**RDS PDP WG Draft Outline of a Phase 1 Work Plan revised 5 May 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 order in which charter questions will actually be deliberated upon will be determined by the WG before this work plan is finalized.

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 identify ***possible*** requirements from the EWG Final Report along with ***possible*** requirements obtained from other key inputs such as those from the sources identified by the three WG small teams on Data, Purpose and Privacy, those identified in the Issue Report, those from any community inputs and any suggested by 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, GNSO SG/Cs and the broader community, 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.
* 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 deliberation will inevitably be iterative and 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).

It is essential that the list of ***possible*** requirements be drafted, 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 for membership review  | 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 | 1 Mar 16 |
| 2.c |  | Consider poll results and recommend outreach activities to try to fill identified membership gaps, if any | Small Team | 22 Mar 16 | 22 Mar 16 |
| 2.d |  | Review & edit/agree upon outreach activities, if deemed necessary | Full WG | N/A | N/A |
| 2.e |  | Begin implementation of outreach activities, if deemed necessary | Staff & leaders | N/A | N/A |
| 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 |  |  |  |  |
| 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 | 9 Mar 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 |  | 2 Feb 16 |
| 4.c |  | Identify and summarize [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 additional key inputs, along with further tutorial needs. | Purpose, Data, and Privacy teams | 3 Apr 16 |  |
| 4.d |  | Review ALL key inputs, including 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 | Ongoing (see Task 8) As the WG deliberates on each related question |  |
| 5 | Review Rules of Engagement from Charter with an emphasis on the recommended method for discovering the consensus level designation onrequirements |  | Full WG | 1 Mar 16 | 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 | 5 May 16 |  |
| 6.e |  | Approve final work plan | Full WG |  10 May 16 |  |
| 7 | Outreach #1 (formal) – SOs, ACs, SGs, Cs and broader community |  |  |  |  |
| 7.a |  | Develop draft outreach message #1 | Leadership Team | 2 May 16 | 2 May 16 |
| 7.b |  | Review outreach message #1 | Full WG | 8 May 16 |  |
| 7.c |  | Approve outreach message #1 | Full WG | 8 May 16 |  |
| 7.d |  | Send outreach message #1, providing a minimum of 35 days to respond | Staff/Chair | 9 May 16 |  |
| 7.e |  | Begin to review & analyze outreach message #1 input by using comment review tool  | Full WG | 7 Jun 16(35 days after 7.d) |  |
| 7f. |  | Finalize comment review tool | Full WG | 21 Jun 16 |  |
| 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 possible requirements, drawing from EWG report as example and starting point | Leadership Team | 12 May 16 |  |
| 8.b |  | Send Draft #1 to full WG for review & comment | Leadership Team | 13 May 16 |  |
| 8.c |  | Review & comment on Draft #1 & ask the WG to supplement the list, drawing from other identified input documents | Full WG | 14-24 May 16 |  |
| 8.d |  | Create Draft #2 of Initial Possible Requirements List to include WG input  | Staff | 25 May 16 |  |
| 8.e |  | Review and confirm that Draft #2 of Possible Requirements List is sufficiently complete to serve as the foundation for WG deliberation | Full WG | 30 May 16 |  |
| 9 | Outreach #2 (informal) |  |  |  |  |
| 9.a |  | Develop draft outreach message #2 (request comments on Possible Requirements List Draft #2) | Leadership Team | 26 May 16 |  |
| 9.b |  | Review & approve outreach message #2 | Full WG | 31 May 16 |  |
| 9.c |  | Request additional possible requirements to Draft #2 of Possible Requirements List [via WG members &/or an informal request?] | Staff/Chair | 1 Jun 16 |  |
| 9.d |  | Review & analyze Outreach #2 input | Full WG | 7 Jun 16 |  |
| 9.e |  | Incorporate additional possible requirements suggested during Outreach #2 into Draft #3 of Possible Requirements List | Staff | 12 Jun 16 |  |
| 10 | Finalize Initial Possible Requirements List |  | Full WG | 14 Jun 16 |  |
| 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 | 14 Jun 16 |  |
| 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 | 14 Jun 16 |  |
| 12 | Deliberate on ***possible*** fundamental requirements |  |  |  |  |
| 12.a |  | First pass at deliberating requirements for questions 1-3: * [Users/Purposes](https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=56986720) requirements**:** Who should have access to gTLD registration data and why?
* [Data Elements](https://community.icann.org/display/gTLDRDS/Data%2BElements%2B-%2BKey%2BInputs) requirements**:** What data should be collected, stored, and disclosed?
* [Privacy](https://community.icann.org/display/gTLDRDS/Privacy%2B-%2BKey%2BInputs) requirements: What steps are needed to protect data and privacy?
 | Full WG |  |  |
| 12.b |  | Second pass at deliberating questions 1-3.  | Full WG |  |  |
| 12.c |  | Deliberate on [Gated Access](https://community.icann.org/display/gTLDRDS/Gated%2BAccess%2B-%2BKey%2BInputs) requirements **(**What steps should be taken to control data access for each user/purpose?) and [Data Accuracy](https://community.icann.org/display/gTLDRDS/Data%2BAccuracy%2B-%2BKey%2BInputs) (What steps should be taken to improve data accuracy?). | Full WG |  |  |
| 12.d |  | Deliberate on General Requirements (GR1 – GRx) including any additional foundational questions that apply to any registration directory service | Full WG |  |  |
| 12.e |  | 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.d |  | Full WG |  |  |
| 14 | Outreach #3 (Request 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 12d) –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. |  | 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 |  |  |
| 17 | Initial Report for Phase 1 |  | Full WG |  |  |
| 18 | Review and analyze input received on Initial Report through public comment review tool, identifying any revisions needed to draft WG recommendations |  | Full WG |  |  |
| 19 | Final Report for Phase 1 |  | Full WG |  |  |