

Annex B – DNS Abuse Mitigation PDP 2 Draft Charter

ICANN | GNSO

Generic Names Supporting Organization

WG Name:	DNS Abuse Mitigation PDP2	
Section I: Working Group Identification		
Chartering Organization(s):	Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) Council	
Charter Approval Date:	<Enter Approval Date>	
Name of WG Leadership:	<Enter Elected WG Leadership>	
Name(s) of Appointed Liaison(s):	<Enter Liaison>	
WG Workspace URL:	<Enter Active Project URL from GNSO Site>	
WG Mailing List:	<Enter Mailman archive link>	
GNSO Council Resolution:	Title:	Initiation of the Policy Development Process on DNS Abuse Mitigation PDP 2
	Ref # & Link:	<Enter Resolution link>

Important Document Links:	Procedural Documents: • Annex A: GNSO Policy Development Process • Annex 2: Policy Development Process Manual • GNSO Working Group Guidelines Non Exhaustive List of Substantive Documents: • Final Issue Report • DNS Abuse Small Team Report 2025 • DNS Abuse Small Team Report 2022 • ICANN's Enforcement of DNS Abuse Mitigation Requirements - A look at the first 6 months • NetBeacon White Paper • INFERMAL Study • NetBeacon Analysis: How have the gTLD contractual amendments impacted DNS Abuse? • Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA): Section 3.18 on DNS Abuse • Base Registry Agreement (RA): Specification 6.4 Abuse • ICANN Advisory on Compliance With DNS Abuse Obligations • Registration Data Policy
----------------------------------	---

Section II: Mission, Purpose, and Deliverables

Mission & Scope:

Background

The GNSO Council [requested](#) an Issue Report on DNS Abuse in August 2025 and in doing so, suggested three (3) priority topics that should be included in the Policy Development Process (PDP) on DNS Abuse that is expected to follow the completion of the Final Issue Report. The DNS Abuse Small Team, in alignment with community support, [recommended](#) narrowly scoped PDP on three issues. The [Final Issue Report](#) concluded that all of the three identified priority issues are appropriate for policy development. However, the report suggests that only **two** of the three identified DNS Abuse Issues should be prioritized for policy development, while one could potentially be addressed more directly and expeditiously outside of the policy development process. This prioritization reflects where policy intervention could likely reduce DNS Abuse at scale, is broadly applicable across the gTLD space, and aligns with the community input and lifecycle-and-cluster analysis used in the updated Small Team [gap matrix](#).

Informed by the DNS Abuse Small Team's recommendations and the Community's support for a narrowly scoped Policy Development Process (PDP), the Council initiated a PDP on:

1. **Safeguards for Application Programming Interface (API) access to new customers:** A proactive approach that seeks to introduce friction for new customer accounts, prior to gaining access to high volume registration tools (i.e., API access for new customers), until trust is established.

Malicious actors use ungated APIs to exploit the ability to register large volumes of abusive domains in a short amount of time. According to studies such as the INFERMAL

study, insufficient gating or friction for new users to access these tools can lead to the proliferation of DNS Abuse. Specifically, registrars that provided unrestricted API-based registrations saw a significantly elevated risk of phishing domains. The study found that the presence of easy automation for domain name registrations (via APIs) can multiply the likelihood of abuse by roughly four times, all else being equal. By contrast, the study noted that registrars employing restrictions on API usage for unverified users or requiring some form of vetting saw lower abuse rates. Many registrars require some sort of friction before a new customer account has access to an API for domain name registration but there is no uniform requirement(s) for API safeguards on friction in this area.

In preparing this charter, it was recognized that concentrating on just APIs would be too limiting. While the Issue was described as relating to API in the Final Issue Report, the proposed scope and Charter Questions have been updated using a technology neutral approach to avoid tailoring policy to a specific technology implementation and ensure the policy remains adaptable as technologies evolve.

Scope & Charter Questions – Safeguards for access to domain name registrations at scale for new customers

This PDP would seek to introduce a requirement to put safeguards in place to ensure that registrants, particularly new or untrusted accounts, cannot immediately access domain name registrations at scale until they have demonstrated basic trustworthiness.

Furthermore, the PDP would seek to develop a Consensus Policy requiring ICANN-accredited registrars to enforce certain obligations and controls over their resellers or third parties who are authorised to access registrar platforms (e.g., APIs, white-label systems, plugins) for automated domain registration or management. Understanding that Registrars value their customers and namespace, the PDP WG should ensure to keep in mind the Registrant's rights and responsibilities throughout the process. The goal is to create binding requirements for registrars to limit the ability of threat actors to rapidly register domains at scale for use in phishing, malware, and other DNS Abuse campaigns.

Purpose:

- Establish a framework of responsibility and accountability in relation to authorized partners that access covered capabilities on registrars' behalf.
- Establish due diligence, monitoring, and enforcement obligations related to domain name registrations at scale for users, resellers, or relevant third parties.
- Introduction of proportionate, risk-based friction for new or untrusted accounts before granting access to domain name registrations at scale. This friction should be based on customer activity, not just identity, to avoid unnecessary barriers for legitimate users.

Charter Questions:

The WG should answer:

Covered Capabilities

1. Which domain registration capabilities that enable new customers to register domain names at scale, whether by volume, speed, or both, should be subject to policy requirements?

Access requirements

2. What minimum safeguards should registrars be required to implement before granting initial access to those capabilities?
 - a. What procedural "friction" is needed, if any?

- b. What criteria should registrars use to determine when a customer has established sufficient trust?
3. How should those minimum safeguards be calibrated to be proportionate to the risk of DNS Abuse while minimizing unnecessary impacts on legitimate customers?

Ongoing administration

4. What is required for customers to maintain access to those capabilities, if anything? What obligations should registrars have, if any, in monitoring and reviewing those customer requirements?
5. What customers actions, or inactions, should result in customers losing access to those capabilities?
 - a. Where a customer has lost access to those capabilities, what minimum safeguards are required to regain access, if different than gaining initial access?

Roles and Responsibilities

6. What responsibilities should registrars have for resellers, and other authorized third parties that access registrar platforms for automated registration or management?
7. What minimum operational and accountability requirements should apply consistently across registrars to achieve the policy objectives, while allowing appropriate implementation flexibility?

Considerations:

- Consider impact on Consensus Policies and Data Protection Considerations.
- What aspects should be consensus policy requirements and what aspects can be subject to best practices, or potentially left to the discretion of the contracted party.
- What metrics will be used to evaluate the policy's effectiveness.
- How can registrars demonstrate their compliance with the obligations to ICANN and what types of evidence and information can registrars submit.

Impact on Human Rights

The WG is expected to consider the potential impact of any recommendations on human rights. Based on the information included in the request for an Issue Report and the Issue Report, the WG is expected to further consider whether there is a likely human rights impact, and if so, who are the groups expected to be impacted and the expected severity of the impact (high / medium / low). If an impact is anticipated, the WG is expected to address the following questions: 1) is the proposed action necessary to achieve the desired outcome, 2) is the proposed action proportionate, 3) is the proposed action legitimate.

Impact on the Global Public Interest

The WG is also expected to consider the potential impact of any recommendations on the Global Public Interest. In order to facilitate this analysis, the WG may wish to consult this [checklist](#) and may also benefit from consulting the [GPI Toolkit Wiki page](#).

Deliverables:

To develop, at a minimum, an Initial Report and a Final Report regarding the WG's recommendations on issues relating to DNS Abuse Mitigation, following the processes described in Annex A of the ICANN Bylaws and the GNSO PDP [Manual](#).

If the WG concludes with any recommendations, the WG shall (or recommend the subsequent policy Implementation Review Team to) conduct a policy impact analysis and identify a set of metrics to measure the effectiveness of the policy change, including source(s) of baseline data for that purpose:

- Identification of policy goals
- Identification of metrics used to measure whether policy goals are achieved
- Identification of potential problems in attaining the data or developing the metrics
- Identification of potential impact of its recommendations on any currently existing requirements on registrars and registry operators
- A suggested timeframe in which the measures should be performed
- Define current state baselines of the policy and define initial benchmarks that define success or failure
- Metrics may include but not limited to (Refer to the [Hints & Tips](#) Page):
 - ICANN Compliance data
 - Industry metric sources
 - Community input via public comment
 - Surveys or studies

Data and Metric Requirements:

The WG should as soon as practicable:

- Determine a set of questions which, when answered, provide the insight necessary to achieve the policy goals.
- Determine whether certain data is required to help understand a specific issue or answer a charter question.
- Determine a set of data and metrics which can be collected and analyzed to help answer the specific question.
- Submit a Working Group Metrics Request Form (see [GNSO Working Group Guidelines Section 4.5](#)), if data gathering at the charter drafting phase or during the working phase is deemed necessary.

WG leaders shall review the Guidance document below to understand the need for performing due diligence before submitting a data gathering request to the GNSO Council.

Section III: Project Management

Work Product Requirement:

The WG leadership, in collaboration with the WG support staff and GNSO Council liaison, shall use a standard set of project management work products that help plan, guide, track, and report the progress of the WG from start to finish, and include the necessary data and information to assess the progress of the WG. These work products include but not limited to:

- Work Plan
- Summary Timeline
- Project Situation Report
- Project Plan
- Action Items

See the full suite of work products in the [GNSO Project Work Product Catalog](#).

Project Status & Condition Assessment:

The WG leadership, in collaboration with the WG support staff, and the GNSO Council liaison, shall assess the Status and Condition of the project at least once a month. Such frequency is required in preparation for the GNSO Council monthly meeting, where At-Risk or In-Trouble projects are subject to review by GNSO Council leadership, and in some instances may be deliberated by the full GNSO Council.

The WG leadership, in collaboration with the WG support staff and the GNSO Council Liaison, shall use an [escalation procedure](#), which defines specific conditions that trigger the execution of a repeatable mitigation plan. The objective of this exercise is to return the project to an acceptable state ultimately achieving its planned outcomes.

Project Change Request:

The WG shall submit a [Project Change Request \(PCR\) Form](#) to the GNSO Council when its deliverable and baseline delivery date are revised. The PCR shall include a rationale for why these changes were made, their impacts on the overall timeframe of the PDP or any other interdependencies, and a proposed remediation plan.

The use of the PCR mostly occurs when primary deliverable dates are changed due to unforeseen or extreme circumstances. However, it can also be used to document changes in the deliverable requirements that may not have been identified in the chartering process.

When the PCR is required, it should be completed by the WG Chair and it will likely be presented to the GNSO Council for approval.

Resources Tracking:

The purpose for resource tracking is to deliver its work according to the work plan and be responsible for managing these resources.

For projects where dedicated funds are provided outside of budgeted policy activities, the WG shall provide regular budget versus actual expense reporting updates using a GNSO approved tool to allow for a better tracking of the use of resources and budget.

Section IV: Formation, Staffing, and Organization

Working Group Model:

Working Group Model: Representative

Rationale: The WG will utilize a Representative Model. Please see the Membership Structure section below for further details.

Membership Structure:

Role Descriptions: All Members participating in the Working Group are expected to abide by the Statement of Participation, which is enforceable by the WG Chair and GNSO Council Leadership Team. See Section V. for details.

- **Members:** Members are expected to participate during the course of deliberations and in any WG consensus calls. Members are expected to represent the view of their appointing organization, and may be called on to provide the official position of their appointing organization. Members are required to have a level of expertise in the relevant issues and ICANN policies and procedures as that may be impacted.
- **Participants:** Participants may be from a GNSO SG/C or SO/AC as listed in the chart below. Participants will be able to actively participate in and attend all WG meetings. Participants are encouraged to engage in the WG deliberation throughout its lifecycle and are expected to keep up with all relevant WG deliberations to ensure they remain informed and can contribute when needed. However, Participants do not participate in the consensus designation process. Participants are encouraged to possess similar levels of expertise as Members.
- **Alternates:** Alternates will only participate if a Member is not available. Alternates will be responsible for keeping up with all relevant WG deliberations to ensure they remain informed and can contribute when needed.
- **Observers:** Anyone interested in this PDP may join as an observer. Observers are subscribed to the mailing list on a read-only basis but are NOT able to post. Similarly, observers are NOT allowed to actively participate in PDP Team meetings, however, they will be allowed to follow the live zoom webinars and observe zoom chat. Recordings / transcripts of meetings will be posted publicly.
- **GNSO Council Liaison:** The GNSO Council shall appoint one (1) Liaison who is accountable to the GNSO. The GNSO Council Liaison must be a member of the Council, and the Council recommends that the Liaison should be a Council member and be able to serve during the life of this WG. See detailed description in the “GNSO Council Liaison” section below.
- **ICANN Org Liaison(s):** ICANN Org shall appoint at least one (1) Liaison, who is expected to provide timely input on issues that may require ICANN Org input such as implementation-related queries and issues that might benefit from their subject matter expertise. The ICANN Staff Liaison(s) is not expected to advocate for any position and will not participate in any PDP Team consensus calls.
- **ICANN Board Liaison:** While not required, the ICANN Board is encouraged to appoint a liaison to this PDP. The liaison should participate in accordance with the [Guidelines for Board Members Serving as Liaisons to ICANN Community Groups](#).

Representative Membership Structure:

Some groups may choose not to appoint any Members, Participants, or Alternates to the WG. The table below indicates the maximum number of Members, Participants, and Alternates that groups may appoint. Participants are to contribute additional expertise or capacity. These participants take part fully in discussions, drafting, and deliberations, but do not alter the formal representational balance of the Working Group for consensus

assessment purposes. Alternates will only participate if a Member is not available. Alternates will not take the place of a Participant if they are not available.

Group	Member (up to)	Participant	Alternates	Liaison
RrSG	4	1	1	
RySG	2	1	1	
IPC	2	1	1	
BC	2	1	1	
ISPCP	2	1	1	
NCSG	2	1	1	
NPOC	2	1	1	
NCUC	2	1	1	
ccNSO	2	1	1	
ALAC	2	1	1	
GAC	2	1	1	
SSAC	2	1	1	
RSSAC	2	1	1	
GNSO Council				1
ICANN Org GDS				At least 1
ICANN Board				1

The GNSO Secretariat is expected to circulate a “Call For Volunteers” in accordance with the group structure determined by the GNSO Council:

- Publication of announcement on relevant ICANN web sites including but not limited to the GNSO and other Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committee web pages; and
- Distribution of the announcement to GNSO Stakeholder Groups, Constituencies and other ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees

Membership Criteria:

A. Expected Skills for Working Group Members

WG members shall review the full text of the [Working Group Member Skills Guide](#) to understand the responsibilities and skills that they are expected to have in order to fully participate in the WG activities.

Collectively as a group, the WG Members **MUST** possess:

- A solid understanding of the DNS ecosystem, DNS abuse patterns, and the operational, technical, and privacy considerations involved in domain registration and abuse mitigation;
- Participants should understand how automated registration tools and domain name registrations at scale occur, and the range of technical and procedural safeguards that can reduce DNS Abuse while supporting legitimate registrations.
- Familiarity with GNSO policy development processes; direct experience is strongly preferred;
- Commitment to participating in Working Group meetings on a regular and ongoing basis;
- Highly effective oral, written, and interpersonal communication skills (in simple, comprehensible English);
- Ability to create factual, relevant and easily understandable messages, and able to succinctly deliver them to the Working Group;
- Research skills with the ability to discern factual, factually relevant, and persuasive details and sources;
- Commitment to manage a diverse workload, while collaborating with a Working Group of individuals with different backgrounds and interests in driving objectives;
- Knowledge of Working Group discussions, actions taken at meetings, and deliverables;
- Understanding of the perspectives and interests of the members' own stakeholder group or constituency;
- Understanding of what consensus means and how consensus-building process works;
- Commitment to facilitate consensus by listening, explaining, mediating, proposing clear actions, and helping other members;
- Commitment to avoid blocking consensus by looking beyond the stakeholder group or constituency affiliation of other Working Group members and judging proposals/positions on their merits;
- Commitment to avoid re-litigating closed issues or deliberate obfuscation;
- Commitment to review the [Consensus Playbook](#) and attend potential training related to the Playbook, facilitate consensus building by employing the tools and techniques as detailed in the playbook;
- Maintain high personal levels of ethical conduct and integrity, including transparency of affiliation in the SOI, in treatment of others and respecting the professional reputation of all in the ICANN community.

B. Joining of New Members After Project Launch

New Members will only join after the launch of the PDP if a current Member is no longer able to continue in its membership. New WG Members should be mindful that, once input/comment periods have been closed, discussions or decisions should not be resurrected unless there is group consensus that the issue should be revisited in light of new information that has been introduced. If the reopening is perceived as abusive or dilatory, a WG member may appeal to the WG leadership.

C. Expert Contributors

The WG has flexibility/discretion to invite participation of the expert contributors in specific fields as it deems necessary.

Expert contributors are not expected to participate in any consensus designation process, but provide perspective/expertise/knowledge to the PDP WG. Based on the WG's determination, the Council may be able to use an independent evaluation process (e.g., GNSO Council Standing Selection Committee) to confirm whether those individuals have demonstrated the expertise/knowledge/perspective.

Leadership Structure:

One (1) Chair + One (1) Vice Chair

The GNSO Council will appoint one (1) qualified, independent Chair (neutral, not counted as from the WG membership) for the WG.

The WG, once formed, may select one (1) Vice Chair to assist the Chair. The Vice Chair can be selected among the WG's Members. However, if a Member is selected as the Vice Chair, his/her appointing organization may appoint a new Member as a replacement.

Should at any point a Vice Chair need to step into the role of Chair, the same expectations with regards to fulfilling the role of Chair as outlined in this charter will apply.

Leadership Criteria:

Expectations for the WG Leadership (Chair + Vice Chair):

The WG leadership is expected to carry out the role and responsibilities and meet the qualification as detailed in the [Expectations for Working Group Leaders & Skills Checklist](#).

In short, the WG leadership is expected to:

- Lead with neutrality and impartiality;
- Encourage representational balance;
- Ensure WG documents represent the diversity of views;
- Balance working group openness with effectiveness;
- Make time commitment;
- Contribute ideas and knowledge to working group discussions;
- Oversee project management of the WG deliberations;
- Build consensus;
- Make consensus designation on working group recommendations;
- Enforce compliance with Statement of Participation;
- Enforce compliance with ICANN's Expected Standards of Behavior;
- Ensure compliance with Community Anti-Harassment Policy;
- Be versed in GNSO Operating Procedures; and
- Handle working group complaint process.

Expectation for the WG Chair:

As outlined in the GNSO Working Group Guidelines, the purpose of a Chair is to call meetings, preside over working group deliberations, manage the process so that all members have the opportunity to contribute, and report the results of the Working Group to the Chartering Organization. These tasks require a dedicated time commitment as each week calls have to be prepared, the agenda concretized, and relevant material reviewed. The Chair shall be neutral. While the Chair may be a member of any group which also has representation on the Working Group, the Chair shall not act in a manner which favors such a group. The Chair shall not be a member of the Working Group for purposes of consensus calls.

In addition, it is expected that interested candidates shall have considerable experience in chairing working groups, and direct experience with at least one GNSO Policy Development Process throughout its lifecycle. Familiarity with the functioning of a Working Group is important to understand the various leadership skills that are necessary to employ during a WG's lifecycle. For example, a Chair has to ensure that debates are conducted in an open and transparent manner and that all interests are equally and

adequately represented within the Group's discussions. During the later stages of a WG when recommendations are drafted, a Chair will benefit from understanding the viewpoints of various members to ensure that an acceptable and effective outcome – ideally in the form of consensus – can be achieved.

The WG Chair is specifically expected to carry out the following responsibilities, including but not limited to:

- Attend all PDP Working Group meetings to assure continuity and familiarity with the subject matter and the ongoing discussions;
- Prepare meetings by reading all circulated materials;
- Be familiar with the subject matter and actively encourage participation during the calls;
- Be active on the PDP mailing list and invite PDP WG members and liaisons to share their viewpoints;
- Drive the progress forward and assure that discussions remain on point;
- Work actively towards achieving policy recommendations that ideally receive full consensus;
- Ensure that particular outreach efforts are made when community reviews are done of the group's output;
- Underscore the importance of achieving overall representational balance on any sub-teams that are formed;
- Enforce Statement of Participation, ICANN's Standards of Behavior, and Community Anti-Harassment Policy;
- Coordinate with staff and ensure that the WG is supported as effectively as possible; and
- Conduct consistent, adequate, and timely reporting to the GNSO Council on the progress of the PDP.

The WG Chair is expected to meet most of the following qualifications:

- Direct experience in consensus building processes and preferably direct experience in GNSO PDPs;
- Knowledge of and preferably direct experience in DNS Abuse related work at ICANN;
- Knowledge of ICANN policies and procedures as they relate to the relevant issue;
- Project management skills: including facilitating goal-oriented Working Group meetings, agenda setting and adherence, time management, encouraging collaboration, driving the completion of action items and achieving milestones in accordance with the WG timeline and work plan, keeping the Working Group's actions, discussions and meetings focused on serving its ultimate goals and deliverables;
- Ability to enforce compliance with the Statement of Participation, ICANN's Expected Standards of Behavior, and Community Anti-harassment Policy;
- Ability to determine when outreach is necessary and to undertake it;
- Ability to identify the diversity of views within the Working Group, if applicable;
- Knowledge of and ability to designate consensus on Working Group recommendations based on the level of agreement;
- Ability to help Working Group members understand that a consensus is a decision that is collaboratively reached and that the Working Group members can "live with"; accordingly, it may not be a perfect or unanimous decision;
- Commitment to review the [Consensus Playbook](#) and attend potential training related to the Playbook, facilitate consensus building by employing the tools and techniques as detailed in the playbook;
- Ability to refrain from promoting a specific agenda and ensuring fair, objective treatment of all opinions within the Working Group;

- Ability to distinguish between Working Group members offering genuine dissent and those raising irrelevant or already closed issues merely to block the Working Group's progress toward its goal;

Ability to halt disruption and, in extreme cases, exclude a Working Group member from a discussion per Section 3.5 of the GNSO Working Group Guidelines on Rules of Engagement;

- Ability to ensure that closed Working Group decisions are not revisited, unless there is a consensus to do so (usually in light of new information brought to the Working Group's attention);
- Ability to commit the time required to perform the WG Chair's responsibilities;
- Knowledge of topics in other policy efforts that have relations to or dependencies with the PDP working group topics;
- Ability to create factual, relevant and easily understandable messages, and able to clearly deliver them to the Working Group
- Ability to deliver a point clearly, concisely, and in a friendly way
- Exhibit agility and confidence in evolving situations and is able to swiftly transition from topic to topic
- Highly effective oral, written, and interpersonal communication skills (in simple, comprehensible English);
- Excellent research skills with the ability to discern factual, factually relevant, and persuasive details and sources;
- Commitment to manage a diverse workload, while collaborating with a Working Group of individuals with different background and interests in driving objectives; and
- Able to effectively build a course of action, analyze trade-offs, and make recommendations even in ambiguous situations; and
- Knowledge of and ability to participate in the Working Group complaint process, commitment to review the [Clarification to Complaint Process in GNSO Working Group](#) Guidelines Section 3.7.

Expressions of Interest for the WG Chair:

1. Staff is expected to publish a request for Expressions of Interest for the role of Chair. The Expressions of Interest received will be posted publicly.
2. The GNSO Council leadership will review the application materials and decide which candidate to propose to the GNSO Council.
3. If GNSO Council leadership cannot come to a successful conclusion, leadership may request that the Standing Selection Committee (SSC) review the application materials and propose one, single, Chair to the GNSO Council.
4. Following receipt of the proposed candidate from Council Leadership or the SSC, the GNSO Council will vote to affirm or reject the proposed candidate.
5. If the Council rejects the selection, Council leadership will repeat the process until a suitable Chair candidate is affirmed by the Council.

The Expression of Interest should address the following issues, including but not limited to:

- What is the applicant's interest in this position?
- What particular skills and attributes does the applicant have that will assist him/her in chairing the WG and facilitating consensus building?
- What is the applicant's knowledge of and/or experience in DNS Abuse related work at ICANN, if any?
- What is the applicant's knowledge of ICANN policies and procedures?
- What is the applicant's experience with the GNSO Policy Development Process?

- What is the applicant's experience with consensus building involving various stakeholders, as well as familiarity with the [Consensus Playbook](#)?
- Is the applicant able to commit the time required and necessary work needed to chair the PDP?
- Does the applicant have any affiliation with or involvement in any organization or entity with any financial or non-financial interest in the subject matter of this PDP?
- Also expected to be included:
 - A link to an up-to-date Statement of Interest (SOI) - <https://community.icann.org/x/c4Lg>
 - A statement confirming commitment and ability to act neutrally.

Expectations for the Vice Chair:

Finally, as also pointed out in the GNSO Working Group Guidelines, the Vice Chair may facilitate the work of the Chair by ensuring continuity in case of absence, sharing of workload, and allowing the Chair to become engaged in a particular debate. As a result, similar responsibilities and qualifications are expected from the Vice Chair, although the overall workload may be reduced as a result of being able to share this with the Chair.

Leadership Review:

The review of WG leadership provides a regular opportunity for the GNSO Council to check in with WG leadership and Council Liaison to identify resources or input that Council may need to provide, as well as opportunities for the leadership team to improve. The review also enables the GNSO Council to work with the WG leadership and Council Liaison to develop and execute a plan to address possible issues/opportunities identified.

The GNSO Council leadership and/or the Council Liaison may initiate the WG leadership review in response to circumstances indicating that a review is necessary.

The WG leadership shall review the full text of [Regular Review of Working Group Leadership](#) document to understand the regular review of WG leadership performance by the GNSO Council, as well as the [member survey](#) that feeds into the review. This leadership review may be conducted alongside the [WG self-assessment](#), or be integrated as part of the WG self-assessment based on the GNSO Council's further improvement of the review mechanism.

GNSO Council Liaison

The GNSO Council shall appoint one (1) Liaison who is accountable to the GNSO. The Liaison must be a member of the Council, and the Council recommends that the Liaison should be a Council member and be able to serve during the life of this WG.

The complete description of role & responsibilities for GNSO Council Liaison is described in the [GNSO Council Liaison Supplemental Guidance](#). In short, the GNSO Council Liaison is expected to:

- Fulfill liaison role in a neutral manner
 - Importantly, the liaison is expected to fulfil his/her role in a neutral manner. This means that everything the liaison does during his/her tenure, including but not limited to participating in WG calls, reporting status, conveying information, and escalating issues, should be done in that neutral manner.
- Serve as an interim WG Chair until a Chair is named
- Be a regular participant of WG meetings
- Participate in regular meetings with WG Chair
- Report to Council on the WG progress
- Convey to Council on WG communications, questions, concerns
- Inform WG Chair about Council activities impacting the WG
- Refer to Council questions related to WG Charter
- Assist or engage when WG faces challenges
- Assist in case of abuse of ICANN's Expected Standards of Behavior and Community Anti-Harassment Policy
- Assist with knowledge of WG processes and practices
- Facilitate when there is disagreement regarding consensus designation
- Facilitate when a Section 3.7 Complaint Process is invoked
- Initiate the WG leadership review in response to circumstances indicating that a review is necessary

The liaison shall complete the following actions for onboarding purposes:

- Review the [GNSO Council liaison to the WGs - Role Description](#);
- Review the [New Liaison Briefing and Liaison Handover](#) document to understand the actions the liaison needs to take for onboarding purposes.
- Consult the [supplemental guidance](#) developed to provide more precision in their responsibilities and the frequency in which they must be carried out;
- Familiarize with the provisions of the GNSO Operating Procedures relevant to liaisons;
- Subscribe to the PDP mailing lists and relevant sub teams;
- Subscribe to the PDP Leadership mailing list(s), if applicable. In addition, add to the PDP Leadership chat (or other communication channel) if applicable;
- Consider requesting a catch up call with the relevant GNSO policy support staff. This call should clarify the role of the liaison in terms of PDP conference call attendance, expected responsibilities and an update as to the current status of the PDP if already in operation (milestones and anticipated hurdles);
- Review links to the wiki workspaces and mailing list archives via email;
- (If the PDP is already in operation) Consider requesting that PDP Leadership and the outgoing liaison(s) share relevant briefing documents specific to the PDP, to highlight the scope of the PDP charter, current status, timeline, milestones, problem areas/challenges, anticipated hurdles, etc;
- (If the PDP is already operational) Participate in an onboarding conference call with the incoming and outgoing liaisons as well as PDP Leadership; GNSO policy support staff will also be present on the call.

Support Staff:

The ICANN Staff assigned to the WG will fully support the work of the Working Group as requested by the Chair including meeting support, document drafting, editing and distribution and other substantive contributions when deemed appropriate.

Staff assignments to the Working Group:

- ICANN policy staff members
- GNSO Secretariat

In addition, regular participation of and consultation with other ICANN Org departments such as the GDS is anticipated to ensure timely input on issues that may require ICANN org input such as implementation-related queries. As such, the ICANN Org GDS is expected to appoint at least one (1) Liaison to the WG, as specified in the “Membership Structure” section above.

Furthermore, additional policy staff resources are available to assist the WG leadership for consensus building purposes.

Section V: Rules of Engagement

Statements of Interest (SOI) Guidelines:

Each member of the WG is required to submit an SOI in accordance with Section 5 of the GNSO Operating Procedures.

Statement of Participation:

Each Member and Participant of the WG must acknowledge and accept the Statement of Participation (as provided below), including ICANN's Expected Standards of Behavior, before he/she can participate in the WG.

Problem/Issue Escalation & Resolution Process:

The problem/issue escalation & resolution process within the WG is provided in Sections 3.4 and 3.5 of the Working Group Guidelines. WG members should also reference the [Guidelines Concerning ICANN Org Resources for Conflict Resolution and Mediation](#).

Formal Complaint Process:

The formal complaint process within the WG is provided in Section 3.7 of the Working Group Guidelines. Further details regarding the formal complaint process are included in the [Clarification to Complaint Process in GNSO Working Group Guidelines](#) document.

The formal complaint process may be modified by the GNSO Council at its discretion.

Section VI: Decision Making Methodologies

Consensus Designation Process:

Section 3.6 of the GNSO Working Group Guidelines, as included below, provides the standard consensus-based methodology for decision making in GNSO WGs.

For consensus building purposes, the WG Leadership, WG Members, and GNSO Council Liaison are expected to review the [Consensus Playbook](#) which provides practical tools and best practices to bridge differences, break deadlocks, and find common ground within ICANN processes; potential training related to the Consensus Playbook may be provided for WG Leadership, Members, and GNSO Council Liaison.

Who Can Participate in Consensus Designation:
--

Consensus calls or decisions are limited to Members who may consult as appropriate with their respective appointing organizations. However, for the purpose of assessing consensus, groups that do not fulfil their maximum membership allowance should not be disadvantaged.

The WG Chair shall ensure that all perspectives are appropriately taken into account in assessing Consensus designations on the final recommendations.

Unless otherwise specified in this Charter, the GNSO Working Group Guidelines apply in full and Consensus designations are therefore the responsibility of the Work Group Chair and are to be made in accordance with the consensus levels described in Section 3.6 of the Working Group Guidelines.

Termination or Closure of Working Group:

Typically, the WC will close upon the delivery of its last Final Report, unless assigned

Typically, the WG will close upon the delivery of its last Final Report, unless assigned additional tasks or follow-up by the GNSO Council.

The GNSO Council may terminate or suspend the WG prior to the publication of its last Final Report for significant cause such as changing or lack of community volunteers, the planned outcome for the project can no longer be realized, or when it is clear that no consensus can be achieved.

The WG Chair, in collaboration with the WG support staff and the GNSO Council Liaison, shall use an [escalation procedure](#), which helps define the health of the WG and informs the GNSO Council's decision on whether the WG should be terminated or suspended.

Section VII: Change History

--

Section VIII: Charter Document History

Version	Date	Description
1.0	TBD	

Staff Contact:	TBD	Email:	TBD
-----------------------	-----	---------------	-----

Translations: If translations will be provided please indicate the languages below:

[illegible]