



Overview of the GNSO/Board Process Framework for a PDP WG on Next-Generation gTLD RDS (March 2016)

Who created the process framework?

- In 2012, the ICANN Board requested a GNSO PDP on Next-Generation gTLD Registration Directory Services (RDS)
- ⊙ In late 2014, after the EWG submitted its findings to ICANN's CEO, members of the GNSO Council and the ICANN Board convened to recommend next steps and how to structure this PDP for success
- A suggested process framework for this PDP was published in April 2015, adopted by the Board in May, and used as input to this PDP WG's charter, adopted by the GNSO council in November

Board Members

- Cherine Chalaby
- Steve Crocker
- Chris Disspain
- Ram Mohan
- Ray Plzak
- Bruce Tonkin



GNSO Members

- James Bladel, RrSG
- Don Blumenthal, RySG
- Ching Chiao, RySG
- Avri Doria, NCSG
- Susan Kawaguchi, BC
- Dan Reed, Nom Com Appointee
- Jonathan Robinson, GNSO Chair



What does the framework suggest?

- The framework suggests a phased PDP WG approach: <u>https://community.icann.org/display/gTLDRDS/Process+Framework</u>
- The framework groups and sequences a series of 11 questions that the PDP WG should address when attempting to reach consensus
 - ⊙ Phase 1: Policy Requirements Definition (IF & WHY)
 - Phase 2: Policy Functional Design
 - Phase 3: Implementation Guidance
- (WHAT) (HOW)
- Pre-WG steps already completed: New Issue Report (included key inputs and draft PDP WG charter); Public Comment; Final Issue Report; GNSO Council consideration; PDP WG formation
- Post-WG steps: GNSO Council and Board Approval of WG's final report; IRT formation; implementation, informed by guidance



What questions did the framework identify?

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.

Included in the Issue Report and WG Charter as a *minimum* set of questions to be addressed by the PDP WG.







This framework was reflected in the WG's charter as a starting point to guide the WG as it develops a work plan for this PDP. Questions?







Why are there three phases?

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.

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

3-Phase PDP WG Process: Detailed Descriptions, Slide 1 of 2

Pre-WG Steps: Issue Report & Input Development	Phase 1: Policy - Requirements	Phase 2: Policy - Functional Design	Phase 3: Implementation & Coexistence Guidance	Post-WG Steps: Approvals IRT Formation Implementation
Users/Purposes - EWG Principles Sect 3 - Use Cases (Annex C) - GAC WHOIS Principles - WHOIS RT Report	<u>Users/Purposes Reqs</u> - Permissible Users - Permissible Purposes - Guiding Principles	<u>Users/Purposes Design</u> - Data per Purpose - Update Process - Accreditation Policy Per User Community	<u>Users/Purposes Guidance on</u> - Accreditor Criteria - Terms of Service Needs	These further details were
Gated (Differentiated) Access - EWG Principles Sect 4bc - Access Examples (Annex E) - RDS User Accreditation RFI - WHOIS Misuse Study	<u>Gated Access Reqs</u> - Levels of Access (e.g., Public/Gated) - Criteria for each Level - LE Access Principles	<u>Gated Access Design</u> - Authorized Levels Per User/Purpose - Credentialing Policy - Anti-Abuse Policy	Gated Access Guidance on - Access Protocol Needs - Authentication Needs - Credential Admin Needs - Training Needs	expanded upon in the Issue Report. All inputs <i>(at left)</i> have been linked to the WG's wiki.
Data Accuracy - EWG Principles Sect 5 - Validation Service RFI - ccTLD Validation Survey - WHOIS Accuracy Studies	Data Accuracy Reqs - Accuracy Principles - Contact Data Validation Needs	<u>Data Accuracy Design</u> - Validation Levels - Contact Management - Remediation Policy	Data Accuracy Guidance on - Validator Criteria - Contact Auth Needs - Interface Needs (RDS/Validator/RR/Ry)	
Data Elements - EWG Principles Sect 4a - Data Needs (Annex D) - 2013 RAA WHOIS record - WHOIS RegID Study	<u>Data Element Reqs</u> - Data Collection Needs - Data Access Needs - Guiding Principles	<u>Data Element Design</u> - RR/Ry Data Elements - Registrant Data Elements - PBC Data Elements - Update Process	Data Element Guidance on - EPP/RDAP Mapping Needs - WHOIS Data Migration Needs	These questions were also copied into
Privacy - EWG Principles Sect 6&7 - P/P Provider Survey - WHOIS P/P Abuse Study - Data Protect/Privacy Memo - GNSO PPSAI WG Report	<u>Privacy Reqs</u> - Privacy/Proxy Needs - At-Risk Reg Needs - Data Protection Laws	Privacy Design - Overarching DP Policy - DP Law Compliance - Privacy/Proxy Policies - Secure Protected Creds	Privacy Guidance on - RDS Privacy Policy Needs - Detailed Legal Analysis - P/P Accreditation Needs - SPC Provider Criteria	a starting point for the WG's work plan.

Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group

Output of PDP WG

3-Phase PDP WG Process: Detailed Descriptions, Slide 2 of 2

Pre-WG Steps: Issue Report & Input Development	Phase 1: Policy - Requirements	Phase 2: Policy - Functional Design	Phase 3: Implementation & Coexistence Guidance	Post-WG Steps: Approvals IRT Formation Implementation
<u>Coexistence</u> <u>Compliance</u> - EWG Principles Sect 6cd - 2013 RAA Compliance	<u>Coexistence Reqs</u> - Coexistence Needs (incl. Time Period, Phased Transition Plan) <u>Compliance Reqs</u> - Guiding Principles for Anti-Abuse Deterrents, Auditing, Enforcement - Establish Goals/Metrics	<u>Coexistence Design</u> - Policies to address Coexistence Needs Per Stakeholder <u>Compliance Design</u> - Compliance Policy Per Ecosystem Player (e.g., RDS Operator, Requestors, Validators)	Coexistence Guidance on - Incremental Test/Adoption - Transition Plan for each Area (e.g., Access, Accuracy, Privacy) Compliance Guidance on - Contract Ammend. Needs (RAA and Registry) - New Contract Needs - Compliance Benchmarks	In the draft work plan, these cross-cutting questions are only addressed
System Model - EWG Principles Sect 8 - EPP and RDAP RFCs - Translation WG Report	<u>System Model Reqs</u> - Collection, Access, and Storage Reqs - Performance, Scalability, Stability and Security Reqs - Internationalization Reqs	<u>System Model Design</u> - Systems Architecture (Entities & Interfaces) - Performance, Scalability, Stability, Security Policies - Internationalization Policy Updates	System Model Guidance on - RDS Operator Criteria - Implementation Needs - Protocol Extension Needs - Testing Needs to demonstrate that requirements are met	if the WG decides that a Next-Gen RDS may be needed to meet fundamental requirements
<u>Cost Model</u> - EWG Principles Sect 9 - IBM RDS Cost Analysis - Cost Impact Assessment on all Ecosystem Players	<u>Cost Model Reqs</u> - List of Expenses - List of Income Sources - Cost Drivers & Principles on Goals/Metrics/Mitigation	<u>Cost Model Design</u> - Management & Allocation of Costs - Recovery Model (e.g., fees - Cost Tracking Policies	Cost Model Guidance on - Ballpark Cost #s for entire Ecosystem, based on Model) Design, covering full lifecycle (dev, test, migration, operation)	
<u>Benefit Analysis</u> - EWG Risk Survey (Initial) - WHOIS & RDS Benefit Survey	<u>Benefit Analysis Reqs</u> - Guiding Principles on Benefit Goals/Metrics	<u>Benefit Analysis Design</u> - Benefit Tracking Policies	Benefit Analysis Guidance on - Benefit Modeling, Metrics & Benchmarks	
<u>Risk Assessment</u> - EWG Risk Survey (Initial) - WHOIS & RDS Risk Survey	<u>Risk Assess Reqs</u> - Guiding Principles to reconcile Risks, Impacts, and Benefits	<u>Risk Assess Design</u> - Identify Risks - Assess Impacts	Risk Assess Guidance on - Possible measures to accept, mitigate, and transfer risks	

Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group

What else did the framework suggest?

- ⊙ Oversight
 - At each decision point, the GNSO Council may define a set of questions to decide whether sufficient progress has been made to move to the next phase
 - GNSO Council should approve Phase 1 outputs before the PDP WG proceeds to Phase 2
 - Oversight should be provided during Phases 2-3 to ensure continuing alignment with Phase 1 requirements
- ⊙ Timeline
 - To foster sustained progress and timely completion, the WG should work towards a defined timeline and targets
 - During Phase 1, a single PDP WG team should address all policy areas simultaneously
 - Phases 2-3 contain opportunities for parallel progress, sequenced for inter-dependencies, subject to resourcing

