

Program	Project	Description: What	Urgency: When	Importance: Why
RPM	Rights Protection Mechanisms Phase 2	RPMs Phase 2 is work that the Council has previously committed to, which is intended to focus on the UDRP. In concluding RPMs Phase 1, the Council had postponed the start of Phase 2 until Phase 1 implementation completed. The Council also agreed to consider whether amendments may be needed to the charter before starting the work. <b>At some point prior to reinitiating this work, a <u>charter drafting team</u> will need to be convened.</b> However, that step does not preclude additional data gathering and analysis happening prior.	<b>PRIORITY?</b> <b>DEFER?</b>  - The Council has deferred taking next steps (i.e., establish a charter drafting team) several times, starting in February 2023.	- In considering the importance of this initiative, the Council may want to consider passage of time since the original PDP was chartered. Is this work still a priority? Are there clear issues to address?
DNS Abuse	DNS Abuse	Small team convened to evaluate available data, especially related to the DNS abuse amendments in the RA and RAA. <b>The small team is tasked with helping to determine whether gaps remain which should be investigated in an <u>Issue Report</u>.</b>	<b>PRIORITY?</b> <b>DEFER?</b>  - Some have connected a lack of progress on this topic to potential concerns about the multistakeholder model / WSIS+20.	- Broad SO/AC designation as a high priority topic.
RDDS	Registration Data Request System	A standing committee established to analyze data from the RDRS and provide recommendations to the Council to help inform subsequent decisions on how to proceed with the SSAD recommendations.  Depending upon the recommendations from the standing committee, a variety of	<b>PRIORITY?</b> <b>DEFER?</b>  - It is not clear yet whether there is alignment on the priority of future work on SSAD recommendations.	- The conclusion of the two year trial period for the RDRS is approaching and the standing committee believes it has adequate data to conclude its work.

		outcomes/mechanisms (push for Board adoption of existing SSAD recommendation, amend SSAD recommendations, develop new recommendations, a combination of these activities, or other) can be pursued by the Council. <b>In other words, anticipated next steps are currently unclear until the standing committee completes its work.</b>		
RDDS	Accuracy	<p>Small team convened to review written input received to the Council's threshold questions and to provide the Council <b>with a summary of input received. The small team is also asked to provide recommendation(s) on how to best progress the registration data accuracy topic.</b></p> <p>Note: There is an inability to access registration data for the purposes of determining whether there are linkages between inaccurate data and DNS abuse. However, data has shown that some validation steps have a meaningful impact in reducing DNS abuse. <i>There may be opportunities to leverage a potential PDP on DNS abuse to make incremental progress on accuracy related concerns.</i></p>	<p><b>PRIORITY? DEFER?</b></p> <p>- Some have connected a lack of progress on this topic to potential concerns about the multistakeholder model / WSIS+20.</p>	- Some SO/ACs have designated this as a high priority topic.
gTLDs	Moving from Rounds to an Open Process	From the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP, there is a recommendation that specifically calls for new gTLDs to be introduced via rounds. In doing so, challenges are introduced, such as the uncertainty from gaps between rounds, the need to resolve string contention, expensive	<p><b>PRIORITY? DEFER?</b></p> <p>- With the immediate Next Round expected to launch in April 2026, and an anticipated conclusion of the round in 2030, a PDP would need to</p>	- Switching to an open process would provide more certainty to potential applicants and more stability/cost-savings to ICANN org.

		startup and winddown program costs from the round format, etc. <b>In order to move to an ongoing and open process, a new PDP would presumably be needed.</b>	conclude far enough in advance to avoid a further round or rounds.	
Expiration Policies	Expiration Policies	A Policy Status Report (PSR) was just published for <a href="#">public comment</a> . The PSR “examines how both the Expired Domain Deletion Policy (EDDP) and Expired Registration Recovery Policy (ERRP) perform based on three overarching goals: uniformity, clarity, and sufficient notice.” Once the public comment period concludes and amendments are made, as needed, <b>the Council will determine next steps</b> , which may conclude that the expiration policies are functioning as needed, that a PDP is needed, or perhaps that incremental non-policy work can be done.	<b>PRIORITY?</b> <b>DEFER?</b>  - TBD based on PSR	- TBD based on PSR
Transfers	Dispute Mechanism	The Transfer Policy Review PDP Final Report included this recommendation, which was adopted by the GNSO Council: “ <b>The Working Group recommends the GNSO request an <u>Issues Report</u> or other suitable mechanism</b> to further research and explore the pros and cons of (i) expanding the TDRP to registrant filers and (ii) creating a new standalone dispute resolution mechanism for registrants who wish to challenge improper transfers, including compromised and stolen domain names. There remains a need for an intermediary mechanism to remedy unauthorized transfers between ToS claw backs and litigation as well as other issues	<b>PRIORITY?</b> <b>DEFER?</b>  - TBD based on Council discussion.	- Some groups within the GNSO have expressed that this is an important issue to registrants and further work is needed.

		as may be identified by the GNSO. The Working Group recommends that any such additional dispute mechanism that empowers registrants should be in addition to and not prohibit any informal resolution that Registrars successfully employ in the overwhelming number of instances.”		
--	--	---	--	--