TPR_P1_Project_Plan

smartsheet

WBS	Task Name	Current Duration	Current Start	Current Finish	Predecessors	% Complete	Status
	TPR_P1 POLICY DEVELOPMENT	746d	02/18/21	12/28/23		14%	In Progress
1	PROJECT CONTROL	746d	02/18/21	12/28/23		28%	In Progress
2	GROUP DELIBERATIONS	465d	05/13/21	02/22/23		17%	In Progress
2.1	First meeting of Team	1d	05/13/21	05/13/21	8	100%	Complete
2.2	Understand Charter, organize materials and develop initial approach	10d	05/13/21	05/26/21	8	100%	Complete
2.3	Overview & initial discussion of all Policy Topics	15d	05/13/21	06/02/21	8	100%	Complete
2.4	Develop definitions and terminology	30d	05/13/21	06/23/21	8	100%	Complete
2.5	Input from other SO/ACs & GNSO SG/Cs	91d	05/27/21	09/30/21		29%	In Progress
2.6	Phase 1A Policy Topics	240d	06/02/21	05/04/22		6%	In Progress
2.7	Phase 1B Policy Topics	180d	06/15/22	02/22/23			
3	INITIAL REPORT	495d	06/24/21	05/17/23		1%	In Progress
3.1	Phase 1A Initial Report	290d	06/24/21	08/03/22		2%	In Progress
3.2	Phase 1B Initial Report	240d	06/16/22	05/17/23			
4	FINAL REPORT	270d	08/04/22	08/16/23			Not Started
5	POST GROUP TASKS	95d	08/17/23	12/27/23			Not Started
	PDP CHECKLIST	198d	06/20/20	03/24/21		0%	

WBS	Task Name	Current Duration	Current Start	Current Finish	Predecessors	% Complete	Status
	TPR_P1 POLICY DEVELOPMENT	746d	02/18/21	12/28/23		15%	In Progress
1	PROJECT CONTROL	746d	02/18/21	12/28/23		30%	In Progress
1.1	Project start confirmed	0	02/18/21	02/18/21		100%	Complete
1.2	Adopt/Confirm charter	25d	02/18/21	03/24/21	3	100%	Complete
1.3	Confirmation of Team	50d	02/18/21	04/28/21	3	100%	Complete
1.4	Appointment of Team Chair	50d	02/18/21	04/28/21	3	100%	Complete
1.5	Appointment of Liaison to GNSO Council	50d	02/18/21	04/28/21	3	100%	Complete
1.6	Chair / Staff preparations	10d	04/29/21	05/12/21	6	100%	Complete
1.7	Project Management	696d	04/29/21	12/28/23		11%	In Progress
1.7.1	Develop and confirm Project Plan	30d	04/29/21	06/09/21	6	75%	In Progress
1.7.2	Obtain project plan approval from GNSO Council	30d	06/10/21	07/21/21	10		In Progress
1.7.3	Develop monthly Project Packages and deliver to Group & Council	165d	07/22/21	03/09/22	11		In Progress
1.7.4	Leadership Sub team	600d	04/29/21	08/16/23		11%	In Progress
1.7.4.1	On-going preparation and planning of group activities	600d	04/29/21	08/16/23	6	11%	In Progress
1.7.5	Close project and transition project to implementation	1d	12/28/23	12/28/23	14, 222		
2	GROUP DELIBERATIONS	465d	05/13/21	02/22/23		17%	In Progress
2.1	First meeting of Team	1d	05/13/21	05/13/21	8	100%	Complete
2.2	Understand Charter, organize materials and develop initial approach	10d	05/13/21	05/26/21	8	100%	Complete
2.3	Overview & initial discussion of all Policy Topics	15d	05/13/21	06/02/21	8	100%	Complete
2.4	Develop definitions and terminology	30d	05/13/21	06/23/21	8	100%	Complete
2.5	Input from other SO/ACs & GNSO SG/Cs	91d	05/27/21	09/30/21		29%	In Progress
2.5.1	Develop template for input	25d	05/27/21	06/30/21	18	100%	Complete
2.5.2	Announce input opportunity	1d	07/01/21	07/01/21	22	100%	Complete
2.5.3	Collect and collate input in to Review Tool	25d	07/02/21	08/05/21	23	1%	In Progress
2.5.4	Group to review input and determine relevance to policy deliberations on issues within scope	40d	08/06/21	09/30/21	24		In Progress
2.6	Phase 1A Policy Topics	240d	06/02/21	05/04/22		6%	In Progress
2.6.1	Topic 1 Deliberations - Gaining FOA	40d	12/09/21	02/02/22			
2.6.1.1	Understand topic and determine need to deliberate	5d	12/09/21	12/15/21	40		
2.6.1.2	Deliberate policy considerations and determine approach	5d	12/09/21	12/15/21	40		
2.6.1.3	Deliberate policy issues	25d	12/16/21	01/19/22			
2.6.1.3.1	a1) Is the requirement of the Gaining FOA still needed? What evidence did the Working Group rely upon in making the determination that the Gaining FOA is or is not necessary to protect registrants?	25d	12/16/21	01/19/22	29		
2.6.1.3.2	a2) If the Working Group determines the Gaining FOA should still be a requirement, are any updates (apart from the text, which will likely need to be updated due to the gTLD Registration Data Policy) needed for the process? For example, should additional security requirements be added to the Gaining FOA (two-factor authentication)?	25d	12/16/21	01/19/22	29		
2.6.1.3.3	a3) The language from the Temporary Specification provides, "[u]ntil such time when the RDAP service (or other secure methods for transferring data) is required by ICANN to be offered, if the Gaining Registrar is unable to gain access to then-current Registration Data for a domain name subject of a transfer, the related requirements in the Transfer Policy will be superseded by the below provisions…". What secure methods (if any) currently exist to allow for the secure transmission of then-current Registration Data for a domain name subject to an inter-registrar transfer request?	25d	12/16/21	01/19/22	29		
2.6.1.3.4	a4) If the Working Group determines the Gaining FOA is no longer needed, does the AuthInfo Code provide sufficient security? The Transfer Policy does not currently require specific security requirements around the AuthInfo Code. Should there be additional security requirements added to AuthInfo Codes, e.g., required syntax (length, characters), two-factor authentication, issuing restrictions, etc.?	25d	12/16/21	01/19/22	29		
2.6.1.3.5	a5) If the Working Group determines the Gaining FOA is no longer needed, does the transmission of the AuthInfo Code provide for a sufficient "paper trail" for auditing and compliance purposes?	25d	12/16/21	01/19/22	29		
2.6.1.4	Develop draft work product	25d	12/16/21	01/19/22	29		
2.6.1.5	Conduct First Reading + verbal and email response	5d	01/20/22	01/26/22	36		
2.6.1.6	Conduct Second Reading + verbal response + adoption or discard	5d	01/27/22	02/02/22	37		
2.6.1.7	Confirm draft as stable	0	02/02/22	02/02/22	38		
2.6.2	Topic 2 Deliberations - Losing FOA	40d	10/14/21	12/08/21			
2.6.2.1	Understand topic and determine need to deliberate	5d	10/14/21	10/20/21	51		
2.6.2.2	Deliberate policy considerations and determine approach	5d	10/14/21	10/20/21	51		
2.6.2.3	Deliberate policy issues	25d	10/21/21	11/24/21			
2.6.2.3.1	a7) Is the Losing FOA still required? If yes, are any updates necessary?	25d	10/21/21	11/24/21	42		
2.6.2.3.2	a8) Does the CPH Proposed Tech Ops Process represent a logical starting point for the future working group or policy body to start with? If so, does it provide sufficient security for registered name holders? If not, what updates should be considered?	25d	10/21/21	11/24/21	42		
2.6.2.3.3	a9) Are there additional inter-registrar transfer process proposals that should be considered in lieu of or in addition to the CPH TechOps Proposal? For example, should affirmative consent to the Losing FOA be considered as a measure of additional protection?	25d	10/21/21	11/24/21	42		
2.6.2.4	Develop draft work product	25d	10/21/21	11/24/21	42		
2.6.2.5	Conduct First Reading + verbal and email response	5d	11/25/21	12/01/21	47		
2.6.2.6	Conduct Second Reading + verbal response + adoption or discard	5d	12/02/21	12/08/21	48		
2.6.2.7	Confirm draft as stable	0	12/08/21	12/08/21	49		
2.6.3	Topic 3 Deliberations - Additional Security Measures	40d	08/19/21	10/13/21			
2.6.3.1	Understand topic and determine need to deliberate	5d	08/19/21	08/25/21	60		
2.6.3.2	Deliberate policy considerations and determine approach	5d	08/19/21	08/25/21	60		
2.6.3.3	Deliberate policy issues	25d	08/26/21	09/29/21			

								Q1			Q2			Q3			Q4			Q1			Q2			Q3			Q4			Q1			Q2			Q3	
WBS	Task Name	Current Duration	Current Start	Current Finish	Predecessors	% Complete	Status	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	Sep
2.6.3.3.1	a6) Survey respondents noted that mandatory domain name locking is an additional security enhancement to prevent domain name hijacking and improper domain name transfers. The Transfer Policy does not currently require mandatory domain name locking; it allows a registrar to NACK an inter-registrar transfer if the inter-registrar transfer was requested within 60 days of the domain name's creation date as shown in the registry RDDS record for the domain name or if the domain name is within 60 days after being transferred. Is mandatory domain name locking an additional requirement the Working Group believes should be added to the Transfer Policy?	25d	08/26/21	09/29/21	53																																			
2.6.3.4	Develop draft work product	25d	08/26/21	09/29/21	53																																			
2.6.3.5	Conduct First Reading + verbal and email response	5d	09/30/21	10/06/21	56																																			
2.6.3.6	Conduct Second Reading + verbal response + adoption or discard	5d	10/07/21	10/13/21	57																																			
2.6.3.7	Confirm draft as stable	0	10/13/21	10/13/21	58																																			
2.6.4	Topic 4 Deliberations - Auth-Info Code Management	55d	06/03/21	08/18/21		25%																																		
2.6.4.1	Understand topic and determine need to deliberate	5d	06/03/21	06/09/21	19	100%	Complete																																	
2.6.4.2	Deliberate policy considerations and determine approach	5d	06/03/21	06/09/21	19	100%	Complete																																	
2.6.4.3	Deliberate policy issues	40d	06/10/21	08/04/21		13%	In Progress																																	
2.6.4.3.1	b1) Is AuthInfo Code still a secure method for inter-registrar transfers? What evidence was used by the Working Group to make this determination?	40d	06/10/21	08/04/21	62	25%	In Progress																																	
2.6.4.3.2	b2) The registrar is currently the authoritative holder of the AuthInfo Code. Should this be maintained, or should the registry be the authoritative AuthInfo Code holder? Why?	40d	06/10/21	08/04/21	62	20%	In Progress																																	
2.6.4.3.3	b3) The Transfer Policy currently requires registrars to provide the AuthInfo Code to the registrant within five business days of a request. Is this an appropriate SLA for the registrar's provision of the AuthInfo Code, or does it need to be updated?	40d	06/10/21	08/04/21	62	5%	In Progress																																	
2.6.4.3.4	b4) The Transfer Policy does not currently require a standard Time to Live (TTL) for the AuthInfo Code. Should there be a standard Time To Live (TTL) for the AuthInfo Code? In other words, should the AuthInfo Code expire after a certain amount of time (hours, calendar days, etc.)?	40d	06/10/21	08/04/21	62	0%	In Progress																																	
2.6.4.4	Develop draft work product	40d	06/10/21	08/04/21	62	25%	In Progress																																	
2.6.4.5	Conduct First Reading + verbal and email response	5d	08/05/21	08/11/21	68																																			
2.6.4.6	Conduct Second Reading + verbal response + adoption or discard	5d	08/12/21	08/18/21	69																																			
2.6.4.7	Confirm draft as stable	0	08/18/21	08/18/21	70																																			
2.6.5	Topic 5 Deliberations - Bulk Use of Auth-Info Codes	40d	02/03/22	03/30/22																																			
2.6.5.1	Understand topic and determine need to deliberate	5d	02/03/22	02/09/22	60, 51, 40, 27																																			
2.6.5.2	Deliberate policy considerations and determine approach	5d	02/03/22	02/09/22	60, 51, 40, 27																																			
2.6.5.3	Deliberate policy issues	25d	02/10/22	03/16/22																																			
2.6.5.3.1	b5) Should the ability for registrants to request AuthInfo Codes in bulk be streamlined and codified? If so, should additional security measures be considered?	25d	02/10/22	03/16/22	74																																			
2.6.5.3.2	b6) Does the CPH TechOps research provide a logical starting point for future policy work on AuthInfo Codes, or should other options be considered?	25d	02/10/22	03/16/22	74																																			
2.6.5.3.3	b7) Should required differentiated control panel access also be considered, i.e., the registered name holder is given greater access (including access to the auth code), and additional users, such as web developers would be given lower grade access in order to prevent domain name hijacking?	25d	02/10/22	03/16/22	74																																			
2.6.5.4	Develop draft work product	25d	02/10/22	03/16/22	74																																			
2.6.5.5	Conduct First Reading + verbal and email response	5d	03/17/22	03/23/22	79																																			
2.6.5.6	Conduct Second Reading + verbal response + adoption or discard	5d	03/24/22	03/30/22	80																																			
2.6.5.7	Confirm draft as stable	0	03/30/22	03/30/22	81																																			
2.6.6	Topic 6 Deliberations - Wave 1, Recommendation 27	25d	03/31/22	05/04/22																																			
2.6.6.1	Understand topic and determine need to deliberate	5d	03/31/22	04/06/22	60, 51, 40, 27, 72																																			
2.6.6.2	Deliberate policy considerations and determine approach	5d	03/31/22	04/06/22	60, 51, 40, 27, 72																																			
2.6.6.3	Deliberate policy issues	10d	04/07/22	04/20/22																																			
2.6.6.3.1	c1) How should the identified issues be addressed?	10d	04/07/22	04/20/22	85																																			
2.6.6.3.2	c2) Can the FOA-related Transfer Policy issues (identified in paragraphs 5 and 9 of Wave 1 Report), as well as the proposed updates to the Gaining and Losing FOAs, be discussed and reviewed during the review of FOAs?	10d	04/07/22	04/20/22	85																																			
2.6.6.4	Develop draft work product	10d	04/07/22	04/20/22	85																																			
2.6.6.5	Conduct First Reading + verbal and email response	5d	04/21/22	04/27/22	89																																			
2.6.6.6	Conduct Second Reading + verbal response + adoption or discard	5d	04/28/22	05/04/22	90																																			
2.6.6.7	Confirm draft as stable	0	05/04/22	05/04/22	91																																			
2.6.7	Unplanned Issues & Tasks	0	06/02/21	06/02/21																																			
2.7	Phase 1B Policy Topics	180d	06/15/22	02/22/23																																			
2.7.1	Topic 7 Deliberations - Change of Registrant / Overall Policy	40d	06/16/22	08/10/22																																			
2.7.1.1	Understand topic and determine need to deliberate	5d	06/16/22	06/22/22	202																																			
2.7.1.2	Deliberate policy considerations and determine approach	5d	06/16/22	06/22/22	202																																			
2.7.1.3	Deliberate policy issues	35d	06/23/22	08/10/22																																			
2.7.1.3.1	d1) According to the Transfer Policy Review Scoping Team Report, the Change of Registrant policy "does not achieve the stated goals" and "is not relevant in the current & future domain ownership system." To what extent is this the case and why? Are the stated goals still valid? If the Change of Registrant policy is not meeting the stated goals and those goals are still valid, how should the goals be achieved?	35d	06/23/22	08/10/22	113																																			
2.7.1.3.2	d2) Data gathered in the Transfer Policy Status Report indicates that some registrants find Change of Registrant requirements burdensome and confusing. If the policy is retained, are there methods to make the Change of Registrant policy simpler while still maintaining safeguards against unwanted transfers?	35d	06/23/22	08/10/22	113																																			

WBS	Task Name	Current Duration	Current Start	Current Finish	Predecessors	% Complete	Status
2.7.1.3.3	d3) The Transfer Policy Review Scoping Team Report suggests that there should be further consideration of establishing a standalone policy for Change of Registrant. According to the Scoping Team, the policy should take into account the use case where a Change of Registrar occurs simultaneously with a Change of Registrant. To what extent should this issue be considered further? What are the potential benefits, if any, to making this change? To what extent does the policy need to provide specific guidance on cases where both the registrar and registrant are changed? Are there particular scenarios that need to be reviewed to determine the applicability of COR? ○ Gaining Registrar allows a new customer to input the Registrant information when requesting an inbound inter-registrar transfer. The information entered by the customer does not match Registration Data available in the Whois display. ○ In the case of "thin" domain names, the Gaining Registrar obtains information from the Registry. If it is determined that the Change of Registrant policy should be retained and modified, the following specific areas may be appropriate for further review.	35d	06/23/22	08/10/22	113		
2.7.1.4	Develop draft work product	5d	06/23/22	06/29/22	113		
2.7.1.5	Conduct First Reading + verbal and email response	5d	06/30/22	07/06/22	118		
2.7.1.6	Conduct Second Reading + verbal response + adoption or discard	5d	07/07/22	07/13/22	119		
2.7.1.7	Confirm draft as stable	0	07/13/22	07/13/22	120		
2.7.2	Topic 8 Deliberations - Change of Registrant / 60-Day Lock	40d	08/11/22	10/05/22			
2.7.2.1	Understand topic and determine need to deliberate	5d	08/11/22	08/17/22	111		
2.7.2.2	Deliberate policy considerations and determine approach	5d	08/11/22	08/17/22	111		
2.7.2.3	Deliberate policy issues	35d	08/18/22	10/05/22			
2.7.2.3.1	d4) Survey responses and data provided by ICANN's Global Support Center indicate that registrants do not understand the 60-day lock and express frustration when it prevents them from completing an inter-registrar transfer. Does the 60-day lock meet the objective of reducing the incidence of domain hijacking? What data is available to help answer this question? Is it the 60-day lock the most appropriate and efficient mechanism for reducing the incidence of hijacking? If not, what alternative mechanisms might be used to meet the same goals? Are there technical solutions, such as those using the control panel or two-factor authentication, or other alternatives that should be explored?	35d	08/18/22	10/05/22	124		
2.7.2.3.2	d5) Survey responses and data provided by ICANN's Global Support Center and Contractual Compliance Department indicate that registrants have expressed significant frustration with their inability to remove the 60-day lock. If the 60-day lock is retained, to what extent should there be a process or options to remove the 60-day lock?	35d	08/18/22	10/05/22	124		
2.7.2.3.3	d6) Due to requirements under privacy law, certain previously public fields, such as registrant name and email may be redacted by the registrar. Is there data to support the idea that the lack of public access to this information has reduced the risk of hijacking and has therefore obviated the need for the 60-day lock when underlying registrant information is changed?	35d	08/18/22	10/05/22	124		
2.7.2.3.4	d7) In its survey response, the Registrar Stakeholder Group indicated that the 60-day lock hinders corporate acquisitions, consolidations, and divestitures of large lists of domains to new legal entities. To what extent should this concern be taken into consideration in reviewing the 60-day lock?	35d	08/18/22	10/05/22	124		
2.7.2.3.5	d8) If the policy is retained, are there areas of the existing policy that require clarification? For example, based on complaints received by ICANN Contractual Compliance, the following areas of the policy may be appropriate to review and clarify: ○ There have been different interpretations of footnote 4 in the Transfer Policy, which states: "The Registrar may, but is not required to, impose restrictions on the removal of the lock described in Section II.C.2. For example, the Registrar will only remove the lock after five business days have passed, the lock removal must be authorized via the Prior Registrant's affirmative response to email, etc." Is the language in footnote 4 sufficiently clear as to whether registrars are permitted to remove the 60-day lock once imposed under the existing policy? If not, what revisions are needed? ○ Should additional clarification be provided in Section II.C.1.3, which addresses how the information about the lock must be provided in a clear and conspicuous manner? Does the policy contemplate enough warning for registrants concerning the 60-day lock where they are requesting a COR? ○ Should clarification be provided in Section II.C.2 that the option to opt-out is provided only to the Prior Registrant? For example, would the following revision be appropriate: "The Registrar must impose a 60-day inter-registrar transfer lock following a Change of Registrant, provided, however, that the Registrar may allow the Prior Registrant to opt out of the 60-day inter-registrar transfer lock prior to any Change of Registrant request."?	35d	08/18/22	10/05/22	124		
2.7.2.4	Develop draft work product	5d	08/18/22	08/24/22	124		
2.7.2.5	Conduct First Reading + verbal and email response	5d	08/25/22	08/31/22	131		
2.7.2.6	Conduct Second Reading + verbal response + adoption or discard	5d	09/01/22	09/07/22	132		
2.7.2.7	Confirm draft as stable	0	09/07/22	09/07/22	133		
2.7.3	Topic 9 Deliberations - Change of Registrant / Privacy/Proxy Customers	35d	10/06/22	11/23/22			
2.7.3.1	Understand topic and determine need to deliberate	5d	10/06/22	10/12/22	122		
2.7.3.2	Deliberate policy considerations and determine approach	5d	10/06/22	10/12/22	122		
2.7.3.3	Deliberate policy issues	30d	10/13/22	11/23/22			
2.7.3.3.1	d9) A Change of Registrant is defined as "a Material Change to any of the following: Prior Registrant name, Prior Registrant organization, Prior Registrant email address Administrative Contact email address, if there is no Prior Registrant email address." Registrars have taken the position that the addition or removal to a privacy/proxy service is not a Change of Registrant; however, there is not currently an explicit carve-out for changes resulting from the addition or removal of privacy/proxy services vs. other changes. To what extent should the Change of Registrant policy, and the 60-day lock, apply to underlying registrant data when the registrant uses a privacy/proxy service? o Registrars have identified a series of specific scenarios to consider in clarifying the application of COR policy requirements where the customer uses a privacy/proxy service. Are there additional scenarios that need to be considered that are not included in this list?	30d	10/13/22	11/23/22	137		
2.7.3.3.2	d10) Should the policy be the same regardless of whether the registrant uses a privacy service or a proxy service? If not, how should these be treated differently?	30d	10/13/22	11/23/22	137		
2.7.3.3.3	d11) Are notifications provided to privacy/proxy customers regarding COR and changes to the privacy/proxy service information sufficient? For example, should there be additional notifications or warnings given to a privacy/proxy customer if the privacy/proxy service regularly changes the privacy/proxy anonymized email address?	30d	10/13/22	11/23/22	137		
2.7.3.4	Develop draft work product	5d	10/13/22	10/19/22	137		
2.7.3.5	Conduct First Reading + verbal and email response	5d	10/20/22	10/26/22	142		
2.7.3.6	Conduct Second Reading + verbal response + adoption or discard	5d	10/27/22	11/02/22	143		
2.7.3.7	Confirm draft as stable	0	11/02/22	11/02/22	144		
2.7.4	Topic 10 Deliberations - Change of Registrant / Designated Agent	25d	11/24/22	12/28/22			
2.7.4.1	Understand topic and determine need to deliberate	5d	11/24/22	11/30/22	135		

WBS	Task Name	Current Duration	Current Start	Current Finish	Predecessors	% Complete	Status
2.7.4.2	Deliberate policy considerations and determine approach	5d	11/24/22	11/30/22	135		
2.7.4.3	Deliberate policy issues	20d	12/01/22	12/28/22			
2.7.4.3.1	d12) In its survey response, the Registrar Stakeholder Group indicated that, "There is. . . over-use of the Designated Agent, which has basically circumvented the policy." To what extent is this the case? What is the impact?	20d	12/01/22	12/28/22	148		
2.7.4.3.2	d13) If the Designated Agent function is not operating as intended, should it be retained and modified? Eliminated?	20d	12/01/22	12/28/22	148		
2.7.4.3.3	d14) Are there alternative means to meet the objectives of Designated Agent role?	20d	12/01/22	12/28/22	148		
2.7.4.3.4	d15) Based on complaints received by ICANN's Contractual Compliance Department, there appear to be different interpretations of the role and authority of the Designated Agent. If the Designated Agent function remains, should this flexibility be retained? Does the flexibility create the potential for abuse?	20d	12/01/22	12/28/22	148		
2.7.4.3.5	d16) If the role of the Designated Agent is to be clarified further, should it be narrowed with more specific instructions on when it is appropriate and how it is to be used? o Should the Designated Agent be given blanket authority to approve any and all CORs? Or should the authority be limited to specific COR requests? Does the authority to approve a COR also include the authority to request/initiate a COR without the Registered Name Holder requesting the COR?	20d	12/01/22	12/28/22	148		
2.7.4.4	Develop draft work product	5d	12/01/22	12/07/22	148		
2.7.4.5	Conduct First Reading + verbal and email response	5d	12/08/22	12/14/22	155		
2.7.4.6	Conduct Second Reading + verbal response + adoption or discard	5d	12/15/22	12/21/22	156		
2.7.4.7	Confirm draft as stable	0	12/21/22	12/21/22	157		
2.7.5	Topic 11 Deliberations - Change of Registrant / Additional Questions	20d	12/29/22	01/25/23			
2.7.5.1	Understand topic and determine need to deliberate	5d	12/29/22	01/04/23	146		
2.7.5.2	Deliberate policy considerations and determine approach	5d	12/29/22	01/04/23	146		
2.7.5.3	Deliberate policy issues	10d	01/05/23	01/18/23			
2.7.5.3.1	d17) The Registrar Stakeholder Group recommended the following in its survey response: "For a Change of Registrant, both the gaining and losing registrants should be notified of any requests, and should have the option accept or reject, over EPP notifications." Should this proposal be pursued further? Why or why not?	10d	01/05/23	01/18/23	161		
2.7.5.4	Develop draft work product	5d	01/05/23	01/11/23	161		
2.7.5.5	Conduct First Reading + verbal and email response	5d	01/12/23	01/18/23	164		
2.7.5.6	Conduct Second Reading + verbal response + adoption or discard	5d	01/19/23	01/25/23	165		
2.7.5.7	Confirm draft as stable	0	01/25/23	01/25/23	166		
2.7.6	Topic 12 Deliberations - Change of Registrant / Wave 1 - Recommendation 27	20d	01/26/23	02/22/23			
2.7.6.1	Understand topic and determine need to deliberate	5d	01/26/23	02/01/23	111, 122, 135, 146, 1		
2.7.6.2	Deliberate policy considerations and determine approach	5d	01/26/23	02/01/23	111, 122, 135, 146, 1		
2.7.6.3	Deliberate policy issues	10d	02/02/23	02/15/23			
2.7.6.3.1	e1) How should the identified issues be addressed?	5d	02/02/23	02/08/23	170		
2.7.6.3.2	e2) Can the Change of Registrant-related issue (identified in paragraph 6 of the Wave 1 report) be discussed and reviewed during the review of the Change of Registrant Process?	10d	02/02/23	02/15/23	170		
2.7.6.4	Develop draft work product	5d	02/02/23	02/08/23	170		
2.7.6.5	Conduct First Reading + verbal and email response	5d	02/09/23	02/15/23	174		
2.7.6.6	Conduct Second Reading + verbal response + adoption or discard	5d	02/16/23	02/22/23	175		
2.7.6.7	Confirm draft as stable	0	02/22/23	02/22/23	176		
2.7.7	Unplanned Issues & Tasks	0	06/15/22	06/15/22			
3	INITIAL REPORT	495d	06/24/21	05/17/23		1%	In Progress
3.1	Phase 1A Initial Report	290d	06/24/21	08/03/22		2%	In Progress
3.1.1	Populate stable drafts as required	230d	06/24/21	05/11/22	20	2%	In Progress
3.1.2	Discuss/approve findings and interim recommendations	10d	05/12/22	05/25/22	27, 40, 51, 60, 72, 83		
3.1.3	Consolidate interim recommendations and findings	10d	05/26/22	06/08/22	198		
3.1.4	Build Draft Report for public comment	10d	05/26/22	06/08/22	198		
3.1.5	Approve Draft Report for public comment	5d	06/09/22	06/15/22	200		
3.1.6	Publish Initial Report	0	06/15/22	06/15/22	201		
3.1.7	Communicate Initial Report	5d	06/16/22	06/22/22	201		
3.1.8	Public comment forum on the Initial Report (45 days)	35d	06/16/22	08/03/22	201		
3.2	Phase 1B Initial Report	240d	06/16/22	05/17/23			
3.2.1	Populate stable drafts as required	60d	06/16/22	09/07/22	202		
3.2.2	Discuss/approve findings and interim recommendations	10d	02/23/23	03/08/23	111, 122, 135, 146, 1		
3.2.3	Consolidate interim recommendations and findings	10d	03/09/23	03/22/23	207		
3.2.4	Build Draft Report for public comment	10d	03/09/23	03/22/23	207		
3.2.5	Approve Draft Report for public comment	5d	03/23/23	03/29/23	209		
3.2.6	Publish Initial Report	0	03/29/23	03/29/23	210		
3.2.7	Communicate Initial Report	5d	03/30/23	04/05/23	210		
3.2.8	Public comment forum on the Initial Report (45 days)	35d	03/30/23	05/17/23	210		
4	FINAL REPORT	270d	08/04/22	08/16/23			Not Started
4.1	Review of public comments - Phase 1A	30d	08/04/22	09/14/22	204		
4.2	Review of public comments - Phase 1B	30d	05/18/23	06/28/23	213		
4.3	Continue deliberations of policy topics towards a Final Report	50d	05/18/23	07/26/23	204, 213		
4.4	Build Final Report & Final Deliberations	5d	07/27/23	08/02/23	217		
4.5	Determine consensus levels on interim recommendations	10d	08/03/23	08/16/23	218		
4.6	Adopt final recommendations and report	10d	08/03/23	08/16/23	218		
4.7	Submission of Final Report to the GNSO Council	0	08/16/23	08/16/23	220		
5	POST GROUP TASKS	95d	08/17/23	12/27/23			Not Started