|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Source | Reference | Issue | RDS-WHOIS2 Possible? | Decision |
| Bylaws | 4.6(e)(iv) | Prior WHOIS-RT Recommendations *(iv) The Directory Service Review Team shall assess the extent to which prior [Directory Service Review recommendations](http://www.icann.org/en/about/aoc-review/whois/final-report-11may12-en.pdf) have been implemented and the extent to which implementation of such recommendations has resulted in the intended effect.* | AG: Yes | Call #5: Team agreed in-scope |
| Bylaws | 4.6(e)(ii) | Current Implementation "effectiveness" *(ii) The Board shall cause a periodic review to assess the effectiveness of the then current gTLD registry directory service…* | AG: Yes, but effectiveness in what way? Last RDS-RT Recommendations?  Call #5: Some said RDS PDP is determining purpose(s) of and requirements for WHOIS; this duplication should be avoided. | Call #5: Team agreed in-scope  but did not converge on criteria for determining “effectiveness.”  **Action:** Stephanie to suggest language on effectiveness component |
| Bylaws | 4.6(e)(ii) | Current Implementation & legitimate needs  *(ii) …and whether its implementation meets the legitimate needs of law enforcement, promoting consumer trust and safeguarding registrant data* | Call #5: Some said RT should assess effectiveness for three purposes listed in bylaws: *law enforcement, promoting consumer trust and safeguarding registrant data.* | Call #5: May be covered by Action under GNSO Scope Pg2 below |
| Bylaws | 4.6(e)(iii) | OECD Privacy/Transborder Data Flow *(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](https://www.oecd.org/sti/ieconomy/2013-oecd-privacy-guidelines.pdf) and as may be amended from time to time* | AG: Yes (as per my message) | Call #5: Team agreed in-scope;  may state simply that today’s WHOIS is in conflict with some related laws (e.g., GDPR)  **Action:** ICANN org to produce draft text for leadership to refine reflecting OECD component of bylaws mandate |
| GNSO | Scope Msgs Page 2 | Assess whether RDS efforts meet “legitimate needs of law enforcement, promoting consumer trust and safeguarding registrant data.” | AG: RDS PDP: No. Other: ? | Call #5: See discussion under Bylaws 4.6.(e)(ii) above  **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. |
| GNSO | Scope Msgs Page 2 | Assess how RDS current & future recommendations might be improved and better coordinated | AG: No  Call #5: Several stated this would unnecessarily overlap RDS PDP. |  |
| GNSO | Scope Msgs Page 3 | Assess Compliance enforcement actions, structure, and processes; Availability of transparent enforcement of contractual obligations data | AG: Yes |  |
| GNSO | Scope Msgs Page 3 | Assess the value and timing of RDAP as a replacement protocol | AG: No | Call #5: 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 | Scope Msgs Page 3 | Assess current protocol for current purposes | AG: Yes (effort minimal) | Reflected above |
| Carlton, others | Scope Msgs Page 1 | IDN | AG:Yes |  |

|  |
| --- |
| 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 |