

Index

Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part D Policy Development Process2

Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues Policy Development Process4

Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information Policy Development Process ...6

**IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms Policy Development
Process.....8**

Policy & Implementation 10

Data & Metrics for Policy Making Working Group.....12

Discussion Group: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures.....14

**Cross Community Working Group (CWG) to Develop an IANA Stewardship Transition
Proposal on Naming Related Functions 16**

**Cross Community Working Groups on the Use of Country and Territory Names as TLDs
..... 18**

**Cross Community Working Group (CWG) on Framework of Principles for Future Cross
Community Working Groups 20**

**GAC-GNSO Consultation Group on GAC Early Engagement in GNSO Policy
Development Processes.....22**

Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part D Policy Development Process

What is this about?

The Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) Part D PDP Working Group was chartered by the GNSO Council to answer six questions in relation to the IRTP: 1) whether reporting requirements for registries and dispute providers should be developed; 2) whether to amend the Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy on how to handle disputes when multiple transfers have occurred; 3) whether dispute options for registrants should be developed; 4) whether registrars should be required to make information on transfer dispute resolution options available to registrants; 5) whether additional penalties for IRTP breaches should be introduced, and; 6) whether the universal adoption and implementation of EPP AuthInfo codes has eliminated the need for FOAs.

Why is this important?

ICANN's Compliance Department received a total of 6333 transfer-related complaints between August 2013 and August 2014 alone, making it one of the most common issues of community complaint. However, at the same time, the Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy (TDRP), explicitly designed to handle disputed inter-registrar transfers, is hardly ever used by registrars. This appears to be a contradiction in view of the number of complaints relation to the IRTP, and in this context the WG has drawn up a list of use cases of disputed transfers that is currently not covered by the TDRP (Annex C of the Final Report).

What is the current status of this project?

The Working Group published its Initial Report for Public Comment on 3 March 2014. Following the Public Comment and Reply Period, the Working discussed the input received from the Community and published its Final Report on 24 September 2014.

The Report contains 18 Recommendations including:

- 1) Reporting requirements be incorporated into the TDRP policy;
- 2) A domain name be returned to the original Registrar of Record if it is found through a TDRP procedure that a non-IRTP compliant domain name transfer has occurred;
- 3) The statute of limitation to launch a TDRP be extended from current 6 months to 12 months from the initial transfer;
- 4) If a request for enforcement is initiated under the TDRP the relevant domain be 'locked' against further transfers;
- 5) No dispute options for registrants be developed and implemented as part of the current TDRP, but the GNSO should ensure that IRTP-C inter-registrant transfer recommendations are implemented and include appropriate dispute-resolution mechanisms;
- 6) The TDRP be modified to eliminate the First Level (Registry) layer of the TDRP;
- 7) The Form of Authorization (FOA) should not be abandoned, and;
- 8) Following the implementation of all IRTP recommendation, a future review of the IRTP and the TDRP should be initiated, based on relevant data points that the Registries and Registrars should starting collect as soon as possible.

Expected next steps

The GNSO Council is expected to consider the Final Report during its meeting in Los Angeles. If/when the GNSO Council adopts the Final Report and its recommendations, these will be put out for public comment prior to consideration by the ICANN Board.

Background

The IRTP is a 2004 consensus policy developed through the GNSO's policy development process (PDP) and is currently under review by the GNSO through a series of PDPs. The IRTP provides a straightforward procedure for domain name holders to transfer domain names between registrars. On the recommendation of the IRTP Part C WG, the GNSO Council agreed to combine all the remaining IRTP issues into this final PDP, IRTP Part D, in addition to one issue that was raised by the IRTP Part C WG in its Final Report. The GNSO Council unanimously adopted the request for an Issue Report on IRTP Part D at its meeting on 17 October 2012. The Working Group started its deliberations on 25 February 2013. This PDP is the fourth and final policy development process of different aspects of the Inter Registrar Transfer Policy.

How can I get involved?

Once the GNSO Council has adopted the Final Report you can provide comments through the public comment forum that will be opened prior the ICANN Board's consideration of the recommendations.

Where can I find more information?

- Final Report: <http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/irtp-d>
- Initial Report: <http://gns0.icann.org/en/issues/transfers/irtp-d-initial-03mar14-en.pdf>
- Final Issue Report - <http://gns0.icann.org/en/issues/issue-report-irtp-d-08jan13-en.pdf>
- Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy - <http://www.icann.org/en/resources/registrars/transfers/policy-01jun12.htm>
- Working Group Community Wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/B4JwAg>

Staff responsible: Lars Hoffmann and Steve Chan

Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues Policy Development Process

What is this about?

The Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA) is the contract that governs ICANN's relationship with its accredited registrars. Revised periodically, the newest form of RAA was approved by the ICANN Board in June 2013. Registrars wishing to sell domain names in the new gTLD program will have to sign up for the new 2013 RAA, as will registrars operating under the older 2009 RAA who wish to renew their contracts with ICANN.

The 2013 RAA negotiations had dealt with a number of high priority topics previously identified by the ICANN community. One of these was the accreditation of providers of privacy and proxy services for domain name registrations. A *privacy service* is one in which a domain name is registered in the registrant's name, but other contact details displayed in the publicly-accessible Whois system are those given by the privacy service provider and not those of the registrant. A *proxy service* is one in which the registered name holder licenses use of the domain to the customer who actually uses the domain, and the contact information displayed in the Whois system is that of the registered name holder. The *Whois system* is a form of Internet data directory service, utilizing a protocol that permits public lookup of a domain name, including certain contact and technical information about the registrant and the domain.

The topic of privacy and proxy services accreditation was not addressed in the 2013 RAA negotiations. The 2013 RAA does, however, contain a temporary specification on the use of privacy and proxy services that will expire either on January 1, 2017 or the implementation by ICANN of a Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Program (whichever first occurs). ICANN has already committed to such an Accreditation Program. This PDP was initiated to examine the policy issues related to the provision and accreditation of privacy and proxy services, with a view toward assisting ICANN with its development of such a program.

What is the current status of this project?

- The PDP Working Group was chartered by the GNSO Council in October 2013 and is meeting on a weekly basis.
- The WG will have a face-to-face meeting in Los Angeles, and is continuing to discuss substantive questions under its charter that it was tasked to address.

Why is this important?

The 2013 RAA temporary specification that governs registrars' obligations in respect of privacy and proxy services. will expire either on 1 January 2017 or ICANN's implementation of a privacy and proxy accreditation program, whichever first occurs. The GNSO has also commissioned several studies on the Whois system, including one on privacy and proxy abuse, the results of which were finalized and published in March 2014. Finally, the issue of accrediting privacy and proxy services is being discussed in the broader context of ICANN's ongoing review of the Whois system, including within an Expert Working Group formed in December 2012 that was tasked to look at the fundamental purpose and possible redesign of gTLD registration data services. This PDP represents an opportunity for the GNSO and other interested community members to assist

ICANN with developing its Privacy and Proxy Accreditation Program and informing its broader work on Whois more generally.

Expected next steps

The Working Group is addressing the substantive questions posed to it by the GNSO Council in the WG charter. The questions span several categories, ranging from registration and termination to Relay and Reveal procedures. The WG aims to produce an Initial Report for public comment in early 2015.

Background

In October 2011, the ICANN Board initiated negotiations with the Registrars Stakeholder Group for a new form of RAA, and simultaneously requested an Issue Report from the GNSO on issues not covered by the negotiations and otherwise suited for a PDP. The Final Issue Report was published in March 2012, and recommended that the GNSO commence its PDP as soon as possible after receiving a report that the negotiations were concluded.

In June 2013, the ICANN Board formally approved the new 2013 RAA. In September 2013, ICANN staff published a paper for the GNSO reporting on the conclusion of the RAA negotiations and highlighting issues relating to privacy and proxy services, including their accreditation and Relay/Reveal procedures. Following a number of discussions on the topic, the GNSO Council formally approved the charter for the PDP WG at its meeting on 31 October 2013.

How can I get involved?

The Working Group is open to anyone interested in participating. If you want to join the WG please contact the GNSO Secretariat to be added to the mailing list (gns.secretariat@gnsso.icann.org). You can also attend the WG's meeting in Los Angeles on Wednesday morning, scheduled from 0830-1000 a.m. Pacific time (please see the final LA Meeting Schedule for confirmation).

Where can I find more information?

- WG webpage with links to background information: <http://gnsso.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/ppsa>
- WG collaborative wiki workspace: <https://community.icann.org/x/9iCfAg>
- 2013 RAA including Privacy & Proxy Specification: <http://www.icann.org/en/resources/registrars/raa/approved-with-specs-27jun13-en.htm-privacy-proxy>
- Open F2F meeting during ICANN meeting in Los Angeles: <http://la51.icann.org/en/schedule/wed-ppsai>

Staff responsible: Mary Wong and Marika Konings

Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information Policy Development Process

What is this about?

Following the recommendations in the Internationalized Registration Data Working Group (IRD-WG)'s [Final Report](#), the GNSO Council requested an Issue Report on the Translation and transliteration of contact information in October 2012. In this context 'contact information' is a subset of Domain Name Registration Data and thus the information that enables someone using a Domain Name Registration Data Directory Service (such as WHOIS) to contact the domain name registration holder. It usually includes the name, organization, and postal address of the registered name holder, technical contact, as well as administrative contact. 'Translation' is defined as the translation of a text into another language whereas 'transliteration' is the writing of a word using the closest corresponding letters of a different alphabet.

Why is this important?

The continued internationalization of the domain name system in general and specifically of registration data means that there is an urgent need to allow for standardized query of international registration data and to assure its internationalization functionality. The ongoing expansion of the gTLD space and the creation of a large number of internationalized domain names, combined with the reforms attempts of gTLD Directory Services – especially the Expert Working Group on New gTLD Directory Services – makes the need to establish GNSO policy for the translation and transliteration of contact information even more pressing. The PDP WG is in fact expected to tie in with some of the work that is currently under way.

What is the current status of this project?

The GNSO Council [initiated a Policy Development Process](#) (PDP) on this topic and the WG was formed in December 2013. Since then the WG sent a request to the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees as well as to the GNSO's Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies to provide input on questions relating to the translation and transliteration of contact. The WG analyzed the input it received and is producing a draft initial report on which it will seek comments during and following the ICANN 51 meeting in Los Angeles. The Working Group is also considering the outcomes from the ICANN-commissioned study on the commercial feasibility of translation and transliteration of contact information and the Expert Working Group on gTLD Directory Services.

Expected next steps

The PDP WG aims to publish a draft Initial Report in time for ICANN51 and submit it to public comment shortly after the Meeting.

Background

At its meeting on 13 June 2013, the GNSO Council initiated a PDP on the translation and transliteration of contact information. The GNSO Council approved the Charter on 20 November 2013. The two main questions covered by the Charter are:

1. Whether it is desirable to translate contact information to a single common language or transliterate contact information to a single common script.

2. Who should decide who should bear the burden translating contact information to a single common language or transliterating contact information to a single common script.

The PDP WG has asked the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees to provide input on the following questions relating to the two issues identified in the PDP:

- Whether it is desirable to translate contact information to a single common language or transliterate contact information to a single common script.
- What exactly the benefits to the community are of translating and/or transliterating contact information, especially in light of the costs that may be connected to translation and/or transliteration?
- Should translation and/or transliteration of contact information be mandatory for all gTLDs?
- Should translation and/or transliteration of contact information be mandatory for all registrants or only those based in certain countries and/or using specific non-ASCII scripts?
- What impact will translation/transliteration of contact information have on the WHOIS validation as set out under the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement?
- When should any new policy relating to translation and transliteration of contact information come into effect?
- Who should decide who should bear the burden translating contact information to a single common language or transliterating contact information to a single common script?
- Who does your SG/C believe should bear the cost, bearing in mind, however, the limits in scope set in the Initial Report on this issue?

How can I get involved?

If you would like to join the WG as a member, please contact the GNSO Secretariat (gnso-secs@icann.org).

Where can I find more information?

- Issue Report - [Final Issue Report on Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information](#)
- PDP Workspace - <https://community.icann.org/x/FTR-Ag>
- Open F2F WG meeting during ICANN meeting in Los Angeles: <http://la51.icann.org/en/schedule/mon-transliteration-contact>

Staff responsible: Julie Hedlund and Lars Hoffmann

IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms Policy Development Process

What is this about?

One of the consensus recommendations from the GNSO's PDP Working Group on IGO and INGO Protections in All gTLDs (IGO-INGO WG) was for the GNSO Council to request an Issue Report, as a preceding step to a possible PDP, on permitting International Governmental Organizations (IGOs) and International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGOs) to access and use existing curative rights protection mechanisms (namely, the Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP) and Uniform Rapid Suspension (URS) procedure), to protect their names and acronyms at the second level in both existing and new gTLDs. The IGO-INGO PDP WG's consensus recommendations were adopted unanimously by the GNSO Council in November 2013. The Preliminary Issue Report was published for public comment in March 2014 and the Final Issue Report submitted to the GNSO Council on 25 May 2014. In June 2014 the GNSO Council approved the initiation of a PDP and chartered a new PDP Working Group to consider this issue.

Why is this important?

Protecting the names and acronyms of IGOs and INGOs at the top and second levels has been a long-standing issue over the course of the New gTLD Program. The GNSO Council submitted its recommendations to the ICANN Board for its consideration in February 2014. There are a number of differences between the GNSO's policy recommendations and the Government Advisory Committee's (GAC) Advice to the Board, notably in respect of protections for IGO acronyms. In February 2014, the Board tasked its New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC) to develop a proposal that would take into account both the GNSO's recommendations and GAC advice for the Board's further consideration at a subsequent Board meeting. The NGPC sent a proposal to the GAC in March. In April 2014 the Board resolved to adopt those of the GNSO's recommendations that are not inconsistent with GAC advice received on the topic, and requested additional time to consider the remaining recommendations. It also resolved to facilitate dialogue between the GAC and the GNSO to resolve the remaining differences. These largely pertain to the scope and duration of protection for certain names associated with the international Red Cross movement (an INGO) and for IGO acronyms, including the use of the Trademark Clearinghouse. The NGPC and the GNSO Council are currently discussing the possibility of the GNSO's amending its remaining recommendations so as to reconcile them with GAC advice, in accordance with the prescribed procedure in the GNSO's PDP Manual.

This new PDP is not dependent on the outcome of those discussions, as it concerns the issue of curative (i.e. occurring after a third party has registered a domain name) remedies for IGOs and INGOs that have already been identified as eligible for certain second level protections by the original IGO-INGO WG.

What is the current status of this project?

The WG has been created and has begun to meet weekly to discuss the issues raised in its Charter. The Charter essentially directs the WG to consider whether the UDRP and URS should be amended to resolve the problems faced by IGOs and/or INGOs and if so in what way, or if a

separate, narrowly tailored dispute resolution procedure should be developed to apply only to IGOs and/or INGOs.

Expected next steps

The WG has embarked on Phase I of its Work Plan, which requires it to review and analyze prior community and external work on these issues as well as conduct research and gather data to determine the scope of the problem in light of developments such as the new gTLD program. It is aiming to complete this first phase of work by ICANN52 in February 2015.

Background

In November 2013 the GNSO Council unanimously adopted all the consensus recommendations of the IGO-INGO WG, including calling for an Issue Report on allowing IGOs and INGOs access to and use of the curative rights protections afforded by the UDRP and URS. An Issue Report is the preceding step toward the possible initiation of a PDP by the GNSO Council.

IGOs and INGOs are currently unable to use either the UDRP or URS for a number of reasons. For IGOs, the requirement that a complainant submit to the jurisdiction of a national court may jeopardize an IGO's status as being immune from national jurisdiction. For both IGOs and INGOs, the fact that the UDRP and URS were designed as protective mechanisms for trademark owners currently means that they cannot utilize these procedures unless they also own trademarks in their names and/or acronyms. Both types of organizations are also concerned about the cost involved in using these procedures, which would mean diverting resources and funds from their primary missions.

How can I get involved?

The Working Group is open to anyone interested in participating. If you want to join the WG either as a Member or as an Observer please contact the GNSO Secretariat to be added to the mailing list (gnso.secretariat@gnso.icann.org). You can also attend the WG's meeting in Los Angeles on Wednesday (10.00-1130 a.m. local time).

Where can I find more information?

- IGO-INGO WG Final Report: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/igo-ingo-final-10nov13-en.pdf>
- GNSO Council Recommendations Report to the ICANN Board: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/council-board-igo-ingo-23jan14-en.pdf>
- Final Issue Report on IGO & INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/drafts/igo-ingo-crp-final-25may14-en.pdf>
- IGO-INGO Curative Rights Protection WG webpage with links to background information: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/igo-ingo-crp-access>
- IGO-INGO Curative Rights Protection WG collaborative wiki space: <https://community.icann.org/x/37rhAg>.
- Open F2F WG meeting during the ICANN meeting in LA: <http://la51.icann.org/en/schedule/wed-igo-ingo-crp>

Staff responsible: Mary Wong and Steve Chan

Policy & Implementation

What is this about?

Mainly as a result of discussions stemming from implementation related issues of the new gTLD program, there is increased focus on which topics call for policy and which call for implementation work, including which processes should be used, at what time and how diverging opinions should be acted upon.

Following several discussions by the GNSO Council on this topic, the GNSO Council formed a Working Group which has been tasked to provide concrete recommendations on how to address some of these issues from a GNSO perspective.

Why is this important?

While developing a bright-line rule as to what is policy or implementation may not be possible, the hope is that by developing clear processes and identifying clear roles and responsibilities for the different stakeholders, it will become easier to deal with these issues going forward and allow for broad participation and involvement.

What is the current status of this project?

The WG started its deliberations in August 2013 and has been tasked to provide the GNSO Council with recommendations on:

1. A set of principles that would underpin any GNSO policy and implementation related discussions, taking into account existing GNSO Operating Procedures.
2. A process for developing gTLD policy, perhaps in the form of "Policy Guidance", including criteria for when it would be appropriate to use such a process (for developing policy other than "Consensus Policy") instead of a GNSO Policy Development Process;
3. A framework for implementation related discussions associated with GNSO Policy Recommendations;
4. Criteria to be used to determine when an action should be addressed by a policy process and when it should be considered implementation, and;
5. Further guidance on how GNSO Implementation Review Teams, as defined in the PDP Manual, are expected to function and operate.

The WG developed a set of working definitions and posted a set of working principles that underpin the WG deliberations on the charter questions. The WG has now started its deliberation on the charter questions and is considering recommending additional processes for developing gTLD policy and guidance such as a GNSO Guidance Process, a GNSO Input Process and a Fast Track PDP Process. In addition, the WG is considering recommendations in relation to implementation related issues such as how Implementation Review Teams are expected to interact with staff during the implementation process as well as the GNSO Council, and what processes should the GNSO Council have at its availability to address policy and/or implementation related issues as they arise during the implementation phase.

Expected next steps

The WG will continue its deliberations as outlined in its work plan (see https://community.icann.org/x/rC_fAg) with the aim of delivering an Initial Report for community input by the end of 2014 / early 2015.

Background

In order to facilitate these discussions, ICANN Staff developed a draft framework for community discussion that identifies a number of steps and criteria that might facilitate dealing with similar questions in the future. The paper identifies a number of questions that the community may want to consider further in this context, as well as a couple of suggested improvements that could be considered in the short term. In addition, a session on this topic was held at the ICANN Meeting in Beijing, which resulted in the formation of the Working Group by the GNSO Council.

How can I get involved

The Working Group is open to anyone interested. If you want to join the Working Group please contact the GNSO Secretariat to be added to the mailing list (<mailto:gnsosecretariat@gnsos.icann.org>). Furthermore, public input will be sought on the Initial Report in due time (see <http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment>).

Where can I find more information?

- Working Group workspace – <https://community.icann.org/x/y1V-Ag>
- Policy & Implementation Working definitions & principles - <https://community.icann.org/x/9xrRAg>
- Staff discussion paper - <http://gnsos.icann.org/en/correspondence/policy-implementation-framework-08jan13-en.pdf>
- Los Angeles WG F2F meeting session – scheduled for Wednesday 15 October 2014 from 16.30 – 18.30 (see <http://la51.icann.org/en/schedule/wed-policy-implementation>)

Staff responsible: Marika Konings, Mary Wong

Data & Metrics for Policy Making Working Group

What is this about?

The Working Group (WG) is exploring opportunities to review standard methodologies of reporting and metrics that could better inform fact-based policy development and decision making; including how the community can collaborate with Contracted Parties and other service providers in the sharing of metrics and data.

Why is this important?

The effort is expected to investigate more formal processes for requests of data, metrics and other reporting needs from the GNSO that may aid in GNSO policy development efforts. Areas the WG will explore:

- Evaluate previous PDP and non-PDP efforts and how metrics could have enhanced the WG process (*Complete*)
- Establish a baseline of current practices & capabilities to problem reporting (*Complete*)
- Review existing GNSO work product templates, like charters, issue reports, and final reports for possible enhancements to inform the PDP and non-PDP process (*Started*)
- Evaluate external data sources, such as abuse statistics or DNS industry related data from 3rd parties and/or Contracted Parties, that may benefit the policy process and define a possible framework in how it may be accessed (*Started*)

What is the current status of the project?

The WG is beginning to define a framework and/or process flow for data and metrics requests from Contracted Parties that touches upon categories like costs, confidentiality, and discrimination. It is the desire of the WG to create a draft document of principles and protocols to share with Contracted Parties in preparation for the discussion of this issue at the Los Angeles ICANN 51 meeting.

Expected next steps

- WG to meet in Los Angeles – Monday @ 10:30 local time
- Continue WG sessions post ICANN 51 meeting
- Create Initial Report & Conduct Public Comment

Background Information on the Issue

The 2010 Registration Abuse Policies Working Group (RAPWG) identified the Meta Issue: Uniformity of Reporting which it described as “need for more uniformity in the mechanisms to initiate, track, and analyze policy-violation reports.” The RAPWG recommended in its Final Report that “the GNSO and the larger ICANN community in general, create and support uniform problem-reporting and report-tracking processes.”

The GNSO Council recommended the creation of an Issue Report to further research metrics and reporting needs in hopes to improve the policy development process. The report created by

ICANN Staff outlined accomplishments regarding reporting and metrics by the Contractual Compliance function and it also reviewed other reporting sources that may be of relevance. The GNSO Council subsequently adopted the recommendation to form this non-PDP Working Group tasked with exploring opportunities for developing reporting and metrics processes and/or appropriate standardized methodologies that could better inform fact-based policy development and decision making. The GNSO resolution states:

Resolved,

The GNSO Council does not initiate a Policy Development Process at this stage but will review at the completion of the ICANN Contractual Compliance three-year plan expected for 31 December 2013 whether additional action is required; (*Completed 4 Sep 2014, <http://gns0.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#20140904-1>*)

The GNSO Council further approves the creation of a drafting team to develop a charter for a non-PDP Working Group to consider additional methods for collecting necessary metrics and reporting from Contracted Parties and other external resources to aid the investigation.

How can I get involved?

The Working Group is open to anyone interested. If you want to join the Working Group please contact the GNSO Secretariat to be added to the mailing list (<mailto:gns0.secretariat@gns0.icann.org>). Furthermore, public input will be sought on the Initial Report in due time (see <http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment>). You are also encouraged to join the face-to-face meeting in Los Angeles, taking place on Monday 13 October, 10:30am local time (17:30 UTC) in Enrico room; see <http://la51.icann.org/en/schedule/mon-dmpm>.

Further Information:

- Data & Metrics for Policy Making Web Page - <http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/dmpm>
- DMPM Charter - <http://gns0.icann.org/en/issues/dmpm-charter-23jan14-en.pdf>
- Uniformity of Reporting Final Issue Report - <http://gns0.icann.org/en/issues/uofr-final-31mar13-en.pdf>
- Los Angeles Session – Scheduled for Monday 13 October at 10:30 local time (see <http://la51.icann.org/en/schedule/mon-dmpm>)

Staff responsible: Steve Chan, Lars Hoffmann

Discussion Group: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures

What is this about?

This Discussion Group was created to begin evaluating the first round of the new gTLD program and to discuss and reflect upon experiences gained. The Discussion Group is expected to report its findings to the GNSO Council, which may include a list of recommended subjects for future GNSO issue reports that may lead to changes or adjustments for subsequent new gTLD application procedures.

Why is this important?

The Discussion Group plays an important role in identifying issues that arose from the first round of the new gTLD program. The findings of the group, which are expected to be presented to the GNSO Council in the form of a report, will likely include a number of points and concerns that in turn will be recommended to feed into future GNSO Issue Reports. The resultant actions from the GNSO Council review will be pivotal to the development of the subsequent procedures for the new gTLD program. As such the Discussion Group's outcome will mark the beginning of a process of substantive policy development work on the issue of subsequent new gTLD procedures.

What is the current status of the project?

The Discussion Group was created on 25 June 2014. To date, the group has held two meetings and continues to identify issues. Group members have also started to categorize relevant issues in order to facilitate and focus possible future policy development activities.

Expected next steps

The Discussion Group will seek to complete organizing the issues into logical categories, including, amongst others, further details for each issue such as scope, possible mechanisms for resolution, identifying affected parties, establishing priorities, and recognizing interdependencies with other issues. The group will meet face to face on Wednesday 15 October at 8:30 am local time (15:30 UTC) during ICANN 51, see: <http://la51.icann.org/en/schedule/wed-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures>.

Background Information on the Issue

In June 2008, the ICANN Board adopted the GNSO's policy recommendations for the introduction of new gTLDs and directed staff to develop an implementation plan for a new gTLD introduction process. In June 2011 the ICANN Board approved an Application Guidebook ("AGB") for new gTLDs and authorized the launch of the New gTLD Program. The AGB provided that it was intended to govern "the first round of what is to be an ongoing process for the introduction of new gTLDs" and that "ICANN's goal [was] to launch subsequent gTLD application rounds as quickly as possible" and promised to base the timing of the subsequent rounds on "experiences gained and changes required after this round is completed" with a "goal...for the new application round to begin within one year of the close of the application submission period for the initial round."

With the application submission period for the initial round closing in June 2012, the GNSO Council believes that it has a continuing interest and role to play in evaluating the experiences of the first round and proposing policy recommendations, if necessary, for changes to subsequent rounds. This Discussion Group was created to begin that evaluation process and possibly identify areas for future GNSO policy development.

The Discussion Group is to review the first round of the new gTLD program and discuss and reflect upon experiences gained. The Discussion Group is expected to report its findings to the GNSO Council, which may include a list of recommended subjects for future GNSO issue reports that may lead to changes or adjustments for subsequent new gTLD application procedures. Issue reports are a required first step in developing new policies.

How can I get involved?

The Discussion Group is open to anyone interested. If you want to join the Working Group please contact the GNSO Secretariat to be added to the mailing list (<mailto:gns0.secretariat@gns0.icann.org>). You are also encouraged to join the face-to-face meeting in Los Angeles, taking place on Sunday 12 October, 18:30am local time (01:30 UTC Monday 13 October) in Constellation room; see <http://la51.icann.org/en/schedule/wed-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures>.

Further Information:

- Discussion Group – New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Web page - <http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/non-pdp-new-gtld>
- Group Wiki - <https://community.icann.org/display/DGNGSR/Discussion+Group+%28DG%29+-+New+gTLD+Subsequent+Rounds+Home>
- Mailing List Archive - <http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/gns0-newgtld-dg/>
- Open F2F WG meeting of Discussion Group during the ICANN meeting in Los Angeles: <http://la51.icann.org/en/schedule/wed-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures>

Staff responsible: Steve Chan, Lars Hoffmann

Cross Community Working Group (CWG) to Develop an IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal on Naming Related Functions

What is this about?

The primary goal of the CWG is to produce a consolidated transition proposal for the elements of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) Functions relating to the Domain Name System. The charter of the CWG has been adopted to date by the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC), the Country Code Supporting Organization (ccNSO), the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) and the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) while the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) is considering its adoption.

Why is this important?

It was determined that Stewardship Transition proposals for each of the IANA functions should be developed by the directly affected communities, the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) and Internet Architecture Board (IAB) for IANA functions related to Internet Protocol Parameters; the Number Resource Organization (NRO), the Address Supporting Organization (ASO), and the Regional Internet Registries (RIRs) for functions related the management and distribution of numbering resources; and the GNSO and ccNSO for functions related to the Domain Name System. These efforts will inform the work of the IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group (ICG), whose responsibility is to develop an overall integrated transition proposal from these autonomously developed components.

Two of IANA's global directly affected communities, the addressing and Internet protocol parameter communities, have responded to the NTIA's announcement and the formation of the ICG, by establishing working groups to provide input on their specific needs and expectations with respect to the IANA Stewardship Transition.

This CWG was formed as an integral part of this transition process, and to develop a proposal for the elements of the IANA Stewardship Transition that directly affect the naming community.

What is the current status of this project?

The CWG has just formed. To date, the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC), the Country Code Supporting Organization (ccNSO), the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) and the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) have adopted the charter, and are in the process of appointing members.

Expected next steps

The CWG will have its first meeting (via teleconference) on 6 October at 13.00 UTC, followed by a F2F meeting in Los Angeles during the ICANN meeting (scheduled for Monday 13 October from 12.15 – 13.45 local time (19.15 – 22.45 UTC), with remote participation). Both sessions will be recorded and transcribed.

Background

The National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) has requested that ICANN "convene a multistakeholder process to develop a plan to transition the U.S. government

stewardship role” with regard to the IANA Functions and related root zone management. In making its announcement, the NTIA specified that the transition proposal must have broad community support and meet the following principles:

- Support and enhance the multistakeholder model
- Maintain the security, stability, and resiliency of the Internet DNS
- Meet the needs and expectation of the global customers and partners of the IANA services
- Maintain the openness of the Internet.

NTIA also specified that it would not accept a proposal that replaces the NTIA role with a government-led or an intergovernmental organization solution.

On June 6 ICANN proposed the creation of an IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group (ICG) “responsible for preparing a transition proposal reflecting the differing needs of the various affected parties of the IANA functions.”

How can I get involved?

Participation in the CWG is open to members and observers. In addition to members, who are appointed by the chartering organizations, anyone interested in the work of the CWG, can join as an observer. Observers are expected to actively participate and attend all meetings. The only difference between a member and an observer is that any consensus calls or formal decisions that may need to be made will be limited to CWG members appointed by the chartering organizations. However, this does not take away that it is the expectation that the CWG will operate as much as possible with the views and consensus support of all participants in mind as the importance of considering all input and views on this important topic is recognized. Observers may be from a chartering organization, from a stakeholder group or organization not represented in the CWG or currently active within ICANN, or self-appointed. Those interested in joining should contact Grace Abuhamad (grace.abuhamad@icann.org), or the secretariats of your Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee.

Where can I find more information?

- [Charter of Cross Community Working Group \(CWG\) to develop an IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal on Naming Related Functions](#)
- [CWG Wiki](#)
- Open CWG F2F WG meeting during the ICANN meeting in Los Angeles: <http://la51.icann.org/en/schedule/mon-iana-stewardship-naming>

Staff responsible: Marika Konings (GNSO), Bart Boswinkel (ccNSO)

Cross Community Working Groups on the Use of Country and Territory Names as TLDs

What is this about?

The purpose of this CWG is to further review the issues pertaining to the use of country and territory names under different policies (new gTLD, IDN ccTLD, RFC 1591), and, if feasible, develop a definitional framework that could be used across these. With adoption of the charter, one of the two recommendations of the ccNSO Study Group on use of names of country and territories has been implemented.

Why is this important?

The treatment of country and territory names as Top Level Domains is a topic that has been discussed by the ccNSO, GAC, GNSO, ALAC and the ICANN Board for a number of years. Issues regarding the treatment of representations of country and territory names have arisen in a wide range of ICANN policy processes, including the IDN fast track, IDN ccPDP, and the development of the new gTLD Applicant guidebook. References to country and territory names and their use are also present in guidelines such as the GAC's "Principles and Guidelines for the Delegation and Administration of Country Code Top Level Domains" and "Principles regarding new gTLDs". Similarly, references are made in foundation documents, such as RFC1591 and administrative procedures such as those followed by IANA in the delegation and redelegation of ccTLDs (in accordance with ISO3166---1).

The CWG will 1) Further review the current status of representations of country and territory names, as they exist under current ICANN policies, guidelines and procedures; 2) Provide advice regarding the feasibility of developing a consistent and uniform definitional framework that could be applicable across the respective SOs and ACs; and 3) Should such a framework be deemed feasible, provide detailed advice as to its content.

What is the current status of this project?

The CWG held its first meeting on 10 June and subsequently met face to face during ICANN 50 in London. It has developed an initial work plan, decided on typology and developed a draft progress report (see <https://community.icann.org/x/4xXxAg>).

Expected next steps

The CWG will meet F2F in Los Angeles to meet with members from the GAC, to discuss issues identified by the Study Group and revisit the Group's work plan (see <http://la51.icann.org/en/schedule/thu-ccwg-ctn>).

Background

The ccNSO Council established a Study Group on the use of Country and Territory Names on 8 December 2010. The Study Group was tasked with developing an overview of:

- How names of countries and territories are currently used within ICANN, be it in the form of policies, guidelines and/or procedures.

- The types of strings, relating to the names of countries and territories that currently used, or proposed to be used, as TLDs.
- The issues that arise (or may arise) when current policies, guidelines and procedures are applied to these representations of country and territory names.

The Study Group was comprised of representatives from across the ICANN stakeholder community and conducted its work between May 2011 and June 2013. The Study Group advised the ccNSO Council to set up a cross community working group, with participants from ALAC, ccNSO, GAC and GNSO to further review the current status of representations of country and territory names, and provide detailed advice on the feasibility and content of a consistent and uniform definitional framework that could be applied across the respective SO's and AC's. The ccNSO Council was also advised to request the ICANN Board to extend the current rule in the new gTLD Applicant Guidebook regarding the exclusion of all country and territory names in all languages, for consecutive rounds of new gTLD applications, until such a time that the ccWG developed the framework.

How can I get involved?

If you are interested in joining the WG as a GNSO participant, please email the GNSO Secretariat at gns.secretariat@icann.org to be added to the mailing list.

Where can I find more information?

- More information on the ccWG, including its charter can be found at: <http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/ccwg-unct.htm> and <https://community.icann.org/x/X7XhAg>
- The Working Group builds on the work of its predecessor, the Study Group on the Use of Names for Countries and Territories as TLDs; its Final Report is available at <http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/unct-final-08sep12-en.pdf> [PDF, 717 KB]

Staff responsible: Marika Konings (GNSO), Bart Boswinkel (ccNSO), Lars Hoffmann (GNSO)

Cross Community Working Group (CWG) on Framework of Principles for Future Cross Community Working Groups

What is this about?

With the increasing reliance on Cross Community Working Group, the ICANN community has recognized that there is an increasing number of issues that cut across and affect more than one of ICANN's Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees. CWGs have been created previously (e.g. the Joint DNS Security & Stability Analysis Working Group (DSSA) involving At Large, ccNSO, GNSO, NRO, and SSAC, and the Joint IDN Working Group (JIG) involving the ccNSO and GNSO), but to date there have been no agreed guidelines on their use or outcomes. Many ICANN community members have highlighted the need for a set of uniform principles to guide the formation and operations of these cross-community working groups. This CWG has been chartered by the ccNSO and GNSO Councils to develop a framework of operating principles that would allow for the effective and efficient functioning of future CWGs.

Why is this important?

Each SO and AC within ICANN is responsible for different aspects of policy development and advice, and operates under different mandates and remits. There has, however, been an increase in the number of issues that affect or interest more than one SO/AC. Up to now, cross community working groups have been formed on a relatively ad-hoc basis, without a framework of consistent operating principles that take into account the differences between each SO/AC. In order to facilitate the successful functioning of CWGs, the ccNSO and GNSO believe that it would be beneficial to attempt to develop such a framework in collaboration with other SO/ACs.

What is the current status of this project?

The CWG's charter was approved by the ccNSO and GNSO Councils in March 2014. It has begun meeting to review past cross community efforts to generate "lessons learned" to aid in the development of a final proposed framework of principles. It continues to accept members and observers, and specifically encourages participation from all ICANN SO/ACs.

Expected next steps

The CWG is reviewing the outcomes and "lessons learned" from past cross community efforts with the aim to create a set of checklists or guidelines as part of a template for the formation, operation and termination of future CWGs.

Background

In March 2012 the GNSO Council approved an initial set of operating principles for CWGs that it sent to other SOs and ACs for feedback. Detailed comments and suggestions were received from the ccNSO suggesting additions and clarifications to the initial principles in June 2013. In October 2013, a Drafting Team to be co-chaired by the ccNSO and GNSO was approved by the GNSO Council. The DT was tasked to develop a charter for a WG that will take up the initial work already done, and develop a finalized framework governing the formation, chartering, operation, decision-making and termination of CWGs that would be workable across all SO/ACs. The charter was approved by the ccNSO and GNSO Councils at their respective Council meetings



GNSO Background Briefing

in Singapore, in March 2014.

How can I get involved?

If you are interested in joining the CWG, please email the GNSO Secretariat at gnso.secretariat@icann.org to be added to the mailing list. Membership limits per SO/AC are set out in the CWG charter (see <https://community.icann.org/x/pgfPAQ>).

Where can I find more information?

- Background information: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/cross-community>
- CWG Workspace: <https://community.icann.org/x/rQbPAQ>
- Open F2F CWG meeting during the ICANN meeting in Los Angeles: <http://la51.icann.org/en/schedule/wed-framework-op-principles>

Staff responsible: Mary Wong, Steve Chan and Bart Boswinkel (ccNSO)

GAC-GNSO Consultation Group on GAC Early Engagement in GNSO Policy Development Processes

What is this about?

The Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) and the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) jointly established a consultation group to explore ways for the GAC to engage early in the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) and to improve overall cooperation between the two bodies (for example, by exploring the option of a liaison). The consultation group commenced its work in December 2013.

Why is this important?

The launch of this GAC-GNSO Consultation Group on Early Engagement is the result of discussions between the two entities at the ICANN meeting in Buenos Aires as well as previous ICANN meetings, reflecting a joint desire to explore and enhance ways of early engagement in relation to GNSO policy development activities. The issue was also specifically called-out by both Accountability and Transparency Review Teams (ATRT).

ICANN receives input from governments through the GAC. The GAC's key role is to provide advice to ICANN on issues of public policy, and especially where there may be an interaction between ICANN's activities or policies and national laws or international agreements. The GAC usually meets three times a year in conjunction with ICANN Public Meetings, where it discusses issues with the ICANN Board and other ICANN Supporting Organizations, Advisory Committees and other groups. The GAC may also discuss issues between times with the Board either through face-to-face meetings or by teleconference.

The GNSO is responsible for developing policies for generic Top-Level Domains (e.g., .com, .org, .biz). The GNSO strives to keep gTLDs operating in a fair, orderly fashion across one global Internet, while promoting innovation and competition. The GNSO uses the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) to develop policy recommendations which, following approval, are submitted to the ICANN Board for its consideration.

What is the current status of this project?

The Consultation Group comprises approximately equal numbers of representatives from each of the GAC and the GNSO to a total number of approximately 12 active members. The work is divided into two work streams, the first concentrating on Mechanisms for day to day co-operation and the second on the detail options for GAC engagement in the GNSO policy development process (PDP). The Consultation Group has been holding conference calls every two weeks. As a result of these conversations, a first pilot project is being implemented in the form of a GNSO Liaison to the GAC. Mason Cole was selected in this role which will formally commence during the ICANN meeting in Los Angeles. The CG is in the process of discussing and developing additional ideas to promote early engagement and sharing of information between the two groups.

Expected next steps

The Consultation Group is expected to provide a status update including a number of proposed recommendations that may be implemented as pilot projects during the joint GNSO – GAC meeting which is scheduled to take place on Sunday 12 October.

How can I get involved?

You can follow review the conversations on the mailing list (see <http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/gac-gns0-cg/>) or review the materials on the wiki (see <https://community.icann.org/x/phPRAg>).

Where can I find more information?

- Consultation Group Wiki: <https://community.icann.org/x/phPRAg>
- Mailing List Archives: <http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/gac-gns0-cg/>
- Consultation Group Charter: <https://community.icann.org/x/PyLRAg>
- Joint GNSO - GAC meeting during the ICANN meeting in Los Angeles: <http://la51.icann.org/en/schedule/sun-1500-gac-gns0>
- Open GAC-GNSO Consultation Group meeting during the IcANN meeting in Los Angeles: <http://la51.icann.org/en/schedule/sun-1830-gac-gns0>

Staff responsible: Marika Konings (GNSO), Olof Nordling (GAC)