

RDS-WHOIS2 Review Team - Subgroup Report Gap Assessment Tool – Draft as of 12 July

Does this Subgroup’s Report	R1 Strat Priority	R2 Single Policy	R3 Out reach	R4 Comp	R5 Accur	R10 P/P	R11 Comm I/F	R12 IDN	R15 Plans & Reports	2 Any New	3 LE Need	4 Cons Trust	5 Safe Data
SUBSECTION 1 – TOPIC													
Clearly Identify Topic	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Link Topic to ToR Objective	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Identify Key Questions	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	u	✓	✓
SUBSECTION 2 – RESEARCH													
Summarize Research Sources	✓	m	✓	✓	m	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	u	✓
Summarize Methodology	✓	m	m	✓		m	✓	✓	m	m	u	m	✓
SUBSECTION 3 – ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS													
Summarize Important Findings	✓	u/m	✓	u	✓	✓	?	✓	✓	u		u	✓
Relate Findings to Key Questions	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	u			✓
Provide Analysis for Major Findings	✓	u/m	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	✓	✓	u			✓
SUBSECTION 4 – PROBLEM/ISSUE													
Clearly Identify Problems (if any)	✓	u	✓	u/m	u	✓	✓	?	u	u		u	✓
Link Problems to Analysis	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓						✓
Give Rationale for Problems	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓						✓
Identify Impacted Groups		m		?	✓								✓
SUBSECTION 5 – RECOMMENDATIONS (for each Recommendation, also see Recommendation Assessment Tool)													
Provide Clear Conclusion (e.g., Was Rec fully implemented? Is Board action recommended?)	✓	u/m	✓	u	u	u	✓	✓	u	u		u	✓
FOR RT TO ANSWER:													
Consensus (#agree:#disagree)													
Overall - Clear Enough?													
Overall - Concise Enough?													
Further Edits Needed?													

Key:

- ✓ Fully-addressed in Subgroup draft report, in designated Subsection
- m Fully-addressed but needs to be MOVED to designated Subsection
- u Addressed, but Subsection text is pending a planned update by Subgroup
- blank Not yet fully-addressed – Subgroup should expand draft report to fill identified gaps (see comments below)

Subgroup	Explanation of Identified Gaps (as of 12 July 2018)
Rec1 Strategic Priority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 5 lacks ‘problem statement’ flowing from identification of issues What specific, measurable outcome is envisioned for this Recommendation?
Rec2 Single Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft report to be updated to incorporate recent WHOIS policy changes (Temporary Spec and ePDP). Subsection 2: Extract concise list of materials from Subsection 3 & methodology from Subsection 4. Subsection 4 appears to present analysis, not state a problem or issue. Move analysis to Subsection 3, leaving concise list of problem(s) yet to be addressed in Subsection 4. Subsection 5’s “Recommendation” does not appear to be a recommendation to the Board. Flesh out Recommendation, or reframe as conclusion with no Recommendation? What specific, measurable outcome is envisioned for this Recommendation?
Rec3 Outreach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subsection 1: Move methodology to Subsection 2. Subsection 4: Would benefit from a structure such as: Bolded problem statement. Why it is a problem. Who does it affect. For example, Why is lack of outreach to non-ICANN audiences a problem? Who might benefit from outreach?
Rec4 Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft report to be updated to address ICANN62 feedback and further responses from ICANN Org Subsection 3 is still a work in progress but should become more concise Some Problems/Issues given in Subsection 3 need to be moved/summarized in Subsection 4 Flesh out all Recommendations, phrasing all as recommended actions with specific, measurable outcomes.
Rec5-9 Accuracy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft report to be updated to address ICANN62 feedback (aligned with Rec4 Compliance report) Subsection 1: A very brief summary of WHOIS1 Recs 5-9 would be helpful Subsection 2: Add methodology and specific list of research materials Subsections 3 and 4: Could be made more concise and clear. For example, cite data sources instead of copying in data tables, simplify lengthy sentences, delete template instructions. Subsection 5: Add conclusion specifically linking each identified Problem to any new recommendation(s)
Rec10 Privacy Proxy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft report to be updated to address ICANN62 and possibly Subgroup feedback Subsection 3: Move key questions and methodology to Subsections 1 & 2. Subsection 4: Would benefit from a structure such as: Bolded problem statement. Why it is a problem. Who it affects. It is unclear how Findings/Analysis led to the Issues listed in Subsection 4. Subsection 5 needs further explanation – for example, how can the WHOIS1 Recommendation be fully implemented if the PPSAI-defined policy has not yet been implemented?
Rec11 Common Interface	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subsection 3: Focuses on details about the common interface without first giving an overview of how the recommendation was implemented. Add a brief description of the microsite and how that addresses Rec 11. Subsection 3’s analysis needs to be more explicitly linked to the key questions listed in Subsection 1.

Rec12-14 IDN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Note: This draft’s Subsection numbering is inconsistent with the template • Subsection 2 (Topic) does not appear to define key questions that the Subgroup tried to answer • As such Subsection 4 (Findings/Analysis) cannot tie back to key questions • Subsection 5 (Problem/Issue) states a finding but does not really explain the problem caused by that finding. Expand to briefly state the problem, explain why it is a problem, and identify who is affected. • Recommendation in Subsection 6 needs to be fleshed out and made specific & measurable • To reduce length: Are the Appendices necessary to include in the Review Team’s report?
Rec15-16 Plans & Reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft report to be updated to address questions raised by Subgroup members • Subsection 1: Move methodology to Subsection 2. • Subsection 4: Problems do not appear to be linked to Subsection 3 Findings/Analysis. Instead of summarizing the problems identified by other subgroups, this Subsection needs to identify problems (if any) that result from the analysis presented in Subsection 3, leading to the Recommendation in Subsection 5. • Recommendation in Subsection 5 needs to be fleshed out and made specific & measurable.
Anything New	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft report to be updated to include material presented on ICANN62 slides for this Subgroup • Subsection 1: Contains methodology which should be moved to Subsection 2. • Subsection 3: Table needs to be updated to reflect ICANN62 slide. Center column and “main findings” list should be fleshed out to tie back to key questions currently listed in Subsection 1. • Subsection 4: Template text/action item to be replaced with text from ICANN62 slide • Subsection 5: Template text to be deleted and replaced with Subgroup’s overall conclusion
LE Needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft report to be updated with survey approach, goals, audience, questions subgroup wishes to answer • After survey ends, results (findings) and analysis to be added to Subgroup’s report
Consumer Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft report to be updated to address ICANN62 feedback (adding new materials & any associated findings) • Note: This draft’s Subsection numbering is inconsistent with the template • Subsection 4: Contains excerpts from documents (Findings) but little Analysis. Needs Analysis text to tie Findings back to key questions currently listed in Subsection 1. • Subsection 5 (Problem/Issue): Contains methodology which should be moved to Subsection 2. Needs more concise Problem statement for Reseller Transparency, tied back to Analysis. Currently, Findings and Analysis do not tie at all to the identified Problem/Issue. • Recommendation in Subsection 6 needs to be fleshed out and made specific & measurable. • To reduce length: Are all of the excerpts in Subsection 4 necessary to include in the Review Team’s report?
Safeguard Data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations in Subsection 5 need to be fleshed out and made specific & measurable. • Tighten up first part of “Recommendation” if possible – for example, by moving bracketed text