RDS PDP WG Leadership Team Recommended Work Plan Approach 23 February 2016

For full WG consideration, the RDS PDP WG leadership team prepared the following draft approach to planning Phase 1 WG activities. Discussion of this approach will be a key agenda item for the WG meeting scheduled for Wednesday, 24 February (Tuesday, 23 February for some). Our objectives in the meeting will be to provide an overview of the approach, answer questions, receive feedback and hopefully obtain support for a work approach that can be applied in developing a WG Work Plan as required by the charter.

Assumptions

- The bulk of our work in Phase 1 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 seems reasonable for the WG to 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, **without debate**, we should design a very systematic approach to maximize efficiency in discussion and attempting to reach consensus on requirements for registration directory services.
- To obtain input from SO/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 we consider our decisions final until we have 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) whether existing WHOIS can be modified to 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).

Outline of Approach for Phase 1

1. Review Section IV – Rules of Engagement of the PDP WG Charter
2. Develop a comprehensive list of *possible* requirements for registration directory services without debate (Note that thorough debate will happen in step 4.)

a. Identity all possible requirements in the EWG Final Report
      i. The leadership team will prepare Draft #1 for consideration by the full WG.
      ii. The full WG will review and provide input to create Draft #2.
   b. Identify possible requirements from sources other than the EWG Final Report
      i. The full WG will suggest additional possible requirements that will be added to Draft #2 to create Draft #3.
      ii. Either through a direct request or indirectly via WG members, SOs and ACs will be asked to suggest possible requirements not included in Draft #3.
      iii. SO and AC input will be incorporated into Draft #3 to create Draft #4.
3. Develop a WG methodology for systematically debating all of the requirements in Draft #4.
   a. Decide how and when to determine consensus requirements recommendations
   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 Phase 1 Final Report.
   c. Decide how to apply the EWG suggestion that "The RDS should be adopted as a whole." (p.6 of the EWG Final Report)
4. Deliberate on *possible* requirements for questions 1-5.
   a. Discuss, modify and determine level of agreement on *possible* requirements for questions 1-5, realizing that deliberation on some *possible* requirements may be deferred to later on in the process such as for questions 6-11 or Phases 2 or 3.
   b. Discuss, modify and determine level of agreement on *possible* requirements for any other Fundamental Requirements, i.e., requirements that are expected of any registration directory service but may not be associated directly with first five questions or that may apply multiple questions or new questions
5. Deliberate on the following foundational question posed by the WG Charter: Is a new registration directory services system needed or can the existing Whois system be modified to satisfy the recommended requirements for questions 1-5?
   a. Develop a recommendation of a WG answer to this question including the level of consensus and rationale
   b. SOs and ACs will be asked to comment on the requirements recommended for questions 1-5 as well as the results of item 4.a, formally or informally (to be decided by the WG).
6. Expand Phase 1 Work Plan depending on the results of step 5.
7. Deliberation on questions 6-11.
8. Initial Report for Phase 1.
9. Review and take into consideration public comments received on Initial Report for Phase 1.
10. Identify any revisions needed to draft WG recommendations and then publish Final Report for Phase 1.