ICANN | GNSO

Generic Names Supporting Organization

GNSO Council Strategic Planning Session
29-31 January 2018
Meeting Report

Status of This Document

This is the meeting report of the first GNSO Council Strategic Planning Session held outside of an ICANN meeting. The meeting, a dedicated strategic planning session, focused on developing a work plan for the year ahead and beyond, factoring in the existing workload as well as new responsibilities of the GNSO following the IANA stewardship transition and as part of the Empowered Community.

Table of Contents

Summary

A.   Background

This is the report of the first GNSO Council Strategic Planning Session held outside of an ICANN meeting. The meeting was funded through the FY18 Additional Budget Request, at the request of the GNSO Council to conduct a focused and dedicated strategic planning session in order to develop a work plan for the year ahead and beyond, factoring in the existing workload as well as the new responsibilities following the IANA Stewardship transition, and as part of the Empowered Community. All the preparatory materials for this meeting can be found here: https://drive.google.com/open?id=1BZtK5S4pC1Fx9hkieNS5Nm1WwPvM1-yF.

B.   Focus

The meeting spanned three days, each of which had a specific focus and objective:

● **Day 1 - Roles & Remit of Council, Council Leadership and Liaisons**. During Day 1, the Council focused on reviewing the relevant Bylaws and GNSO Operating Procedures to ensure a common understanding of and appreciation for the unique roles that the GNSO and the GNSO Council have with regard to gTLD policy development. Furthermore, the GNSO Council discussed the role of Council leadership, which has evolved over time as a result of new responsibilities following the IANA Stewardship transition. As a result of that discussion, members agreed to explore the creation of emergency consultation mechanisms that propose to allow the GNSO Chair and/or Council Vice-Chairs to consult with the GNSO Council and/or Stakeholder Group / Constituencies on issues that require an urgent response or decision. Councilors also discussed the role of GNSO Council liaisons to Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Groups, Implementation Review Teams (IRTs), Cross-Community Working Groups as well as other Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees. It was agreed that, in addition to the existing language in the GNSO Operating Procedures, there is a need to be more specific about the responsibilities of liaisons, especially since the role of a liaison has become more important in recent PDPs and IRTs. The Council agreed to further review and refine a role and responsibilities description. Concurrent with this work, the Council will re-confirm liaisons for all ongoing activities.

● **Day 2 - Role and Responsibilities of the GNSO Council in the Empowered Community.** The objective of Day 2 was to understand how the roles and responsibilities of the GNSO Council have changed now that the GNSO is a participant in the Empowered Community. As such, a panel of Council members that had been involved in transition-related activities provided context and detail with regards to the new accountability mechanisms that had been created, including the Empowered Community. Furthermore, the GNSO Council reviewed in detail the proposed changes to the GNSO Operating Procedures and ICANN Bylaws which were the output of a GNSO drafting team. The Drafting Team had previously reviewed all the new roles and responsibilities included in the post-transition Bylaws and made recommendations as to how these should be taken up by the GNSO as a decisional participant in the Empowered Community. Later that day, during the GNSO Council meeting (which was calendared to leverage the face-to-face opportunity), the Council adopted the revised GNSO Operating Procedures and recommended to the ICANN Board a revision to

the GNSO voting thresholds in the ICANN Bylaws to ensure that the GNSO is fully equipped to take up its role and responsibilities in the post-transition environment.

● **Day 3 - 2018 strategic planning, workload management and objectives**. During day 3, the Council reviewed the workload for the year ahead using the 2018 Project Timing Planning tool (see Annex B) and confirmed expected milestones, noting that the average timeline for delivery of an Initial Report has increased 2-4 times compared to previous PDPs. In addition, the Council explored challenges encountered in a number of PDPs, informed by a staff discussion paper on optimizing increased engagement & participation while ensuring efficient and effective policy development. Key among these challenges are increasing PDP participant and observer numbers, onboarding new participants, divergent motivations and desired outcomes, and difficulties in reaching consensus. Critical discussions centred on how the GNSO Council, as manager of the policy development process, can and should act in addressing challenges if/when these occur. In order to engage the broader GNSO community in this discussion, the GNSO Council agreed to develop a white paper-type proposal setting out possible incremental changes to the policy development process to address specific challenges encountered.

C.   Outcomes

This report provides further details on the discussions, agreements, and action items coming out of the GNSO Council Strategic Planning Session. The outcomes of the meeting can be summarized as follows:

● Established a common understanding of Council's remit and responsibilities under ICANN governance documents;
● Clarified the various Council roles (leadership, liaisons);
● Enhanced understanding of the GNSO's history and present role within broader ICANN community;
● Preparedness of the GNSO as a Decisional Participant in the Empowered Community through the adoption of revised GNSO Operating Procedures and recommended amendments to ICANN Bylaws;
● Critically evaluated the Council's role as manager of the policy development process, including identification of existing inefficiencies and possible solutions, and;
● Reviewed and organized the Council's work flow for 2018, with PDP milestones.

Day One

A.   Focus for day one

What is the GNSO Council and what is its function within ICANN?

Overarching goal of day one is to establish a common baseline of foundational knowledge about what the GNSO Council does and what Councilors' roles are (including Council leadership and liaisons).

B.   Role of the GNSO in the context of its history

Objective: Explain the "picket fence" and ICANN SO/AC structure in the context of history of the organization and how this impacts on the GNSO's role and function within ICANN

High level notes:
See presentation provided by Becky Burr (https://gnso.icann.org/en/picket-fence-concept-overview-29jan18-en.pdf).
- ICANN's picket fence – what is it and where did it come from?
- In October 1998 agreement to transition from Verisign as sole registry and registrar for .com, .net and .org, followed by naming of competing registrars in April 1999.
- First registry agreement and registrar accreditation agreement signed on 10 November 1999.
- ICANN needed the ability to uniformly enforce obligations, including the ability to add additional obligations without contractual negotiations. As part of that discussion, there was a need to identify the areas in which such additional contractual obligations could be added, tied to ICANN's mission as well as a process by which such additional contractual obligations could be developed.
- The "picket fence" characterized this area that would delineate the topics for which ICANN could enforce additional contractual obligations which would have gone through an agreed upon process; anything outside of that area would need to be subject of contract negotiations.
- Registry and registrar agreements cover the picket fence in slightly divergent ways. A number of examples were included in the agreements to provide an illustration of what topics would be considered within the picket fence.
- Picket fence incorporated into the post-transition Bylaws:
  - The mission of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers ("ICANN") is to ensure the stable and secure operation of the Internet's unique identifier systems … (the "Mission"). Specifically, ICANN:
  - Coordinates the allocation and assignment of names in the root zone of the Domain Name System ("DNS") and coordinates the development and implementation of policies concerning the registration of second-level domain names in generic top-level domains ("gTLDs"). In this role, ICANN's scope is to coordinate the development and implementation of policies:
  - For which uniform or coordinated resolution is reasonably necessary to facilitate the openness, interoperability, resilience, security and/or stability of the DNS

including, with respect to gTLD registrars and registries, policies in the areas described in Annex G-1 and Annex G-2; and
- o That are developed through a bottom-up consensus-based multistakeholder process and designed to ensure the stable and secure operation of the Internet's unique names systems.
- ● Annex G-2 (Registry specification):
  - o The topics, issues, policies, procedures and principles referenced in Section 1.1(a)(i) with respect to gTLD registries are:
  - o Issues for which uniform or coordinated resolution is reasonably necessary to facilitate interoperability, security and/or stability of the Internet or DNS;
  - o functional and performance specifications for the provision of registry services;
  - o security and stability of the registry database for a TLD;
  - o registry policies reasonably necessary to implement Consensus Policies relating to registry operations or registrars;
  - o resolution of disputes regarding the registration of domain names (as opposed to the use of such domain names); or
  - o restrictions on cross-ownership of registry operators and registrars or registrar resellers and regulations and restrictions with respect to registry operations and the use of registry and registrar data in the event that a registry operator and a registrar or registrar reseller are affiliated.
- ● Registrar specification (G-1) only differs with regards to domain name use.
- ● As a result of the transition-related work, namely the CCWG-Accountability recommendations, the picket fence was incorporated into the Bylaws as part of ICANN's mission. The mission is now clarified with regards to the constraints that are in place with regards to ICANN's authority as well ability to enforce contractual obligations on the topics as outlined in the Bylaws.
- ● It was necessary from a contracted parties' perspective to balance out ICANN's need to develop policies and impose them on contracted parties, where those policies are necessary for security and stability. Incorporating the picket fence into ICANN's mission provides some measure of predictability and stability that businesses like contracted parties need. This sets up a unique situation whereby a contracting party is legally bound to terms which may not be consented to.
- ● Picket fence circumscribes ICANN's authority with regards to names.
- ● Effective policy-making requires that affected stakeholders be able to participate, hence the structure of the GNSO Council.
- ● In addition to examples of what is within the picket fence, the base registry and registrar agreements also contain certain examples of matters outside of the picket fence, such as pricing, fees paid to ICANN, etc.
- ● Picket fence concept is inherently based on consensus-driven process There is more predictability in the sense that there is more discussion and understanding of the different positions, that you may not get in a voting model. Consensus provides balance against capture. It is also the tradition by which decisions are made in the technical community.
- ● (CANN Board has committed to tying decisions and actions explicitly to relevantBylaws provisions that empower the Board to act or not act for any decisions going forward. SO/ACs will be encouraged to adopt this approach going forward.

C.   What is the GNSO Council and what does it do?

Objective:
- Establish a collaborative, safe environment in which all feel free to participate and contribute to the discussion.
- Develop a common understanding by all of the role and responsibilities of the GNSO Council as well as our shared role and responsibilities.
- Ensure all Councilors appreciate the precise responsibilities established by Bylaws Article 11.
- Set the scene for Day 2 discussions which will consider post-transition new responsibilities of Council and Councilors by identifying activities/efforts Council is involved in that may not fall strictly within Article 11.
- Consider the historic role of Council as scene-setting for IANA Stewardship transition changes.

High level notes:
From article 11 of the ICANN Bylaws:
- There shall be a policy-development body known as the Generic Names Supporting Organization (the "Generic Names Supporting Organization" or "GNSO", and collectively with the ASO and ccNSO, the "Supporting Organizations"), which shall be responsible for developing and recommending to the Board substantive policies relating to generic top-level domains and other responsibilities of the GNSO as set forth in these Bylaws.
- The GNSO shall consist of:
  (a) A number of Constituencies, where applicable, organized within the Stakeholder Groups
  (b) Four Stakeholder Groups organized within Houses
  (c) Two Houses within the GNSO Council
  (d) A GNSO Council responsible for managing the policy development process of the GNSO
- The GNSO Council shall consist of:
  (i)   three representatives selected from the Registries Stakeholder Group
  (ii)   three representatives selected from the Registrars Stakeholder Group;
  (iii)   six representatives selected from the Commercial Stakeholder Group;
  (iii)   six representatives selected from the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group; and
  (iv)   three representatives selected by the ICANN Nominating Committee, one of which shall be non-voting, but otherwise entitled to participate on equal footing with other members of the GNSO Council including, e.g. the making and seconding of motions and of serving as Chair if elected. One Nominating Committee appointee voting representative shall be assigned to each House by the Nominating Committee.
- The GNSO Council is responsible for managing the policy development process of the GNSO. It shall adopt such procedures (the "GNSO Operating Procedures") as it sees fit to carry out that responsibility, provided that such procedures are approved by a majority vote of each House.
- Unique environment legally where outsiders who are not party to a contract have a say in that contract, and contracted parties relinquish legal rights as a contract party in order to allow that.

- Obligation for contracted parties to implement policy recommendations derived from a PDP following adoption by the ICANN Board.
- Sensitivities may arise when issues are discussed that are outside of the picket fence but where non-contracted parties do wish to express views. Comments may be the only ability to have a voice in that process. It does not mean that these are off-limits for discussions, but they do not fall within the remit of policy making as defined in the ICANN Bylaws. While this clear distinction is necessary, as a private company a contracted party will conduct their business in compliance with their own policies and legal requirements.
- What/how can the GNSO Council defend this unique mission and assure that others in the community understand this role and responsibility? Above all else, it is important to stress that GNSO policy development activities are open to anyone interested. Similarly, other parts of the ICANN community, such as the ICANN Board, may need to be reminded of this role and what it entails on a regular basis.
- What are the tools of the Council to ensure that PDPs remain on track and are able to deliver on the GNSO's unique mission. See further discussion on day 3.
- Reference to "other responsibilities" in the ICANN Bylaws creates some uncertainty amongst many in the community of what that entails. How much time is spent on activities that are firmly within the picket fence vs. on "other responsibilities"?

Agreements:
- Article 11 outlines the unique mission of the GNSO being responsible for developing and recommending to the Board substantive policies relating to generic top-level domains.

Action items:
- Council leadership to consider adding references to relevant ICANN Bylaw sections for agenda items on the GNSO Council agenda, following the example of the ICANN Board.
- Council to discuss with the ICANN Board on Day 3 what can be done to facilitate understanding and communication between the GNSO Council and the ICANN Board – may require more than 1 hour at every ICANN meeting. (COMPLETED)

Parking lot of issues that are not within scope for this discussion but important to note for possible future discussions:
- How to deal with issues that are or are perceived (possibly historically) multistakeholder but do not naturally fall inside the picket fence / policy development process.

D.   Role and responsibilities of Council leadership

Objectives:
- Develop a common understanding of the role and responsibilities of the GNSO Council leadership, appreciating how this has evolved over time (thereby establishing a foundation for further evolution discussions in day 2 re post-IANA Stewardship transition)
- Develop a common understanding of and build trust in the GNSO Council's bicameral structure.
- Identify what the leadership team does/does not do and dispel any possible misconceptions.
- Develop an appreciation for the role that staff play in assisting leadership's work.

- Workshop possible problem areas with the leadership team, consider how these may be identified and resolved.

High level notes:
- From the ICANN Bylaws Article 11: "The GNSO Council shall select the GNSO Chair for a term the GNSO Council specifies, but not longer than one year. Each House (as described in Section 11.3(h)) shall select a Vice-Chair, who will be a Vice-Chair of the whole of the GNSO Council, for a term the GNSO Council specifies, but not longer than one year. The procedures for selecting the Chair and any other officers are contained in the GNSO Operating Procedures. In the event that the GNSO Council has not elected a GNSO Chair by the end of the previous Chair's term, the Vice-Chairs will serve as Interim GNSO Co-Chairs until a successful election can be held".
- Some specific tasks and responsibilities for the GNSO Chair and Council Vice-Chairs are explicitly identified in the GNSO Operating Procedures. However, there is quite a lot more that gets done that is not captured in the GNSO Operating Procedures, such as preparatory meetings that take place, new obligations as a result of the post-transition Bylaws and developing and carrying out ICANN meeting strategy.
- Current challenges encountered: time zone challenges due to leadership being in different time zones, workload involved in taking a leadership position, different ways in which SO/AC Chairs operate, with the GNSO Chair in most instances needing to consult with the GNSO community. GNSO is not one person – it may be important to remind the broader community of this on a regular basis.
- Role of GNSO Chair has changed over time, partly as the result of the new roles & obligations as the result of the post-transition Bylaws. To a certain degree, the tendency to focus on SO/AC leadership can also be seen as the result of a desire to have a single point of contact and a misconception that an SO/AC Chair represents and can speak on behalf of the whole community he/she hails from.
- More responsibilities have been delegated to Council Vice-Chairs as a result of the increased workload. Regular communication within the leadership team is key.
- Changes in leadership also require staff to adapt to new styles and working methods, which requires a certain level of flexibility.
- Is there a need to institutionalize and document some of the division of labor between GNSO Chair and Council Vice-Chairs?
- What is the role of the GNSO Chair in relation to the broader GNSO community?
- How to deal with ambiguity in the ICANN Bylaws with regards to role of SO/AC Chairs? For example, in the SSR2, SO/AC Chairs are put into a position that is not spelled out in the ICANN Bylaws, opening up the potential for different interpretations of the power or authority of the Chair vis-a-vis their SO/AC community. Too much tendency to focus on equal representation instead of ensuring that different positions are represented. The focus on equal representation does not seem to align with the concepts of multistakeholder and consensus. This is also translated in recent "votes" such as topics for cross-community sessions, instead of focusing on trying to achieve consensus.

Action items:
- GNSO Council to consider whether existing mechanisms provide for sufficient opportunity to conduct "emergency" consultations to allow for GNSO Chair to gather input on certain topics and/or decisions that need to be taken.

- Council members to provide leadership team with feedback on leadership team's performance & actions on a regular basis.
- Current Council Chair (Heather Forrest) to provide report at the end of her term outlining main challenges / concerns / recommendations in fulfilling the role.
- GNSO Council to consider whether Council leadership should have a contract / letter of appointment that would outline role, responsibilities and expectations.

E.   Role of Council liaisons

Objectives:
- Develop a common understanding of the role and responsibilities of GNSO Council liaisons (including PDP, Review Teams and GAC).
- Identify all current liaison positions and their current appointees.
- Develop an overarching position description and expectations.
- Confirm/appoint new liaisons to all positions, as appropriate (note: GAC liaison is fixed)

High level notes:
- Observations from existing liaisons:
  - Formality of certain (but not all) liaison appointments, for example the GNSO liaison to the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC);
  - Changes in leadership team in other SO/ACs affects operation of liaison role;
  - As long as things go well, it is easy to forget the role and responsibilities of the liaison;
  - Also easy for WG leadership / Council to forget that there is a liaison who should be involved in certain discussions;
  - Liaisons sign up before a WG has defined its work plan and activities, which sometimes means that a liaison may get much more responsibilities than they bargained for (for example, is a liaison expected to cover all work tracks of a PDP or are additional liaisons needed if a PDP decides to create additional work tracks / work teams);
  - Within an IRT, there is no appointed chair which allows for consultation with the liaison like in a WG;
  - Need clarity that the liaison role is between Council and WG/IRT and not other parts of ICANN;
  - No clear expectations with regards to what is expected of the liaison to non-PDP WGs or IRTs, for example GNSO Review Working Group;
  - Lack of regular updates by liaisons to the GNSO Council;
  - What is the balance between being the GNSO Council liaison as well as a WG member?.
- Continuing an effort initiated under the leadership of previous Council Chair James Bladel, the current Council leadership team will meet prior to every ICANN meeting with PDP WG leadership team, including the liaison, to provide an update on the status of work. Liaison could provide some additional insight and/or heads-up on potential issues prior to this meeting.
- GNSO Working Group Guidelines note that "the liaison is expected to fulfill the liaison role in a neutral manner" – is that feasible as many will want to participate as a WG member or would it in effect mean that the liaison is also a vice-chair? Note that this refers to the liaison role, so it may be possible to separate liaison role from WG member

role. Also, liaison also has a responsibility to address / intervene in issues that may involve the leadership team, so it would not be appropriate for the liaison to be a chair or vice/co-chair.

● Role of liaison should focus on the management / administration of the PDP, not the substance of discussions.
● Proposed responsibilities for liaisons document shared with the GNSO Council in preparation for this meeting. The document translates the requirements in the GNSO Working Group guidelines in tangible responsibilities and expectations. Objective is to get feedback and eventual buy-in for this document. Feedback:
  o Liaison role to WGs is expected to be a two-way street – also allow Council to provide input / feedback to the WG;
  o There might be friction about Council liaison reporting to the Council separate from updates that are provided by WG leadership;
  o Consider having liaison report in advance of an ICANN meeting, while the chairs of the WG provide an update during an ICANN meeting. This could be a standing item on the calendar;
  o Consider revising the term "intervene" – "engage" may be a better word or just remove the reference to intervene;
  o Should guidelines / template be provided for liaison reporting? What are the items that are most important for the Council in its role as manager of the PDP? For example, timeline, milestones.;
  o Serving as a mediator could be extremely challenging – neutrality could be an issue. This section needs to be cross-referenced with 3.6 and 3.7 of the WG Guidelines. Role of the liaison is currently not called out in 3.7.;
  o Council liaison is accountable to GNSO Council, not to individual PDP participants, SG/Cs or others. It would be helpful to make this clearer;
  o Further guidance may be needed on how to assist in cases of abuse of ICANN's Expected Standards of Behavior;
● Need to reiterate at the start of WGs the role and responsibilities of the liaison.
● Role and responsibilities of the GNSO Council liaison to an IRT are documented and detailed in the IRT Guidelines. Any changes or updates to those would need to be separately considered (note that a review of these is expected to take place in the near future in the context of the review of the Policy & Implementation WG recommendations). As these have only been recently adopted / implemented, it may require some further practical experience to be able to assess whether these work or not.
● GNSO Council Liaison to the ccNSO – expectations are not derived from any existing document, but rather capture general expectations. It may not be feasible to participate in meetings and activities of the ccNSO – consider adding "as far as reasonably possible" or clarify that this relates to conference calls not meetings at ICANN meetings. Note that a request has now also been received for a liaison to the ccNSO SOP Working Group – important to ensure that there is no duplication although this role may not be intended to be a liaison in the strict sense of the word.
● GNSO Council Liaison to the GAC – described and formalized role as a result of the recommendations of the GAC-GNSO Consultation Group. One thing to note is that the liaison is not allowed to be added to the mailing list which does not make it easier to follow deliberations. Also note the different filters, for example different levels of staff

support on the GAC side, may make it more challenging. Also, important to have an understanding of how the GAC conducts its business.

Action items:
- Staff to update liaison document based on input provided and circulate it to the Council for further review and discussion.
- Council to reconfirm liaisons to PDP WG, IRTs and other projects once agreement has been achieved on the role and responsibilities of liaisons.

F. Role and responsibilities of GNSO more broadly

Objectives:
- With the morning session's history of GNSO and ICANN as a foundation for this discussion, compare historic and current perspectives on the role of the GNSO within ICANN as a unifying topic to bring the day's discussion together.
- Recognition of common collective and individual responsibility of Councilors and Council to maintain the integrity of the PDP and exclusive role of the GNSO within ICANN.
- Develop ideas for improving/optimizing the validity and legitimacy of the PDP vis-à-vis GAC, ccNSO, ALAC, CCWGs, etc.
- Develop ideas for building and maintaining confidence amongst the broader Community that PDP is the mechanism to address problems within the picket fence.
- Develop appreciation for councilors' role as stewards/officers of the Bylaws and org structure (ie, appreciate personal responsibility).

High level notes:
- Other parts of the community each have their respective role to play in the ICANN eco-system, but it is the GNSO's responsibility to develop policy recommendations related to gTLDs. As such, the PDP needs to be defended and respected by all, with regular reminders that anyone interested can participate in a PDP.
- How to communicate to other parts of the community in a way that is not frightening or aggressive? May need to further emphasize the difference between CCWGs and PDPs. Similar to further explaining and fully communicating" the role and responsibilities of the GNSO and the GNSO Council. Note that recent communication has gone out to the SO/AC Chairs following the adoption of the CCWG Principles, also outlining the differences with PDPs. See also https://gnso.icann.org/en/council/comparison-chart-pdp-ccwg-30jan18-en.pdf.
- Demonstrating success of PDP by engaging others and encouraging participation can demonstrate the robustness and inclusiveness of the PDP.

G. Wrap up and Summary of Action Items

Action items Day 1 (compilation):
#1. Council leadership team to send "thank you" note to Becky Burr for her presentation and Jonathan Robinson for his facilitation skills (COMPLETED)
#2. Council leadership to consider adding references to relevant ICANN Bylaw sections for agenda items on the GNSO Council agenda, following the example of the ICANN Board.

#3. Council to discuss on Wednesday with the ICANN Board what can be done to facilitate understanding and communication between the GNSO Council and the ICANN Board – may require more than 1 hour at every ICANN meeting. (COMPLETED)

#4. GNSO Council to consider whether existing mechanisms provide for sufficient opportunity to conduct "emergency" consultations to allow for GNSO Chair to gather input on certain topics and/or decisions that need to be taken.

#5. Council members to provide leadership team with feedback on leadership team's performance & actions on a regular basis.

#6. Heather to provide report at the end of her term outlining main challenges / concerns in relation to the GNSO Chair role.

#7. GNSO Council to consider whether Council leadership should have a contract / letter of appointment that would outline role, responsibilities as well as expectations of Council leadership.

#8. Staff to update liaison document based on input provided and circulate it to the Council for further review and discussion.

#9. Council to reconfirm liaisons to PDP WG, IRTs and other projects once agreement has been achieved on the role and responsibilities of liaisons.

Day Two

A.   Focus for day two

Role and Responsibilities of the GNSO Council: How have these changed now that the GNSO is a participant in the Empowered Community?

B.   GNSO Post-Transition

Objectives:
- Build on baseline understanding from Day 1 sessions on the role of Council and Council leadership to achieve a common understanding of what the implications of the IANA Stewardship transition are and specifically, what the Empowered Community is. Also, why the EC was introduced, and what the EC replaces from prior USG contractual oversight
- Identify possible situations where specific issues and challenges might arise in relation to GNSO participation in the EC and possible means for resolving difficult situations.

High level notes:
- See also https://drive.google.com/open?id=1o2WaD9OtLTLvbiZyEDb7WzGgJ7Jj5vnT.
- IANA Stewardship Transition to the global multistakeholder community resulted in the current accountability mechanisms. INTA played a back-stop role that needed to be replaced. September 2016 is when the transition came into effect and the new accountability mechanisms into place.
- Naming part of the IANA Function is what GNSO community is mainly concerned by.
- No "traditional" stakeholder – Board relationship was in place prior to the transition, this needed to be addressed with the community becoming a stakeholder and charged with IANA Stewardship. Similarly, the community needed to ensure accountability within itself and have the relevant mechanisms in place.
- This resulted in new rights and responsibilities of the community. ALAC, ASO, ccNSO, GAC and the GNSO are the decisional participants in the Empowered Community (EC). Amongst others, under the ICANN Bylaws, the EC has the following powers and rights:
  - Appoint and remove Directors
  - Recall the entire Board
  - Reject ICANN and IANA budgets, and ICANN operating and strategic plans
  - Reject standard Bylaw amendments
  - Approve fundamental Bylaw and Articles amendments, and asset sales
  - Reject PTI governance actions
  - Require the ICANN Board to review its rejection of IFR (IANA Naming Function Review process), special IFR, SCWG (creation), and SCWG (Separation Cross-Community Working Group) recommendation decisions
  - Initiate community reconsideration request, mediation, or IRP
  - Enforce its powers and rights in court
- With new powers come new responsibilities; important for the Council to be aware of these and take these on. For example, close review and consideration of ICANN's budget as well as the upcoming creation of a standing IRP Panel.

- As part of the community work on the CWG-Stewardship and CCWG-Accountability a number of new work methods were developed (e.g. note taking during a meeting). It also resulted in the formalization of the principles for Cross-Community Working Groups. No mechanism was in place to deal with the transition-related questions as it wasn't a policy question – as a result a cross-community mechanism was created. The NTIA announcement included 4 criteria that needed to be met in order for any proposal to be acceptable.
- Some issues still remain to be addressed and implemented, while at the same time a review of the new mechanisms is already foreseen to be initiated later this year (IFR and CSC review).
- Transition may have also affected "balance of power" by, for example, enshrining in the Bylaws that the Board can only reject GAC advice through a vote and accompanying process. Similarly, it would potentially open up ICANN up to competition which means that the community has a responsibility to ensure that ICANN's "products" remain attractive and competitive.
- Each Decisional Participant shall adopt procedures for exercising the rights of the individual Decisional Participants. There is no timeline associated with this, but it does mean that until such time new procedures are in place, existing procedures apply, which in certain cases may lead to problems with no clear solution.
- Important to distinguish between the responsibilities of the Empowered Community Administration and SO/AC Chairs, even if the composition may be largely the same.
- Challenges to enforce accountability within community structures. How to address these challenges?

C.   Role of GNSO Council post-Transition

Objectives:
- Identify and discuss the specific impacts of EC membership on the GNSO Council
- Highlight any changes in the roles of GNSO Council or Council leadership arising from GNSO membership in the EC
- Opportunity to further explore other areas where there may have been or may be future expansion of Council's remit and document points of agreement and disagreement

High level notes:
- The GNSO Council created a Drafting Team (DT) to 'fully identify all the new or additional rights and responsibilities that the GNSO has under the revised Bylaws, including but not limited to participation of the GNSO within the Empowered Community, and to develop new or modified structures and procedures (as necessary) to fully implement these new or additional rights and responsibilities' (June 2016);
- DT requested to provide the GNSO Council with an implementation plan 'which will have the consensus of the Drafting Team, including any recommendations for needed further changes to ICANN Bylaws and/or GNSO Operating Procedures to enable effective GNSO participation in ICANN activities under the revised ICANN Bylaws, not later than 30 September 2016'.

- The DT Final Report was submitted to the GNSO Council on 12 October 2016. The recommendation that Council would speak for GNSO achieved "Strong support but significant opposition".
- Nonetheless, all DT members contributed to "Consensus" recommendations for voting thresholds on the assumption that GNSO Council would approve nominations and actions created under the new ICANN Bylaws. DT found 101 relevant instances in the new bylaws, and grouped those into three categories: 1) Obligations of the GNSO as a Decisional Participant of the Empowered Community; 2) Engagement in the new Customer Standing Committee; and 3) Processes relating to voting thresholds.
- On 1 December 2016, the GNSO Council accepted the recommendations in the DT's Final Report and directed ICANN Policy Staff to draft proposed language for any necessary modifications or additions to the GNSO Operating Procedures / ICANN Bylaws. The GNSO Council also requested that ICANN Legal evaluate whether the proposed modifications were consistent with the post-transition Bylaws and report their findings to the GNSO Council.
- All changes are related to the new roles and responsibilities coming out of transition, with no impact on Annex A or any of the other documents related to the policy development process.

D.   Changes to GNSO Operating Procedures and related governance documents to facilitate participation in Empowered Community

Objectives:
- Council to review proposed changes to Operating Procedures in order to acknowledge these and be able to decide on next steps in the Council meeting taking place in the afternoon
- All Councilors to have a common understanding of why Operating Procedures require amendments and to appreciate the precise changes proposed

High level notes:
- Proposed changes presented to the GNSO Council (see https://gnso.icann.org/en/drafts/gop-bylaws-20sep17-en.pdf). These changes are the proposed implementation of the Bylaws Drafting Team. The proposed changes can be categorized as follows:
    o No changes needed because sufficient guidance is provided or has been addressed otherwise (e.g., SSC);
    o Changes to ICANN Bylaws to reflect new voting thresholds;
    o Changes to GOP to reflect that certain decisions are accepted "automatically" through consent agenda;
    o Waiver for current timing requirements in specific circumstances to meet DP obligations;
    o Clarification that certain petitions submitted by an individual need to go via SG/C;
    o Clarification that all petitions by an individual for Board Director removal need to be submitted directly to the GNSO Council.

- For the additional procedures that need to be developed by the GNSO Council as well as GNSO Stakeholder Groups / Constituencies, is there value in working together on developing this further or if someone has already done this the approach could be shared with others? NCUC and Registrars already have provisions in their charters in place and could serve as a model for others.

Action items Day 2:
#10. Council leadership to reach out to SG/C leadership to notify them of the changes made to the GNSO Operating Procedures and the requirements for SG/Cs to develop supporting procedures and processes.
#11. Staff to work on first draft of templates for motions related to EC powers as highlighted in the staff report (see https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/proposed-revisions-gnso-op-procedures-bylaws-staff-report-16may17-en.pdf).

Day Three

A.   Focus for Day Three

2018 Strategic planning: What is the GNSO's workload this year, what milestones will arise, and how can we improve effectiveness in meeting those milestones?

B. How to manage Council's 2018 workload: strategies to increase effectiveness

Objectives:
- Identify 2018 workload (see Annex B – 2018 Project Timing Planning)
- Identify areas of improvement in managing the workload
- Identify strengths and weaknesses in Council's relationship with and support from ICANN org.

High level notes:
- Overarching questions: What is urgent, what is important? Traffic control, what should the community focus on? What do we not know enough about to keep pushing forward?
- Should we have policy principles / criteria that apply to the work / outcomes of PDP WGs, for example; simple – is what is in front of the Council in a simple enough form that it is useful; affordable – are the recommendations affordable to the parties that are directly affected; predictable – is it predictable; timely - deadlines should be baked in to ensure timely delivery of recommendations.
- Need to understand the problems to be able to work on solutions. Link cost & time together – should calculate what a PDP costs (for example, including volunteer time) to make clear what the costs of delays are, enhance role of liaisons.
- Efficiency and effectiveness: how do we make sure that under the Council's watch, there is efficiency and effectiveness when it comes to policy development activities. How can GNSO Council improve program and project management work in fulfilling its role as manager of the PDP?
- Need to be able to set realistic timelines to set the expectations of participants and allow for planning accordingly.
- How to ensure that participants to a WG are willing to address problems or obstacles and working in good faith to find a solution?
- How to give PDP chairs the tools and skills to act according to WG Guidelines?
- Challenge here is that there is no common interest and diametrically opposed views. This results in little trust, which is an important element for the success of multistakeholder policy development.
- Creative thinking on how to make PDP WGs more effective and efficient – establish a small group to develop ideas for addressing challenges. For example, the group could look at how to ensure effective participation in WGs – is there a need to limit the # of

WG members and consider other ways in which individuals can engage and provide input?

- Consensus requires compromise – if behavior shows that there is no willingness to compromise, could that be measured / quantified to restrict participation?
- Don't let the perfect be the enemy of the good – look for incremental changes that may address some of the issues raised here.
- Council as the manager of the PDP has the ability to make changes to WG charters, if deemed necessary.
- How to effectively plan for and monitor ongoing activities as well as work in the pipeline? How to prioritize the Council's work?
- Common understanding of the issues needed before being able to identify solutions.
- Has the Council ever intervened in a PDP when issues / problems occur? No serious interventions in recent memory. Council is good at identifying problems informally, but these do not necessarily result in action. Do we miss institutional memory?
- Does Council take a sufficiently active role in "managing" PDP working groups? For example, is sufficient attention paid to the work plans that are submitted and whether these represent realistic timelines and/or why deadlines are not being met? Council should take a proactive role in managing PDPs. Council should provide criteria for information that needs to be provided by PDP WG leadership as part of their updates so that the Council can more effectively conduct its role as a manager. At the same time, the Council should be careful to avoid second guessing or micromanaging the leadership of a WG.
- Should Council start tracking issues that are identified to keep track and benefit from lessons learned?
- What role does the Council have in overseeing requests that come out of WGs that have a budgetary impact? Similarly, should resources dedicated to a WG be overseen and tracked by the Council? Consider implementing financial reporting for PDP WGs to better track resources spent.
- Ensure that the right tools are in place to facilitate project management of WGs.
- Effectiveness – review all efforts going on and determine whether these are on track or whether there is a need to pause some of the work.
- Efficiency – track resources for the different work efforts. Could also budget for volunteer hours available.
- Need to set parameters around how many hours a PDP is expected to take. This allows setting clear expectations about the effort expected and required.
- How to empower PDP leadership to raise issues about PDP progress, difficulty reaching consensus, PDP leaders or members, etc., as these arise? Council leadership will continue the initiative of the previous Council leadership team of meeting by call with PDP WG leadership prior to ICANN meetings. There is a disconnect between informally raised concerns about PDPs and what is reported by PDP leadership in these meetings.
- Need to consider whether existing model of open WG is still working. Of particular concern is new WG members signing up at a later stage of the PDP lifespan, which causes significant disruption. Consider having unlimited observers but limit WG members to those designated by different groups. Also get those WG members to commit to the # of hours / timeline that has been identified to ensure there is buy-in and understanding of what is required.

- Important that all those involved understand that multistakeholder bottom-up policy development requires compromise and finding consensus – this common goal and message seems to have gotten lost in recent PDP WGs.
- Other opportunities, for example at ICANN meetings, should be better leveraged to make progress on difficult topics.
- Consider drafting a type of "White Paper" that would outline how to move the PDP process to a new phase.
- What does "good" look like?
    - Policy development that is efficient, effective, representative and data driven.
    - Accept that a certain level of knowledge, availability and representation are needed.
    - Ensure that public at-large is able to weigh in at various states of the process and observe deliberations.
    - Various models that could be explored, e.g. Expert WG, Rapporteur, Parliamentary Style model.
    - Other tools that may facilitate these models such as moderator/facilitator, F2F meetings.
- Needs to be a recognition of the difference between perspectives of those that represent other entities or bodies compared to those that represent no one but themselves. Consider a model of members, participants and observers, where the discussions can involve both members appointed by SG/C and participants but where ultimately the members make a final decision on the recommendations put forward.
- Need to find a balance to the restrictive task force model and the open WG model. Also consider whether there should be a restriction on the # of members on sub-teams or sub-tracks.
- The PDP Manual notably provides flexibility with regards to how the work is expected to be done: "Upon approval of the PDP Charter, the GNSO Council may form a working group, task force, committee of the whole or drafting team (the "PDP Team"), to perform the PDP activities. The preferred model for the PDP Team is the Working Group model due to the availability of specific Working Group rules and procedures that are included in the GNSO Operating Rules and Procedures. The GNSO Council should not select another model for conducting PDPs unless the GNSO Council first identifies the specific rules and procedures to guide the PDP Team's deliberations which should at a minimum include those set forth in the ICANN Bylaws and PDP Manual". How can this flexibility be leveraged to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the PDP?
- Need to engage the broader community in this conversation, especially PDP WG leadership teams. Need to be clear on what the questions are that are expected to be answered. Should also benefit from best practices that could be identified.
- Council needs to focus on how to deliver on its responsibilities under Bylaws article 11.
- Timeline: ICANN61 opportunity to meet with PDP Leadership to discuss and generate further ideas, target ICANN62 to share White Paper with broader community.

Action item:
- Council leadership to develop clear timeline for action items listed hereunder as well as who will be responsible for delivering on these.
- Engage with PDP leadership teams at ICANN61 during GNSO weekend sessions to discuss state of work, identify challenges and possible paths forward. Council leadership team to review ICANN61 schedule and carve out time for this discussion.

● Develop a white paper on incremental changes to the PDP that outlines these discussions as well as main findings of staff discussion paper to engage the broader community in this conversation.

I.B.1 What does Council need/want to achieve in 2018, and how to do this?

Objectives:
● Develop a shared understanding of GNSO work efforts and timelines in order to develop a roadmap for the 12 months ahead;
● Identify shared (Council and PDPs) milestones, strategic targets;
● Consider how 16 days of f2f meeting time will be utilized to meet these shared milestones and targets (advanced planning for ICANN61, 62 and 63).

High level notes:
● Block schedule, based on the recommendations of the Meeting Strategy Working Group, provides the basis for scheduling for ICANN meetings.
● Planning committee consisting of SO/AC/SG/C representatives work with ICANN staff to plan cross-community discussions as well as resolve any conflicts that emerge.
● GNSO Council Leadership team works with staff to build out the proposed GNSO schedule, based on the input and requests from GNSO policy development activities.
● At the most recent meeting, ICANN60, approximately 60 sessions were GNSO-led (out of over 300 sessions).
● GNSO works diligently to map its face to face time carefully to avoid conflicts or overlaps, but it cannot control meetings that are scheduled without its knowledge by other parts of the community or staff that may also be of interest to the ICANN community.
● Incremental changes to face-to-face meetings – proposal to extend the Policy Forum by one day. GNSO Council supportive of this provided use of the day is not prescriptive.
● GNSO should consider enhanced co-ordination around cross-community discussion topics that are submitted for consideration. Maybe these could come to the Council so that there is some visibility to these requests and see whether there is a way to rationalize these and/or get some kind of agreement around priorities.
● Need specific criteria around cross-community discussion topics – carving out set slots puts pressure on the overall meeting agenda. Should consider that a minimum of e.g. 3 SO/ACs agree that something is worthy of a cross-community discussion topic.
● ICANN Staff should also be in a position to put topics forward for consideration for cross-community discussions.
● Consider also tracking in the project timing planning when public comment periods are expected so it could also be aligned with meeting planning and possible requests for cross-community discussion topics. Consider also tracking dependencies.
● How do external factors factor into managing PDPs, for example, how does / should the GDPR discussions factor into the RDS PDP? Is progress possible while parallel activities are ongoing? However, suspending work for a certain period of time may result in volunteers disengaging. Important to be able to point to ongoing processes that are intended to address issues in the longer term. There may an opportunity for rapid start

of a WG and ensure more specific focus. As this is a Board-initiated PDP, any refocus may require a dialogue with the GNSO Council.
● Consider whether there should be more regular reporting from GNSO-appointed members to CCWGs, especially when those groups are getting closer to a Final Report that requires Council consideration.
● Need to review and rationalize projects that overlap or have a similar focus.

Agreements:
Aim to finalize work of Curative Rights and Reconvened PDP in the next six months; Council leadership to discuss feasibility with the PDP leadership teams.

Action item:
● Donna Austin to share comments on scheduling of cross-community discussions with the GNSO Council.
● Staff to keep project timing planning document up to date and share it with the Council prior to every ICANN meeting to facilitate review and oversight of timelines. Explore whether there is a more dynamic way in which the document can be publicly shared.
● Council leadership to reach out to leadership of Curative Rights and Reconvened WG on RCRC to see whether it is feasible to deliver Final Reports within 6-month timeframe.
● Council leadership to notify ICANN Board with regards to PDPs that are expected to deliver to finalize their report shortly so that concerns or issues can be raised prior to GNSO Council consideration.
● Council leadership to request update from GNSO-appointed members to RDS Review Team at upcoming GNSO Council meeting
● Council to explore mechanisms and tools for monitoring / reviewing costs related to PDP WGs with a view to improving efficiency and effectiveness
● Council to discuss potential to rationalize projects that overlap or have a similar focus, for example RDS-related projects – add to future Council meeting agenda.
● Council members to review framework for post-implementation reviews and provide input. Council leadership to add this to an upcoming Council meeting agenda to continue this discussion. Council to consider forming a small group of volunteers to work with staff on further developing the framework.

I.B.2 Wrap up and close of session

Action items Day 3 (compilation):
#12. Council leadership to develop clear timeline for action items listed hereunder (items #11 & 12) as well as who will be responsible for delivering on these.
#13. Engage with PDP Leadership teams at ICANN61 during GNSO weekend sessions to discuss state of work, identify challenges and possible paths forward. Leadership team to review ICANN61 schedule and carve out time for this discussion.
#14. Develop a white paper on incremental changes to the PDP that outlines these discussions as well as main findings of staff discussion paper to engage the broader community in this conversation.
#15. Donna Austin to share comments on scheduling of cross-community discussions with the GNSO Council

#16. Staff to keep project timing planning document up to date and share it with the Council prior to every ICANN meeting to facilitate review and oversight of timelines. Explore whether there is a more dynamic way in which the document can be publicly shared.

#17. Council leadership to reach out to leadership of Curative Rights and Reconvened WG on RCRC to see whether it is feasible to deliver Final Reports within 6-month timeframe.

#18. Council leadership to provide heads-up to ICANN Board with regards to PDPs that are expected to deliver to finalize their report shortly so that a conversation can take place prior to GNSO Council consideration.

#19. Council leadership to request update from GNSO appointed members to RDS Review Team at upcoming GNSO Council meeting

#20. Council to explore how to monitor / review costs related to PDP WGs

#21. Council to discuss whether there is any way to rationalize projects that overlap or have a similar focus, for example RDS related projects – add to future Council meeting agenda.

#22. Council members to review framework for post-implementation reviews and provide input. Council leadership to add it to an upcoming Council meeting to continue this discussion. Council to consider bringing together a small group of volunteers to work with staff on further fleshing out the framework.

I.B.3 Evaluations, Conclusions and Next steps

Evaluations: All those that responded to the evaluation survey agreed that the meeting was good value for time spent and would like to see this event continued in the future. The overall rating for the meeting was good to excellent. For further details see:
https://www.surveymonkey.com/results/SM-BVXHHTQ38/

Conclusions: On reflection, the following key conclusions are reached in relation to the inaugural GNSO Council Strategic Planning Session:

● The matters discussed were of such detail and importance (for example, understanding Bylaws obligations and recommending amendments to Bylaws and Operating Procedures) as to benefit from face-to-face interaction outside of the typical distractions of an ICANN public meeting.

● The Strategic Planning Session was a timely opportunity to discuss priorities and working methods in view of the FY19 budget, which had been published just prior to the session taking place. Knowledge of budgetary pressures encouraged critical thinking in planning the year ahead and longer-term recommendations for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the PDP.

● GNSO Council members have achieved a common understanding of the "picket fence" and how this impacts and regulates their work.

Next steps: The Council has begun to take up the Action Items identified throughout this report. The GNSO Council submitted an Additional Budget Request on 31 January 2018 proposing that a strategic planning session similar to the session described in this report be held in early 2019. That application acknowledges the need for the program of the three days to reflect the needs of the Council members at that time. Council leadership will encourage the new leadership team formed at ICANN63 to revisit this report to inform 2019 planning and a strategic planning session, if funded.

ANNEX A – GNSO Strategic Planning Session Agenda

Monday 29 January 2018

What is the GNSO Council and what is its function within ICANN? Overarching goal is to establish a common baseline of foundational knowledge about what the GNSO Council does and what Councilors' roles are (including Council leadership and liaisons).

Timing	Topic	Facilitator
08.00 – 08.30	Arrival at ICANN office	
08.30 – 09.30	Welcome & Introductions	Heather Forrest (HF)
09.30 – 10:30	Role of the GNSO in the context of its history	Becky Burr
10.30 – 11.00	**Email break**	
11.00 – 12.30	What is the GNSO Council and what does it do?	Jonathan Robinson (JR)
12.30 – 13.30	**Lunch Break**	
13.30 – 14.30	Role and responsibilities of Council leadership	JR (lead and participate as appropriate)
14.30 – 15.30	Role and responsibilities of Council Liaisons	JR
15.30 – 16.00	**Email break**	
16.00 – 17.30	Role and responsibilities of GNSO more broadly	JR
17.30 – 18.00	Wrap up and summary of action items	JR Council Leadership Team
19.00 – 22.00	**Council Development Activity**	

Tuesday 30 January 2018

Role and Responsibilities of the GNSO Council: How have these changed now that the GNSO is a participant in the Empowered Community?

Timing	Topic	Facilitator
08.30 – 09.00	Arrival at ICANN office	
09.00 – 10.30	GNSO Post-Transition	JR as facilitator Panel of Councillors
10.30 – 11.00	**Email break**	
11.00 – 12.00	Role of GNSO Council post-Transition	JR
12.00 – 13.00	Changes to GNSO Operating Procedures and related governance documents to facilitate participation in Empowered Community	JR (with involvement of Staff)
13.00 – 14.00	**Lunch break**	
14.00 – 16.00	GNSO Council Meeting	
16.00 – 18.00	Cocktail at ICANN office with invited staff guests	
18.00 onwards	**Free evening**	

Wednesday 31 January 2018

2018 Strategic planning: What is the GNSO's workload this year, what milestones will arise, and how can we improve effectiveness in meeting those milestones?

Timing	Topic	Facilitator
08.30 – 09.00	Arrival at ICANN office	
09.00 – 11.00	How to manage Council's 2018 workload: strategies to increase effectiveness	Council leadership
11.00 – 11.15	**Email break**	
11:15 – 12:00	What does Council need/want to achieve in 2018, and how to do this?	Council leadership
12.00 – 13.30	**Lunch with GNSO Board Members and Liaisons**	
13.30 – 15.00	What does Council need/want to achieve in 2018, and how to do this? (cont'd)	Council leadership

15.00 – 16.00	Wrap up and close of session	JR and Council leadership
16.00	**Departures**	

ANNEX B - 2018 Project Timing Planning

◇ = If applicable, Initial Report　　◇ = If applicable, close of Public Comment　　◇ = If applicable, Final Report

Efforts	Already Underway	Q1 2018	Q2 2018	Q3 2018	Q4 2018	2019	2020	GNSO Council Role	Level of Priority (1-5: where 1=could, 3=should, 5=must)	Level of Effort for GNSO Council (1-5)	Level of Effort for GNSO Support Staff (1-5)	Level of Effort for GNSO Community (1-5)	High-Level Description
-- Policy Development Processes --													
PDP IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms								Chartering Organization	5	3	5	5	PDP to determine whether existing curative rights mechanisms are sufficient for IGO/INGO usage, or if the mechanisms need to be amended and/or new mechanisms need to be established.
PDP Next-Generation gTLD Registration Directory Services to replace Whois								Chartering Organization	5	3	5	5	Board-initiated PDP to define the purpose of collecting, maintaining and providing access to gTLD registration data, and to consider safeguards for protecting such data.
PDP: Protection of International Organizational Names in All gTLDs (Reconvened WG on RCRC)								Chartering Organization	5	3	3	5	Reconvened PDP tasked with amending Recommendation 5 as it relates to protections afforded the full names of the Red Cross National Societies and full names of the International Committee of the Red Cross and International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies.
PDP: Protection of International Organizational Names in All gTLDs (IGO Acronyms)	Recommendations sitting with the ICANN Board.							Chartering Organization	5	N/A	N/A	N/A	PDP to consider if special protections should be provided to certain IGOs, RCRC, IOC, and INGOs. The PDP's consensus recommendations reside with Board, where some have been determined to be inconsistent with GAC Advice.
PDP Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms in All gTLDs - Phase 1								Chartering Organization	5	3	5	5	PDP to review gTLD rights protections mechanisms, with Phase 1 concentrating on those specific to the new gTLD program (e.g., URS, TMCH, Sunrise periods, Trademark Claims, and PDDRPs).
PDP Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms in All gTLDs - Phase 2								Chartering Organization	5	3	5	5	PDP to review gTLD rights protections mechanisms, with Phase 2 concentrating on the UDRP.
PDP New gTLD Subsequent Procedures								Chartering Organization	5	3	5	5	PDP to reflect on the 2012 round of the New gTLD Program and to determine what changes are needed to the original policy recommendations related to new gTLDs.
-- Cross Community Working Groups --													
CCWG on New gTLD Auction Proceeds								Chartering Organization	5	3	5	5	CCWG responsible for providing recommended mechanism(s) for the use of funds collected via last resort auctions in the 2012 round of the New gTLD Program.
CCWG on Enhancing ICANN Accountability (WS2)								Chartering Organization	5	2	3	5	CCWG to investigate accountability mechanisms regarding all functions provided by ICANN. WS2 will focus on accountability topics that can be addressed post IANA Stewardship Transition.
CCWG on Internet Governance			CCWG-IG to revise charter, GNSO to no longer be CO					TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	CCWG to coordinate, facilitate, and increase the participation of the ICANN community in discussions and processes pertaining to Internet Governance.
-- Implementation Review Teams --													
IRT - PDP Protection of IGO and INGO Identifers in All gTLDs		Policy already announced (those not inconsistent with GAC Advice)						GNSO is source of policy recommendations and responsible for considering challenges in implementation. Council liaison provided.	5	1	3	3	Implementation Review Team to implement recommendations from the PDP on the Protection of IGO and INGO Identifiers in All gTLDS that are NOT inconsistent with GAC Advice.
IRT - PDP Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues Working Group								GNSO is source of policy recommendations and responsible for considering challenges in implementation. Council liaison provided.	5	1	3	3	Implementation Review Team to implement recommendations from the PDP on Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation, which will result in the Privacy and Proxy Accreditation Program.
IRT - PDP "Thick" Whois	Policy already announced							GNSO is source of policy recommendations and responsible for considering challenges in implementation. Council liaison provided.	5	1	3	3	Implementation Review Team to implement recommendations from the PDP on "Thick" Whois.
IRT - PDP Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information								GNSO is source of policy recommendations and responsible for considering challenges in implementation. Council liaison provided.	5	1	3	3	Implementation Review Team to implement recommendations from the PDP on Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information
-- Other Projects --													
GNSO Rights & Obligations under Revised ICANN Bylaws								As a Decisional Participant in the Empowered Community, the GNSO must ensure that its Operating Procedures and the new ICANN Bylaws are adjusted in conjunction with the revised Bylaws.	5	3	5	3	The GNSO Council formed a drafting team to identify all new or additional rights and responsibilities under the revised Bylaws for the GNSO as a member of the Empowered Community. Subsequently, staff was instructed by the GNSO Council to translate the recommendations of the Bylaws DT into proposed changes to the GNSO Operating Procedures and ICANN Bylaws which were then published for public comment. In addition, additional work was identified which needs to be carried out such as development of templates and development of new procedures.
GNSO Review Working Group								Support implementation	5	3	3	3	A WG established to develop a work plan and manage implementation of a set of recommendations coming from the GNSO organizational review, which was required by the ICANN Bylaws.
-- Standing Committees --													
Standing Committee on Budget and Operations (SCBO)	Ongoing committees							Council committee charged with consideration of budgetary issues specific to how they impact Council	3	3	3	3	A standing committee established by the GNSO Council to consider ICANN budget related issues in the context of the Council, especially around the Fiscal Year planning cycle.
Standing Selection Committee	Ongoing committees							Council committee charged with performing candidate review and selection processes as requested by Council.	3	3	3	3	A standing committee established by the GNSO Council to perform candidate reviews and selection processes as directed by the Council (e.g., GNSO members for Specific Reviews, GAC liaison, etc.).
-- Specific Reviews --													
Accountability and Transparency Review (ATRT3)	Unknown start date							Endorses GNSO candidates for the Review Team and is informed of progress	5	2	2	5	One of the four Specific Reviews as required by the ICANN Bylaws. The GNSO is guaranteed three members but can appoint up to seven. This review focuses on how well ICANN supports mechanisms for public input, accountability, and transparency.
Security, Stability and Resiliency of the DNS (SSR2-RT)					Project has been "paused"			Endorses GNSO candidates for the Review Team and is informed of progress	5	2	2	5	One of the four Specific Reviews as required by the ICANN Bylaws. The GNSO is guaranteed three members but can appoint up to seven. This review focuses on how well ICANN is improving security, operational stability, and resiliency matters relating to the coordination of the Internet's system of unique identifiers.
Registration Directory Service Policy Review (RDS)								Endorses GNSO candidates for the Review Team and is informed of progress	5	2	2	5	One of the four Specific Reviews as required by the ICANN Bylaws. The GNSO is guaranteed three members but can appoint up to seven. This review focuses on how effectively the gTLD registry directory service balance the legitimate needs of law enforcement with the need to safeguard registrant data and promote consumer trust.
Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review (CCT-RT)								Endorses GNSO candidates for the Review Team and is informed of progress	5	2	2	5	One of the four Specific Reviews as required by the ICANN Bylaws. The GNSO is guaranteed three members but can appoint up to seven. This review focuses on whether the expansion of the new gTLD Program promotes competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice.
-- ICANN Org Related Work --													
Customer Standing Committee Charter Review								Approval of review members and charter	3	2	2	3	As required by the revised Bylaws, the Customer Standing Committee Charter will be reviewed by a committee of representatives from the ccNSO and the RySG. The review was commenced one year after the first meeting of the CSC.
PTI Budget Approval	Already completed by SCBO							Council has no specific role, can choose to contribute	3	2	3	3	Public comment opportunity on the Draft FY Public Technical Identifiers Operating Plan and Budget and the Draft IANA FY Operating Plan and Budget.
ICANN Budget Approval	To be completed by SCBO							Council has no specific role, can choose to contribute	3	2	3	3	Public comment opportunity on ICANN's Draft FY Operating Plan and Budget and the year's update to the Five-Year Operating Plan.
-- Additional Possible Work --													
-- ICANN Org Related Work --													
Customer Standing Committee Effectiveness Review								Approval of review members and charter	5	3	2	4	As required by the revised Bylaws, the effectiveness of the Customer Standing Committee will be reviewed two years after the first meeting of the CSC.
IANA Naming Function Review								Approval of review members and charter	5	3	2	4	As required by the revised Bylaws, the Board can cause periodic and/or special reviews of PTI's performance of the IANA naming function against the contractual requirements in the IANA Naming Function Contract and IANA Naming Function SOW.
-- Policy Reviews --													
ICANN Procedure for Handling Whois Conflicts with Privacy Law		Charter drafting team established for subsequent group						Chartering Organization. **Determination of next steps**	5	TBD (based on charter)	TBD (based on charter)	TBD (based on charter)	Effort to review how the access and usefulness of the ICANN Procedure For Handling WHOIS Conflicts with Privacy Law implementation can be improved.

							Consideration of report/public comments and determination of next steps	TBD, depending on if and what actions are needed	TBD, depending on if and what actions are needed	TBD, depending on if and what actions are needed	TBD, depending on if and what actions are needed	
2013 RAA Whois Accuracy Program Specification Review					→		Consideration of report/public comments and **determination of next steps**	TBD, depending on if and what actions are needed	TBD, depending on if and what actions are needed	TBD, depending on if and what actions are needed	TBD, depending on if and what actions are needed	Potential review of the WHOIS accuracy requirements contained in the 2013 RAA. If the review takes place and depending on the outcome of the review, the GNSO may need to take action.
Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy					→		Consideration of report/public comments and **determination of next steps**	TBD, depending on if and what actions are needed	TBD, depending on if and what actions are needed	TBD, depending on if and what actions are needed	TBD, depending on if and what actions are needed	Data collection and review of the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy, as recommended by the IRTP Part D PDP WG. Depending on the outcome of the review, the GNSO may need to take action (e.g. initiation of a PDP).
Transfer Emergency Action Contact					TBD		Consideration of report/public comments and **determination of next steps**	TBD, depending on if and what actions are needed	TBD, depending on if and what actions are needed	TBD, depending on if and what actions are needed	TBD, depending on if and what actions are needed	Review of the Transfer Emergency Action Contact as recommended by the IRTP Part B PDP WG, especially in relation to whether the TEAC is effectively establishing contact between registrars in case of emergency, whether the TEAC is being used for non-emergency issues, and whether the "undo" option in case of failure to respond to the TEAC should be mandatory. Expected to be rolled into review of IRTP (see previous item).
Expired Registration Recovery Policy					TBD		Consideration of report/public comments and **determination of next steps**	TBD, depending on if and what actions are needed	TBD, depending on if and what actions are needed	TBD, depending on if and what actions are needed	TBD, depending on if and what actions are needed	Review of the Expired Registration Recovery Policy, as recommended by the Post Expiration Domain Name Recovery PDP WG. The data collected is primarily from Contractual Compliance and related to complaints about renewal and/or post expiration related matters. Depending on the outcome of the review, the GNSO may need to take action.
Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation					TBD		Consideration of report/public comments and **determination of next steps**	TBD, depending on if and what actions are needed	TBD, depending on if and what actions are needed	TBD, depending on if and what actions are needed	TBD, depending on if and what actions are needed	While the IRT is still in the process of implementing the policy, the WG recommended that in the future, the effectiveness of the accreditation program be reviewed. When the review takes place and depending on the outcome of the review, the GNSO may need to take action.