WBS	Task Name	Current Duration		Current Finish	Predecessors % Complet	Status	Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2 Q3
1	■ EPDP: Internationalized Domain Names		20/05/21	18/08/23	14%		Jan Feb Mar Apr May Jun Jul Aug Sep Oct Nov Dec Jan Feb Mar Apr May Jun Jul Aug Sep Oct Nov Dec Jan Feb Mar Apr May Jun Jul Aug
2 1	+ PROJECT CONTROL		20/05/21	10/07/23	29%		
16 2	- GROUP DELIBERATIONS		11/08/21	16/03/23	9%		
17 2.1	First meeting of Team	1d	11/08/21	11/08/21	8 100%		
18 2.2	Understand Charter, organize materials and develop initial approach	10d	11/08/21	24/08/21	8 100%	Complete	
19 2.3	Overview & initial discussion of all Policy Topics	10d	11/08/21	24/08/21	8 100%	Complete	
20 2.4	Develop definitions and terminology	28d	11/08/21	17/09/21	8 100%	Complete	
21 2.5	● Input from other SO/ACs & GNSO SG/Cs	60d	09/09/21	01/12/21	23%		
26 2.6	● Topic A Deliberations: Consistent definition and technical utilization of RZ-LGR	50d	25/08/21	02/11/21	12%		
44 2.7	● Topic B Deliberations: "Same entity" at the top-level	40d	03/11/21	28/12/21			
57 2.8	◆ Topic C Deliberations: "Same entity" at the second-level	40d	29/12/21	22/02/22			
71 2.9	Topic D Deliberations: Adjustments in registry agreement, registry service, registry transition process, and other processes/procedures related to the domain name lifecycle	65d	23/02/22	24/05/22			
87 2.10	Topic E Deliberations: Adjustments to objection process, string similarity review, string contention resolution, reserved strings, and other policies and procedures	50d	25/05/22	02/08/22			
02 2.11	■ Topic F Deliberations: Adjustments in registration dispute resolution procedures and trademark protection mechanisms	40d	03/08/22	27/09/22			
12 2.12	▼ Topic G Deliberations: Process to update the IDN Implementation Guidelines	28d	28/09/22	04/11/22			
21 2.13	● Unplanned Issues & Tasks	0	24/08/21	24/08/21			
38 2.14	Key Group Events	364d	25/10/21	16/03/23			
45 3	+ INITIAL REPORT	360d	20/09/21	03/02/23		Not Started	
54 4	+ FINAL REPORT	45d	06/02/23	07/04/23		Not Started	
61 5	+ POST GROUP TASKS	95d	10/04/23	18/08/23		Not Started	
66							
67	■ PDP CHECKLIST	99d	01/01/21	20/05/21			

Exported on 28 September 2021 09:47:57 o'clock PDT

WBS .	Task Name	Current Cur Duration Sta		Current Finish	Predecessors	% Complete	Status	Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2 Q3 Jan Feb Mar Apr May Jun Jul Aug Sep Oct Nov Dec Jan Feb Mar Apr May Jun Jul Aug S
1	EPDP: Internationalized Domain Names	587d 20/0	5/21	18/08/23		14%	In Progress	
2 1	PROJECT CONTROL	558d 20/0	5/21	10/07/23		29%	In Progress	
3 1.1	Project start confirmed	0 20/0		20/05/21		100%	Complete	
4 1.2	Adopt/Confirm charter	0 20/0		20/05/21	3	100%	Complete	
5 1.3	Confirmation of Team	60d 20/0		11/08/21	3	100%	Complete	
6 1.4	Appointment of Team Chair	46d 20/0		22/07/21	2	100%	Complete	
7 1.5	Appointment of Liaison to GNSO Council	46d 20/0		22/07/21	2	100%	<u> </u>	
8 1.6	**				3		Complete	
	Chair / Staff preparations	13d 23/0		10/08/21	0	100%	Complete	
9 1.7	Project Management	512d 23/0		10/07/23	-	6%	In Progress	
10 1.7.1	Develop and confirm Project Plan	50d 23/0		30/09/21	6	30%	In Progress	
1.7.2	Obtain project plan approval from GNSO Council	20d 01/1		28/10/21	10	0%	In Progress	
12 1.7.3	Develop monthly Project Packages and deliver to Group & Council	165d 29/1		16/06/22	11	0%	In Progress	
13 1.7.4	Leadership Sub team	200d 23/0		28/04/22		5%	In Progress	
1.7.4.1	On-going preparation and planning of group activities	200d 23/0		28/04/22	6	5%	In Progress	
1.7.5	Close project and transition project to implementation	1d 10/0	7/23	10/07/23	14, 165	0%		
16 2	GROUP DELIBERATIONS	417d 11/0	8/21	16/03/23		9%	In Progress	
17 2.1	First meeting of Team	1d 11/0	8/21	11/08/21	8	100%	Complete	
18 2.2	Understand Charter, organize materials and develop initial approach	10d 11/0	8/21	24/08/21	8	100%	Complete	
19 2.3	Overview & initial discussion of all Policy Topics	10d 11/0	8/21	24/08/21	8	100%	Complete	
20 2.4	Develop definitions and terminology	28d 11/0	8/21	17/09/21	8	100%	Complete	
21 2.5	Input from other SO/ACs & GNSO SG/Cs	60d 09/0		01/12/21		23%		
22 2.5.1	Develop template for input	15d 09/0		29/09/21		90%	In Progress	
23 2.5.2	Announce input opportunity	30d 30/0		10/11/21	22	1		
24 2.5.3	Collect and collate input in to Review Tool	5d 11/1		17/11/21	23			
25 2.5.4		10d 18/1		01/12/21	24			
26 2.6	Group to review input and determine relevance to policy deliberations on issues within scope  Topic A Deliberations: Consistent definition and technical utilization of RZ-LGR			02/11/21	24	12%	-	
		50d 25/0						
27 2.6.1	Understand topic and determine need to deliberate	5d 25/0		31/08/21	18	100%	Complete	
28 2.6.2	Deliberate policy considerations and determine approach	5d 25/0		31/08/21	18	100%	Complete	
29 2.6.3	Deliberate policy issues	35d 01/0 35d 01/0		19/10/21	28	1%	In Progress	
2.6.3.1	a1) Evaluating all TLDs using RZ-LGR as the one and only authoritative source allows for a consistent approach for reviewing current and future TLDs. The SubPro PDP, the Staff Paper, and the Study Group on Technical Use of RZ-LGR ("TSG") recommend that compliance with RZ-LGR (RZ-LGR-4, and any future RZ-LGR versions) must be required for the validation of all future gTLDs (including IDN and ASCII labels) and the calculation of their variant labels as a matter of policy, including the determination of whether the disposition of the label should be blocked or allocatable. For existing delegated gTLD labels, does the WG recommend using the RZ-LGR as the sole source to calculate the variant labels and disposition values?					1%	In Progress	
2.6.3.2	a2) Before the proposed RZ-LGR mechanism, applications for IDN gTLDs have asked the applicant to identify and list any variant labels (based on their own calculations) corresponding to the applied-for string. The self-identified "variant" labels do not have legal standing, as "[djeclaring variant strings is informative only and will not imply any right or claim to the declared variant strings. The TSG recommends that the self-identified "variant" labels which are also variant labels calculated by RZ-LGR will need to be assigned a variant disposition based on RZ-LGR calculation, as discussed in a1).  If some self-identified "variant" TLD labels by the former gTLD applicants are not found consistent with the calculation of the RZ-LGR, but have been used to certain extent (e.g., used to determine string contention sets), how should such labels be addressed in order to conform to the LGR Procedure and RZ-LGR calculations?  Consider this question by taking into account the data to be collected in the "Data and Metric Requirements" section of this charter.	35d 01/0	9/21	19/10/21	28	1%	In Progress	
2.6.3.3	a3) SubPro PDP recommends that ICANN establish a mechanism that allows specific parties to challenge or appeal certain types of actions or inactions that appear to be inconsistent with the Applicant Guidebook. SubPro PDP recommends that such a limited challenge/appeal mechanism applies to several types of evaluations and formal objections decisions, including the DNS Stability aspect of evaluation/challenge procedures. Previously, both the SSAC and TSG also recommended a challenge process for resolving disagreement with the RZ-LGR calculation on certain strings.  If an applied-for TLD label, whose script is supported by the RZ-LGR, is determined to be "invalid", is there a reason NOT to use the evaluation challenge processes recommended by SubPro? If so, rationale must be clearly stated. If SubPro's recommendation on the evaluation challenge process should be used, what are the criteria for filling such a challenge? Should any additional specific implementation guidance be provided, especially pertaining to the challenge to the LGR calculation as it can have a profound, decimating impact on the use of RZ-LGR?	35d 01/0	9/21	19/10/21	28	1%	In Progress	
2.6.3.4	a4) For future gTLD applications, the SubPro PDP proposes an implementation guidance that if a script is not yet integrated into the RZ-LGR, applicants should be able to apply for a string in that script, and it should be processed up to but not including contracting. Applicants under such circumstances should be warned of the possibility that the applied-for string may never be delegated and they will be responsible for any additional evaluation costs. The burden in this case is on the applicant, who may have to wait for an indeterminate amount of time but is not aware of any other serious concerns. The SubPro PDP developed this implementation guidance by taking into consideration the TSG recommendation that the application should remain on-hold (or other appropriate status) until the relevant script is integrated into the RZ-LGR.  The WG and the SubPro IRT to coordinate and consider the following questions in order to develop a consistent solution: should the SubPro recommendation be extended to existing TLDs that apply for a variant TLD label whose script is not yet supported by the applicable version of the RZ-LGR? Consider this question in tandem with b4) and by taking into account the data to be collected in the "Data and Metric Requirements" section of this charter. If not, what should be the process for an existing TLD registry who wishes to apply for a variant TLD label whose script is not yet supported by the applicable version of the RZ-LGR?	35d 01/0	9/21	19/10/21	28	1%	In Progress	
2.6.3.5	a5) SAC060 notes that variant code points in LGR may introduce a "permutation issue", possibly creating a large number of variant domain names, which "presents challenges for the management of variant domains at the registry, the registrar and registrant levels."8SAC060 advises that "ICANN should ensure that the number of strings that are activated is as small as possible." The TSG agreed with this SSAC advice. Appendix C of the Staff Paper reviewed the factors causing numerous variant labels and suggested measures to address this issue.  Should there be a ceiling value or other mechanism to ensure that the number of delegated top-level variant labels remains small, understanding that variant labels in the second level may compound the situation? Should additional security and stability guidelines be developed to make variant domains manageable at the registry, registrar, and registrant levels?	35d 01/0	9/21	19/10/21	28	1%	In Progress	

Exported on 28 September 2021 09:49:45 o'clock PDT

WBS 1	Task Name	Current Current Duration Start	Current Finish	Predecessors	% Complete	Status	Q1 Jan Feb Mar	Q2 Apr May Jur	Q3 n Jul Aug	Sep Oct	Q4 Nov Dec	Q1 Jan Feb	Q2 Mar Apr Ma	Jun	Q3 Jul Aug Ser	Q4 Oct Nov	/ Dec Jan	Q1 Feb Mar A	Q2 or May Jun	n Jul	Q3 Aug Sep
35 2.6.3.6	a6) Since RZ-LGR can be updated over time, the WG needs to consider the implications for existing TLD labels and their variant labels (if any), including any potential changing of status or disposition value. The TSG further recommends that the Generation Panel (GP) must call out the exception where an existing TLD is not validated by their proposed solution during the public comment period and explain the analysis and reasons for not supporting the existing TLD in their script LGR proposal.13This will allow the community and the GP to review such a case to confirm that an exception is indeed warranted.  Does the WG agree with TSG's suggested approach? If So, to what extent should the TLD policies and procedures be updated to allow an existing TLD and its variants (if any), which are not validated by a script LGR, to be grandfathered? If not, what is the recommended approach to address changes to the current version of the RZ-LGR that assign different disposition values to existing TLDs? Consider this question by taking into account the data to be collected in the "Data and Metric Requirements" section of this charter.	35d 01/09/21	19/10/21	28	1%	In Progress															
36 2.6.3.7	a7) The SubPro PDP recommends that single character gTLDs may be allowed for limited script/language combinations where a character is an ideograph (or ideogram) and do not introduce confusion risks that rise above commonplace similarities, consistent with SAC052 and Joint ccnSO-GNSO IDN Workgroup (JIG) report. What mechanism or criteria should be used to identify the scripts/languages appropriate for single-character TLDs? Once those scripts/languages are identified, what mechanism or criteria should be used to identify a specific list of allowable characters which can be used as a single-character TLD within such scripts/languages? Should any specific implementation guidance be provided? Furthermore, should the relevant GP tag these code points in the RZ-LGR for a consistent analysis and to ease their identification and algorithmic calculation?1	35d 01/09/21	19/10/21	28	1%	In Progress															
37 2.6.3.8	a8) What additional aspects of gTLD policies and procedures, which are not considered in the above charter questions, need to be updated to ensure that the validation of existing TLD labels and calculation of variantlabels depend exclusively on the RZ-LGR in a consistent manner?	35d 01/09/21	19/10/21	28	1%	In Progress															
38 2.6.3.9	a9) A given label in an Internationalized Domain Label (IDL) set may be in one of the following non-exhaustive status: delegated, withheld-same-entity, blocked, allocated, rejected. The WG and the SubPro IRT to coordinate and develop a consistent definition of variant label status in the IDL set.	35d 01/09/21	19/10/21	28	1%	In Progress															
39 2.6.3.10	a10) Individual labels in an IDL set may go through the following possible status transformations:  •from "withheld-same-entity" to "allocated": Allocation only to the same entity as another label in the IDL set. This change happens if a variant was not initially requested for allocation and later is. Allocating withheld labels would be the application process for a variant TLD.  •from "blocked" to "withheld-same-entity": A later LGR may broaden the availablel abels in the IDL set. Such possible labels automatically become withheld-same-entity.  •from "allocated" to "delegated": Happens when name servers are added. (Not new.)  •from "delegated" to "delegated": If a domain is removed from the DNS, the allocation can remain in place anyway. Rare in the root zone, but not new.  •from "rejected" to "withheld-same-entity": Every Rejected label is automatically Withheld-same-entity as well. If the Rejected status comes off, the label can be handled as any other Withheld-same-entity label. Note that an allocated or withheld-same-entity label cannot become blocked unless a new version of the LGR makes this possible. The WG and the SubPro IRT to coordinate and consider the following questions in order to develop a consistent solution: what is the procedure to change the label status for individual variant labels?	35d 01/09/21	19/10/21	28	1%	In Progress															
40 2.6.4	Develop draft work product	35d 01/09/21	19/10/21	28	1%	In Progress			ı	7											
41 2.6.5 42 2.6.6	Conduct First Reading + verbal and email response  Conduct Second Reading + verbal response + adoption or discard	5d 20/10/21 5d 27/10/21	26/10/21 02/11/21	40																	
43 2.6.7	Confirm draft as stable	0 02/11/21	02/11/21	42			<b>+</b>			1											
44 2.7	Topic B Deliberations: "Same entity" at the top-level	40d 03/11/21	28/12/21																		
45 2.7.1	Understand topic and determine need to deliberate	5d 03/11/21	09/11/21	43						i											
46 2.7.2	Deliberate policy considerations and determine approach	5d 03/11/21	09/11/21	43						l	1										
47 2.7.3 48 2.7.3.1	■ Deliberate policy issues  b1) Both the SubPro PDP and the Staff Paper recommend that variant TLDs that ICANN delegates must have the  "same entity" as the sponsoring organization and the "Registry Operator" be used as the definition of the "same entity" at the top-level.  Should this recommendation be extended to existing TLDs?	25d   10/11/21 25d   10/11/21	14/12/21	46																	
49 2.7.3.2	b2) Both the SubPro PDP and the Staff Paper recommend that variant TLDs be operated by the same back-end registry service provider, the organization providing one or more registry services (e.g., DNS, DNSSEC, RDDS, EPP) for a registry operator. Should this recommendation be extended to existing TLDs and their variant TLD labels?	25d 10/11/21	14/12/21	46																	
50 2.7.3.3	b3) Beyond having the same Registry Operator and same back-end registry service provider, as referenced in b1) and b2), is there a need for additional constraints for the same entity requirement for the top-level? If so, the rationale must be clearly stated.	25d 10/11/21	14/12/21	46																	
51 2.7.3.4	b4) The policy recommendation advises that variant TLD labels be allocated to the same entity, however a process to apply for a variant TLD does not exist. The WG and the SubPro IRT to coordinate and consider the following questions in order to develop a consistent solution: what should an application process look like in terms of timing and sequence for an existing and future Registry Operator with respect to applying or activating their allocatable variant TLD labels? b4a) For the variant labels with status "withheld for the same entity" (i.e. not requested for allocation in the application process), what role do they play?	25d 10/11/21	14/12/21	46																	
52 2.7.3.5	b5) Do restrictions that apply to a TLD (e.g., community TLDs, dot brand TLDs) also apply to its variants? Are these labels equally treated as different versions of the same string, or completely independent strings not bound by the samerestrictions?	25d 10/11/21	14/12/21	46																	
53 2.7.4	Develop draft work product	25d 10/11/21	14/12/21	46							1										
54 2.7.5	Conduct First Reading + verbal and email response	5d 15/12/21	21/12/21	53							1										
55 2.7.6 56 2.7.7	Conduct Second Reading + verbal response + adoption or discard  Confirm draft as stable	5d 22/12/21 0 28/12/21	28/12/21	54			<del>                                      </del>														
57 2.8	Topic C Deliberations: "Same entity" at the second-level	40d 29/12/21	22/02/22				Ť l														
58 2.8.1	Understand topic and determine need to deliberate	5d 29/12/21	04/01/22	56							i										
59 2.8.2	Deliberate policy considerations and determine approach	5d 29/12/21	04/01/22	56																	
60 2.8.3	Deliberate policy issues	25d 05/01/22	08/02/22	59																	
61 2.8.3.1	c1) Both the SubPro PDP and the Staff Paper recommend that: 1) a given second-level label beneath each allocated variant TLD must have the "same entity"; and 2) all allocatable second-level IDN variantlabels that arise from a registration based on a second-level IDN table must have the "same entity". Should this recommendation be extended to existing second-level labels?	25d 05/01/22	08/02/22	59																	
62 2.8.3.2	c2) Currently Registry Operators may activate the IDN variant labels at the second-level when requested by the sponsoring Registrar of the canonical name as described in the IDN Tables and IDN Registration Rules. Both the SubPro PDP and the Staff Paper recommend that at the second-level, the same entity definition can be achieved by ensuring that the registrant is the same. Should this recommendation be extended to the already activated IDN variant labels at the second-level? How does the "same entity" requirement impact the current rules for Registry Operators for activating IDN variant labels?	25d 05/01/22	08/02/22	59																	

Exported on 28 September 2021 09:49:45 o'clock PDT

WBS <b>T</b>	ask Name	Current Current Duration Start	Current Finish	Predecessors	% Status Complete	Q1 Feb Mar Ap	Q2 r May Jun	Q3 Jul Aug Sep	Q4 Oct Nov	Dec Ja	Q1 an <u>Feb</u>	Mar Apr	Q2 May Jun	Q3 Jul Aug	Sep_(	Q4 Oct <u>Nov</u>	Dec Jan	Q1 Feb Mar Apr	Q2 May Jur	n Jul_	Q3 Aug <u>Ser</u>
2.8.3.3	c3) The WG and the SubPro IRT to coordinate and consider the following question in order to develop a consistent solution: what is the appropriate mechanism to identify the registrant as the "same entity" at the second-level for future and existing labels?  The Staff Paper recommends using ROID to ensure that the same label beneath all variant labels is allocated to the same entity. However, some registrars in practice may not reuse contact objects for different registrations by the same registrant, and there is no existing data on the number/percentage of ICANN accredited registrars that reuse contact ROID.  Is ROID a reasonable mechanism to determine the same registrant at the second-level for both future and existing labels? If not, what mechanism/functional definition can be used to ensure the second-level variant labels are allocated to the same entity for both current and future TLDs? Consider this question by taking into account the data to be collected in the "Data and Metric Requirements" section of this charter.  c3a) If the Working Group determines to use ROID as the mechanism to identify the registrant as the "same entity" at the second-level, are there additional requirements to ensure the "same entity" principle is followed?	25d 05/01/22	08/02/22	59																	
2.8.3.4	c4) A registry TLD may offer registrations using different IDN tables to support different languages or scripts. In case multiple IDN tables are offered, IDN tables should produce a consistent set of second-level variant labels to help achieve the security and usability goals for managing variant labels in a stable manner, promoting a good user experience.  As such, the Staff Paper recommends that IDN tables of variant TLDs be mutually coherent, i.e. any two code points (or sequences) that are variants in TLD "11" cannot be non-variants in LD "11". This recommendation also implies that any two code points (or sequences) that are variants in IDN Table A for TLD 12, which does not have any variant TLD, cannot be non-variants in another IDNTable B for the same TLD 12.  Should the second-levelIDN tables offered under a TLD, including IDN variant TLDs, be required to be mutually coherent? If yes, how should existing registrations which may not meet the "mutually coherent" requirement of second-level IDN tables be addressed? Rationale must be clearly stated.  c4a) Notwithstanding that IDN tables need to be mutually coherent, the SubPro PDP and the Staff Paper recommend that the set of allocatable or activated second-level variant labels may not be identical across the activated IDN variant TLDs. Meaning, their behavior/disposition can be different.  Under the conditions above, may the set of allocatable or activated second-level variant labels not behave identically under an individual TLD, which does not have any variant TLD label?	25d 05/01/22	08/02/22	59																	
2.8.3.5	c5) There is existing practice by registries to harmonize IDN tables, but there is no data on the various methods they may have used. The Staff Paper suggests maintaining a common set of harmonized second-level IDN tables for all IDN variant TLDs, and then (a) choosing all these IDN tables to offer for all IDN variant TLDs, or (b) choosing a relevant different subset of IDN tables to offer for each different IDN variant TLD.  The WG and the SubPro IRT to coordinate and consider the following question in order to develop a consistent solution: are the above suggested methods in the Staff Paper sufficient for IDN table harmonization purposes? Should any additional implementation guidance be provided for a registry?	25d 05/01/22	08/02/22	59																	
2.8.3.6	c6) To facilitate the harmonization of IDN tables, the Staff Paper recommends that IDN tables for the second-level be formatted in the machine readable LGR format specified in RFC 7940, Representing Label Generation Rulesets Using XML. However, each Registry Operator can harmonize the IDN tables today via software development solutions or are already in process of doing so.  The WG and the SubPro IRT to coordinate and consider the following question in order to develop a consistent solution: should Registry Operators be required to use the machine readable LGR format as specified in RFC 7940 for their second-level IDN tables? Or should Registry Operators have the flexibility to resolve the harmonization issue so long as it can predictably and consistently produce the same variant labels, alibeit with different disposition values, across the same-script IDN tables? Consider this question by taking into account the data to be collected in the "Data and Metric Requirements" section of this charter.	25d 05/01/22	08/02/22	59																	
67 2.8.4	Develop draft work product	25d 05/01/22	08/02/22	59							1										
68 2.8.5	Conduct First Reading + verbal and email response	5d 09/02/22	15/02/22	67																	
69 2.8.6 70 2.8.7	Conduct Second Reading + verbal response + adoption or discard  Confirm draft as stable	5d 16/02/22 0 22/02/22	22/02/22	68							-										
71 2.9	Topic D Deliberations: Adjustments in registry agreement, registry service, registry transition process, and other	65d 23/02/22	24/05/22																		
72 2.9.1	processes/procedures related to the domain name lifecycle  Understand topic and determine need to deliberate	5d 23/02/22	01/03/22	70																	
73 2.9.2	Deliberate policy considerations and determine approach	5d 23/02/22	01/03/22	70																	
74 2.9.3	Deliberate policy issues	50d 02/03/22	10/05/22	73																	
7.5 2.9.3.1	d1) The same entity principle for variant TLDshaving the same registry operator and the same back-end registry service provider for gTLD and its variant labels at the top-levelneeds to be effectuated legally and operationally. From a legal standpoint there will be a binding document(s) between ICANN and the registry operator (e.g., Registry Agreement), which should memorialize the relationship between each allocated TLD and its variant labels, as well as the obligations to maintain such condition during the life of the contract(s). From an operational standpoint, an application process, testing of registry services, fee structure, and other aspects need to be defined and developed.  The EPDP should discuss and develop the proper legal and operational framework in order to strike a balance between conservatism, innovation, adoption and other aspects of the implementation. The WG and the SubPro IRT to coordinate and consider the following questions in order to develop a consistent solution:  d1a) A TLD is subject to a Registry Agreement with ICANN. In case of IDN variant TLDs, ICANN would execute the Registry Agreement with the same entity but potentially diverge in future Registry Agreement with ICANN? If not, should each TLD label be the subject of a separate Registry Agreement with ICANN? If not, should each TLD label along with its variant labels be subject to one Registry Agreement with the same entity? Rationale for such definition must be clearly stated along with the answer, including goals and motivations.  d1b) What should be the process by which an existing registry operator could apply for, or be allocated, a variant for its existing gTLD? What should be the process by which an applicant applying for a new IQT DC ould seek and obtain any allocatable variant (S)? What should be the associated fee(s), including the application fees and annual registration fees for variant TLDs? Should any specific implementation guidance be provided?	50d 02/03/22	10/05/22	73																	
76 2.9.3.2	d2) In order to ensure that the same entity principle is maintained for a gTLD and its allocated variant TLD labels, what are the operational and legal impacts to the:  Registry Transition Process or Change of Control in the Registry Agreement;  Emergency Back-End Registry Operator (EBERO) provisions; and  Reassignment of the TLD as a result of the Trademark Post-Delegation Dispute-Resolution Procedure (TM-PDDRP)?	50d 02/03/22	10/05/22	73																	
77 2.9.3.3	d3) In order to ensure that the same entity principle is maintained, what are the operational and legal impacts to the data escrow policies, if any.	50d 02/03/22	10/05/22	73																	
2.9.3.4	d4) Regarding second-level domain names, should a variant set behave as one unit, i.e. the behavior of one domain name is replicated across the other variant domain names? Or should each variant domain name have its own independent domain name life cycle? Consider the operational and legal impact of the "same entity" principle, if any, to all aspects of a domain name lifecycle, including but not limited to:  •Registration, including registration during the Sunrise Period, any Limited Registration Period, any Launch Program and during General Registration  •Update  •Renewal  •Transfer  •Lock  •Suspension  •Expiration  •Redemption  •Deletion	50d 02/03/22	10/05/22	73																	

Exported on 28 September 2021 09:49:47 o'clock PDT

WBS	Task Name	Current Current Duration Start	Current Finish	Predecessors	% Status	lan	Q1 Feb Mar Apr	Q2	Q3	4 Dec	Q1		Q2	Q3		Q4	Q1	Q2	hul.	Q3
79 2.9.3.5	d5) For reporting and fee accrual purposes, should each variant domain name be considered an independent registration? Or should such variant labels be considered as an atomic set (irrespective of whether any of the names is actually activated in the DNS, andwhether any of the variants is actually registered)? Rationale for such definition must be clearly stated. Should any specific implementation guidance be provided? For example, what would be the impact to the registration payment at the Registry Operator level and at ICANN org?	50d 02/03/22	10/05/22	73		Jan	Too mar 7,pr	May odn	, Adg Ca			7,51		ou nag			100 11101 7	, May San		They suppose the s
80 2.9.3.6	d6)To ensure that the "same entity" principle is followed, the transfer of a domain name registration to a new entityvoluntary or involuntary, and inter-registrants or inter-registrarsshould result in transfer of all variant domain names (i.e., if s1.11 is to be transferred, s1.11, s1.11v1, s1v1.11 and s1v1.11 should all be transferred).  The WG, the Transfer Policy PDP, and the RPM PDP Phase 2 to coordinate and consider the following questions in order to develop a consistent solution: to what extent should the Transfer Policy be updated to reflect domain name relationships due to variants and the "same entity" requirement?  d6a)Should transfers ordered by the Uniform Domain-Name Dispute-Resolution Policy (UDRP) or any other dispute resolution mechanisms be treated the same way to follow the "same entity" requirement?	50d 02/03/22	10/05/22	73																
81 2.9.3.7	d7) Should the policies and procedures related to domain name suspension be updated to ensure that the "same entity" principle is followed for all variant domain names (i.e., if s1.t1 is to be suspended, s1.t1v1, s1v1.t1 and s1v1.t1v1 should all be suspended? In other words, if one domain label is suspended, either voluntarily or involuntarily, should all the variant labels related to that domain be suspended?  d7a) Should the suspensions ordered by the Uniform Rapid Suspension System (URS) or any other dispute resolution mechanisms be treated the same way to follow the "same entity" requirement?	50d 02/03/22	10/05/22	73																
82 2.9.3.8	d8) What additional updates to the Registry Agreement are necessary to ensure the labels under variant TLDs follow the 'same entity' rule? For example, the Staff Paper recommends that the following requirements must be included in the Registry Agreement; some of the charter questions are also related to those topics:  • Subordinate names allocated by the Registry Operator in the TLD be treated as an atomic set. This is true irrespective of whether any of the names is actually activated in the DNS, and whether any of the variants is actually registered. [related to questions c1, d4, d5]  • All the different IDN tables being used by the IDN gTLD and its variant gTLDs be harmonized. [related to questions c4, c5]  • All the IDN variant TLDs be implemented through the same registry service provider, to promote a consistent and stable implementation across all such variant TLDs. [related toquestions b2, b4]  Are there any additional updates that need to be considered that are not included in this list?	50d 02/03/22	10/05/22	73																
83 2.9.4	Develop draft work product	50d 02/03/22	10/05/22	73							i		1							
84 2.9.5	Conduct First Reading + verbal and email response	5d 11/05/22	17/05/22	83									1							
85 2.9.6	Conduct Second Reading + verbal response + adoption or discard	5d 18/05/22	24/05/22	84		$\overline{}$														
86 2.9.7 87 2.10	Confirm draft as stable  Topic E Deliberations: Adjustments to objection process, string similarity review, string contention resolution, reserved	0 24/05/22 50d 25/05/22	24/05/22 02/08/22	85		<del>- Y</del> -														
2.10	strings, and other policies and procedures	550 25/55/22	02/00/22										1							
88 2.10.1	Understand topic and determine need to deliberate	5d 25/05/22	31/05/22	86																
89 2.10.2	Deliberate policy considerations and determine approach	5d 25/05/22	31/05/22	86																
90 2.10.3 91 2.10.3.1	Deliberate policy issues  e1) In considering the conclusion(s) with respect to question b4a), what role, if any, do TLD labels "withheld for possible allocation" or "withheld for the same entity" play vis-a-vis:     objection process; and     string similarity review process?	35d 01/06/22 35d 01/06/22	19/07/22	89																
92 2.10.3.2	e2) Under the rules of the most recent gTLD application round, there are four criteria for objections to a string (see gTLD Applicant Guidebook, version 2012-06-04, section 3.2.1). The SubPro PDP has also affirmed the continuation of these four criteria for objections to a string, while proposing recommendations and implementation guidance to enhance/adjust these criteria.  The WG and the SubPro IRT to coordinate to ensure consistency in the implementation of the objection process for the variant label applications of existing and future TLDs.	35d 01/06/22	19/07/22	89																
93 2.10.3.3	e3) In the Initial Evaluation for new gTLD applications, a proposed applied-for TLD is checked against several criteria as part of the string similarity review process (see gTLD Applicant Guidebook, version 2012-06-04, section 2.2.1.1.1). The SubPro PDP affirmed these standards, while proposing recommendations and implementation guidance to enhance the process.  The WG and the SubPro IRT to coordinate to ensure consistency in the implementation of the string similarity reviewprocedure for variant label applications of existing and future gTLDs.  e3a) After a requested variant string is rejected as a result of a string similarity review, should the other variant strings in the same variant set remain allocatable? Should individual labels be allowed to have different outcomes/actions (e.g., some labels be blocked and some be allowed to continue with an application process)?	35d 01/06/22	19/07/22	89																
94 2.10.3.4	e4) Under current procedures, resolution of string contention for applied for gTLD strings may include components such as a settlement between the parties, a community priority evaluation (if a community-based applicant in a contention set elects this option), and an auction. SubProp PDP affirmed these components while proposing recommendations and implementation guidance to enhance the mechanisms for string contention resolution. The WG and the SubPro IRT to coordinate to ensure consistency in the implementation of the string contention resolution mechanism for variant label applications of existing and future new gTLDs.	35d 01/06/22	19/07/22	89																
95 2.10.3.5	e5) The WG and the SubPro IRT to coordinate and consider the following questions in order to develop a consistent solution: should the reserved stringsineligible for delegation for existing and future gTLDs be updated to include any possible variant labels? Consider this question by taking into account the data to be collected in the "Data and Metric Requirements" section of this charter.	35d 01/06/22	19/07/22	89																
96 2.10.3.6	e6) The WG and the SubPro IRT to coordinate and consider the following questions in order to develop a consistent solution: is there any reason to permit the registration of gTLDs consisting of decorated two-character Latin labels which are not variant labels of any two-letter ASCII labels? If so, rationale must be clearly stated.	35d 01/06/22	19/07/22	89																
97 2.10.3.7	e7) Besides the objection process, string similarity review, and string contention resolution, what other ICANN policies and procedures should be updated to enforce the "same entity" rule and the use of RZ-LGR as the sole source to calculate the variant Labels and disposition values? See the list of ICANN Consensus Policies here: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/registrars/consensus-policies-en	35d 01/06/22	19/07/22	89																
98 2.10.4	Develop draft work product	35d 01/06/22	19/07/22	89									1							
99 2.10.5	Conduct First Reading + verbal and email response	5d 20/07/22	26/07/22	98										i,						
100 2.10.6	Conduct Second Reading + verbal response + adoption or discard	5d 27/07/22	02/08/22	99										1						
101 2.10.7	Confirm draft as stable	0 02/08/22	02/08/22	100		<u></u>								•						
102 2.11	■ Topic F Deliberations: Adjustments in registration dispute resolution procedures and trademark protection mechanisms	40d 03/08/22	27/09/22																	
103 2.11.1	Understand topic and determine need to deliberate	5d 03/08/22	09/08/22	101						 										
104 2.11.2	Deliberate policy considerations and determine approach	5d 03/08/22	09/08/22	101																
105 2.11.3	Deliberate policy issues	25d 10/08/22	13/09/22	104																

Exported on 28 September 2021 09:49:48 o'clock PDT

WBS	Task Name	Current Current Duration Start	Current Finish	Predecessors	% Complete		Q1	Q2		Q3	Q4		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1		Q2	Q3
2.11.3.1	f1)Trademark Clearinghouse (TMCH) mechanism functions include authenticating information from rights holders and providing this information to registries and registrars. Recording a trademark with the TMCH provides a rights holder with access to Sunrise registration periods in new gTLD registries and the Trademark Claims services. If Registry Operator has implemented IDN variant registration policies for the TLD, Registry Operator MAY allocate or register IDN variant labels generated from a label included in a valid SMD file during the Sunrise Period, provided that (i) such IDN variant registration policies are based on the Registry Operator's published IDN tables for the TLD and (ii) such policies are imposed consistently in the Sunrise Period, any Limited Registration Period, any Launch Program and during General Registration.  The Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) in All gTLDs PDP Phase 1 recommends maintaining the TMCH's current 'exact match' rules, the current availability of Sunrise registrations only for identical matches, and the current exact matching riteria for the Caliams Notice.  In considering the information above, are there any adjustments to the TMCH and its Sunrise and Trademark Claims services needed? Consider this question by taking into account the data to be collected in the 'Data and Metric Requirements' section of this charter.	25d 10/08/22	13/09/22	104		Jali	reu iviai Api	way Juli	Jul	Aug Sep	Oca Nov	Dec 3	all rev war	Apt may Jul	July	Sep Oct Nov	Dec Sall Feb	у ман жүрт к	Juli	Sul Aug Sep
2.11.3.2	f2) In order to ensure that the "same entity" principle is maintained, what are the additional operational and legal impacts to the following RPMs that are not considered in the above charter questions, which mostly concern the outcomes or remedies of dispute resolution procedures or trademark protection mechanisms?  •TMCH and its Sunrise and Trademark Claims services  •URS  •TM-PDDRP  •UDRP	25d 10/08/22	13/09/22	104																
108 2.11.4	Develop draft work product	25d 10/08/22	13/09/22	104												_				
109 2.11.5	Conduct First Reading + verbal and email response	5d 14/09/22	20/09/22	108												<u></u>				
110 2.11.6	Conduct Second Reading + verbal response + adoption or discard	5d 21/09/22	27/09/22	109																
111 2.11.7	Confirm draft as stable	0 27/09/22	27/09/22	110																
112 2.12	Topic G Deliberations: Process to update the IDN Implementation Guidelines	28d 28/09/22	04/11/22																	
113 2.12.1	Understand topic and determine need to deliberate	1d 28/09/22	28/09/22	111																
114 2.12.2	Deliberate policy considerations and determine approach	1d 28/09/22	28/09/22	111																
115 2.12.3	Deliberate policy issues [Enter an indented row for each Charter Question or Policy Topic]	25d 29/09/22	02/11/22	114																
116 2.12.3.1	g1) What should be the proper vehicle to update the IDNI Implementation Guidelines? g1a)Given that the contracted parties are contractually bound to adhere to the IDNI Implementation Guidelines, is there a need for a separate legal mechanism specifically for the implementation of IDNs among gTLDs, as well as a general guideline for any registry (including ccTLD registries) that wishes to implement IDNs?	25d 29/09/22	02/11/22	114																
117 2.12.4	Develop draft work product	25d 29/09/22	02/11/22	114																
118 2.12.5	Conduct First Reading + verbal and email response	1d 03/11/22	03/11/22	115												<u> </u>				
119 2.12.6	Conduct Second Reading + verbal response + adoption or discard	1d 03/11/22	03/11/22	117																
120 2.12.7	Confirm draft as stable	1d 04/11/22	04/11/22	118												ľ				
121 2.13	Unplanned Issues & Tasks	0 24/08/21	24/08/21			<b>\</b>														
138 2.14	Key Group Events	364d 25/10/21	16/03/23																	
139 2.14.1	■ ICANN Meetings/WG Team F2F Meeting	364d 25/10/21	16/03/23																	
140 2.14.1.1	ICANN72	4d 25/10/21	28/10/21																	
141 2.14.1.2	ICANN73	5d 05/03/22	10/03/22																	
142 2.14.1.3	ICANN74	4d 13/06/22	16/06/22																	
143 2.14.1.4	ICANN75	5d 17/10/22	21/10/22																	
144 2.14.1.5	ICANN76	5d 11/03/23	16/03/23																	
145 3	- INITIAL REPORT	360d 20/09/21	03/02/23			Not Started														
146 3.1	Populate stable drafts as required	300d 20/09/21	11/11/22	20						i										
147 3.2	Discuss/approve findings and interim recommendations	10d 14/11/22	25/11/22	146																
148 3.3	Consolidate interim recommendations and findings	10d 28/11/22	09/12/22	147																
149 3.4	Build Draft Report for public comment	10d 28/11/22	09/12/22	147												•	4			
150 3.5	Approve Draft Report for public comment	5d 12/12/22	16/12/22	149													<u></u>			
151 3.6	Publish Initial Report	0 16/12/22	16/12/22	150		<b>\</b>											*			
152 3.7	Communicate Initial Report	5d 19/12/22	23/12/22	150																
153 3.8	Public comment forum on the Initial Report (40 days)	35d 19/12/22	03/02/23	150													,			
154 <b>4</b>	FINAL REPORT	45d 06/02/23	07/04/23			Not Started														
155 4.1	Review of public comments	30d 06/02/23	17/03/23	153																
156 4.2	Continue deliberations of policy topics towards a Final Report	30d 06/02/23	17/03/23	153																
157 4.3	Build Final Report & Final Deliberations	5d 20/03/23	24/03/23	156														4		
158 4.4	Determine consensus levels on interim recommendations	10d 27/03/23	07/04/23	157																
159 4.5	Adopt final recommendations and report	10d 27/03/23	07/04/23	157														<b>,</b>		
160 4.6	Submission of Final Report to the GNSO Council	0 07/04/23	07/04/23	159		<b>\</b>												•		
161 5	+ POST GROUP TASKS	95d 10/04/23	18/08/23			Not Started														
166																				
167	PDP CHECKLIST	99d 01/01/21	20/05/21																	

Exported on 28 September 2021 09:49:50 o'clock PDT