The Next Generation Registration Directory Service (RDS) PDP Working Group has been tasked with defining the policies associated with an improved RDS that will meet the (domain name) needs of the existing global Internet and accommodate changes already anticipated, should it be determined that a new RDS is required. "analyzing the purpose of collecting, maintaining and providing access to gTLD registration data and considering safeguards for protecting that data, determining if and why a next-generation Registration Directory Service (RDS) is needed to replace WHOIS, and creating policies and coexistence and implementation guidance to meet those needs."[‡]

> **Comment [CG1]:** I am curious why you deleted the direct quote from our charter and replaced it with previous wording. It seems pretty safe and accurate to quote our charter.

The core problem that will need to be solved in defining this policy will be resolving the tension among the varied and competing views of stakeholders on key issues while accounting for rules, regulations, and laws that vary widely from region to region.

> **Comment [CG2]:** What policy? I personally don't think this is needed.

Consumers, the domain name industry, governments, and law enforcement bodies, intellectual property owners, security practitioners, registrants, end-users, and other stakeholders all claim to have vested interests in an RDS system that contains accurate and complete registration data, and which is secure, resilient, accessible, auditable, and performs wellof sufficient performance. These stakeholders have varying requirements regarding the particular data that should be collected and the conditions under which it should be viewed. For example, there are some registrants entities (entities which may be individuals, organizations, companies, or belonging to other groups altogether) who desire anonymity or pseudonymity and their requirements regarding data collection and data access may be at odds with those of other stakeholders. Members of the global population of end-users, whether they are individuals, organizations, companies, or other groups, may fall into either camp depending on circumstances.

> **Comment [CG3]:** Several working group members have expressed concern on the list in our call earlier this week about adding this so I don't think you took that into consideration especially considering you are the one that originally proposed it.

> **Comment [CG4]:** This seems like an insignificant change. Am I missing something?

> **Comment [CG5]:** 'Registrant' is a very well defined term that needs no qualification. And it is registrants whose information is at stake. Not sure why you changed it.

> **Comment [GA6]:** TBD: What are the two camps being referred to? Unclear what this sentence means.

> **Comment [CG7]:** Deleting this sentence is one way of dealing with the question Greg asked.

In order to support various stakeholders within the RDS fairly and pragmatically, with their varied priorities, requires the Working Group to review the purpose of the RDS that supports it. This understanding will enable the Working Group to satisfy its charter.

Note that this problem statement is meant as a tool to aid in discussion, consistent with but not a constraint on the Working Group and its Charter.

[‡] Charter: https://gnso.icann.org/en/drafts/whois-ng-gtld-rds-charter-07oct15-en.pdf