



Phase	Title	Links
1 - Issue Identification	GNSO Council Action Items [refer to list on wiki]	<a href="#">LINK</a>
2 - Issue Scoping	Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy – Policy Review (IRTP-PR)	<a href="#">LINK</a>
3 - Initiation	- none -	
4 - Working Group	WHOIS Procedure Implementation Advisory Group – (WPIAG)	<a href="#">LINK</a>
4 - Working Group	PDP: Protection of International Organization Names in All gTLDs – Reconvened WG (IGO-RCRC)	<a href="#">LINK</a>
4 - Working Group	Cross Community Working Group on New gTLD Auction Proceeds (CWG-Auction)	<a href="#">LINK</a>
4 - Working Group	Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability (WS2)	<a href="#">LINK</a>
4 - Working Group	PDP: Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms in All gTLDs (RPM)	<a href="#">LINK</a>
4 - Working Group	PDP: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP (Sub-Pro)	<a href="#">LINK</a>
4 - Working Group	PDP: Next-Generation gTLD Registration Directory Services (RDS) to replace WHOIS (RDS)	<a href="#">LINK</a>
4 - Working Group	PDP: Curative Rights Protections for IGO/INGOs (IGO-INGO-CRP)	<a href="#">LINK</a>
5 – Council Deliberations	- none -	
6 – Board Vote	GNSO Rights & Obligations under Revised ICANN Bylaws Drafting Team (RODT)	<a href="#">LINK</a>
6 – Board Vote	PDP: Protection of International Organization Names in All gTLDs (IGO-INGO)	<a href="#">LINK</a>
6 – Board Vote	Geo Regions Review (GEO)	<a href="#">LINK</a>
7 – Implementation	GNSO Review Working Group (GRWG)	<a href="#">LINK</a>
7 – Implementation	PDP: Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues (PPSAI)	<a href="#">LINK</a>
7 – Implementation	PDP: Translation & Transliteration of gTLD Registration Data (T&T)	<a href="#">LINK</a>
7 – Implementation	PDP: ‘Thick’ WHOIS (THICK-WHOIS)	<a href="#">LINK</a>
Other	GNSO Standing Committee on Budget and Operations (SCBO)	<a href="#">LINK</a>
Other	GNSO Standing Selection Committee (SSC)	<a href="#">LINK</a>
Other	Consumer Choice Competition and Trust Review Team (CCT-RT)	<a href="#">LINK</a>
Other	Expired Registration Recovery Policy – Policy Review (ERRP-PR)	<a href="#">LINK</a>

Phase	Title	Links
Other	Policy & Implementation Recommendations Review (PollImp – RR)	<a href="#">LINK</a>

Last updated: 16 May 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 - <a href="#">LINK</a>	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><b>Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP-PR)</b> Staff: J. Gore, C. Tubergen, M. Konings</p>	2018-02-28	June 2018	GNSO Council	<p>Final modifications to the <a href="#">Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy</a> were implemented 1 Dec 2016 as a result of the final PDP WG, IRTP-D, which were <a href="#">adopted</a> by the GNSO Council. That WG produced a series of recommendations after deliberating on issues on the use of the EPP AuthInfo Code, FOAs, and penalties for policy violations. The WG's <a href="#">final two recommendations</a> suggest that data be collected and an eventual review of the entire IRTP be conducted:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The GNSO Council received <a href="#">a letter</a> from Jennifer Gore, GDD Staff, with proposed next steps to commence the review. The Council considered the proposed approach in further detail during its meeting on 26 April 2018 and subsequently via email. Staff has been requested to deliver the proposed post-implementation policy assessment report by June 2018.</p> <p>Transfer Emergency Action Contact: The TEAC became a part of the IRTP Consensus Policy on 1 Jun 2012 as a result of <a href="#">adopted</a> recommendations produced from the GNSO's <a href="#">Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy – Part B (IRTP-B) PDP WG</a>. That WG produced a</p>

### 2 - Issue Scoping

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
				<p>series of recommendations based on issues around domain hijacking, urgent returns of inappropriately transferred names and lock status. As a part of the WG's <a href="#">first recommendation</a>, it requested an follow-up review of the TEAC:</p> <p>“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 emergency) and whether the option to ‘undo’ a transfer in case of failure to respond to a TEAC should be made mandatory.”</p> <p>Since the policy effective date, ICANN’s Contractual Compliance has processed several TEAC complaints over the years, and as part of its Audit Program, Registrars are asked to provide their TEAC information should it not match what is listed in RADAR. Further, compliance reports about this specific policy are posted on the compliance site.</p>

### 3 – Initiation

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

4 – Working Group				
Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p><b>WHOIS Procedure Implementation Advisory Group (WPIAG)</b>                      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-Jun-1	Staff	<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. The 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. Per the Council's instructions, staff will circulate the call for volunteers on or after June 1, 2018 to the GNSO Stakeholder Groups with the request for each Stakeholder Group to appoint up to 3 members to the IAG. Further, staff will to circulate through the normal communication channels a call to the wider ICANN community for volunteers for interested participants and observers to join the IAG.</p>
<p><b><a href="#">Protection of International Organization Names in All gTLDs PDP (Reconvened WG)</a></b>                      Chair: Thomas Rickert                      Council liaison (interim): Heather Forrest                      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-Jul-30	Reconvened WG (for Red Cross names only)	<p>At ICANN57 (Nov. 2016) in Hyderabad, the Board proposed that the GAC and GNSO enter into a facilitated dialogue to try to resolve the outstanding issues from the original PDP. Facilitated discussions took place at ICANN58 (Mar. 2017) in Copenhagen and were moderated by former Board member Bruce Tonkin based on a set of Problem Statements and Briefing Papers reviewed by the parties. Following the facilitated discussions, the GNSO passed a <a href="#">resolution</a> in May 2017 requesting that the original PDP WG be reconvened using the GNSO's policy amendment process concerning a limited set of Red Cross names.</p> <p>The reconvened WG has reached preliminary agreement on the international law basis for protecting Red Cross National Society names. The RCRC representatives completed the definitive list of the 192 Red Cross Society's identifiers to be protected, and the list is currently under review by the WG. The WG's recommendations will be published for public comment before a</p>

### 4 – Working Group

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
				final report is submitted to the GNSO Council with a target date of end-July or early August 2018.
<p><a href="#">New gTLD Auction Proceeds Cross-Community Working Group (CCWG)</a>                      Co-Chairs: Ching Chiao (ccNSO); Erika Mann (GNSO)                      Staff: M. Konings (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 Auction Proceeds. As part of this proposal, the CCWG is also expected to consider the scope of fund allocation, due diligence requirements that preserve ICANN’s tax status as well as how to deal with directly related matters such as potential or actual conflicts of interest. The CCWG will not make any recommendations or determinations with regards to specific funding decisions (i.e. which specific organizations or projects are to be funded or not).</p>	2016-Mar-10	Ongoing	CCWG	<p>The CCWG held its first meeting on 26 January 2017 and has started meeting on a weekly basis to meet its target of delivering an Initial Report for public comment by ICANN62 (June 2018). The latest version of the work plan can be found here: <a href="https://community.icann.org/x/dUPwAw">https://community.icann.org/x/dUPwAw</a>. The CCWG commenced its work on stage 3 – compiling a list of possible mechanisms that could be considered by CCWG during its F2F meeting at ICANN60 (November 2017). Following that, the CCWG reached out to external experts with a set of questions in relation to the different mechanisms that have been identified, to help inform deliberations. Review of responses and engagement with external experts commenced during its meeting on 10 March 2018 at ICANN61. Input received to date can be reviewed here: <a href="https://community.icann.org/x/BSW8B">https://community.icann.org/x/BSW8B</a>. Based on the input received from external experts, the CCWG is now conducting a straw poll survey to determine whether it is possible to prioritize one or more of the four mechanisms identified for further consideration. To review the status of deliberation on the different charter questions as well as preliminary agreements reached to date, see <a href="https://community.icann.org/x/PNrRAw">https://community.icann.org/x/PNrRAw</a>.</p>
<p><a href="#">Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability</a>                      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</p>	2016-Jun-26	June 2018	CCWG	<p>The CCWG-WS2 commenced work on Work Stream 2 (WS2) at ICANN56 (June 2016). It is addressing the remaining nine issues that were deferred from WS1 (i.e. Diversity, Guidelines for Good Faith Conduct, Human Rights, Jurisdiction, Ombudsman, Reviewing the Cooperative Engagement Process (CEP), SO/AC Accountability, Staff Accountability, and Transparency). The CCWG has submitted its <a href="#">final report for public comment</a>, which closed on 11 May 2018. The CCWG-WS2 intends to submit its Final Report to the Chartering Organizations by ICANN62, June 2018.</p>



4 – Working Group				
Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
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><a href="#">Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) in All gTLDs PDP</a></p> <p>Co-Chair(s): Philip Corwin, Kathy Kleiman, Brian Beckham (provisional appointment)            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 is tasked to review all the RPMs that have been developed by ICANN in a two-phased PDP. By the end of its work, the WG will be expected to also have considered the overarching issue as to whether or not the RPMs collectively fulfil their purposes or whether additional policy recommendations will be necessary, including to clarify and unify the policy goals.</p>	2011-Feb-03	Ongoing	WG	<p>On 28 February 2016, the GNSO Council voted to <a href="#">initiate</a> this Policy Development Process (PDP) and adopted a revised Working Group Charter in March (<a href="https://community.icann.org/x/2CWAAw">https://community.icann.org/x/2CWAAw</a>). The PDP is being conducted in two phases, beginning with the RPMs developed for the 2012 New gTLD Program, with the 1999 Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy to follow in Phase 2. The WG has completed an initial review of the Trademark Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution Procedure (TM-PDDRP), and much of the TMCH structure and operations. For the Sunrise and Trademark Claims RPMs, the GNSO Council approved an extensive data request in the form prescribed by the 2015 Data &amp; Metrics for Policy Making Working Group at its 20 September 2017 meeting. Staff has completed evaluation of the proposals submitted under the Request for Proposal that closed in March, and is finalizing contract negotiations with the selected vendor. Staff continues to compile quantitative data on Sunrise registrations, Trademark Claims and Uniform Rapid Suspension filings to complement the surveys. Some additional data collection needs relating to additional voluntary marketplace RPMs being offered by a few registry operators have also been identified.</p> <p>In the interim, the WG began to review the Uniform Rapid Suspension procedure (URS) through the use of three additional Sub Teams to take on various aspects of this work. It is aiming to complete initial data collection for the URS review by ICANN62, following which it hopes to review results from the Sunrise and Claims surveys.</p> <p>As a result of the time required to complete the full data collection effort, the WG is likely to be working on Phase 1 through early 2019.</p>

### 4 – Working Group

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p><a href="#">New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP</a>                      Co-Chair(s): Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Jeff Neuman                      Council Liaison: Donna Austin 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 WG was chartered by the GNSO Council in January 2016 (<a href="https://community.icann.org/x/KAp1Aw">https://community.icann.org/x/KAp1Aw</a>). It has completed preliminary deliberations on a set of overarching topics and 30+ additional topics identified in the WG's charter. These additional issue areas have been addressed through a series of Work Track Sub Teams (WTs 1-4). The WG has considered input received from the community through two rounds of community comment and is now finalizing preliminary recommendations, options, and questions for community input to include in the Initial Report. The WG's goal is to complete its Initial Report and publish it for public comment in May 2018.</p> <p>The PDP also includes a Work Track 5, which addresses geographic names at the top level. WT5, operating under an inclusive leadership structure but nonetheless operating under GNSO Operating Procedures, has completed its <a href="#">Terms of Reference</a>, developed a work plan, and made progress on substantive deliberations through bi-weekly meetings. As WT5 was formed later than the other Work Tracks and is therefore on a different timeline than other parts of the PDP, it is seeking to publish a separate Initial Report in July 2018.</p>
<p><a href="#">PDP on the next generation gTLD Registration Directory Service to replace WHOIS</a>                      Chair: Chuck Gomes (resigned)                      Vice-Chairs: David Cake, Michele Neylon, Susan Kawaguchi, Marc Anderson                      Council liaison: TBC                      Staff: M. Konings, L. Phifer, C. Tubergen</p> <p>The WG is tasked to provide the GNSO Council</p>	2012-Nov-8	Ongoing	WG	<p>The PDP Working Group was chartered in November 2015 (<a href="https://community.icann.org/x/E4xlAw">https://community.icann.org/x/E4xlAw</a>) and first convened at the end of January 2016. The WG continues to refine its Work Plan (see <a href="https://community.icann.org/x/olxlAw">https://community.icann.org/x/olxlAw</a>). 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</p>

### 4 – Working Group

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
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>requirements was completed and deliberations on <a href="#">the list of possible requirements</a> commenced at ICANN57 (Nov 2016). However, the WG decided to first focus on a number of <a href="#">key concepts</a> which are intended to facilitate the deliberations on the list of possible requirements. For ICANN61 (Mar 2018), the WG focused on purposes for which it formed seven drafting teams to further develop the purposes identified in the EWG Final Report. The WG has paused its weekly meetings and confirmed it will not be meeting at ICANN62 (June 2018), as it awaits further direction from the GNSO Council and ICANN Board with respect to how the WG’s efforts may be affected by concurrent GDPR compliance efforts.</p> <p>The WG tentative agreements achieved to date can be found here: <a href="https://community.icann.org/x/p4xlAw">https://community.icann.org/x/p4xlAw</a>, and an updated PDP WG newsletter has been published, and can be found here: <a href="https://community.icann.org/x/RmOAw">https://community.icann.org/x/RmOAw</a>.</p>
<p><a href="#">Curative Rights Protections for IGO/INGOs PDP</a> Co-Chair(s): Philip Corwin, Petter Rindforth Council Liaison: Susan Kawaguchi Staff: M. Wong, S. Chan</p> <p>This WG is tasked with providing the GNSO Council with recommendations as to whether to amend the UDRP and URS to allow access to and use of these mechanisms by IGOs and INGOS and, if so in what respects or whether a separate, narrowly-tailored dispute resolution procedure that takes into account the particular needs and specific circumstances of IGOs and INGOS should be developed.</p>	2014-Jun-05	Ongoing	WG	<p>Based on the recommendation of the IGO-INGO PDP Working Group in 2013, the GNSO Council resolved to initiate a PDP on the specific topic of curative rights, and chartered the WG in June 2014 (<a href="https://community.icann.org/x/77rhAg">https://community.icann.org/x/77rhAg</a>). The PDP WG is tasked to explore possible amendments to the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP) and the Uniform Rapid Suspension procedure (URS) to address the specific needs of International Governmental Organizations (IGOs) and International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGOs). The WG’s preliminary recommendations and its Initial Report were published for public comment on 20 January 2017 (see <a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/igo-ingo-crp-access-initial-2017-01-20-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/igo-ingo-crp-access-initial-2017-01-20-en</a>). The WG modified certain initial recommendations as a result of the comments received. It continues to try to reach consensus on a remaining recommendation to deal with IGO jurisdictional immunity and registrants’ rights to file court proceedings. To resolve a procedural appeal filed by a WG member under the GNSO WG Guidelines, the Council liaison to the WG has begun actively facilitating the</p>

### 4 – Working Group

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
				WG's discussions and is working with staff and the group to try to complete a Final Report in time for the Council's June 2018 meeting.

5 – Council Deliberation				
Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
- None -				

### 6 – Board Vote

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p><a href="#">GNSO Rights &amp; Obligations under Revised ICANN Bylaws Drafting Team (DT) Recommendations</a></p> <p>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.</p>	2016-Jun-30	June 2018	Board	<p>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. These proposed changes to the ICANN Bylaws will need to be posted for public comment prior to ICANN Board consideration. 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. Staff has initiated a 40-day public comment period that closed on 05 May 2018. The ICANN Board considered the comments and adopted the proposed additions during its meeting on 13 May. Subsequently, Staff 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. .</p>
<p><a href="#">Protection of International Organization Names in All gTLDs PDP</a></p> <p>Chair: Thomas Rickert Council liaison: Keith Drazek 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,</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 (<a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-30apr14-en.htm#2.a">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-30apr14-en.htm#2.a</a>). An Implementation Review Team (IRT) was formed, led by Dennis Chang of GDD, to implement those recommendations adopted by the Board. The finalized Consensus Policy was 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 (see e.g. <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2013-07-17-en#1.a">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2013-07-17-en#1.a</a>) 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</p>

### 6 – Board Vote

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
specifically including the Red Cross/Red Crescent Movement (RCRC) and the International Olympic Committee (IOC).				<p>remain in place until the differences between the GNSO recommendations and the GAC advice are reconciled.</p> <p>At ICANN57 (Nov. 2016) in Hyderabad, the Board proposed that the GAC and GNSO enter into a facilitated dialogue to try to resolve the outstanding issues. Facilitated discussions took place at ICANN58 (Mar. 2017) in Copenhagen and were moderated by former Board member Bruce Tonkin based on a set of Problem Statements and Briefing Papers reviewed by the parties.</p> <p><b>Next steps on IGO acronyms protections:</b> Further discussions relating to possible next steps for protecting IGO acronyms are expected to take place following indications from the IGO-INGO Curative Rights PDP WG as to its likely recommendations and whether or not these are expected to differ from GAC advice on the subject.</p> <p><b>Next steps on Red Cross names</b> See above (under Section 4: Working Group) for updates on the reconvened PDP on this topic.</p>
<p><a href="#">Geo Regions Review Community-wide Working Group</a> 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	TBC	Board	<p>A community Public Comment opportunity has been established for this matter (see <a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/geo-regions-2015-12-23-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/geo-regions-2015-12-23-en</a>. The comment period closed on 24 April 2016 and 7 submissions were received. The staff report of public comments was published (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-geo-regions-13may16-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-geo-regions-13may16-en.pdf</a>) and the Board is now expected to review the comments received and consider next steps.</p>

### 7 – Implementation

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p><b>GNSO Review Working Group</b>                      Chair: Jennifer Wolfe                      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 (<a href="http://gns0.icann.org/en/drafts/review-feasibility-prioritization-25feb16-en.pdf">http://gns0.icann.org/en/drafts/review-feasibility-prioritization-25feb16-en.pdf</a>) which have been <b>adopted</b> by the ICANN Board.</p>	2016-Jul-21	Ongoing	WG	The GNSO Council adopted the WG Charter ( <a href="http://gns0.icann.org/en/drafts/gns0-review-charter-11jul16-en.pdf">http://gns0.icann.org/en/drafts/gns0-review-charter-11jul16-en.pdf</a> ) 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 ( <a href="https://gns0.icann.org/en/drafts/review-implementation-recommendations-plan-21nov16-en.pdf">https://gns0.icann.org/en/drafts/review-implementation-recommendations-plan-21nov16-en.pdf</a> ) 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. The Working Group submitted an update on its implementation progress to the OEC of the ICANN Board and to the GNSO Council at ICANN60 (Oct. 2017) in which it agreed by full consensus that all recommendations for Phase 1 and Phase 2 have been implemented. The Working Group is meeting bi-weekly and has begun work on Phase 3 recommendations. In addition, the WG responded to the OEC concerning questions relating to its implementation progress report. The Working Group has provided a written update to the GNSO Council prior to ICANN61 (Mar. 2018). Another written update was provided prior to the GNSO Council meeting of 24 May 2018.
<p><b><u><a href="#">Privacy &amp; Proxy Services Accreditation Issues PDP Recommendations</a></u></b>                      Council Liaison: Darcy Southwell                      IRT Support Staff: Amy Bivins (GDD)</p> <p>The <i>Registrar Accreditation Agreement</i> (RAA), the contract governing the relationship between ICANN and accredited registrars, has been in place since 2001. The Board initiated negotiations for a new RAA in October 2011,</p>	2009-May-21	Ongoing	Staff/IRT	The WG's Final Report was sent to the GNSO Council on 8 December 2015 and in January 2016, the GNSO Council voted unanimously to approve all the WG's final recommendations ( <a href="https://gns0.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#201601">https://gns0.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#201601</a> ). In May 2016, the Board acknowledged receipt of the PDP recommendations and requested additional time to allow for possible timely GAC input. The GAC issued advice via its Helsinki Communique requesting that its concerns be addressed during implementation to the extent feasible. On 9 August 2016, the Board adopted the PDP recommendations ( <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-08-09-en#2.e">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-08-09-en#2.e</a> ). An IRT was formed and is being led



### 7 – Implementation

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p>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 &amp; 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>				<p>by Amy Bivins of GDD.</p> <p>The IRT has discussed a draft framework developed by the GAC's Public Safety Working Group (PSWG) in relation to privacy and proxy services' handling of law enforcement requests, a draft accreditation agreement and related specifications. It had intended to post these materials for public comment before ICANN62; however, the Registrars Stakeholder Group has asked ICANN organization to consider pausing the IRT work in view of the imminent enforcement date of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). This question remains under discussion and review.</p> <p>IRTP-C: At the request of the Registrars’ Stakeholder Group, which raised a substantive concern regarding the application of IRTP-C to privacy and proxy services, the GNSO Council wrote to the ICANN Board to recommend that the matter be referred to the PPSAI IRT for consideration before the Policy effective date (<a href="https://gns0.icann.org/en/correspondence/bladel-to-crocker-01dec16-en.pdf">https://gns0.icann.org/en/correspondence/bladel-to-crocker-01dec16-en.pdf</a>). The Board responded on 21 December 2016 to note that it is reviewing the Council’s request and in the interim directing that ICANN Compliance defer enforcement of the issue (<a href="https://gns0.icann.org/en/correspondence/crocker-to-bladel-21dec16-en.pdf">https://gns0.icann.org/en/correspondence/crocker-to-bladel-21dec16-en.pdf</a>). On 3 February 2017, the Board passed a resolution confirming its instructions regarding deferral of Compliance enforcement and declaring its intention of further discussing the concerns raised by the GNSO Council at a subsequent meeting. On 16 March 2017, the Board passed a resolution directing the ICANN CEO to instruct ICANN staff to work with the Registrars’ Stakeholder Group and other interested parties to determine the appropriate path forward.</p> <p>Per the GNSO Council’s motion of 30 November 2017, the PPSAI IRT will consider the issue of privacy/proxy registrations and IRTP Part C as outlined in the annex to the GNSO Council letter (see <a href="https://gns0.icann.org/en/correspondence/bladel-to-crocker-01dec16-en.pdf">https://gns0.icann.org/en/correspondence/bladel-to-crocker-01dec16-en.pdf</a>) and put forward recommendations for implementation that are</p>

### 7 – Implementation

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
				consistent with the IRT Part C policy recommendations as well as the PPSAI policy recommendations. The IRT was expected to undertake this work only after the PPSAI IRT closes its expected comment period.
<p><a href="#">Translation/Transliteration of Internationalized Registration Data PDP Recommendations</a></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"> <li>Whether it is desirable to translate contact information to a single common language or transliterate contact information to a single common script; and</li> <li>Who should bear the burden translating contact information to a single common language or transliterating contact information to a single common script?</li> </ol> <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 (<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2015-09-28-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2015-09-28-en</a>). 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><b>Thick WHOIS PDP Recommendations</b>                      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 (<a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-07feb14-en.htm">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-07feb14-en.htm</a>). 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 <a href="#">published</a> on 1 February 2017: 1) <a href="#">Thick Whois Consensus Policy Requiring Consistent Labeling and Display of RDDS (WHOIS) Output for All gTLDs</a> and 2) <a href="#">the Proposed Implementation of GNSO Thick RDDS (WHOIS) Transition Policy for .COM, .NET and .JOBS</a>.</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>The transition from Thin to Thick for .JOBS continues as planned.</p> <p>For .COM and .NET, Verisign, the registry operator, has proposed changes to its Registry-Registrar Agreement (RRA) to accept Thick WHOIS data. However, Verisign and RrSG hit an impasse when they could not agree on RRA proposed by Verisign. During its meeting on 29 October 2017 the ICANN Board adopted a resolution to defer enforcement of the policy (see <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-10-29-en#2.b">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2017-10-29-en#2.b</a>).<a href="#">This</a> effectively allows additional 180 days for implementation before enforcement takes effect.</p>

Other				
Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p><a href="#">GNSO Standing Committee on ICANN Budget and Operating Plan (SCBO)</a>                      Chair: Ayden Ferdeline                      Council Liaison: Heather Forrest                      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's interim charter was adopted by the GNSO Council at the December 2017 GNSO Council meeting. The standing committee has reviewed the ICANN FY19 Draft Budget and Operating Plan and <a href="#">submitted comments</a> on behalf of the Council. The SCBO is reviewing the responses from ICANN Org to the Council comment, among others, and will inform the Council of issues, if any. Towards June 2018, the SCBO will review its prior activity and efforts and develop an after-action report for the Council to consider any changes to the SCBO Charter and confirm the group's continued existence.
<p><a href="#">GNSO Standing Selection Committee (SSC)</a>                      Chair: Susan Kawaguchi                      Vice-Chair: Maxim Alzoba                      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 SSC has recently completed a review of its charter to assess whether the charter provides sufficient guidance and flexibility to carry out its work, and whether any modifications should be considered. The SSC sent proposed revisions to the GNSO Council, which the Council will consider in its May meeting.
<p><a href="#">Consumer Choice Competition and Trust Review Team</a>                      Chair: Jonathan Zuck                      Staff: Eleeza Agopian, Brian Aitchison (GDD)</p> <p>This Review Team was formed in Nov. 2015 to examine the extent to which the introduction or expansion of gTLDs has promoted</p>	2015-Feb-12	2018-Mar-31	Review Team	Under its <a href="#">bylaws</a> , ICANN is committed to ensuring that, as it contemplates expanding the top-level domain space, the various issues that are involved will be adequately addressed prior to implementation. These include issues such as competition, consumer protection, security, stability and resiliency, malicious abuse issues, sovereignty concerns, and rights protection. The bylaws also requires ICANN to convene a community-driven review team to examine the extent to which the introduction or expansion of gTLDs has promoted competition, consumer trust and

Other				
Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
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>consumer choice, as well as the effectiveness of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The application and evaluation process</li> <li>• Safeguards put in place to mitigate issues involved in the introduction or expansion</li> </ul> <p>The CCT-RT is currently developing its final report for delivery to the ICANN Board. The updated report will contain additional sections including results from a new generic top-level domain (gTLD) <a href="#">cost impact survey</a> and the <a href="#">Statistical Analysis of Domain Name System (DNS) Abuse in gTLDs Final Report</a>. The CCT-RT has produced its <a href="#">Report of Public comments</a> on new sections and revised recommendations. It is now working towards its final report.</p>
<p><b>Expired Registration Recovery Policy – Policy Review (ERRP-PR)</b> Staff: M. Konings</p>	FY18	TBD	Staff	<p>The ERRP Consensus Policy became effective 31 Aug 2013 as a result of <a href="#">adopted</a> recommendations produced from the GNSO’s <a href="#">Post Expiration Domain Name Recovery (PEDNR)</a> 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. <a href="#">One recommendation</a> from the WG requested monitoring and follow-up:</p> <p><a href="#">Recommendation #18</a>: The Working Group recommends that ICANN Compliance be requested to provide updates to the GNSO Council on a 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.</p> <p>Staff has started collecting initial data to conduct a review from a contractual compliance perspective as well as other sources. Once complete, a report will be delivered to the GNSO Council for their review.</p>

Other				
Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p><b>Policy &amp; Implementation Recommendations Review</b> (PollImp-RR) Staff: B. Aitchison, M. Konings</p>	FY20	TBD	GNSO Council	<p>The GNSO Council adopted the PollImp WG’s recommendations in June of 2015 with the Board approving the necessary changes to Bylaws Article X, section 3-9 and to Annex A for the newly defined procedures. The results of this effort can be found in the <a href="#">GNSO Operating Procedures</a>. As part of the Council’s resolution a review is to take place:</p> <p><i>“The GNSO Council recommends that a review of these recommendations is carried out at the latest five years following their implementation to assess whether the recommendations have achieved what they set out to do and/or whether any further enhancements or changes are needed.”</i></p> <p>In the meantime and as noted in Point H of the CPIX, 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 are proposing a number of amendments to it for the consideration of the GNSO Council.</p> <p>On 5 March 2018, a redlined CPIX document and a document detailing a set of guidelines for ICANN Org to follow when considering engagement in a GNSO PDP were <a href="#">circulated</a> on the Council email list.</p> <p>The Council may consider at its 26 April meeting the proposed changes and additional document developed by ICANN’s GDD and discuss next steps.</p>