



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

Last updated: 19 October 2018

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

### 1 - Issue Identification

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
GNSO Council Action Items - <a href="#">LINK</a>	NA	NA	NA	Refer to most recent action item list for latest status

2 - Issue Scoping				
Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p><b>Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP-PR)</b>                      Staff: J. Gore, B. Aitchison, C. Tubergen, M. Konings</p>	2018-02-28	2018-11-31	GNSO Council	<p>Final modifications to the <a href="#">Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy</a> were implemented 1 Dec 2016 as a result of the final PDP WG, IRTP-D, which were <a href="#">adopted</a> by the GNSO Council. That WG produced a series of recommendations after deliberating on issues on the use of the EPP AuthInfo Code, FOAs, and penalties for policy violations. The WG's <a href="#">final two recommendations</a> suggest that data be collected and an eventual review of the entire IRTP be conducted:</p> <p>Recommendation #17: The WG recommends that, once all IRTP recommendations are implemented (incl. IRTP-D, and remaining elements from IRTP-C), the GNSO Council, together with ICANN staff, should convene a panel to collect, discuss, and analyze relevant data to determine whether these enhancements have improved the IRTP process and dispute mechanisms, and identify possible remaining shortcomings.</p> <p>Recommendation #18: The Working Group recommends that contracted parties and ICANN should start to gather data and other relevant information that will help inform a future IRTP review team in its efforts, especially with regard to those issues listed in the Observations (4.2.7.1) above.</p> <p>The GNSO Council received <a href="#">a letter</a> from Jennifer Gore, GDD Staff, with proposed next steps to commence the review. The Council considered the proposed approach in further detail during its meeting on 26 April 2018 and subsequently via email. Staff currently plans to deliver the proposed post-implementation policy assessment shortly.</p> <p>Transfer Emergency Action Contact:                      The TEAC became a part of the IRTP Consensus Policy on 1 Jun 2012 as a result of <a href="#">adopted</a> recommendations produced from the GNSO's <a href="#">Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy – Part B (IRTP-B) PDP WG</a>. That WG produced a series of recommendations based on issues around domain hijacking, urgent returns of inappropriately transferred names and lock status. As a</p>

2 - Issue Scoping				
Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
				<p>part of the WG's <a href="#">first recommendation</a>, it requested an follow-up review of the TEAC:</p> <p>“The Working Group recommends that the GNSO perform a follow-up review of the TEAC 12 to 24 months after the policy is implemented to identify any issues that may have arisen and propose modifications to address them. This review should specifically address whether the TEAC is working as intended (to establish contact between registrars in case of emergency), whether the TEAC is not abused (used for issues that are not considered an emergency) and whether the option to ‘undo’ a transfer in case of failure to respond to a TEAC should be made mandatory.”</p> <p>Since the policy effective date, ICANN’s Contractual Compliance has processed several TEAC complaints over the years, and as part of its Audit Program, Registrars are asked to provide their TEAC information should it not match what is listed in RADAR. Further, compliance reports about this specific policy are posted on the compliance site.</p>

### 3 – Initiation

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p><b>WHOIS Procedure Implementation Advisory Group (WPIAG)</b>                      Chair: TBC                      Council Liaison: Keith Drazek                      Staff: TBC</p> <p>The ICANN Procedure For Handling WHOIS Conflicts with Privacy Law Implementation Advisory Group (WHOIS Procedure IAG) is tasked to provide the GNSO Council with recommendations on how to address the comments and input that have been received in response to the public comment forum on the Revised ICANN Procedure for Handling WHOIS Conflicts with Privacy Law: Process and Next Steps.</p>	2018-Feb-22	TBC	Council	<p>The GNSO Council adopted the charter for the ICANN Procedure For Handling WHOIS Conflicts with Privacy Law Implementation Advisory Group (WHOIS Procedure IAG) during its meeting on 22 February. The WHOIS Procedure IAG is tasked to provide the GNSO Council with recommendations on how to address the comments and input that have been received in response to the public comment forum on the Revised ICANN Procedure for Handling WHOIS Conflicts with Privacy Law: Process and Next Steps. Per the Council’s recent discussions, noting the current workload and activities that may impact the IAG’s work, staff will refrain from circulating the call for volunteers to the GNSO Stakeholder Groups with the request for each Stakeholder Group to appoint up to 3 members to the IAG, until the EPDP Team completes its first milestone of delivering an Initial Report. Following the EPDP Team’s delivery of its Initial Report, the Council will revisit if it is the appropriate time to circulate the call for volunteers. When instructed, staff will circulate through the normal communication channels a call to the wider ICANN community for volunteers for interested participants and observers to join the IAG.</p>

### 4 – Working Group

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p><a href="#">Expedited Policy Development Process on the Temporary Specification on gTLD Registration Data</a></p> <p>Chair(s): Kurt Pritz            Council Liaison: Rafik Dammak            Staff: M. Konings, C. Tubergen, B. Cobb</p> <p>Following the adoption by the ICANN Board of a temporary specification on gTLD Registration Data to enable contracted parties to continue to comply with existing ICANN contractual requirements and with community-developed policies as they relate to WHOIS, while also complying with the European Union’s General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), a one-year policy development process is required to be initiated to confirm whether or not the temporary specification should become a consensus policy.</p>	2018-Jul-19	2019-Jan-31	WG	<p>At its meeting on 19 July 2018, the GNSO Council initiated an Expedited Policy Development Process on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data and adopted the <a href="#">EPDP Team Charter</a>. The EPDP Team consists of appointed representatives from GNSO Stakeholder Groups. In addition, the ALAC, GAC and SSAC have appointed members (the ccNSO and RSSAC decided not to). Furthermore, the ICANN Board and ICANN Org have appointed liaisons to the EPDP Team. See <a href="https://community.icann.org/x/4lpHBQ">https://community.icann.org/x/4lpHBQ</a> for membership details. The Council appointed Kurt Pritz as the Chair of the EPDP. The scope of the EPDP Team’s efforts includes confirming, or not, the Temporary Specification by 25 May 2019 (the date the Temporary Specification will expire). Additionally, the scope includes discussion of a standardized access model to nonpublic registration data; however, the discussion of a standardized access model will occur only after the EPDP Team has comprehensively answered a series of “gating questions”, which have been specified in the EPDP Team’s Charter. The EPDP Team held its first meeting on Wednesday, 1 August 2018 and agreed to continue with two meetings a week. Its first focus is the development of a triage document that outlines with sections of the temporary specification, if any, have the full consensus support of the EPDP Team. The triage report was transmitted to the GNSO Council. The EPDP Team is continuing its substantive discussion of the Temporary Specification, per the schedule articulated in the <a href="#">project plan</a>. <a href="#">Following its F2F</a> in Los Angeles from 24-26 September 2018, the EPDP Team has continued its twice-per-week meeting schedule in an effort to prepare its Initial Report. In addition to the twice-per-week plenary meetings, small teams comprised of EPDP Team Members have been meeting in an effort to work through additional charter questions. The EPDP Team is organizing four face-to-face meetings at ICANN63: (1) from 08:30 – 18:30 local time on Saturday, 20 October 2018; (2) from 17:00 – 18:30 local time on Sunday, 21 October 2018; (3) from 17:00-18:30 local time on Wednesday, 24 October 2018; and 08:30-10:15 local time on Thursday, 25 October. Additionally, there is an EPDP high interest topic meeting from 15:15-16:45 local time on Monday, 22 October 2018. The EPDP Team plans to provide an update on the Initial Report and preview proposed recommendations with the community.</p>

### 4 – Working Group

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
				The Initial Report is expected to be published shortly after ICANN63.
<p><a href="#">New gTLD Auction Proceeds Cross-Community Working Group (CCWG)</a>                      Co-Chairs: Ching Chiao (ccNSO); Erika Mann (GNSO)                      Staff: M. Konings (GNSO), E. Barabas (GNSO), J. Braeken (ccNSO)</p> <p>This CCWG is tasked with developing a proposal(s) for consideration by its Chartering Organizations on the mechanism that should be developed in order to allocate the new gTLD Auction Proceeds. As part of this proposal, the CCWG is also expected to consider the scope of fund allocation, due diligence requirements that preserve ICANN’s tax status as well as how to deal with directly related matters such as potential or actual conflicts of interest. The CCWG will not make any recommendations or determinations with regards to specific funding decisions (i.e. which specific organizations or projects are to be funded or not).</p>	2016-Mar-10	Ongoing	CCWG	<p>The CCWG held its first meeting on 26 January 2017 and has met regularly since that time. The latest version of the work plan can be found here: <a href="https://community.icann.org/x/dUPwAw">https://community.icann.org/x/dUPwAw</a>. The CCWG completed its work on stage 5 – answer the remaining charter questions from the perspective of the different mechanisms identified. A first draft of responses to the remaining charter questions was shared with the CCWG and was further discussed during the CCWG’s F2F session at ICANN62 (June 2018). Additional information about deliberations on the different charter questions and preliminary agreements is available at <a href="https://community.icann.org/x/PNrRAw">https://community.icann.org/x/PNrRAw</a>.</p> <p>Following the completion of the responses to the remaining charter questions, the CCWG conducted a final poll prior to producing of the Initial Report to determine which mechanisms are preferred. The CCWG published its Initial Report for public comment on 8 October 2018. The public comment period is scheduled to close on 27 November 2018. The CCWG is hosting a community session at ICANN63 on Monday 22 October 2018 to present its Initial Report and answer any questions.</p>
<p><a href="#">Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) in All gTLDs PDP</a>                      Co-Chair(s): Philip Corwin, Kathy Kleiman, Brian Beckham                      Council Liaison: Paul McGrady                      Community Liaisons (to/from the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG): Robin Gross, Susan Payne                      Staff: M. Wong, J. Hedlund, A. Liang</p>	2011-Feb-03	Ongoing	WG	<p>On 28 February 2016, the GNSO Council voted to <a href="#">initiate</a> this Policy Development Process (PDP) and adopted a revised Working Group Charter in March (<a href="https://community.icann.org/x/2CWAaw">https://community.icann.org/x/2CWAaw</a>). The PDP is being conducted in two phases, beginning with the RPMs developed for the 2012 New gTLD Program, with the 1999 Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy to follow in Phase 2. By end-2017, the WG had completed an initial review of the Trademark Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution Procedure (TM-PDDRP), and much of the Trademark Clearinghouse (TMCH) structure and operations. For the Sunrise and Trademark Claims RPMs, the GNSO Council approved an</p>

4 – Working Group				
Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p>This WG is tasked to review all the RPMs that have been developed by ICANN in a two-phased PDP. By the end of its work, the WG will be expected to also have considered the overarching issue as to whether or not the RPMs collectively fulfil their purposes or whether additional policy recommendations will be necessary, including to clarify and unify the policy goals.</p>				<p>extensive data request in the form prescribed by the 2015 Data &amp; Metrics for Policy Making Working Group at its 20 September 2017 meeting. The Analysis Group was announced as the selected vendor following staff evaluation of the proposals submitted under the Request for Proposal that closed in March 2018. Working with the group’s Data Sub Team, all required surveys were finalized (including beta testing) and issued into the field in early September. The surveys closed on 05 October and initial results will be presented by Analysis Group at ICANN63.</p> <p>Staff compiled quantitative data on Sunrise registrations, Trademark Claims and Uniform Rapid Suspension (URS) filings to complement the surveys. Some additional data collection needs relating to additional voluntary marketplace RPMs being offered by a few registry operators were also identified by the Data Sub Team.</p> <p>The initial data collection and related analysis for the URS review has been completed. The WG is starting to develop potential recommendations for the URS that will be put out for public comment in its Initial Report (currently anticipated to be completed by end-Mach 2019). The WG expects to move on to consider possible recommendations relating to the Sunrise and Trademark Claims RPMs following its review of the Analysis Group’s reports.</p> <p>As a result of the time required to complete the full data collection effort, the WG is likely to be working on Phase 1 through mid-2019, with the aim of submitting a Phase One report to the GNSO Council early in the third quarter of 2019. The WG may continue to rely on multiple sub teams as well as additional meetings in particular weeks to facilitate progress in view of what is a relatively tight timeline.</p>
<p><a href="#">New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP</a> Co-Chair(s): Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Jeff Neuman Council Liaison: Donna Austin and Keith Drazek</p>	2014-Jun-25	Ongoing	WG	<p>The WG was chartered by the GNSO Council in January 2016 (<a href="https://community.icann.org/x/KAp1Aw">https://community.icann.org/x/KAp1Aw</a>). It has completed preliminary deliberations on a set of overarching topics and 30+ additional topics identified in the WG’s charter. These additional issue areas have been</p>



### 4 – Working Group

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p>Community Liaisons (to/from the RPM Review PDP WG): Robin Gross, Susan Payne                      Community Liaison (to/from CCT-RT): Carlos Raúl Gutiérrez                      Staff: S. Chan, J. Hedlund, E. Barabas</p> <p>This WG is tasked with calling upon the community’s collective experiences from the 2012 New gTLD Program round to determine what, if any changes may need to be made to the existing 2007 Introduction of New Generic Top-Level Domains policy recommendations. Those policy recommendations will remain in place for subsequent rounds unless modified via a PDP. The work of this WG follows the efforts of the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Discussion Group (DG), which identified a set of issues for a future PDP-WG to consider in their deliberations.</p>				<p>addressed through a series of Work Track Sub Teams (WTs 1-4). The WG considered input received from the community through two rounds of community comment and has published its Initial Report for public comment, including preliminary recommendations, options, and questions for community input. The public comment period on the Initial Report closed on 26 September 2018. The WG is currently finalizing a supplemental Initial Report on several additional topics that were not included in the Initial Report. The WG will soon turn its attention to reviewing public comment received to its Initial Report.</p> <p>The PDP also includes a Work Track 5, which addresses geographic names at the top level. WT5, operating under an inclusive leadership structure but nonetheless operating under GNSO Operating Procedures, has deliberated on the topics within its scope and is now reviewing and refining a draft Initial Report to publish for public comment. As WT5 was formed later than the other Work Tracks and is therefore on a different timeline than other parts of the PDP, it is seeking to publish a separate Initial Report in late November 2018. This Initial Report is expected to be similar to that of the full WG in that it will likely include options and questions, in addition to preliminary recommendations.</p>

### 4 – Working Group

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p><a href="#">PDP on the next generation gTLD Registration Directory Service to replace WHOIS</a></p> <p>Co-Chair: Susan Kawaguchi, Marc Anderson  Vice-Chairs: David Cake, Michele Neylon  Council liaison: Stephanie Perrin  Staff: M. Konings, L. Phifer, C. Tubergen</p> <p>The WG is tasked to provide the GNSO Council with recommendations on the following two questions as part of phase 1: What are the fundamental requirements for gTLD registration data and is a new policy framework and next-generation RDS needed to address these requirements?</p> <p><b>To be removed on next version of Project List, pending GNSO Council adoption</b></p>	2012-Nov-8	On hold	WG	<p>The PDP Working Group was chartered in November 2015 (<a href="https://community.icann.org/x/E4xlAw">https://community.icann.org/x/E4xlAw</a>) and first convened at the end of January 2016. The WG continues to refine its Work Plan (see <a href="https://community.icann.org/x/olxlAw">https://community.icann.org/x/olxlAw</a>). The Working Group has compiled a list of possible requirements for gTLD registration directory services, providing a foundation upon which to recommend answers to these two questions: What are the fundamental requirements for gTLD registration data and directory services, and is a new policy framework and next-generation RDS needed to address these requirements? Triage on the list of possible requirements was completed and deliberations on <a href="#">the list of possible requirements</a> commenced at ICANN57 (Nov 2016). However, the WG decided to first focus on a number of <a href="#">key concepts</a> which are intended to facilitate the deliberations on the list of possible requirements. For ICANN61 (Mar 2018), the WG focused on purposes for which it formed seven drafting teams to further develop the purposes identified in the EWG Final Report. The WG has paused its weekly meetings and it did not meet at ICANN62 (June 2018) as it decided to await Council's next steps following the adoption of the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data by the ICANN Board. Now that the GNSO Council has initiated an EPDP on the Temporary Specification, the leadership team and the WG will need to consider next steps which could include recommending to the GNSO Council to terminate or suspend this effort as it is understood that this WG cannot continue its deliberations in parallel to the EPDP.</p> <p>The WG tentative agreements achieved to date can be found here: <a href="https://community.icann.org/x/p4xlAw">https://community.icann.org/x/p4xlAw</a>, and an updated PDP WG newsletter has been published, and can be found here: <a href="https://community.icann.org/x/_RmOAw">https://community.icann.org/x/_RmOAw</a>.</p>

### 5 – Council Deliberation

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p><a href="#">PDP on the next generation gTLD Registration Directory Service to replace WHOIS</a>                      Co-Chair: Susan Kawaguchi, Marc Anderson                      Vice-Chairs: David Cake, Michele Neylon                      Council liaison: Stephanie Perrin                      Staff: M. Konings, L. Phifer, C. Tubergen</p> <p>The WG is tasked to provide the GNSO Council with recommendations on the following two questions as part of phase 1: What are the fundamental requirements for gTLD registration data and is a new policy framework and next-generation RDS needed to address these requirements?</p>	2012-Nov-8	On hold	Council	<p>The PDP Working Group was chartered in November 2015 (<a href="https://community.icann.org/x/E4xlAw">https://community.icann.org/x/E4xlAw</a>) and first convened at the end of January 2016. The WG continues to refine its Work Plan (see <a href="https://community.icann.org/x/olxlAw">https://community.icann.org/x/olxlAw</a>). The Working Group has compiled a list of possible requirements for gTLD registration directory services, providing a foundation upon which to recommend answers to these two questions: What are the fundamental requirements for gTLD registration data and directory services, and is a new policy framework and next-generation RDS needed to address these requirements? Triage on the list of possible requirements was completed and deliberations on <a href="#">the list of possible requirements</a> commenced at ICANN57 (Nov 2016). However, the WG decided to first focus on a number of <a href="#">key concepts</a> which are intended to facilitate the deliberations on the list of possible requirements. For ICANN61 (Mar 2018), the WG focused on purposes for which it formed seven drafting teams to further develop the purposes identified in the EWG Final Report. The WG has paused its weekly meetings and it did not meet at ICANN62 (June 2018) as it decided to await Council's next steps following the adoption of the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data by the ICANN Board. Now that the GNSO Council has initiated an EPDP on the Temporary Specification, the leadership team and the WG has recommended that the GNSO Council terminate this effort. The GNSO Council is expected to consider termination during its meeting on Wednesday 24 October 2018 at ICANN63.</p> <p>The WG tentative agreements achieved to date can be found here: <a href="https://community.icann.org/x/p4xlAw">https://community.icann.org/x/p4xlAw</a>, and an updated PDP WG newsletter has been published, and can be found here: <a href="https://community.icann.org/x/_RmOAw">https://community.icann.org/x/_RmOAw</a>.</p>

### 5 – Council Deliberation

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p><a href="#">Curative Rights Protections for IGO/INGOs PDP</a></p> <p>Chair: Petter Rindforth Council Liaison: Susan Kawaguchi Staff: M. Wong, S. Chan</p> <p>This WG is tasked with providing the GNSO Council with recommendations as to whether to amend the UDRP and URS to allow access to and use of these mechanisms by IGOs and INGOS and, if so in what respects or whether a separate, narrowly-tailored dispute resolution procedure that takes into account the particular needs and specific circumstances of IGOs and INGOS should be developed.</p>	2014-Jun-05	Ongoing	GNSO Council	<p>Based on the recommendation of the IGO-INGO PDP Working Group in 2013, the GNSO Council resolved to initiate a PDP on the specific topic of curative rights, and chartered the WG in June 2014 (<a href="https://community.icann.org/x/77rhAg">https://community.icann.org/x/77rhAg</a>). The PDP WG was tasked to explore if changes were needed to the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP) and the Uniform Rapid Suspension procedure (URS) to address the specific needs of International Governmental Organizations (IGOs) and International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGOs). The WG’s preliminary recommendations and its Initial Report were published for public comment on 20 January 2017 (see <a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/igo-ingo-crp-access-initial-2017-01-20-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/igo-ingo-crp-access-initial-2017-01-20-en</a>). The WG modified certain initial recommendations as a result of the comments received and continued to try to reach consensus on a remaining recommendation to deal with IGO jurisdictional immunity and registrants’ rights to file court proceedings. To resolve a procedural appeal filed by a WG member under the GNSO WG Guidelines in December 2017, the Council liaison to the WG facilitated some of the WG’s discussions. Following further deliberations, a formal consensus call on proposed final recommendations was opened on 25 May 2018. The GNSO Council passed a resolution at its June meeting requesting that the WG complete its work in time for the Council to begin considering the PDP recommendations at its July meeting. The WG submitted its Final Report on 9 July 2018. Several minority statements were filed by 13 July, which were incorporated into the Final Report before the Council’s July meeting. At its July meeting, the Council accepted the Final Report and resolved to consider it in a holistic fashion, taking into account the overall protections for IGOs.</p> <p>The Council also sought to ensure that it fully understands the Final Report and its recommendations, prior to taking any action. Accordingly, the Council conducted a question and answer webinar on 9 October 2018 and will consider the WG’s Final Report during its next Council meeting on 24 October.</p>

### 6 – Board Vote

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p><a href="#">Protection of International Organization Names in All gTLDs PDP (Reconvened WG)</a>                      Chair: Thomas Rickert                      Council liaison: Heather Forrest                      Staff: M. Wong, B. Cobb</p> <p>This reconvened WG is tasked with providing the GNSO Council with policy recommendation changes, if any, as it pertains to the protection of the Red Cross National Society and International Movement designations that are inconsistent with GAC Advice.</p>	2017-May-03	2018-Aug-06	Board	<p>At ICANN57 (Nov. 2016) in Hyderabad, the Board proposed that the GAC and GNSO enter into a facilitated dialogue to try to resolve the outstanding issues from the original PDP. Facilitated discussions took place at ICANN58 (Mar. 2017) in Copenhagen and were moderated by former Board member Bruce Tonkin based on a set of Problem Statements and Briefing Papers reviewed by the parties. Following the facilitated discussions, the GNSO passed a <a href="#">resolution</a> in May 2017 requesting that the original PDP WG be reconvened using the GNSO’s policy amendment process concerning a limited set of Red Cross names.</p> <p>The reconvened WG has reached agreement on the international legal basis for protecting specific Red Cross National Society names as well as a set of principles governing the inclusion of specific common and usual names for each Society. These were based on a list compiled by RCRC representatives that is intended to be the definitive, finite and specific list of permitted names and variants. The WG’s recommendations were published for <a href="#">public comment</a> and the WG updated its final report following a full review of all input received. The Final Report was submitted to the GNSO Council on 6 August 2018.</p> <p>At its September meeting, the Council voted unanimously to approve all the WG’s recommendations. A motion to transmit the requisite GNSO Council Recommendations Report to the ICANN Board has been proposed for the October 2018 Council meeting.</p>
<p><a href="#">Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability</a>                      Co-Chairs: Jordan Carter (ccNSO), Thomas Rickert (GNSO), Tijani Ben Jemaa (ALAC)                      Staff: B. Turcotte</p> <p>This CCWG is expected to deliver proposals that would enhance ICANN’s accountability towards all stakeholders. In Work Stream 1, it</p>	2016-Jun-26	Sept 2018	Board	<p>The CCWG-WS2 commenced work on Work Stream 2 (WS2) at ICANN56 (June 2016). It is addressing the remaining nine issues that were deferred from WS1 (i.e. Diversity, Guidelines for Good Faith Conduct, Human Rights, Jurisdiction, Ombudsman, Reviewing the Cooperative Engagement Process (CEP), SO/AC Accountability, Staff Accountability, and Transparency). The CCWG has submitted its <a href="#">final report for public comment</a>, which closed on 11 May 2018. The CCWG-WS2 has now submitted its Final Report to the Chartering Organizations.</p>

### 6 – Board Vote

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
identified those mechanisms that must be in place or committed to before the IANA Stewardship Transition occurs. Currently, in Work Stream 2 it is considering those mechanisms for which a timeline for implementation extends beyond the IANA Stewardship Transition.				The GNSO Council adopted the Final Report for adoption at its September meeting with both the WS2 CCWG and the ICANN Board being notified
<p><b>GNSO Review Working Group</b>                      Chair: Jennifer Wolfe                      Vice-Chair: Wolf-Ulrich Knoben                      Council Liaison: Rafik Dammak                      Staff: J. Hedlund, E. Barabas</p> <p>This WG was tasked to develop an implementation plan for the GNSO Review recommendations (<a href="http://gns0.icann.org/en/drafts/review-feasibility-prioritization-25feb16-en.pdf">http://gns0.icann.org/en/drafts/review-feasibility-prioritization-25feb16-en.pdf</a>) which have been <a href="#">adopted</a> by the ICANN Board.</p>	2016-Jul-21	Ongoing	Council	<p>The GNSO Council adopted the WG Charter (<a href="http://gns0.icann.org/en/drafts/gns0-review-charter-11jul16-en.pdf">http://gns0.icann.org/en/drafts/gns0-review-charter-11jul16-en.pdf</a>) during its meeting on 21 July 2016. The Working Group delivered its proposed implementation plan for the Board-adopted GNSO Review recommendations to the GNSO Council on 21 November (<a href="https://gns0.icann.org/en/drafts/review-implementation-recommendations-plan-21nov16-en.pdf">https://gns0.icann.org/en/drafts/review-implementation-recommendations-plan-21nov16-en.pdf</a>) On 15 December the GNSO Council unanimously approved the proposed plan. The Board’s Organizational Effectiveness Committee (OEC) reviewed the plan and recommended it to the Board for adoption. The Board accepted the recommendations at its 3 February 2017 meeting, and requested that the Working Group provide updates to the OEC every six months through implementation. The Working Group submitted an update on its implementation progress to the OEC of the ICANN Board and to the GNSO Council at ICANN60 (Oct. 2017) in which it agreed by full consensus that all recommendations for Phase 1 and Phase 2 have been implemented. The Working Group is meeting bi-weekly and has nearly completed work on Phase 3 recommendations. The Working Group provided a written update to the GNSO Council prior to ICANN61 (Mar. 2018) and in May 2018. An implementation progress report was sent to the OEC and the GNSO Council at ICANN62 (June 2018). The GNSO Review Working Group has since agreed by full consensus that all recommendations have been implemented. The Working Group provided its Implementation Final Report and a draft motion for GNSO Council consideration at its meeting on 16 August 2018. The GNSO Council approved the motion to adopt the Final Report on 16 August, after which staff provided the Final Report to the OEC for consideration.</p>

### 6 – Board Vote

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p><a href="#">Protection of International Organization Names in All gTLDs PDP</a>                      Chair: Thomas Rickert                      Council liaison: Keith Drazek                      Staff: M. Wong, S. Chan, B. Cobb</p> <p>This WG was tasked to provide the GNSO Council with policy recommendations as to whether there is a need for special protections at the top and second level in all gTLDs for the names and acronyms of International Governmental Organizations (IGOs) and international non-governmental organizations (INGOs) receiving protections under treaties and statutes under multiple jurisdictions, specifically including the Red Cross/Red Crescent Movement (RCRC) and the International Olympic Committee (IOC).</p>	2012-Apr-12	Ongoing	Board/ Council	<p>In April 2014 the Board voted to adopt those of the GNSO’s recommendations, approved unanimously by the GNSO Council in November 2013, that are not inconsistent with GAC advice received on the topic (<a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-30apr14-en.htm#2.a">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-30apr14-en.htm#2.a</a>). An Implementation Review Team (IRT) was formed, led by Dennis Chang of GDD, to implement those recommendations adopted by the Board. The finalized Consensus Policy was announced in January 2018, with an effective date of August 2018 for most aspects of the Policy.</p> <p>For those policy recommendations that are inconsistent with GAC advice, the Board passed a number of resolutions in 2013 and 2014 (see e.g. <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2013-07-17-en#1.a">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2013-07-17-en#1.a</a>) to temporarily reserve the Red Cross National Society names at issue as well as the names and acronyms of the IGOs that appear on the list provided by the GAC to ICANN in March 2013. These interim protections remain in place until the differences between the GNSO recommendations and the GAC advice are reconciled.</p> <p>At ICANN57 (Nov. 2016) in Hyderabad, the Board proposed that the GAC and GNSO enter into a facilitated dialogue to try to resolve the outstanding issues. Facilitated discussions took place at ICANN58 (Mar. 2017) in Copenhagen and were moderated by former Board member Bruce Tonkin based on a set of Problem Statements and Briefing Papers reviewed by the parties.</p> <p><b>Next steps on IGO acronyms protections:</b>                      Further discussions relating to possible next steps for protecting IGO acronyms are expected to take place following the recent completion of the IGO-INGO Curative Rights PDP.</p> <p><b>Next steps on Red Cross names</b>                      See above (under Section 4: Working Group) for updates on the reconvened PDP on this topic.</p>

### 6 – Board Vote

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p><a href="#">Geo Regions Review Community-wide Working Group</a>                      Chair: Cheryl Langdon-Orr (ccNSO/APRALO)                      Staff: M. Wong</p> <p>This Board-chartered cross community WG has consulted with ICANN stakeholders regarding the definition and applications of ICANN’s Geographic Regions.</p>	2008-Aug-07	2018-Dec-30	Board	<p>The Working Group completed its Final Report toward the end of 2015 and a Public Comment forum conducted (see <a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/geo-regions-2015-12-23-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/geo-regions-2015-12-23-en</a>). Following publication of the staff report of public comments received on the Working Group’s final proposals (<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-geo-regions-13may16-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-geo-regions-13may16-en.pdf</a>), the Board began its review of the recommendations. The Board is expected to take action on the report before end-2018.</p>



### 7 – Implementation

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p><a href="#">GNSO Rights &amp; Obligations under Revised ICANN Bylaws Drafting Team (DT) Recommendations</a></p> <p>Chair: Steve DelBianco Staff: M. Wong, J. Hedlund, M. Konings</p> <p>This DT was created to work with ICANN staff to identify the GNSO’s new rights and obligations under the revised ICANN Bylaws, and to prepare an implementation plan for the GNSO Council’s consideration.</p>	2016-Jun-30	June 2018	Board	<p>On 30 January 2018, the GNSO Council adopted the revised GNSO Operating Procedures and recommended to the ICANN Board the modification of the ICANN Bylaws to include a set of additional GNSO voting thresholds in relation to the post-transition roles and responsibilities of the GNSO as a member of the Empowered Community. The ICANN Board approved a resolution on 15 March 2018 at ICANN61 to direct staff to post the proposed additions to the ICANN Bylaws for public comment. The 40-day public comment period closed on 05 May 2018 and the ICANN Board adopted proposed additions based on comments received during its meeting on 13 May. The requisite Empowered Community process for a possible Rejection Action was initiated on 19 May. No rejection petitions were received. As a result, the changes became effective under the Bylaws on 21 June 2018.</p> <p>Staff had circulated a follow up document on 17 May which outlines the additional proposed steps to be taken to ensure preparedness as well as facilitate the ability for the GNSO Council to act in relation to the new roles and responsibilities outlined in the post-transition Bylaws, such as development of templates and additional processes/procedures. In the meantime, staff is developing templates and guidelines for the GNSO Council to review, and has updated the <a href="https://gns0.icann.org/en/council/procedures">gns0.icann.org</a> website with the latest procedures and voting thresholds: See: <a href="https://gns0.icann.org/en/council/procedures">https://gns0.icann.org/en/council/procedures</a>. Staff will provide a status update during part II of the GNSO Council meeting on 24 October 2018.</p>
<p><a href="#">Privacy &amp; Proxy Services Accreditation Issues PDP Recommendations</a></p> <p>Council Liaison: Darcy Southwell IRT Support Staff: Amy Bivins (GDD)</p> <p>The <i>Registrar Accreditation Agreement</i> (RAA), the contract governing the relationship between ICANN and accredited registrars, has been in place since 2001. The Board initiated</p>	2009-May-21	Ongoing	Staff/IRT	<p>The WG’s Final Report was sent to the GNSO Council on 8 December 2015 and in January 2016, the GNSO Council voted unanimously to approve all the WG’s final recommendations (<a href="https://gns0.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#201601">https://gns0.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#201601</a>). In May 2016, the Board acknowledged receipt of the PDP recommendations and requested additional time to allow for possible timely GAC input. The GAC issued advice via its Helsinki Communique requesting that its concerns be addressed during implementation to the extent feasible. On 9 August 2016, the Board adopted the PDP recommendations (<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-</a></p>

### 7 – Implementation

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p>negotiations for a new RAA in October 2011, and requested an Issue Report from the GNSO at the same time. The final version of the new RAA was approved by the Board in June 2013, thereby signifying that the RAA negotiations were concluded. Per the Board’s 2011 request, the remaining issues, which were identified as those relating to privacy &amp; proxy services and their accreditation, were examined in a PDP. This IRT was formed to implement the PDP recommendations approved by the ICANN Board.</p>				<p><a href="#">material/resolutions-2016-08-09-en#2.e</a>). An IRT was formed and is being led by Amy Bivins of GDD.</p> <p>The IRT has discussed a draft framework developed by the GAC’s Public Safety Working Group (PSWG) in relation to privacy and proxy services’ handling of law enforcement requests, a draft accreditation agreement and related specifications. The Registrars Stakeholder Group asked ICANN organization to consider pausing the IRT work in view of the impact of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). ICANN organization responded that it believes the public comment proceeding can still be conducted while the GDPR review is ongoing, as the IRT’s work is nearly complete. The IRT has received and reviewed the outcome of a legal review of possible GDPR implications on the policy recommendations.</p> <p>IRTP-C: At the request of the Registrars’ Stakeholder Group, which raised a substantive concern regarding the application of IRTP-C to privacy and proxy services, the GNSO Council wrote to the ICANN Board to recommend that the matter be referred to the PPSAI IRT for consideration before the Policy effective date (<a href="https://gns0.icann.org/en/correspondence/bladel-to-crocker-01dec16-en.pdf">https://gns0.icann.org/en/correspondence/bladel-to-crocker-01dec16-en.pdf</a>). The Board responded on 21 December 2016 to note that it is reviewing the Council’s request and in the interim directing that ICANN Compliance defer enforcement of the issue (<a href="https://gns0.icann.org/en/correspondence/crocker-to-bladel-21dec16-en.pdf">https://gns0.icann.org/en/correspondence/crocker-to-bladel-21dec16-en.pdf</a>). On 3 February 2017, the Board passed a resolution confirming its instructions regarding deferral of Compliance enforcement and declaring its intention of further discussing the concerns raised by the GNSO Council at a subsequent meeting. On 16 March 2017, the Board passed a resolution directing the ICANN CEO to instruct ICANN staff to work with the Registrars’ Stakeholder Group and other interested parties to determine the appropriate path forward.</p> <p>Per the GNSO Council’s motion of 30 November 2017, the PPSAI IRT will consider the issue of privacy/proxy registrations and IRTP Part C as outlined in</p>

### 7 – Implementation

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
				the annex to the GNSO Council letter (see <a href="https://gns0.icann.org/en/correspondence/bladel-to-crocker-01dec16-en.pdf">https://gns0.icann.org/en/correspondence/bladel-to-crocker-01dec16-en.pdf</a> ) and put forward recommendations for implementation that are consistent with the IRTP Part C policy recommendations as well as the PPSAI policy recommendations. The IRT is expected to undertake this work only after the it closes its expected comment period on its initial documents.
<p><b><a href="#">Translation/Transliteration of Internationalized Registration Data PDP Recommendations</a></b>                      Council Liaison: Rubens Kuhl                      IRT Support Staff: Brian Aitchison (GDD)</p> <p>The PDP addressed two primary issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whether it is desirable to translate contact information to a single common language or transliterate contact information to a single common script; and</li> <li>Who should bear the burden translating contact information to a single common language or transliterating contact information to a single common script?</li> </ol> <p>This IRT was formed to implement the final PDP recommendations as approved by the ICANN Board.</p>	2012-Oct-17	Ongoing	Staff/IRT	<p>On 28 September 2015 the ICANN Board approved the adoption of all seven recommendations contained in the Final Report from the PDP Working Group (<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2015-09-28-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2015-09-28-en</a>). An Implementation Review Team (IRT) was formed and a draft implementation plan shared with the IRT, which met for its first meeting on 19 July 2016.</p> <p>As of November 2016, the IRT is engaged in discussions around language and script tags, which appear to be a minimum requirement to meet the standards set by the PDP recommendations.</p> <p>The IRT held its 12th call on 8 June 2017. The team continues to discuss the details of implementing language and script tags. The team discussed the merits of submitting a set of questions on the T/T Recommendations to the GNSO Council for clarification and input. After discussing, they came to the conclusion that it would be better to seek the input of those involved in the T/T PDP Working Group and potentially certain Stakeholder Groups on those questions before considering GNSO Council input. The questions focus on whether the T/T recommendations mandate that ALL new registration data be tagged with the languages and scripts in use by a registrant, how the implementation should ultimately be carried out (eg: Should the implementation date be coordinated with the operationalization of RDAP? Should it be "pilot tested" along with RDAP? Should it be referred to the Next Gen RDS PDP?). Once the above questions are answered, a policy language document will be developed for IRT review and eventually public comment.</p> <p>The timeline for the implementation of the T/T Recommendations is now</p>

### 7 – Implementation

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
				indeterminate due to the indeterminate nature of the RDAP roll-out, which is the minimum requirement to implement the T/T policy recommendations.
<p><b>Thick WHOIS PDP Recommendations</b>                      Council Liaison: Susan Kawaguchi                      IRT Support Staff: Dennis Chang (GDD)</p> <p>This IRT was formed to work with ICANN staff on the implementation of the GNSO’s policy recommendation to require Thick Whois for all gTLD registries, as approved by the ICANN Board.</p>	2012-Mar-14	2019-Feb-01	IRT / Staff / Council	<p>The ICANN Board approved the GNSO recommendations on Thick Whois at its meeting on 7 February 2014 (<a href="http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-07feb14-en.htm">http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-07feb14-en.htm</a>). An IRT was formed and various impact assessments and implementation proposals have been discussed with the IRT in the two decoupled work streams, corresponding to the two expected outcomes in the PDP Recommendations.</p> <p>The work streams have resulted in two policies and <a href="#">published</a> on 1 February 2017: 1) <a href="#">Thick Whois Consensus Policy Requiring Consistent Labeling and Display of RDDS (WHOIS) Output for All gTLDs</a> and 2) <a href="#">the Proposed Implementation of GNSO Thick RDDS (WHOIS) Transition Policy for .COM, .NET and .JOBS</a>.</p> <p>The Consistent Labelling and Display of RDDS Output for All gTLDs policy has completed implementation with the policy effective date of 1 August 2017.</p> <p>On 13 May 2018, the ICANN Board passed a Resolution to defer contractual compliance enforcement of the Thick WHOIS transition policy in consideration of the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). ICANN Contractual Compliance will defer enforcing the following milestones until the dates listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 30 November 2018: The registry operator must begin accepting Thick WHOIS data from registrars for existing registrations in .COM, .NET and .JOBS.</li> <li>• By 30 April 2019: All registrars must send Thick WHOIS data to the registry operator for all new registrations in .COM, .NET and .JOBS.</li> <li>• By 31 January 2020: All registrars are required to complete the transition to Thick WHOIS data for all registrations in .COM, .NET</li> </ul>

### 7 – Implementation

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
				and .JOBS.

### Other

Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
<p><a href="#">GNSO Standing Committee on ICANN Budget and Operating Plan (SCBO)</a>                      Chair: Ayden Ferdeline                      Council Liaison: Heather Forrest                      Staff: M. Konings, S. Chan, B. Cobb</p> <p>The SCBO is tasked to assist the GNSO with providing information and possible comments to ICANN’s Budget and Strategic Operating Plan.</p>	2017-09-12	Ongoing	SCBO	The SCBO’s interim charter was adopted by the GNSO Council at the December 2017 GNSO Council meeting. The standing committee has reviewed the ICANN FY19 Draft Budget and Operating Plan and <a href="#">submitted comments</a> on behalf of the Council. In September 2018, the SCBO reviewed its prior activity and efforts and developed an after-action report for the Council to consider any changes to the SCBO Charter and confirm the group’s continued existence. The report was accepted at the September GNSO Council meeting, and a motion will be considered at the October meeting to adopt the to permanently constitute the standing committee and its charter.
<p><a href="#">GNSO Standing Selection Committee (SSC)</a>                      Chair: Susan Kawaguchi                      Vice-Chair: Maxim Alzoba                      Staff: M. Konings, E. Barabas</p> <p>The SSC is tasked to assist with the selection of GNSO representatives to future Review Teams, including for the various reviews mandated by the ICANN Bylaws, and other ICANN structures</p>	2017-Mar-15	Ongoing	SSC	In order to deal with the different requests for nominations / endorsements of candidates for the different review teams as well as post-transition related structures, the GNSO Council adopted on an interim basis the proposed charter for a GNSO Standing Selection Committee during its meeting at ICANN58 (Mar. 2017). The SSC completed a review of its charter to assess whether the charter provides sufficient guidance and flexibility to carry out its work, and whether any modifications should be considered. The SSC sent proposed revisions to the GNSO Council, which the Council approved in its May 2018 meeting. The SSC has two upcoming

Other				
Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
for which the GNSO will need to appoint, nominate or endorse candidates.				assignments from the GNSO Council: selection of additional GNSO candidates for the ATRT3 and selection of a GNSO representative to the Fellowship Selection Committee.
<p><a href="#">Consumer Choice Competition and Trust Review Team</a>                      Chair: Jonathan Zuck                      Staff: Eleeza Agopian, Brian Aitchison (GDD)</p> <p>This Review Team was formed in Nov. 2015 to examine the extent to which the introduction or expansion of gTLDs has promoted competition, consumer trust and consumer choice. It will also assess the effectiveness of the application and evaluation processes, as well as the safeguards put in place by ICANN to mitigate issues involved in the introduction or expansion of new gTLDs.</p> <p><b>Completed and will be deleted on next version.</b></p>	2015-Feb-12	2018-Sep-31	Review Team	<p>Under its <a href="#">bylaws</a>, ICANN is committed to ensuring that, as it contemplates expanding the top-level domain space, the various issues that are involved will be adequately addressed prior to implementation. These include issues such as competition, consumer protection, security, stability and resiliency, malicious abuse issues, sovereignty concerns, and rights protection. The bylaws also requires ICANN to convene a community-driven review team to examine the extent to which the introduction or expansion of gTLDs has promoted competition, consumer trust and consumer choice, as well as the effectiveness of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The application and evaluation process</li> <li>• Safeguards put in place to mitigate issues involved in the introduction or expansion</li> </ul> <p>The CCT-RT updated its initial report with additional sections including results from a new generic top-level domain (gTLD) <a href="#">cost impact survey</a> and the <a href="#">Statistical Analysis of Domain Name System (DNS) Abuse in gTLDs Final Report</a>. It produced a <a href="#">Report of Public comments</a> on new sections and revised recommendations and published its <a href="#">Final Report</a> on 8 September 2018.</p>
<p><b>Expired Registration Recovery Policy – Policy Review (ERRP-PR)</b>                      Staff: M. Konings</p>	FY18	TBD	Staff	<p>The ERRP Consensus Policy became effective 31 Aug 2013 as a result of <a href="#">adopted</a> recommendations produced from the GNSO’s <a href="#">Post Expiration Domain Name Recovery (PEDNR)</a> PDP WG. That WG deliberated on issues related to the expiration of domain names and to what extent a Registrant should be able to recover domain names after they expire. <a href="#">One recommendation</a> from the WG requested monitoring and follow-up:</p> <p><a href="#">Recommendation #18</a>: The Working Group recommends that ICANN Compliance be requested to provide updates to the GNSO Council on a</p>

Other				
Description	Initiated	Target Date	Who holds Token	Pending action/status
				regular basis in relation to the implementation and effectiveness of the proposed recommendations, either in the form of a report that details amongst others the number of complaints received in relation to renewal and/or post expiration related matters or in the form of audits that assess if the policy has been implemented as intended.
<b>Policy &amp; Implementation Recommendations Review (Pollmp-RR)</b> Staff: B. Aitchison, M. Konings	FY20	TBD	GNSO Council	<p>The GNSO Council adopted the Pollmp WG’s recommendations in June of 2015 with the Board approving the necessary changes to Bylaws Article X, section 3-9 and to Annex A for the newly defined procedures. The results of this effort can be found in the <a href="#">GNSO Operating Procedures</a>. As part of the Council’s resolution a review is to take place:</p> <p><i>“The GNSO Council recommends that a review of these recommendations is carried out at the latest five years following their implementation to assess whether the recommendations have achieved what they set out to do and/or whether any further enhancements or changes are needed.”</i></p> <p>In the meantime and as noted in Point H of the CPIF, which directs “ICANN staff [to] continually review the implementation framework and related materials to encapsulate additional best-practices or to adjust the steps as a result of lessons learned with previous Consensus Policy projects,” a cross-functional group of representatives from ICANN’s GDD and GNSO Policy Development Support teams have reviewed the Framework, and are proposing a number of amendments to it for the consideration of the GNSO Council.</p> <p>On 5 March 2018, a redlined CPIF document and a document detailing a set of guidelines for ICANN Org to follow when considering engagement in a GNSO PDP were <a href="#">circulated</a> on the Council email list. A number of proposed edits were suggested by the end of July 2018 from the RrSG as well as IPC which are being reviewed by staff.</p>