

Source	Reference	Issue	RDS-WHOIS2 Possible?	Decision
Bylaws	4.6(e)(iv)	<p>Prior WHOIS-RT Recommendations</p> <p><i>(iv) The Directory Service Review Team shall assess the extent to which prior Directory Service Review recommendations have been implemented and the extent to which implementation of such recommendations has resulted in the intended effect.</i></p>	AG: Yes	Call #5: Team agreed in-scope
Bylaws	4.6(e)(ii)	<p>Current Implementation "effectiveness"</p> <p><i>(ii) The Board shall cause a periodic review to assess the effectiveness of the then current gTLD registry directory service...</i></p>	<p>AG: Yes, but effectiveness in what way? Last RDS-RT Recommendations?</p> <p>Call #6: Team agreed to treat this objective separately from objective in next row</p>	<p>Call #6: Team agreed that assessing the effectiveness of the now current gTLD RDS is in-scope; but did not converge on criteria for determining "effectiveness." Team also agreed that it may be useful to draw on the first WHOIS Review Team Scope of Work discussions for guidance on further defining the criterion of effectiveness.</p> <p>Action: Stephanie to suggest language on effectiveness component</p>
Bylaws	4.6(e)(ii)	<p>Current Implementation & legitimate needs</p> <p><i>(ii) ...and whether its implementation meets the legitimate needs of law enforcement, promoting consumer trust and safeguarding registrant data</i></p>	Call #6: Team agreed to treat this objective separately from objective is previous row; also agreed that assessing "effectiveness" is not part of this objective	<p>Call #6: Team agreed that assessing whether the now current gTLD RDS implementation meets the legitimate needs of law enforcement, promoting consumer trust and safeguarding registrant data is in-scope.</p> <p>Action: Cathrin to produce draft text reflecting RT's discussion on law enforcement objectives, including possible methodology to obtain targeted community input on objectives, for RT to formulate recommendations w/r/t WHOIS meeting them.</p>

Bylaws	4.6(e)(iii)	OECD Privacy/Transborder Data Flow <i>(iii) The review team for the Directory Service Review will consider the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development ("OECD") Guidelines on the Protection of Privacy and Transborder Flows of Personal Data as defined by the OECD in 1980 and amended in 2013 and as may be amended from time to time</i>	AG: Yes (as per my message) Call #6: Team considered objective drafted to reflect email discussion on privacy. Several questioned relevance of OECD guidelines and whether the RT should provide examples of conflicts. May consider recommending this outdated document be dropped or replaced in Bylaws requirements for future RDS reviews.	Call #6: Team agreed in-scope; as simple consideration of guidelines to produce high-level recommendations, noting that there are issues and pointing to other groups addressing issues.
GNSO	Scope Msgs Page 3	Assess Compliance enforcement actions, structure, and processes; Availability of transparent enforcement of contractual obligations data	AG: Yes	Call #6: Team agreed in-scope
GNSO	Scope Msgs Page 3	Assess the value and timing of RDAP as a replacement protocol	AG: No	Call #5: Team agreed in-scope; Review will evaluate whether RDAP should be implemented before policy is developed.
Carlton	Scope Msgs Page 3	Assess current protocol for current purposes	AG: Yes (effort minimal)	Call #6: Team agreed in-scope; may state simply that RDAP meets current purposes in ways that today's WHOIS protocol cannot (e.g., IDN support)
Carlton, others	Scope Msgs Page 1	IDN	AG:Yes	Call #6: Team agreed in-scope; with minimal effort (see above)

Principles

- Work should be focused on efforts likely to produce real results
- Work should have a reasonable expectation of leading to implementable recommendations

AG: 17 Aug 2017, including draft updates to reflect 17 August Plenary call discussion provided by ICANN org for leadership consideration, updated 24 August