EP-WG’s Proposed Framework for a PDP WG on Next-Generation RDS

This document proposes a framework for a PDP WG on Next-Generation Registration Directory Services (RDS).

This framework was developed by the EWG Process Working Group (EP-WG), a collaboration between the GNSO and Board formed to recommend how to best structure PDP(s) for success – that is, to propose a process which leads to new policies defining the appropriate purpose of gTLD registration data and improving accuracy, privacy and permissible access to that data.

To develop this framework, principles in the EWG’s Final Report on Next-Generation RDS were grouped and sequenced into a process flow consisting of:

Pre-PDP WG Steps
- Phase 1: Policy - Requirements Definition
- Phase 2: Policy – Functional Design
- Phase 3: Implementation Guidance

Post-WG Steps

Tasks to be completed BEFORE a PDP WG is formed
Policies that establish IF & WHY a Next-Gen RDS is needed
Policies that detail WHAT a Next-Gen RDS must do
Guidance on HOW a Next-Gen RDS should implement policy

Tasks to be completed AFTER the WG’s final report
We are at this stage of a board-initiated PDP. More specifically...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Completion Status</th>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2012</td>
<td>Board</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Direct preparation of a (PDP) Issue Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2012</td>
<td>Board</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Launch the EWG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2013</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>PDP - Preliminary Issue Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-Apr 2013</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Public Comment Forum (on above)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 2013</td>
<td>EWG</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>EWG Initial Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-Aug 2013</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Public Comment Forum, Consultations (on above)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2013</td>
<td>EWG</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>EWG Update Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-Feb 2014</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Public Comment Forum, Consultations (on above)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 2014</td>
<td>EWG</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>EWG Final Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-July 2015</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Public Comment Period on New Issue Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2015</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Final Issue Report reflecting Public Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-Oct 2015</td>
<td>GNSO Council</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Refine Charter for PDP Working Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GNSO Council</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Adopt Charter (start of PDP WG process)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pre-PDP WG Steps: What Comes Next


2. The EP-WG considered questions raised at ICANN-52 and incorporated clarifications to address them, finalizing this proposed framework for transmission to the GNSO Council and the ICANN Board.

3. The GNSO Council and the ICANN Board will discuss this proposed framework. The ICANN Board will review and re-confirm its request for this board-initiated PDP.

4. At the ICANN Board’s request, Staff will use EP-WG’s output to draft a new Preliminary Issue Report, including EP-WG’s proposed framework and a draft PDP WG charter that factors in EP-WG guidance.

5. EP-WG members will have an opportunity to preview the Preliminary Issue Report to ensure that the EP-WG’s framework has been reflected.

6. This new Preliminary Issue Report will be posted for a 40-day public comment period.

7. The EP-WG will reconvene as a group to review public comments and identify any needed changes to this proposed framework.

8. Staff will produce a Final Issue Report, reflecting both public comments and the EP-WG’s framework.

9. GNSO Council will consider the Final Issue Report and public comments. Council may, using its own methods, refine the report’s proposed framework and draft charter before adopting a charter and forming a PDP WG to address this issue.
Pre-PDP WG Steps: Inputs needed by the PDP WG

Inputs already available to inform the PDP include:
• EWG Final Report and FAQs, tutorials, & EWG member statements
• EWG Research on Accreditation, Validation, Privacy/Proxy, Costs, Risks & Benefits
• WHOIS Review Team Final Report
• GAC WHOIS Principles
• 2013 RAA Registration Data (WHOIS) Requirements
• WHOIS Studies on Accuracy, Registrant Identification, Misuse, P/P Abuse
• IETF RFCs on RDAP and EPP
• Data Protection/Privacy Issues Memo (ICANN Legal, Aug 2013)

The EP-WG recommends additional inputs be developed to inform the PDP:
• Community feedback on Preliminary Issue Report, including draft PDP WG charter
• GNSO PPSAI WG Final Report
• GNSO Translation/Transliteration Final Report
• Cost Impact Assessment on All Ecosystem Players*
• WHOIS & RDS Benefit Survey
• WHOIS & RDS Risk Survey

* Preliminary efforts to assess migration, deployment and operating cost impacts have shown that it is too early to quantify them in a meaningful way at this stage. Instead, these and other costs (such as development and testing) must be assessed during the PDP, as the PDP WG drafts specific policies upon which impact assessment must be based.
3-Phase PDP WG Process: Introduction

This framework proposes a 3-phase process for the PDP WG to organize its work:

Phase 1: Policy - Requirements Definition  Define IF & WHY a Next-Gen RDS is needed
Phase 2: Policy – Functional Design  Detail WHAT a Next-Gen RDS should do
Phase 3: Implementation & Coexistence Guidance  Consider HOW a Next-Gen RDS should implement policy

Within each phase, work is grouped into areas, drawing from principles covered by the EWG’s Final Report:

- Users/Purposes: Who should have access to gTLD registration data
- Gated Access: What steps should be taken to control data access for each user/purpose
- Data Accuracy: What steps should be taken to improve accuracy
- Data Elements: What data should be collected, stored, and disclosed
- Privacy: What steps are needed to protect data and privacy
- Coexistence: What steps should be taken to enable WHOIS/Next-Gen RDS coexistence
- Compliance: What steps are needed to enforce policies
- System Model: What system requirements must be satisfied by any implementation
- Cost: What costs will be incurred and how must they be covered
- Benefit Analysis: What benefits will be achieved and how will they be measured
- Risk Assessment: What risks do stakeholders face and how will they be reconciled

Each of these areas and associated issues should be defined in the Preliminary Issue Report and PDP WG inputs. As depicted on the following chart, these groups have been time-sequenced to accommodate inter-dependencies and create opportunities for parallel policy development, subject to resource availability.

For example, due to inter-dependencies, all areas labeled A must be considered before work can commence on the area labeled B. Only after B has been considered can work commence on areas labeled C. And so on.
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3-Phase PDP WG Process: Phase Definitions and Examples

Phase 1
The PDP WG examines all requirements for registration directory services at a high level. Due to interdependencies, all areas must be considered together, by a single team. For example, the PDP WG will consider whether gTLD registration data should continue to be accessible for any purpose, or whether data should be accessible only for specific purposes. If the PDP WG decides the latter, it should recommend permissible users and purposes. The output of Phase 1 is therefore a set of fundamental requirements for registration data and a determination of if these requirements are met by WHOIS or should instead be met by a Next-Gen RDS.

The GNSO Council will review Phase 1 outputs before deciding if/how to proceed.

GNSO Council Decision Point (see page 12)

Phase 2
The PDP WG designs detailed policies to satisfy requirements established in Phase 1. For example, the PDP WG might define data elements accessible for each permissible user and purpose. Opportunities for parallel Phase 2 policy design have been identified, sequenced to reflect inter-dependencies. For example, policies labeled B must be drafted before policies labeled C can start, but policies in group C could potentially be drafted in parallel by PDP WG subteams, given sufficient resources and coordination. The GNSO Council will periodically review Phase 2 work-in-progress to identify gaps or inconsistencies and ensure alignment with Phase 1 requirements.

Phase 3
The PDP WG dives more deeply into each policy group to create implementation and coexistence guidance. For example, in Phase 3a), the PDP WG might explore possible Terms of Service for permissible users and purposes and identify challenges that must be overcome. In Phase 3b), the PDP WG might detail WHOIS and Next-Gen RDS data access coexistence. Details explored in Phase 3 may require refinement of certain Phase 2 policies; these must be carefully coordinated to manage inter-dependencies.

Public Comment on PDP WG Draft Report
Final PDP WG Report

GNSO Council Decision Point (see page 12)
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Pre-WG Steps: Issue Report & Input Development

Phase 1: Policy - Requirements
- EWG Principles Sect 3
- Use Cases (Annex C)
- GAC WHOIS Principles
- WHOIS RT Report
- Permissible Users
- Permissible Purposes
- Guiding Principles

Users/Purposes Requirements

Phase 2: Policy - Functional Design
- Data per Purpose
- Update Process
- Accreditation Policy
- Per User Community

Users/Purposes Design

Phase 3: Implementation & Coexistence Guidance
- Accreditor Criteria
- Terms of Service Needs

Users/Purposes Guidance on

Users/Purposes

Gated (Differentiated) Access
- EWG Principles Sect 4bc
- Access Examples (Annex E)
- RDS User Accreditation RFI
- WHOIS Misuse Study
- Levels of Access
- Criteria for each Level
- LE Access Principles
- Authorized Levels
- Credentialing Policy
- Anti-Abuse Policy

Gated Access Requirements

Gated Access Design

Gated Access Guidance on

Gated Access

Data Accuracy
- EWG Principles Sect 5
- Validation Service RFI
- ccTLD Validation Survey
- WHOIS Accuracy Studies
- Accuracy Principles
- Contact Data
- Validation Needs
- Validation Levels
- Contact Management
- Remediation Policy

Data Accuracy Requirements

Data Accuracy Design

Data Accuracy Guidance on

Data Accuracy

Data Elements
- EWG Principles Sect 4a
- Data Needs (Annex D)
- 2013 RAA WHOIS record
- WHOIS RegID Study
- Data Collection Needs
- Data Access Needs
- Guiding Principles
- RR/Ry Data Elements
- Registrant Data Elements
- PBC Data Elements
- Update Process

Data Element Requirements

Data Element Design

Data Element Guidance on

Data Elements

Privacy
- EWG Principles Sect 6&7
- P/P Provider Survey
- WHOIS P/P Abuse Study
- Data Protect/Privacy Memo
- GNSO PPSAI WG Report
- Privacy/Proxy Needs
- At-Risk Reg Needs
- Data Protection Laws
- Overarching DP Policy
- DP Law Compliance
- Privacy/Proxy Policies
- Secure Protected Creds

Privacy Requirements

Privacy Design

Privacy Guidance on

Privacy

Input to PDP WG

Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group

Output of PDP WG
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coexistence</td>
<td>Coexistence Reqs</td>
<td>Coexistence Design</td>
<td>Coexistence Guidance on</td>
<td>Incremental Test/Adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coexistence Needs</td>
<td>- Policies to address</td>
<td>- Transition Plan for each Area</td>
<td>- Transition Plan for each Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(incl. Time Period, Phased Transition Plan)</td>
<td>Coexistence Needs Per Stakeholder</td>
<td>(e.g., Access, Accuracy, Privacy)</td>
<td>(e.g., Access, Accuracy, Privacy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2013 RAA Compliance</td>
<td>Anti-Abuse Deterrents,</td>
<td>Per Ecosystem Player</td>
<td>- New Contract Needs</td>
<td>- Testing Needs to demonstrate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auditing, Enforcement</td>
<td>(e.g., RDS Operator, Requestors, Validators)</td>
<td>that requirements are met</td>
<td>that requirements are met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Model</td>
<td>System Model Reqs</td>
<td>System Model Design</td>
<td>System Model Guidance on</td>
<td>RDS Operator Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- EPP and RDAP RFCs</td>
<td>Storage Reqs</td>
<td>(Entities &amp; Interfaces)</td>
<td>- Protocol Extension Needs</td>
<td>- Testing Needs to demonstrate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Translation WG Report</td>
<td>- Performance, Scalability,</td>
<td>- Performance, Scalability,</td>
<td>- Testing Needs to demonstrate</td>
<td>that requirements are met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stability and Security Reqs</td>
<td>Stability, Security Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Internationalization Reqs</td>
<td>- Internationalization Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Updates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Model</td>
<td>Cost Model Reqs</td>
<td>Cost Model Design</td>
<td>Cost Model Guidance on</td>
<td>Ballpark Cost #s for entire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- EWG Principles Sect 9</td>
<td>- List of Expenses</td>
<td>- Management &amp; Allocation of Costs</td>
<td>- Ecosystem, based on Model Design, covering full lifecycle (dev, test, migration, operation)</td>
<td>Ecosystem, based on Model Design, covering full lifecycle (dev, test, migration, operation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- IBM RDS Cost Analysis</td>
<td>- List of Income Sources</td>
<td>- Recovery Model (e.g., fees)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cost Impact Assessment on all Ecosystem Players</td>
<td>- Cost Drivers &amp; Principles on Goals/Metrics/Mitigation</td>
<td>- Cost Tracking Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- on Goals/Metrics/Mitigation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit Analysis</td>
<td>Benefit Analysis Reqs</td>
<td>Benefit Analysis Design</td>
<td>Benefit Analysis Guidance on</td>
<td>Benefit Modeling, Metrics &amp; Benchmarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- EWG Risk Survey (Initial)</td>
<td>- Guiding Principles on</td>
<td>- Benefit Tracking Policies</td>
<td>- Benefit Analysis Guidance on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- WHOIS &amp; RDS Benefit Survey</td>
<td>Benefit Goals/Metrics</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Benefit Modeling, Metrics &amp; Benchmarks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Assessment</td>
<td>Risk Assess Reqs</td>
<td>Risk Assess Design</td>
<td>Risk Assess Guidance on</td>
<td>Possible measures to accept, mitigate, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- EWG Risk Survey (Initial)</td>
<td>- Guiding Principles to</td>
<td>- Identify Risks</td>
<td>- Risk Assess Guidance on</td>
<td>transfer risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- WHOIS &amp; RDS Risk Survey</td>
<td>reconcile Risks, Impacts,</td>
<td>- Assess Impacts</td>
<td>- Possible measures to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td>accept, mitigate, and transfer risks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Input to PDP WG**

**Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group**

**Output of PDP WG**
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3-Phase PDP WG Process: Further Recommendations

Oversight
To ensure alignment with Phase 1 requirements, oversight should be provided by a coordination team composed of (for example) the PDP WG chair, subchairs for each PDP WG subteam, and one or more GNSO Council Liaison(s).

Timeline
To foster sustained progress and timely completion, the PDP WG should work towards a defined timeline and targets (e.g., complete Phase 1 in 90 days). At this time, it is not known how long each phase will take.

Methodology
To facilitate productive dialog, the PDP WG should hold periodic face-to-face conferences -- for example, meeting face-to-face in subteam sessions schedule over 1-2 days, followed by a plenary meeting for cross-team discussion. The methodology used by the PDP WG must be transparent, consistent with the GNSO Policy Development Process, and take into consideration capacity to ensure adequate resourcing from all stakeholders.

Parallelism
The EP-WG recommends a single PDP WG team address all policy areas simultaneously during Phase 1. If the GNSO chooses, parallel subteams may be used during Phases 2-3 to address policy areas concurrently, in a sequenced manner, given sufficient resources and coordination. Especially during Phase 3, external experts may be called upon to help the PDP WG complete research in selected areas (e.g., data protection laws, risk assessment, cost impact analysis).
At each decision point, the GNSO Council may decide that sufficient progress has been made to move to the next phase, that questions still need to be more fully addressed before moving to the next phase, or that the PDP WG has accomplished its charter.

A set of questions must be defined in advance to guide the GNSO Council at each decision point. Questions may touch on key goals/concerns and how well they have been addressed by the PDP WG. For example:

Has the WG addressed all questions posed in the November 2012 Board Resolution that initiated this PDP, including:

- Why are gTLD registration data collected?
- What purpose will the data serve?
- Who collects the data?
- What value does the public realize with access to registration data?
- Of all the registration data available, which does the public need access to?
- Is the WHOIS protocol the best choice for providing that access?
- What safeguards are provided to protect the data?

Has the WG made suitable progress in this phase towards:

- Establishing a compelling business case for a Next-Gen RDS to meet defined needs for registration data?
- Establishing a coexistence plan enabling phased transition over a defined period of time?
- Creating a viable approach to moving from WHOIS anonymous access to RDS gated access?
- Ensuring scalability, stability and security of the Next-Gen RDS?
- Measuring the effectiveness of the Next-Gen RDS in reaching stated goals?
- Seeking buy-in from all impacted parties, including ecosystem players, consumers & standards bodies?

The above list is not exhaustive; it is provided as a starting point for the GNSO Council to refine.

The EP-WG will continue to consider guidance on GNSO Council Decision Points and may further refine the above suggested list, following public comment on the PDP Issue Report.
ICANN Board adopts GNSO Policy Recommendations and ‘the Board shall, as appropriate, give authorization or direction to ICANN staff to work with the GNSO Council to create an implementation plan based upon the implementation recommendations identified in the Final Report, and to implement the policy.’

ICANN Staff forms internal implementation team to co-ordinate hand-over from policy to services team and starts development of proposed implementation project plan (timing/steps)

ICANN Staff shares proposed implementation project plan with Implementation Review Team

IRT interfaces with the Council, as necessary

* See GDD Consensus Policies Implementation Framework for further details on each phase

Examples of Implementation Guidance
- Validator Criteria
- New Contract Needs

Examples of Implementation Efforts
- Vendor Solicitation/Selection
- Vendor Contracting