RDS PDP WG Draft Outline of a Phase 1 Work Plan prepared 29 February 2016

The following is a draft outline for a RDS PDP WG Work Plan for discussion by the WG. It is based primarily on the mind map and the charter. Once the PDP WG agrees on a final outline, it is assumed that staff would help us put it into a typical format that will maximize usefulness by the WG in managing WG activities and tracking progress. A few potential target dates are suggested for tasks occurring in the first few weeks; additional efforts will be needed to estimate additional time targets, understanding that the Work Plan will be a live document that will need to be updated on an ongoing basis to accommodate changes in WG progress.

Note that the eleven (11) questions in the charter are numbered 1 to 11 to simplify referencing them. Questions 1-5 correspond to mind map item 1.1 and questions 6-11 correspond to mind map item 1.2.

The following assumptions were made in creating the draft outline of a Phase 1 Work Plan:

- The bulk of our work will involve recommending requirements for registration directory services.
- Recognizing that the Board recommended that the EWG Final Report should be the starting point for this PDP and that EWG efforts, although not policy development, were very comprehensive with extensive and thorough consideration of public input, it is believed that the WG should first identify ***possible*** requirements from the EWG Final Report and then supplement those with ***possible*** requirements obtained from other key inputs identified by the Issue Report, community inputs, and WG members.
- After all possible requirements are gathered into a comprehensive and inclusive list, which is compiled without debate on the merits of each of the possible requirements, the WG should design a very systematic approach to maximize efficiency in discussing and attempting to reach consensus on requirements for registration directory services.
- To obtain input from other ICANN SOs, ACs and GNSO SG/Cs, the WG will seek feedback at several critical junctures throughout phase 1 using a variety of methods such as formal requests, informal requests and outreach via WG members to their respective groups. To start things off, a formal request for general comments to help inform the WG deliberations will be made shortly after the Marrakech meetings.
- Because of the interdependency of all eleven questions under which requirements may be grouped, at no point should the WG consider decisions final until it has considered requirements for all eleven areas. In other words, we need to understand as we proceed that all of our decisions may be revisited as we continue to get a fuller picture of the entire set of requirements.
- After reaching consensus on requirements related to questions 1-5, the WG should attempt to reach a consensus recommendation regarding whether a next-gen RDS is needed or (if not) that WHOIS can meet those needs. The remainder of the phase 1 work plan must

then be developed to reflect the recommendation reached (i.e., address questions 6-11 for a next-gen RDS or define how WHOIS can meet needs).

To create the work plan, a fairly comprehensive review of the EWG Final Report was done to identify ***possible*** requirements and categorize them into the eleven (11) charter questions to be considered (at minimum) by this PDP WG. The results of this work will be provided in a separate document. It is essential that the list of ***possible*** requirements be reviewed and edited by the full WG. The ultimate list of ***possible*** requirements that the WG produces will then guide the systematic process of developing consensus requirements for a registration directory services system. The possible requirements are organized as follows:

- ***Possible*** Foundational Questions that must be answered based on all other requirements.
- ***Possible*** General Requirements (GR) that may not map to any question identified in the charter.
- ***Possible*** Requirements that map to one or more of the eleven (11) questions in the charter. These are identified as follows: R1-1, R1-2, etc. for question 1; R2-1, R2-2, etc. for question 2; etc. Note that it is possible that the same requirement may address multiple questions.

Because the Work Plan involving requirements areas 6-11 is dependent on the requirements related to areas 1-5 and the answer as to whether a new RDS is recommended, the work plan below does not detail the deliberation on areas 6-11.

Draft Work Plan

#	Task	Subtask	Responsible Parties	Target Date	Completed
1	Approve leadership team members & structure		Full WG	16 Feb 16	16 Feb 16
2	Identify & attempt to fill membership gaps of expertise and stakeholder representation				
2.a		Form small team	Leadership Team	16 Feb 16	16 Feb 16
2.b		Review WG membership to identify possible gaps in expertise and stakeholder representation – finalize poll to gather input on existing WG areas of expertise	Small Team	1 Mar 16	

#	Task	Subtask	Responsible Parties	Target Date	Completed
2.c		Consider poll results and recommend outreach activities to try to fill identified membership gaps, if any	Small Team	7 Mar 16	
2.d		Review & edit/agree upon outreach activities, if deemed necessary	Full WG	9 Mar 16	
2.e		Begin implementation of outreach activities, if deemed necessary	Staff & leaders	14 Mar 16	
3	Approve regular weekly meeting schedule & times		Full WG	16 Feb 16	16 Feb 16
4	Review on-going library of background documents and key inputs enumerated in Issue Report and hyperlinked on WG wiki to identify missing inputs and tutorial/backgrounder needs		Full WG	Ongoing	
4.a		Review Charter, including Process Framework	Full WG	1 March 16	
4.b		Review Issue Report	Full WG	9 March 16	
4.c		Review Background Materials, including EWG Report and all key inputs enumerated in Issue Report and hyperlinked on WG wiki. Identify any further tutorial needs.	Full WG	Ongoing (see Task 8)	
4.d		Review additional key inputs as they are identified by the WG, SOs/ACs, etc., and added to the WG wiki Background Materials	Full WG	As the WG deliberates on each related question	
5	Review Rules of Engagement from Charter with an emphasis on the recommended method for discovering the consensus level designation on requirements		Full WG	1 Mar 16	

#	Task	Subtask	Responsible Parties	Target Date	Completed
6	Develop work plan				
6.a		Develop WG approach	Leadership Team	22 Feb 16	22 Feb 16
6.b		Review, comment and approve WG approach	Full WG	23 Feb 16	29 Feb 16
6.c		Develop draft work plan	Leadership Team	29 Feb 16	29 Feb 16
6.d		Begin review & comment on draft work plan	Full WG	1 Mar 16	
6.e		Approve final work plan	Full WG	9 Mar 16	
7	SO/AC Outreach #1 (formal)				
7.a		Develop draft SO/AC/SG/C outreach message	Leadership Team	29 Feb 16	
7.b		Review SO/AC/SG/C outreach message #1	Full WG	1 Mar 16	
7.c		Approve SO/AC/SG/C outreach message #1	Full WG	9 Mar 16	
7.d		Send SO/AC/SG/C outreach message #1, providing a minimum of 35 days to respond	Staff/Chair	15 Mar 16	
7.e		Begin to review & analyze SO/AC/SG/C #1 input by using comment review tool	Full WG	19 Apr 16	
7f.		Finalize comment review tool	Full WG		
8	Develop Initial Possible Requirements List, starting from Questions posed by Charter				
8.a		Develop Draft #1 of Initial Requirements List from EWG Final Report	Leadership Team	14 Mar 16	
8.b		Send Draft #1 to full WG for review & comment	Leadership Team	16 Mar 16	
8.c		Review & comment on Draft #1	Full WG	22 Mar 16	
8.d		Create Draft #2 of Initial Requirements List to include WG input & request WG members to suggest additional possible requirements to Draft #2	Staff	29 Mar 16	
8.e		Provide additional possible requirements for Draft #2	Full WG	5 Apr 16	
8.f		Incorporate additional possible requirements to create Draft #3	Staff	11 Apr16	

#	Task	Subtask	Responsible Parties	Target Date	Completed
8.e		Review & Comment on Draft #3 Initial Requirements List	Full WG	12 Apr 16	
8.f		Finalize Draft #3 Initial Requirements List	Staff	19 Apr 16	
9	SO/AC Outreach #2 (informal)				
9.a		Develop draft outreach message #2 (request comments on Draft #3)	Leadership Team		
9.b		Review & approve outreach message #2	Full WG		
9.c		Request additional possible requirements to Draft #3 of Initial Requirements List [via WG members &/or an informal request?]	Staff/Chair		
9.d		Review & analyze SO/AC Outreach #2 input	Full WG		
10	Finalize Possible Requirements List		Full WG		
11	Decide how to use the charter method for reaching consensus in our deliberation of ***possible*** requirements				
11.a		Decide how and when to determine consensus requirements recommendations	Full WG		
11.b		Decide how to apply the debating methodology contained in the charter for deliberating on all ***possible*** requirements, noting that the consensus development criteria will likely be less formal and more flexible as the WG deliberates on individual ***possible*** requirements than it will be when we finalize our recommendations at the end of Phase1 where a formal consensus call will be required as part of the Final Report.	Full WG		
11.c		Decide how to apply the EWG suggestion that "The RDS should be adopted as a whole." (p.6 of the EWG Final Report)	Full WG		

#	Task	Subtask	Responsible Parties	Target Date	Completed
12	Deliberate on ***possible*** fundamental requirements				
12b		Deliberate on Question 1 requirements (R1-1 etc.) **Users/Purposes:** Who should have access to gTLD registration data and why?	Full WG		
12c		Deliberate on Question 2 requirements (R2-1 etc.) **Gated Access:** What steps should be taken to control data access for each user/purpose?	Full WG		
12d		Deliberate on Question 3 requirements (R3-1 etc.) **Data Accuracy:** What steps should be taken to improve data accuracy?	Full WG		
12e		Deliberate on Question 4 requirements (R4-1 etc. **Data Elements:** What data should be collected, stored, and disclosed?	Full WG		
12f		Deliberate on Question 5 requirements (R5-1 etc. **Privacy:** What steps are needed to protect data and privacy?	Full WG		
12g		Deliberate on General Requirements (GR1 – GRx) including any additional foundational questions that apply to any registration directory service	Full WG		
12h		Deliberate on Fundamental Question: Is a new next-gen RDS needed or can the existing WHOIS system be modified to satisfy requirements for questions 1-5?	Full WG		
13	Expand Phase 1 Work Plan depending on the results of 12.h		Full WG		
14	SO/AC Outreach #3 (Request SO/AC feedback on results of above) [Formal or informal request?]		Full WG		

#	Task	Subtask	Responsible Parties	Target Date	Completed
15	Deliberation on Questions 6-11 (cross-cutting requirements that may apply to a Next-Gen RDS, depending upon the conclusion reached in Task 12h) –or- modifications necessary to WHOIS to meet requirements	• **Coexistence:** What steps should be taken to enable next-generation RDS coexistence with and replacement of the legacy WHOIS system? • **Compliance:** What steps are needed to enforce these policies? • **System Model:** What system requirements must be satisfied by any next-generation RDS implementation? • **Cost:** What costs will be incurred and how must they be covered? • **Benefits:** What benefits will be achieved and how will they be measured? • **Risks:** What risks do stakeholders face and how will they be reconciled?	Full WG		
16	Initial Report for Phase 1		Full WG		
17	Review and analyze input received on Initial Report through public comment review tool, identifying any revisions needed to draft WG recommendations		Full WG		
18	Final Report for Phase 1		Full WG		