Work Plan structure for Whois Survey WG: July, 27th, 2011

Current Scope and Objectives from the draft Charter:

The WG aims to draft, implement, and analyze the results of a survey measuring the level of support for various technical requirements outlined in the GNSO WHOIS service requirement report (<http://gnso.icann.org/issues/whois/whois-service-requirements-final-report-29jul10-en.pdf>).

To produce a Report to be delivered to the GNSO Council describing the results of the survey and recommendations for next steps for the GNSO Council’s consideration with concerning the WHOIS service requirements.

Work guidance (from the Wiki):

 Whois Service Requirements – Possible Next Steps

Prepared by Chuck Gomes, 14 April 2011

Ref: Inventory of WHOIS Service Requirements Final Report - 29 July 2010 (http://gnso.icann.org/issues/whois/whois-service-requirements-final-report-29jul10-en.pdf )

The above referenced report includes a lot of conclusions or assumptions. It seems to me that it would be helpful to obtain an estimate of the level of agreement for those conclusions or assumptions within the GNSO community. This might help us determine whether there is reasonable justification for possibly initiating a working group to develop a plan for considering the technical requirement recommendations in the report.

To do this I suggest that an informal survey be developed and performed. A drafting team could be formed to develop the survey as well as a plan for executing it.

In case this idea has any merit, I compiled the following statements (all from the report except the first and last ones) that could form the starting point for the survey and be responded to with these choices: Agree, Disagree, Not Sure.

I personally believe we are way past due on dealing with the Whois protocol issue, but I think we need to find out what the broader GNSO community thinks.

Whois Service Requirements Assumptions

The current Whois protocol is sufficient and no major changes are needed.

WHOIS contact information by users whose local languages cannot be represented in US-ASCII7.

The current WHOIS service is deficient in a number of ways:

- Data accuracy

- Reliability

- Accessibility

- Readability

The current WHOIS service might decrease in reliability and usefulness over time.

The current set of WHOIS tools are inadequate to provide the necessary functions to support existing and proposed WHOIS service policy requirements.

The current set of WHOIS tools is inadequate for use in an IDN environment. A mechanism is needed to find Whois servers.

There needs to be standard Whois query structure.

A standard data structure for WHOIS query responses needs to be defined.

A set of standardized error messages and handling procedures for error conditions should be defined.

Query capabilities need to be expanded.

Whois data should be displayed both in native script and in Latin characters.

Authenticated Whois access should be possible.

Access controls would be a useful feature for Whois.

It would be helpful if Whois access was auditable.

There is community consensus on all the Whois requirements in the report.

The value of making major changes to the existing Whois services would not justify the expense and effort required to do so.

Volunteer Base for Leadership:

Fortunately we’ve had 4 volunteers in leadership positions, three Vice-Chairs and one Chair, this allows us to attempt some parallel work and reach for a short deliverable. However this also requires strong communication and work coordination between Chairs, something I believe we can attain with the strong experience set we have in the team.

Suggested Work Outline

Part A

Item 1: An initial effort from volunteers to draft the charter and then forming the following sub-groups led each by a co-chair:

1. Drafting team for questions

The overall goal of this group is to write the actual survey questions in consideration of the existing requirements, the guidance that Chuck drafted and guidance from stakeholders who the third team will be reaching back out to. Note this team should also create tally mechanisms in the survey that allow respondents to prioritize the requirements.

1. Survey Tool and recipient decision team

The goal of this team is to identify and prepare the survey delivery tool/mechanism and determine the recipient list for the survey. Again we could consider the stakeholders named in the original GNSO resolution that resulted in the Whois Requirements Report, and new stakeholders identified by team 3. Lastly we should consider stakeholders outside the sphere of ICANN related communities to see if we can illicit meaningful responses (or not).

1. Requirements verification team

We discussed in the past call, touching base with the stakeholders that were already consulted in creating the whois requirements report but this team should also consider other stakeholders. For example, should the stakeholders include IETF representatives? We need to check with stakeholders to see if they want to either add clarification and/or support to existing requirements or suggest additional ones.

Each team’s first meeting should be to derive, scope of work, task assignment, project timelines for their area. The Chair will volunteer to write a consolidated project plan for based on the individual group project plans.

Part A ends with the administration of the survey and responses gathered. This concludes our formal ask from the GNSO however we suggest Part B can add value to moving towards implementation of any of these requirements.

Part B

Whole WG exercise:

Assess results, whole team exercise to review tallies from survey results and prioritize requirements based on those tallies.

Gather and add comments from the WG on the initial survey results, identify and document recommendations from the teams in respect of survey findings. Post for public comment and compile responses into final report.

Create recommended next steps (i.e. form implementation WG for top three requirements – PDP) with the purpose of forging a working path towards implementing the top prioritized requirements (per the survey result and WG recommendations).

Meeting Schedule:

Part A

* Sub-groups meet every two weeks to proceed with work elements
* Chairs meet alternate week to update, communicate and feed cross-dependent results to one another’s team. Standard project management meeting as well, verify milestones and progress.
* Every third Chair Meeting is a full WG meeting (every 6 weeks) so all members can be updated to the overall progress.

Part B

* Standard meeting to work through the review and recommendation processes every two weeks until all material to feed the final report is complete.
* Break in meetings during the public comment period.