Possible approach to consensus in deliberation of possible requirements for RDS PDP WG

1. Review Charter Section IV, Rules of Engagement; the leadership team recommends the following regarding determining consensus on possible requirements:
    a. Plan on producing at least two Initial Reports for Phase 1:
        i. After initial deliberation on the first five charter questions (Work Plan steps 12.a, 12.b, 12.c), the General Requirements (Work Plan step 12.d) and the Fundamental Question (Work Plan step 12.e – "Is a new next-gen RDS needed or can the existing WHOIS system be modified to satisfy requirements for questions 1-5?")
            - Note that this would entail adding step 12.f to the Work Plan, i.e., First Initial Report for Phase 1.
        ii. At the end of Phase 1 (Work Plan steps 13-16)
            - Note that Work Plan step 17 would be changed to "Second Initial Report for Phase 1".
    b. Forego formally determining consensus on individual possible requirements according to the charter until after public comment is received and analyzed on the first Initial Report.
        i. In the interim we should try to reach rough consensus on possible requirements and communicate that in the first Initial Report.
        ii. In cases where that is not possible, describe the level of agreement and/or disagreement in the first Initial Report sufficiently enough to allow for public input to help guide the consensus process.
            - For example: 'supported by all', 'supported by most', 'supported by many but also objected to by many' but make clear that a formal consensus call will only take place after the review of comments on the first Initial Report.
    c. Analyze and respond to public comments using the public comment tool.
    d. Taking into consideration the public comment input, formally determine consensus on the possible requirements for the first five questions using the procedures contained in Charter Section IV.
2. Take the following steps to refine the possible requirements list for all eleven charter questions:
    a. Triage list of possible requirements to ensure they are in the correct phase and modify the list accordingly so that applicable possible requirements that should be considered for phases 2 & 3 are listed as placeholders for those phases
        i. This is in response to Greg Aaron's comments.
        ii. Staff and/or the leadership team could take a first crack at this for review and approval by the WG.
            - Do WG members support this?
            - If not, what other ideas are there for accomplishing this task?

b. Identify similarities and interdependencies of possible requirements, group them according to similarities and order them so that any prerequisite steps are covered before dependent ones.

    i. Staff and/or the leadership team could take a first cut at identifying similar/related requirements and grouping them for review and approval by the WG.

        - Do WG members support this?
        - If not, what other ideas are there for accomplishing this task?

    ii. After requirements are arranged into similar/related groups, the WG should identify dependencies and order them accordingly.

    iii. Other ideas?

c. Other steps?

3. Decide where to start deliberation

a. The Work Plan is designed to start with the purpose/privacy/data element questions but we need to decide how to do that; here are a couple of approaches to consider:

    i. Using the prioritized requirements from step 3.b above, randomly order the three question areas and deliberate on the highest possible requirement from each area sequentially; repeat that process, rotating the three areas each round.

    ii. Based on some recent discussions on the WG list, there seems to be some basis for considering the purpose requirements first or least some of them; if that is true, then we could start with some or all of the purpose requirements; is there a small group of possible purpose requirements that we could start with and then do the rotational approach?

    iii. Consider use cases as possible approach to consider privacy, data elements, and purpose simultaneously, in the context of scenarios that reflect how registration data is/should be used.

b. Other ideas?