**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](https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/58721474/Next-Gen%20gTLD%20RDS%20to%20replace%20WHOIS%20PDP%20%283%29.pdf) and the [charter](https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/56986643/whois-ng-gtld-rds-charter-07oct15-en.pdf). 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 |  |
| 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](http://whois.icann.org/sites/default/files/files/final-issue-report-next-generation-rds-07oct15-en.pdf) and hyperlinked on [WG wiki](https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=56986688) to identify missing inputs and tutorial/backgrounder needs |  | Full WG | Ongoing |  |
| 4.a |  | Review [Charter](https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/56986643/whois-ng-gtld-rds-charter-07oct15-en.pdf), including [Process Framework](https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/56986648/next-generation-rds-framework-26apr15-en.pdf) | Full WG | 1 March 16 |  |
| 4.b |  | Review [Issue Report](http://whois.icann.org/sites/default/files/files/final-issue-report-next-generation-rds-07oct15-en.pdf) | Full WG | 9 March 16 |  |
| 4.c |  | Review [Background Materials](https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=56986688), including EWG Report and all key inputs enumerated in [Issue Report](http://whois.icann.org/sites/default/files/files/final-issue-report-next-generation-rds-07oct15-en.pdf) and hyperlinked on [WG wiki](https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=56986688). 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](https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=56986688) | 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 discoveringthe consensus level designation onrequirements |  | Full WG | 1 Mar 16 |  |
| 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](https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/56986643/whois-ng-gtld-rds-charter-07oct15-en.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1450118337000&api=v2)  |  |  |  |  |
| 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 |  |
| 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 |  |  |
| 12 | Deliberate on ***possible*** fundamental requirements |  |  |  |  |
| 12b |  | Deliberate on [Question 1](https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=56986720) requirements (R1-1 etc.) **Users/Purposes:** Who should have access to gTLD registration data and why? | Full WG |  |  |
| 12c |  | Deliberate on [Question 2](https://community.icann.org/display/gTLDRDS/Gated%2BAccess%2B-%2BKey%2BInputs) 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](https://community.icann.org/display/gTLDRDS/Data%2BAccuracy%2B-%2BKey%2BInputs) requirements (R3-1 etc.) **Data Accuracy:** What steps should be taken to improve data accuracy? | Full WG |  |  |
| 12e |  | Deliberate on [Question 4](https://community.icann.org/display/gTLDRDS/Data%2BElements%2B-%2BKey%2BInputs) requirements (R4-1 etc. **Data Elements:** What data should be collected, stored, and disclosed? | Full WG |  |  |
| 12f |  | Deliberate on [Question 5](https://community.icann.org/display/gTLDRDS/Privacy%2B-%2BKey%2BInputs) 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 |  |  |
| 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**](https://community.icann.org/display/gTLDRDS/Coexistence%2B-%2BKey%2BInputs)**:** What steps should be taken to enable next-generation RDS coexistence with and replacement of the legacy WHOIS system?
* [**Compliance**](https://community.icann.org/display/gTLDRDS/Compliance%2B-%2BKey%2BInputs)**:** What steps are needed to enforce these policies?
* [**System Model**](https://community.icann.org/display/gTLDRDS/System%2BModel%2B-%2BKey%2BInputs)**:** What system requirements must be satisfied by any next-generation RDS implementation?
* [**Cost**](https://community.icann.org/display/gTLDRDS/Cost%2B-%2BKey%2BInputs)**:** What costs will be incurred and how must they be covered?
* [**Benefits**](https://community.icann.org/display/gTLDRDS/Benefits%2B-%2BKey%2BInputs)**:** What benefits will be achieved and how will they be measured?
* [**Risks**](https://community.icann.org/display/gTLDRDS/Risks%2B-%2BKey%2BInputs)**:** 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 |  |  |