

WBS	Task Name	Current Duration	Current Start	Current Finish	Predecessors	% Complete	Status	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	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
1	EPDP - Internationalized Domain Names	587d	20/05/21	18/08/23		11%	In Progress																											
1	PROJECT CONTROL	558d	20/05/21	10/07/23		29%	In Progress																											
1.1	Project start confirmed	0	20/05/21	20/05/21		100%	Complete																											
1.2	Adopt/Confirm charter	0	20/05/21	20/05/21	3	100%	Complete																											
1.3	Confirmation of Team	60d	20/05/21	11/08/21	3	100%	Complete																											
1.4	Appointment of Team Chair	46d	20/05/21	22/07/21	3	100%	Complete																											
1.5	Appointment of Liaison to GNSO Council	46d	20/05/21	22/07/21	3	100%	Complete																											
1.6	Chair / Staff preparations	13d	23/07/21	10/08/21	6	100%	Complete																											
1.7	Project Management	512d	23/07/21	10/07/23		6%	In Progress																											
1.7.1	Develop and confirm Project Plan	50d	23/07/21	30/09/21	6	30%	In Progress																											
1.7.2	Obtain project plan approval from GNSO Council	20d	01/10/21	28/10/21	10	0%	In Progress																											
1.7.3	Develop monthly Project Packages and deliver to Group & Council	165d	29/10/21	16/06/22	11	0%	In Progress																											
1.7.4	Leadership Sub team	200d	23/07/21	28/04/22		5%	In Progress																											
1.7.4.1	On-going preparation and planning of group activities	200d	23/07/21	28/04/22	6	5%	In Progress																											
1.7.5	Close project and transition project to implementation	1d	10/07/23	10/07/23	14, 165	0%	In Progress																											
2	GROUP DELIBERATIONS	417d	11/08/21	16/03/23		0%	In Progress																											
2.1	First meeting of Team	1d	11/08/21	11/08/21	8	100%	Complete																											
2.2	Understand Charter, organize materials and develop initial approach	10d	11/08/21	24/08/21	8																													
2.3	Overview & initial discussion of all Policy Topics	10d	11/08/21	24/08/21	8																													
2.4	Develop definitions and terminology	28d	11/08/21	17/09/21	8																													
2.5	Input from other SO/ACs & GNSO SG/Cs	50d	09/09/21	17/11/21																														
2.6	Topic A Deliberations: Consistent definition and technical utilization of RZ-LGR	50d	25/08/21	02/11/21																														
2.6.1	Understand topic and determine need to deliberate	5d	25/08/21	31/08/21	18																													
2.6.2	Deliberate policy considerations and determine approach	5d	25/08/21	31/08/21	18																													
2.6.3	Deliberate policy issues	35d	01/09/21	19/10/21	28																													
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?	35d	01/09/21	19/10/21	28																													
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 "[d]eclaring 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	01/09/21	19/10/21	28																													
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 filing 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	01/09/21	19/10/21	28																													
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	01/09/21	19/10/21	28																													
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." SAC060 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	01/09/21	19/10/21	28																													
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. This 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																													

WBS	Task Name	Current Duration	Current Start	Current Finish	Predecessors	% Complete	Status	Q1		Q2		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	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun
36	2.6.3.7	a7) The SubPro PDP recommends that single character gTLDs may be allowed for limited scrip/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																															
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																															
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																															
39	2.6.3.10	a10) Individual labels in an IDL set may go through the following possible status transformations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 available 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 "allocated": 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 handed 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																															
40	2.6.4	Develop draft work product	35d	01/09/21	19/10/21	28																															
41	2.6.5	Conduct First Reading + verbal and email response	5d	20/10/21	26/10/21	40																															
42	2.6.6	Conduct Second Reading + verbal response + adoption or discard	5d	27/10/21	02/11/21	41																															
43	2.6.7	Confirm draft as stable	0	02/11/21	02/11/21	42																															
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																																
102	2.11	Topic F Deliberations: Adjustments in registration dispute resolution procedures and trademark protection mechanisms	40d	03/08/22	27/09/22																																
112	2.12	Topic G Deliberations: Process to update the IDN Implementation Guidelines	28d	28/09/22	04/11/22																																
121	2.13	Unplanned Issues & Tasks	0	24/08/21	24/08/21																																
138	2.14	Key Group Events	364d	25/10/21	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																															
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																															
150	3.5	Approve Draft Report for public comment	5d	12/12/22	16/12/22	149																															
151	3.6	Publish Initial Report	0	16/12/22	16/12/22	150																															
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	4	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																															
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																															
160	4.6	Submission of Final Report to the GNSO Council	0	07/04/23	07/04/23	159																															
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																																