

## GNSO Work Prioritization: Project Lists

The following list of Eligible Projects in Table 1 is recommended by the ICANN Policy Staff for inclusion in the Work Prioritization program of the GNSO Council. Projects that are categorized as Ineligible for prioritization are included in Table 2 (below) along with a reason code.

**Note 1:** for a [brief description](#) of each project, please click the Name which is linked to an embedded bookmark in this document. External links, where available, can be found in the descriptions.

**Note 2:** sequence numbers in the table are for reference only and imply no hierarchy or order of importance.

**Table 1. Eligible Projects**

Seq No.	Project Name	Abbreviation
1	<a href="#">Constituency &amp; Stakeholder Operations Work Team</a>	CSG
2	<a href="#">Fast Flux Hosting Working Group</a>	FF
3	<a href="#">Geo Regions Review Communitywide Working Group</a>	GEO
4	<a href="#">GNSO Council Operations Work Team</a>	GCOT
5	<a href="#">IDN Fast Track Implementation Plan</a>	IDNF
6	<a href="#">Inter Registrar Transfers Policy – Part B (*)</a>	IRTPB
7	<a href="#">Joint ccNSO-GNSO IDN Working Group</a>	JIG
8	<a href="#">Policy Development Process Work Team</a>	PDP
9	<a href="#">Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery (*)</a>	PEDNR
10	<a href="#">Registrar Accreditation Agreement Drafting Team</a>	RAA
11	<a href="#">Registration Abuse Policy Working Group</a>	RAP
12	<a href="#">Registry/Registrar Vertical Integration (*)</a>	VI
13	<a href="#">SSAC Internationalized Registration Data Working Group</a>	IRD
14	<a href="#">Travel Policy</a>	TRAV
15	<a href="#">Working Group Work Team</a>	WG

(\*) These projects are formal Policy Development Process (PDP) initiatives.

The following projects in Table 2 are recommended as Ineligible for one of four reasons (ref. “Category” column), but they will be maintained so that the GNSO Council does not lose track of them:

- 1) Implementation Phase (“Implem”): the work effort has completed the recommendation phase, has been approved, and is ready to begin or has already started implementation. While it is not consuming large amounts of community resources, the Council needs to understand the impact on Staff as it considers the adoption of new project work within the GNSO.
- 2) Not a GNSO Project (“Inactive”): the work effort is not or not yet a GNSO initiative and cannot be properly evaluated (ranked/rated) and prioritized by the Council.
- 3) Monitor Only (“Monitor”): the work effort is not fundamentally prioritized by the Council, but it does maintain an interest from an informational perspective (Note: also includes liaison activities).
- 4) Community Pending (“Pending”): the work effort has been put on hold status and is waiting on or pending another action (e.g. Staff report) or decision (e.g. Council motion) and is not currently consuming community resources.

**Table 2. Ineligible Projects**

<b>Category</b>	<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Abbreviation</b>
Implem	<a href="#">New gTLDs</a>	GTLD
Implem	<a href="#">Toolkit of GNSO Services</a>	TK
Implem	<a href="#">Work Prioritization Model Drafting Team</a>	WPM
Implem	<a href="#">Communications &amp; Coordination Work Team</a>	CCT
Monitor	<a href="#">GNSO Constituency Reconfirmations</a>	GCR
Pending	<a href="#">Synthesis of WHOIS Service Requirements</a>	WHO2
Pending	<a href="#">WHOIS Studies</a>	WHO1

## Glossary of Short Descriptions for GNSO Projects

*Note: this glossary is organized alphabetically by title. Each project is linked/bookmarked to either Table 1-Eligible Projects or Table 2-Ineligible Projects above.*

<b>Communications &amp; Coordination Work Team</b>	<b>CCT</b>	Chartered: April 2009
<p>This <a href="#">Work Team</a> was chartered by the Operations Steering Committee (OSC) to develop recommendations to: (a) enhance the GNSO’s ability to solicit meaningful community feedback, (b) improve the GNSO’s coordination with other ICANN structures, and (c) find ways to make the GNSO’s website more usable and effective. The Work Team delivered its <a href="#">Consolidated Final Report</a>, which was accepted by the GNSO Council on 21 April 2010 and approved for a 21 day comment period.</p>		

<b>Constituency &amp; Stakeholder Group Operations Work Team</b>	<b>CSG</b>	Chartered: April 2009
<p>For ICANN, the words “Constituency” and “Stakeholder Group” have technical definitions, referring to representative groups officially recognized by the GNSO. Currently, the Constituencies within the Commercial Stakeholder Group (CSG) are: Internet Service Providers (ISPC), Intellectual Property (IPC), and Businesses (BC). The one Constituency in the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group is: Non-Commercial Users (NCUC). The other two Stakeholder Groups (no Constituencies) are: Registries (RySG) and Registrars (RrSG). This <a href="#">Work Team</a>, chartered by the Operations Steering Committee (OSC), focuses on enhancing the existing structure by developing outreach programs to broaden participation, developing well-founded participation guidelines, and recommending Staff services that will streamline and improve operations.</p>		

<b>Fast Flux Hosting Working Group</b>	<b>FF</b>	Chartered: May 2008, Final Report completed September 2009
<p>This Working Group considered the implications of <i>fast flux hosting</i>, a technique that utilizes short Time-To-Live (TTL) settings and frequent updates of DNS records to rapidly rotate what specific IP address a domain name resolves to. Botmasters use this technique to evade lawful authorities and increase the uptime of illegal websites, but fast flux has legitimate uses, too. The group explored who benefits from fast flux, and who is harmed, how Internet users are affected by fast flux hosting, and whether technical and policy changes to DNS reduce the negative effects of fast flux hosting. In a <a href="#">September 2009 motion</a>, the GNSO Council agreed to form a drafting team to develop a plan with a set of priorities and a schedule that can be reviewed and considered by the new Council. The next step is for the GNSO Council to form this drafting team.</p>		

<b>Geographic Regions Working Group</b>	<b>GEO</b>	Initiated: November 2007
<p>Geographic diversity is a fundamental component of ICANN. The ICANN Bylaws currently define five geographic regions: Africa, North America, Latin America/Caribbean, Asia/Australia/Pacific and Europe. Due to the nature of geopolitics, categorizing a territory or country into one of these regions is not always straightforward. This <a href="#">Working Group</a> focuses on making sure that the criteria for assigning geopolitical entities to an ICANN Geographic Region results in fair, consistent, yet appropriately diverse representation in ICANN groups. Altering the definition of a Geographic Region could have broad impact, so this Working Group is a cross-team effort with representation of all Advisory Committees and Supporting Organizations.</p>		

<b>GNSO Constituency Reconfirmations</b>	<b>GCR</b>	Initiated: November 2008
<p>The newly restructured GNSO Council was seated in October 2009 (Seoul), but there are several remaining tasks for the GNSO Constituencies including charter modifications designed to reflect the new Stakeholder Group structure and to make them more transparent, fair, and representative. At its 12 March 2010 meeting, the Board extended the timetable for Constituency reconfirmation submissions to the ICANN International meeting in Brussels, Belgium.</p>		

<b>GNSO Council Operations Work Team</b>	<b>GCOT</b>	Chartered: April 2009
<p>The GNSO Council is changing its decision-making style from that of a legislative body into that of a “strategic manager of the policy process.” This <a href="#">Work Team</a> was chartered by the Operations Steering Committee (OSC) to define what that means, including considering and making suggestions about operational issues. Examples: How should Council members disclose any possible conflicts of interest and handle abstentions that may arise for a variety of reasons? How does the Council define the scope and responsibilities of standing committees? What kind of training should new Council members receive so they can participate effectively? The Work Team developed a new edition of the GNSO Operating Procedures (GOP) which became effective at the ICANN meeting in Seoul. The team is currently working on several additional GOP chapters/sections including: SOI/DOI, Abstentions, Term Limits, Absences, Absentee Voting, and Board Seat Elections.</p>		

<b>IDN Fast Track Implementation Plan</b>	<b>IDNF</b>	Initiated: July 2008
<p>IDN stands for <i>Internationalized Domain Names</i>, the ability to use web domains in localized non-ASCII characters. In ICANN’s technical definition of “policy development,” this Working Group has completed its tasks, and IDNs have moved into the implementation phase. This group is discussing issues surrounding the possible introduction of a limited number of IDN gTLDs for Council/Board consideration (<a href="http://www.icann.org/en/topics/idn/">http://www.icann.org/en/topics/idn/</a>).</p>		

<b>Inter-Registrar Transfers Policy “Part B”</b>	<b>IRTPB</b>	Initiated: April 2009
<p>As part of a broader review of the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP), the first in a set of five distinct policy development processes (PDPs) has now been completed and a second one, IRTP Part B PDP, is now underway. The <a href="#">IRTP Part B PDP Working Group</a> is addressing five issues related to domain hijacking, the urgent return of an inappropriately transferred name and “lock status,” and issues specified further in its <a href="#">Charter</a>. The WG is expected to make recommendations to the GNSO Council. Transfer-related issues are ranked at the top of consumer complaints received by ICANN (see <a href="http://forms.icann.org//idashboard/public/">http://forms.icann.org//idashboard/public/</a>).</p>		

<b>Joint ccNSO-GNSO IDN Working Group</b>	<b>JIG</b>	Initiated: July 2009
<p>This group is charged with identifying IDN issues of common interest to both the ccTLD and gTLD communities and proposing methodology to both Councils to resolve them. Issues of common interest may include aspects of variant management for the root zone, submission and publication of IDN tables and the updating of IDN Guidelines related to both ccTLD and gTLD implementation processes.</p>		

<b>New gTLDs</b>	<b>GTLD</b>	Initiated: N/A
<p>Since ICANN was founded more than ten years ago as a not-for-profit, multi-stakeholder organization dedicated to coordinating the Internet's addressing system, one of its foundational principles has been to promote competition in the domain name marketplace while ensuring Internet security and stability. The expansion of the generic Top-Level Domain (gTLD) space will allow for a greater degree of innovation and choice. This is a complex and involved process that requires the coordination and consensus of many groups and factions. The ICANN team continues to share with the Internet community the ongoing program developments through the release of draft applicant guidebooks, excerpts, explanatory memos and in -person meetings. All details on the many facets of the program can be found via this page: <a href="http://www.icann.org/en/topics/new-gtld-program.htm">http://www.icann.org/en/topics/new-gtld-program.htm</a>.</p>		

<b>Policy Development Process Work Team</b>	<b>PDP</b>	Chartered: March 2009
<p>This <a href="#">Work Team</a>, chartered by the Policy Development Process Steering Committee (PPSC), is tasked to develop recommendations for a new GNSO policy development process (PDP). ICANN’s policies have wide-ranging impact on how domain names are handled in the gTLD environment, so the method of developing the policies matters. The Work Team considers questions such as: Who has the right to introduce a new issue into the PDP? How much background data should participants have before deciding policy? When a PDP is completed, what should the final result be?</p>		

<b>Post Expiration Domain Name Recovery</b>	<b>PEDNR</b>	Initiated: May 2009
<p>This <a href="#">PDP Working Group</a> is addressing questions in relation to what extent should registrants be able to reclaim their domain names after they expire? At issue is whether the current policies of registrars on the renewal, transfer and deletion of expired domain names are adequate. After reviewing current registrar and ICANN practices regarding domain name expiration, renewal, and post-expiration recovery, the group is expected to make recommendations for new (or changes to existing) consensus policy and/or best practices. They address questions such as: Are expiration-related provisions in registration agreements clear and conspicuous enough? Does adequate notice exist to alert registrants of upcoming expirations? Do registrants have adequate opportunity to redeem their expired domain names?</p>		

<b>Registrar Accreditation Agreement Drafting Team</b>	<b>RAA</b>	Initiated: May 2009
<p>The <i>Registrar Accreditation Agreement</i> (RAA) is the contract governing the relationship between ICANN and its accredited registrars. The original agreement had been in place since 2001, with each of roughly 900 accredited registrars signing the same contract. Over time, it became clear that amendments should be made to this important agreement. A first set of amendments, intended to provide clarity and certainty regarding the duties of registrars and the rights of registrants, was approved by the Board in May, 2009. A <a href="#">Working Group</a> has since been convened to develop a “charter of registrants’ rights” and to consider other possible amendments to the RAA.</p>		

<b>Registration Abuse Policies Working Group</b>	<b>RAP</b>	Initiated: February 2009
<p>Registries and registrars seem to lack uniform approaches for dealing with domain name registration abuse and questions persist as to what actions constitute “registration abuse.” The GNSO Council has launched a <a href="#">Registration Abuse Policies (RAP) Pre-PDP Working Group</a> to take a closer look at registration abuse policies. The RAP Working Group is tasked to address issues such as: (a) defining the difference between registration abuse and domain name use abuse; (b) determining the effectiveness of existing registration abuse policies; (c) examining possible benefits or downsides of having a more uniform approach in contracts; and, (d) assessing which areas, if any, would be suitable for GNSO policy development to address registration abuse.</p>		

<b>Registry/Registrar Vertical Integration</b>	<b>RRVI</b>	Initiated: January 2010
<p>The GNSO Council initiated a PDP on vertical integration between registries and registrars at its meeting on 28 January 2010. A <a href="#">Working Group</a> has been convened and is developing the charter to complete the work within the 16 weeks specified in the GNSO resolution. The goal of the Working Group is to complete this work in an expedited manner in order to develop recommendations before the final Applicant Guidebook is issued, if possible.</p>		

<b>SSAC GNSO Internationalized Registration Data Working Group</b>	<b>IRD</b>	Initiated: June 2009
<p>In June the Board asked the SSAC and the GNSO to jointly convene a working group to study the feasibility and suitability of introducing display specifications to deal with the internationalization of WHOIS registration data. The request emerged from concerns that currently no standard format is required for elements of a domain name registration record (Registration Data), such as contact information, host names, sponsoring registrar and domain name status. The <a href="#">Working Group</a> will be soliciting input from interested constituencies including ccTLD operators and the ccNSO during its discussions to ensure broad community input.</p>		

<b>Synthesis of WHOIS Service Requirements</b>	<b>WHO2</b>	Initiated: May 2009
<p>In May 2009 the GNSO Council requested that Staff collect and organize a comprehensive list of potential WHOIS service requirements based on current policies and previous policy discussions. Staff shared the first draft of this report early in 2010 and is soliciting input from the SOs and ACs as requested by the Council. This is an inventory of technical requirements; and the purpose of study is to assure that the data and supporting technology exist to enable policies to be developed via the consensus policy process.</p>		

<b>Toolkit of GNSO Services</b>	<b>TK</b>	Initiated: 17 December 2009
<p>Approved by Council 17 December 2009 and shared with the Board. Staff to implement next steps, including posting report, estimating costs, determining available funding, prioritizing items with Council, and developing and implementing specifics.</p>		

<b>Travel Policy</b>	<b>TRAV</b>	Initiated: August 2008
<p>For its three meetings per year, ICANN provides travel funds for selected community members. This practice provides support for those who might not be able to afford to attend ICANN meetings otherwise; and helps broaden participation in ICANN's processes. However, ICANN's travel budget is finite. This team writes the travel procedures, which lay out administrative aspects of traveling at ICANN's expense. They also author guidelines that clarify who should receive travel funds from ICANN each year.</p>		

<b>WHOIS Studies</b>	<b>WHO1</b>	Initiated: March 2009
<p>The GNSO Council is considering whether to conduct several broad <a href="#">studies of WHOIS</a> including Misuse of WHOIS Data and a Registrant Identification Study. The GNSO has requested general funding for studies in fiscal year 2011 and will be discussing further which studies to approve. Staff is evaluating two other study areas. The first will measure how often domains associated with illegal or harmful Internet communications abuse Proxy and Privacy Services to obscure the perpetrator's identity. Staff is finalizing the terms of reference for this study and will then release an RFP to solicit costs and feasibility. The second Privacy and Proxy study would measure Proxy and Privacy Service responsiveness to registrant identity reveal requests. Staff evaluation is just beginning on this second area. Staff will be providing this information to the GNSO Council when it is complete and then the Council and Staff will consider next steps.</p>		

<b>Working Group Work Team</b>	<b>WG</b>	Chartered: March 2009
<p>In the past, the GNSO decided policy mainly through small legislative bodies called “Task Forces.” Intentionally, it is moving towards a more inclusive, representative model where key parties tackle an issue together as a “Working Group,” then make recommendations to the GNSO Council. The <a href="#">Working Group Work Team</a>, chartered by the Policy Development Process Steering Committee (PPSC), is helping to define the new Working Group model, including guidelines, checklists, and other materials to speed the process of creating, chartering, naming, funding, staffing, and guiding a GNSO Working Group. You can think of it as the Working Group about Working Groups.</p>		

<b>Work Prioritization Model Drafting Team</b>	<b>WPM</b>	Initiated: November 2009
<p>The background for this effort is the growing realization that the GNSO has a very active and growing workload and a limited supply of volunteers that are available to perform the required work. Over the course of five months, this Drafting Team developed and tested a model, processes, and procedures which were recommended to the GNSO Council for adoption as Chapter 6 plus an ANNEX of the GNSO Operating Procedures. At its 21 April 2010 meeting, the Council approved a 21-day comment period for the procedures and a timeline of activities designed to culminate in an initial project prioritization at the Brussels ICANN meeting. The GNSO Council will take further action with respect to the procedures after the first prioritization exercise has been completed.</p>		

## Version Control

Version	Date	Description
1.0	30 Apr 2010	Policy Staff recommendation to GNSO Council for first Work Prioritization effort scheduled to be completed in Brussels.