (THICK-WHOIS) | LINK |
| Other | GNSO Standing Committee on Budget and Operations (SCBO) | LINK |
| Other | GNSO Standing Selection Committee (SSC) | LINK |
| Other | Expired Registration Recovery Policy – Policy Review (ERRP-PR) | LINK |
| Other | Policy & Implementation Recommendations Review (PollImp – RR) | LINK |

Last updated: 10 December 2018

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

| 1 - Issue Identification | | | | |
|--|-----------|-------------|-----------------|---|
| Description | Initiated | Target Date | Who holds Token | Pending action/status |
| GNSO Council Action Items - 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 |
|---|------------|-------------|--------------------------|--|
| <p>Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP-PR) Staff: B. Aitchison, C. Tubergen, M. Konings</p> <p><i>IRTP Part D Recommendation #17: The WG recommends that, once all IRTP recommendations are implemented (incl. IRTP-D, and remaining elements from IRTP-C), the GNSO Council, together with ICANN staff, should convene a panel to collect, discuss, and analyze relevant data to determine whether these enhancements have improved the IRTP process and dispute mechanisms, and identify possible remaining shortcomings.</i></p> <p><i>IRTP Part D Recommendation #18: The Working Group recommends that contracted parties and ICANN should start to gather data and other relevant information that will help inform a future IRTP review team in its efforts, especially with regard to those issues listed in the Observations (4.2.7.1) above.</i></p> <p><i>Transfer Emergency Action Contact (TEAC) “The Working Group recommends that the GNSO perform a follow-up review of the TEAC 12 to 24 months after the policy is implemented to identify any issues that may have arisen and propose modifications to address them. This review should specifically address whether the TEAC is working as intended (to establish contact between registrars in case of emergency), whether the TEAC is not abused (used for issues that are not considered an</i></p> | 2018-02-28 | 2019-Feb | Community / GNSO Council | <p>GDD staff published on 14 November 2018, the IRTP Policy Status Report for public comment. IRTP Policy Status Report is organized to help assess the effectiveness of the IRTP in terms of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Portability: Can registrants easily transfer their names? Are the processes well-standardized and efficient for registrars? 2. Preventing Abuse: Does the Policy include effective protections against abuses such as fraud and domain name hijacking? 3. Information: Are there readily available educational sources about the transfer process and options? <p>Comments are due by 24 December 2018.</p> <p>Once public comments and survey input have been received, ICANN Org will update the Policy Status Report to include relevant information from these feedback mechanisms. The updated report will then be returned to the GNSO Council, who may then consider whether the report provides sufficient information as a standalone report for assessment of the policy, or if further review of the IRTP should be undertaken.</p> |

2 - Issue Scoping

| Description | Initiated | Target Date | Who holds Token | Pending action/status |
|--|-----------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------------|
| <i>emergency) and whether the option to 'undo' a transfer in case of failure to respond to a TEAC should be made mandatory."</i> | | | | |

3 – Initiation

| Description | Initiated | Target Date | Who holds Token | Pending action/status |
|---|-------------|-------------|-----------------|---|
| <p>WHOIS Procedure Implementation Advisory Group (WPIAG) Chair: TBC Council Liaison: Keith Drazek Staff: TBC</p> <p>The ICANN Procedure For Handling WHOIS Conflicts with Privacy Law Implementation Advisory Group (WHOIS Procedure IAG) is tasked to provide the GNSO Council with recommendations on how to address the comments and input that have been received in response to the public comment forum on the Revised ICANN Procedure for Handling WHOIS Conflicts with Privacy Law: Process and Next Steps.</p> | 2018-Feb-22 | 2018-Dec | Council | <p>The GNSO Council adopted the charter for the ICANN Procedure For Handling WHOIS Conflicts with Privacy Law Implementation Advisory Group (WHOIS Procedure IAG) during its meeting on 22 February 2018. The IAG is tasked to provide the GNSO Council with recommendations on how to address the comments and input that have been received in response to the public comment forum on the Revised ICANN Procedure for Handling WHOIS Conflicts with Privacy Law: Process and Next Steps. Per the Council’s recent discussions, noting the current workload and activities that may impact the IAG’s work, staff is refraining from circulating the call for volunteers to the GNSO Stakeholder Groups until the EPDP Team completes certain milestones (e.g., delivery of its Initial Report). Though the EPDP Initial Report has been published for public comment, initiating this effort may still be premature. The GNSO Council is expected to consider at its upcoming meeting when would be the appropriate moment for the Council to reconsider the launch of the call for volunteers.</p> |

4 – Working Group

| Description | Initiated | Target Date | Who holds Token | Pending action/status |
|---|-------------|-------------|-----------------|--|
| <p>Expedited Policy Development Process on the Temporary Specification on gTLD Registration Data</p> <p>Chair(s): Kurt Pritz Council Liaison: Rafik Dammak Staff: M. Konings, C. Tubergen, B. Cobb</p> <p>Following the adoption by the ICANN Board of a temporary specification on gTLD Registration Data to enable contracted parties to continue to comply with existing ICANN contractual requirements and with community-developed policies as they relate to WHOIS, while also complying with the European Union’s General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), a one-year policy development process is required to be initiated to confirm whether or not the temporary specification should become a consensus policy.</p> | 2018-Jul-19 | 2019-Jan-31 | WG | <p>At its meeting on 19 July 2018, the GNSO Council initiated an Expedited Policy Development Process on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data and adopted the EPDP Team Charter. The EPDP Team’s workplan can be found here: https://go.icann.org/2EfN3Pc.</p> <p>The EPDP Team published its Initial Report on 21 November 2018. The Public Comment period will close on 21 December 2018.</p> <p>The EPDP Leadership chose to use a Google form as the format to receive public comments. This is a new format for collecting public comment. It seeks to: (1) Clearly link comments to specific sections of the Initial Report; (2) Encourage commenters to provide reasoning or rationale for their opinions; (3) Enable the sorting of comment so that the EPDP team can more easily read all the comments on any one topic.</p> <p>During the period in which the Initial Report is out for public comment, the EPDP Team will discuss additional outstanding issues which can be discussed in parallel.</p> <p>The EPDP Team will hold its third F2F meeting in Toronto on 16-18 January 2019.</p> |
| <p>New gTLD Auction Proceeds Cross-Community Working Group (CCWG)</p> <p>Co-Chairs: Ching Chiao (ccNSO); Erika Mann (GNSO) Staff: M. Konings (GNSO), E. Barabas (GNSO), J. Braeken (ccNSO)</p> <p>This CCWG is tasked with developing a proposal(s) for consideration by its Chartering Organizations on the mechanism that should be developed in order to allocate the new gTLD</p> | 2016-Mar-10 | Ongoing | CCWG | <p>The CCWG held its first meeting on 26 January 2017 and has met regularly since that time. The latest version of the work plan can be found here: https://community.icann.org/x/dUPwAw. The CCWG published its Initial Report for public comment on 8 October 2018. The public comment period was originally scheduled to close on 27 November 2018. Following requests from the community for additional time to respond, the public comment period was extended to 11 December 2018.</p> |

4 – Working Group

| Description | Initiated | Target Date | Who holds Token | Pending action/status |
|--|-------------|-------------|-----------------|--|
| Auction Proceeds. As part of this proposal, the CCWG is also expected to consider the scope of fund allocation, due diligence requirements that preserve ICANN’s tax status as well as how to deal with directly related matters such as potential or actual conflicts of interest. The CCWG will not make any recommendations or determinations with regards to specific funding decisions (i.e. which specific organizations or projects are to be funded or not). | | | | |
| <p>Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) in All gTLDs PDP</p> <p>Co-Chair(s): Philip Corwin, Kathy Kleiman, Brian Beckham Council Liaison: Paul McGrady Community Liaisons (to/from the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG): Robin Gross, Susan Payne Staff: M. Wong, J. Hedlund, A. Liang</p> <p>This WG was chartered in March 2016 to review all the RPMs that have been developed by ICANN. The PDP is being conducted in two phases, beginning with the RPMs developed for the 2012 New gTLD Program, with the 1999 Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy to follow in Phase 2. By end-2017, the WG had completed an initial review of the Trademark Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution Procedure (TM-PDDRP), and much of the Trademark Clearinghouse (TMCH) structure and operations. By the end of its work, the WG</p> | 2011-Feb-03 | Ongoing | WG | <p>The WG completed its initial data collection and analysis of the Uniform Rapid Suspension (URS) RPM at ICANN63, where it agreed to include all recommendations developed by its URS sub teams as well as all proposals received from individual WG members in its Initial Report (when that is drafted) for public comment.</p> <p>The WG is currently reviewing the results of the professional surveys that were conducted by the Analysis Group on the Sunrise and Trademark Claims RPMs. These surveys were conducted pursuant to the GNSO Council’s approval, in September 2017, of a funding request to ICANN Org. The survey results will supplement additional data that was collected previously and reviewed by the WG. The WG intends to use all the data amassed to date to assist it with answering the questions from its Charter (as further refined and agreed by the WG).</p> <p>The WG now anticipates working on Phase One through mid-2019, with the aim of submitting a finalized Phase One report to the GNSO Council in the third quarter of 2019.</p> |

4 – Working Group

| Description | Initiated | Target Date | Who holds Token | Pending action/status |
|---|-------------|-------------|-----------------|--|
| will be expected to also have considered the overarching issue as to whether or not the RPMs collectively fulfil their purposes or whether additional policy recommendations will be necessary, including to clarify and unify the policy goals. | | | | |
| <p>New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Co-Chair(s): Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Jeff Neuman Council Liaison: Elsa Saade and Keith Drazek Community Liaisons (to/from the RPM Review PDP WG): Robin Gross, Susan Payne Community Liaison (to/from CCT-RT): Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez Staff: S. Chan, J. Hedlund, E. Barabas</p> <p>This WG is tasked with calling upon the community’s collective experiences from the 2012 New gTLD Program round to determine what, if any changes may need to be made to the existing 2007 Introduction of New Generic Top-Level Domains policy recommendations. Those policy recommendations will remain in place for subsequent rounds unless modified via a PDP. The work of this WG follows the efforts of the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Discussion Group (DG), which identified a set of issues for a future PDP-WG to consider in their deliberations.</p> | 2014-Jun-25 | Ongoing | WG | <p>The public comment period on the Initial Report closed on 26 September 2018 and the WG is currently reviewing, launching three Sub Groups for this purpose. Shortly after ICANN63, the WG published for public comment a supplemental Initial Report on several additional topics that were not included in the Initial Report.</p> <p>The PDP also includes a Work Track 5, which addresses geographic names at the top level. WT5, has deliberated on the topics within its scope and is now reviewing and refining a draft Initial Report to publish for public comment. The PDP it is seeking to publish a separate Initial Report in early December 2018. This Initial Report will be similar to that of the full WG in that it will likely include options and questions, in addition to preliminary recommendations.</p> |

| 5 – Council Deliberation | | | | |
|---|-------------|-------------|-----------------|---|
| Description | Initiated | Target Date | Who holds Token | Pending action/status |
| <p>Curative Rights Protections for IGO/INGOs PDP</p> <p>Chair: Petter Rindforth Council Liaison: TBD Staff: M. Wong, S. Chan</p> <p>This WG was chartered in June 2014 to provide the GNSO Council with recommendations as to whether to amend the UDRP and URS to allow access to and use of these mechanisms by IGOs and INGOs and, if so in what respects or whether a separate, narrowly-tailored dispute resolution procedure that takes into account the particular needs and specific circumstances of IGOs and INGOs should be developed.</p> | 2014-Jun-05 | Ongoing | GNSO Council | <p>The WG submitted its Final Report on 9 July 2018, with three minority statements incorporated into the Final Report on 13 July, before the Council’s July meeting. At that meeting, the Council acknowledged receipt of the report and resolved to consider it in a holistic fashion, taking into account the overall protections for IGOs.</p> <p>The Council sought to ensure that it fully understands the Final Report and its recommendations, prior to taking any action; accordingly, it conducted a question and answer webinar on 9 October 2018. A motion to consider the WG’s Final Report was submitted for the 24 October Council meeting, but was withdrawn based on both substantive and procedural concerns raised by several Councilors. Staff prepared a procedural options paper to assist Council to determine next steps for moving forward, which was presented to the Council during its November 2018 meeting. The Council is continuing its discussions on the options so as to determine the best way forward.</p> |

6 – Board Vote

| Description | Initiated | Target Date | Who holds Token | Pending action/status |
|---|-------------|-------------|-----------------|--|
| <p>Protection of International Organization Names in All gTLDs PDP (Reconvened WG) Chair: Thomas Rickert Council liaison: TBD Staff: M. Wong, B. Cobb</p> <p>This reconvened WG is tasked with providing the GNSO Council with policy recommendation changes, if any, as it pertains to the protection of the Red Cross National Society and International Movement designations that are inconsistent with GAC Advice.</p> | 2017-May-03 | 2018-Dec-22 | Board | <p>The Working Group’s Final Report was submitted to the GNSO Council on 6 August 2018 and at its September meeting, the Council voted unanimously to approve all the WG’s recommendations. In October, the Council approved the transmission of the requisite GNSO Council Recommendations Report to the ICANN Board.</p> <p>In accordance with the ICANN Bylaws, the proposed recommendations are now subject to a public comment proceeding (closing on 14 December 2018), prior to ICANN Board consideration. The GAC also has an opportunity to provide timely advice on any public policy concerns at this time.</p> |
| <p>Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability Co-Chairs: Jordan Carter (ccNSO), Thomas Rickert (GNSO), Tijani Ben Jemaa (ALAC) Staff: B. Turcotte</p> <p>This CCWG is expected to deliver proposals that would enhance ICANN’s accountability towards all stakeholders. In Work Stream 1, it identified those mechanisms that must be in place or committed to before the IANA Stewardship Transition occurs. Currently, in Work Stream 2 it is considering those mechanisms for which a timeline for implementation extends beyond the IANA Stewardship Transition.</p> | 2016-Jun-26 | Sept 2018 | Board | <p>The Final Report has now been submitted to the ICANN Board for their consideration.</p> |
| <p>GNSO Review Working Group Chair: Jennifer Wolfe</p> | 2016-Jul-21 | Ongoing | Board | <p>The GNSO Review Working Group has since agreed by full consensus that all recommendations have been implemented. The Working Group provided its</p> |

6 – Board Vote

| Description | Initiated | Target Date | Who holds Token | Pending action/status |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------------|--|
| <p>Vice-Chair: Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen Council Liaison: Rafik Dammak Staff: J. Hedlund, E. Barabas</p> <p>This WG was tasked to develop an implementation plan for the GNSO Review recommendations (http://gns0.icann.org/en/drafts/review-feasibility-prioritization-25feb16-en.pdf) which have been adopted by the ICANN Board. The GNSO Council adopted the WG Charter (http://gns0.icann.org/en/drafts/gns0-review-charter-11jul16-en.pdf) during its meeting on 21 July 2016. The Working Group delivered its proposed implementation plan for the Board-adopted GNSO Review recommendations to the GNSO Council on 21 November (https://gns0.icann.org/en/drafts/review-implementation-recommendations-plan-21nov16-en.pdf) On 15 December the GNSO Council unanimously approved the proposed plan. The Board’s Organizational Effectiveness Committee (OEC) reviewed the plan and recommended it to the Board for adoption. The Board accepted the recommendations at its 3 February 2017 meeting, and requested that the Working Group provide updates to the OEC every six months through implementation.</p> | | | | <p>Implementation Final Report and a draft motion for GNSO Council consideration at its meeting on 16 August 2018. The GNSO Council approved the motion to adopt the Final Report on 16 August, after which staff provided the Final Report to the OEC for consideration. The OEC and ICANN Legal staff have submitted a proposed resolution to approve the report that the ICANN Board is expected to consider at its next meeting in January 2019.</p> |
| <p>Protection of International Organization Names in All gTLDs PDP Chair: Thomas Rickert Council liaison: Keith Drazek</p> | 2012-Apr-12 | Ongoing | Board/ Council | <p>In April 2014 the Board voted to adopt those of the GNSO’s recommendations, approved unanimously by the GNSO Council in November 2013, that are not inconsistent with GAC advice received on the topic. Following work by an Implementation Review Team (IRT), the finalized Consensus Policy was</p> |

6 – Board Vote

| Description | Initiated | Target Date | Who holds Token | Pending action/status |
|--|-----------|-------------|-----------------|--|
| <p>Staff: M. Wong, S. Chan, B. Cobb</p> <p>This WG was tasked to provide the GNSO Council with policy recommendations as to whether there is a need for special protections at the top and second level in all gTLDs for the names and acronyms of International Governmental Organizations (IGOs) and international non-governmental organizations (INGOs) receiving protections under treaties and statutes under multiple jurisdictions, specifically including the Red Cross/Red Crescent Movement (RCRC) and the International Olympic Committee (IOC).</p> | | | | <p>announced in January 2018, with an effective date of August 2018 for most aspects of the Policy.</p> <p>For those policy recommendations that are inconsistent with GAC advice, the Board passed a number of resolutions in 2013 and 2014 to temporarily reserve the Red Cross National Society names at issue as well as the names and acronyms of the IGOs that appear on the list provided by the GAC to ICANN in March 2013. These interim protections remain in place until the differences between the GNSO recommendations and the GAC advice are reconciled.</p> <p>Next steps on IGO acronyms protections: Further discussions relating to possible next steps for protecting IGO acronyms are expected to take place following the Council’s decision as to how it plans to address the concerns that have been raised regarding the IGO-INGO Curative Rights PDP.</p> <p>Next steps on Red Cross names Following the December 2018 close of the ongoing public comment proceeding on the modified policy recommendations for the names of the Red Cross International Movement and its National Societies (as approved by the GNSO Council in September 2018), the ICANN Board will take up consideration of this topic. This is currently anticipated to occur in early 2019.</p> |

7 – Implementation

| Description | Initiated | Target Date | Who holds Token | Pending action/status |
|---|-------------|-------------|----------------------|--|
| <p>Geo Regions Review Community-wide Working Group Chair: Cheryl Langdon-Orr (ccNSO/APRALO) Staff: M. Wong</p> <p>This Board-chartered cross community WG has consulted with ICANN stakeholders regarding the definition and applications of ICANN’s Geographic Regions.</p> | 2008-Aug-07 | 2018-Dec-30 | Staff | The Board adopted the Final Report during its meeting on 25 October 2018 and “directs the ICANN organization to implement those recommendations in a manner that aligns with the Board's expectations as outlined in the mapping document”. ICANN Org staff expects to begin implementation planning as directed by the Board in early 2019. |
| <p>GNSO Rights & Obligations under Revised ICANN Bylaws Drafting Team (DT) Recommendations Chair: Steve DelBianco Staff: M. Wong, J. Hedlund, M. Konings</p> <p>This DT was created to work with ICANN staff to identify the GNSO’s new rights and obligations under the revised ICANN Bylaws, and to prepare an implementation plan for the GNSO Council’s consideration. On 30 January 2018, the GNSO Council adopted the revised GNSO Operating Procedures and recommended to the ICANN Board the modification of the ICANN Bylaws to include a set of additional GNSO voting thresholds in relation to the post-transition roles and responsibilities of the GNSO as a member of the Empowered Community. The ICANN Board approved a resolution on 15 March 2018 at ICANN61 to direct staff to post the proposed additions to the ICANN Bylaws for public comment. The 40-day public comment period</p> | 2016-Jun-30 | 2019-Jan-31 | Staff / GNSO Council | Staff had circulated a follow up document on 17 May which outlines the additional proposed steps to be taken to ensure preparedness as well as facilitate the ability for the GNSO Council to act in relation to the new roles and responsibilities outlined in the post-transition Bylaws, such as development of templates and additional processes/procedures. In the meantime, staff is developing templates and guidelines for the GNSO Council to review, and has updated the gns0.icann.org website with the latest procedures and voting thresholds: See: https://gns0.icann.org/en/council/procedures . Staff provided a status update during the GNSO Council meeting on 29 November and is expected to launch a call for volunteers shortly to work on the outstanding items identified. |

7 – Implementation

| Description | Initiated | Target Date | Who holds Token | Pending action/status |
|---|-------------|-------------|-----------------|---|
| closed on 05 May 2018 and the ICANN Board adopted proposed additions based on comments received during its meeting on 13 May. The requisite Empowered Community process for a possible Rejection Action was initiated on 19 May. No rejection petitions were received. As a result, the changes became effective under the Bylaws on 21 June 2018. | | | | |
| <p>Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues PDP Recommendations</p> <p>Council Liaison: Darcy Southwell IRT Support Staff: Amy Bivins (GDD)</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 those relating to privacy & proxy services and their accreditation, were examined in a PDP. This IRT was formed to implement the PDP recommendations approved by the ICANN Board.</p> | 2009-May-21 | Ongoing | Staff/IRT | <p>The Board adopted all the PDP recommendations in August 2016. An IRT was formed and is being led by Amy Bivins of GDD.</p> <p>In response to a request from the Registrars Stakeholder Group to consider pausing the IRT work in view of the impact of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), ICANN organization had initially proposed going ahead with the public comment proceeding as the IRT’s work was nearly complete. More recently, and in view of ongoing community discussions over GDPR compliance and the evolving legal landscape for data privacy, further IRT work has been slowed pending greater clarity from the community work.</p> <p>IRTP-C: Following concerns raised by the Registrars Stakeholder Group regarding the application of IRTP-C to privacy and proxy services and the GNSO Council’s proposal to refer the question to the PPSAI IRT, the Board confirmed that Compliance enforcement would be delayed and directed ICANN Org to work with the Registrars’ Stakeholder Group and other interested parties to determine the appropriate path forward.</p> <p>On 30 November 2017, the GNSO Council requested that the PPSAI IRT consider the issue and put forward recommendations for implementation that are consistent with both the IRTP-C and PPSAI policy recommendations. At present, the IRT is expected to undertake this work only after it closes its expected comment period on its initial documents.</p> |

7 – Implementation

| Description | Initiated | Target Date | Who holds Token | Pending action/status |
|--|-------------|-------------|-----------------|--|
| <p>Translation/Transliteration of Internationalized Registration Data PDP Recommendations</p> <p>Council Liaison: Rubens Kuhl IRT Support Staff: Brian Aitchison (GDD)</p> <p>The PDP addressed two primary issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Whether it is desirable to translate contact information to a single common language or transliterate contact information to a single common script; and Who should bear the burden translating contact information to a single common language or transliterating contact information to a single common script? <p>This IRT was formed to implement the final PDP recommendations as approved by the ICANN Board.</p> | 2012-Oct-17 | Ongoing | Staff/IRT | <p>On 28 September 2015 the ICANN Board approved the adoption of all seven recommendations contained in the Final Report from the PDP Working Group (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2015-09-28-en). An Implementation Review Team (IRT) was formed and a draft implementation plan shared with the IRT, which met for its first meeting on 19 July 2016.</p> <p>As of November 2016, the IRT is engaged in discussions around language and script tags, which appear to be a minimum requirement to meet the standards set by the PDP recommendations.</p> <p>The IRT held its 12th call on 8 June 2017. The team continues to discuss the details of implementing language and script tags. The team discussed the merits of submitting a set of questions on the T/T Recommendations to the GNSO Council for clarification and input. After discussing, they came to the conclusion that it would be better to seek the input of those involved in the T/T PDP Working Group and potentially certain Stakeholder Groups on those questions before considering GNSO Council input. The questions focus on whether the T/T recommendations mandate that ALL new registration data be tagged with the languages and scripts in use by a registrant, how the implementation should ultimately be carried out (eg: Should the implementation date be coordinated with the operationalization of RDAP? Should it be "pilot tested" along with RDAP? Should it be referred to the Next Gen RDS PDP?). Once the above questions are answered, a policy language document will be developed for IRT review and eventually public comment.</p> <p>The timeline for the implementation of the T/T Recommendations is now indeterminate due to the indeterminate nature of the RDAP roll-out, which is the minimum requirement to implement the T/T policy recommendations.</p> |

7 – Implementation

| Description | Initiated | Target Date | Who holds Token | Pending action/status |
|--|-------------|-------------|-----------------------|---|
| <p>Thick WHOIS PDP Recommendations Council Liaison: Susan Kawaguchi IRT Support Staff: Dennis Chang (GDD)</p> <p>This IRT was formed to work with ICANN staff on the implementation of the GNSO’s policy recommendation to require Thick Whois for all gTLD registries, as approved by the ICANN Board.</p> | 2012-Mar-14 | 2019-Feb-01 | IRT / Staff / Council | <p>The ICANN Board approved the GNSO recommendations on Thick Whois at its meeting on 7 February 2014 (http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-07feb14-en.htm). An IRT was formed and various impact assessments and implementation proposals have been discussed with the IRT in the two decoupled work streams, corresponding to the two expected outcomes in the PDP Recommendations.</p> <p>The work streams have resulted in two policies and published on 1 February 2017: 1) Thick Whois Consensus Policy Requiring Consistent Labeling and Display of RDDS (WHOIS) Output for All gTLDs and 2) the Proposed Implementation of GNSO Thick RDDS (WHOIS) Transition Policy for .COM, .NET and .JOBS.</p> <p>The Consistent Labelling and Display of RDDS Output for All gTLDs policy has completed implementation with the policy effective date of 1 August 2017.</p> <p>On 25 October 2018, the ICANN Board passed another Resolution to defer contractual compliance enforcement of the Thick WHOIS transition policy in consideration of the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). ICANN Contractual Compliance will defer enforcing the following milestones until the dates listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 31 May 2019: The registry operator must begin accepting Thick WHOIS data from registrars for existing registrations in .COM, .NET and .JOBS. • By 30 November 2019: All registrars must send Thick WHOIS data to the registry operator for all new registrations in .COM, .NET and .JOBS. • By 31 May 2020: All registrars are required to complete the transition to Thick WHOIS data for all registrations in .COM, .NET and .JOBS. |

| Other | | | | |
|--|-------------|-------------|-----------------|--|
| Description | Initiated | Target Date | Who holds Token | Pending action/status |
| <p>GNSO Standing Committee on ICANN Budget and Operating Plan (SCBO) Chair: Ayden Ferdeline Council Liaison: Keith Drazek Staff: M. Konings, S. Chan, B. Cobb</p> <p>The SCBO is tasked to assist the GNSO with providing information and possible comments to ICANN's Budget and Strategic Operating Plan.</p> | 2017-09-12 | Ongoing | SCBO | The SCBO awaits the launch of the draft FY20 ICANN Budget and Operating Plan, at which point the group will convene to deliberate the substance of the budget and changes from FY19. |
| <p>GNSO Standing Selection Committee (SSC) Chair: Susan Kawaguchi Vice-Chair: TBD Staff: M. Konings, E. Barabas</p> <p>The SSC is tasked to assist with the selection of GNSO representatives to future Review Teams, including for the various reviews mandated by the ICANN Bylaws, and other ICANN structures for which the GNSO will need to appoint, nominate or endorse candidates.</p> | 2017-Mar-15 | Ongoing | SSC | In order to deal with the different requests for nominations / endorsements of candidates for the different review teams as well as post-transition related structures, the GNSO Council adopted on an interim basis the proposed charter for a GNSO Standing Selection Committee during its meeting at ICANN58 (Mar. 2017). The GNSO Council approved the revised charter in May 2018. In the most recent SSC selection process, the the SSC recommended a revised slate of GNSO candidates to serve on the ATRT3. The Council voted by electronic ballot on the slate of candidates recommended by the SSC and confirmed the nomination of these candidates on 26 November 2018. |
| <p>Expired Registration Recovery Policy – Policy Review (ERRP-PR) Staff: M. Konings</p> | FY18 | TBD | Staff | The ERRP Consensus Policy became effective 31 Aug 2013 as a result of adopted recommendations produced from the GNSO's Post Expiration Domain Name Recovery (PEDNR) PDP WG. That WG deliberated on issues related to the expiration of domain names and to what extent a Registrant should be able to recover domain names after they expire. One recommendation from the WG requested monitoring and follow-up: Recommendation #18 : The Working Group recommends that ICANN Compliance be requested to provide updates to the GNSO Council on a |

| Other | | | | |
|--|-----------|-------------|-----------------|---|
| Description | Initiated | Target Date | Who holds Token | Pending action/status |
| | | | | regular basis in relation to the implementation and effectiveness of the proposed recommendations, either in the form of a report that details amongst others the number of complaints received in relation to renewal and/or post expiration related matters or in the form of audits that assess if the policy has been implemented as intended. |
| Policy & Implementation Recommendations Review (Pollmp-RR) Staff: B. Aitchison, M. Konings | FY20 | TBD | GNSO Council | As noted in Point H of the CPIF, which directs “ICANN staff [to] continually review the implementation framework and related materials to encapsulate additional best-practices or to adjust the steps as a result of lessons learned with previous Consensus Policy projects,” a cross-functional group of representatives from ICANN’s GDD and GNSO Policy Development Support teams have reviewed the Framework, and proposed a number of amendments to it for the consideration of the GNSO Council. The version currently made available to the Council integrates several proposed edits from the RrSG and IPC. This version is expected to be posted shortly. |