

Implementing Human Rights Checklist in PDPs: lessons learned

FBadii (NCSG's GNSO Councilor, August 2025)

Lessons learned from doing TPR HR Checklist (retroactively)

1) Build HR in from the start

- **Chair action at kickoff:** Add a 30-min HR checkpoint to the PDP work plan at **Charter**, **Initial Report**, and **Final Report** stages. Use the one-page checklist; escalate only if triggers hit.
- **Council-appointed Liaison HR duties:**
 - Run the checkpoints with the Chairs.
 - Keep a one-page “risk → mitigation → residual risk → rationale” log.
 - Coordinate with Support Staff; flag when triggers require a short HRIA.
- **Support Staff role:** Provide the template, 30-min onboarding for the WG, maintain the HR log in the wiki, and help compile the final attachment.

[all addition to this boilerplate charter: 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.”

2) Liaising with the Support Staff

- Set a recurring 10-min sync (monthly or at milestones) between **Chairs + Liaison + Support Staff** to:
 - Confirm the checklist is done (time-box to ≤ 15 min).
 - Track mitigations adopted and any residual risks.

3) What happens when recommendations are finalized

Require a short **HR Attachment** alongside the WG's Final Report:

- **Checklist summary (≤1 page):** risks found, mitigations adopted, residual risks, and rationale.
- **Change log (≤1 page):** “What we changed to reduce impact” (e.g., standardized locks, added notice/appeal, data minimization).
- **Trigger assessment (≤½ page):** whether any triggers were hit and, if so, a 3–5 page targeted HRIA (only when triggered).

What should the council do after this? (to discuss with the council)

If the council is not satisfied or still observes residual risks to human rights from the recommendations, what should be done?

Suggestion: Perhaps by drafting a motion, requesting a scoping paper, or using the Issues Report process.

Transfer Policy Review Checklist

NCSG did an HR checklist on TPR

- We presented it to the council
- As a result of the outcome of the human rights impact assessment we recommend the Council to implement recommendation number 33 and to request an Issues Report:

Recommendation #33: Request to GNSO for further work on Transfer Dispute Resolution

- Policy and Potential New Dispute Mechanism

The working group recommends the GNSO request an Issues Report or other suitable mechanism to further research and explore the pros and cons of (i) expanding the TDRP to registrant filers and (ii) creating a new standalone dispute resolution mechanism for registrants who wish to challenge improper transfers, including compromised and stolen domain names. In making this recommendation, the working group recognizes that if such an effort were ultimately adopted by the GNSO Council, this request could be resource-intensive and will require the Council to consider the appropriate timing and priority against other policy efforts.