

PWG-WG - prioritisation framework

Draft for discussion on 4 Feb 2025

This document

In February 2025, the PGA-WG has concluded its analysis of the set of potential gaps or issues identified by IANA, and determined what follow up working method would be applied to deal with any of them.

The PGA-WG now needs to assign priority between the groups of issues identified, for testing with the ccTLD community at ICANN82 in March.

This document proposes a draft prioritization approach for the PGA-WG to consider and further develop.

Once finalised, the framework will then be applied to the issues groups, to determine the priority for dealing with them.

The sections of this document are:

- The factors suggested in the PGA-WG ideas generation discussion on 28 January 2025
- The proposed approach to prioritising
- The factors to use in prioritising

It is worth noting that the method identified to deal with any of the issues is a ccNSO Study Group, to analyse the issue. If formal policy changes were required to finally resolve it, a PDP would then occur - but it would benefit from the earlier analysis and so be a faster process than previous ccPDPs.

This document has been prepared by Jordan Carter, the PGA-WG Chair, as a draft for the PGA-WG's use.

The list of issues in the analysis worksheet is available [here](#). The groups of issues, in the order of priority suggested by IANA, is at the end of this document, [here](#).

Factors suggested by the PGA-WG

In the discussion on 28 Jan, PGA-WG members suggested a number of possible factors to take into account in setting priorities. They included ideas that dealing with issues should be prioritised based on these factors:

- the technical functioning of ccTLDs
- the trust and confidence / reputation of ccTLDs
- IANA priorities
- those fastest /easiest to solve
- where dealing with the issue helps solve other issues

Proposed prioritisation approach

I propose we adopt a scoring process based on a set of factors set out in the next section, to generate an initial prioritisation.

Then as a group, the PGA-WG should sense-check the outcome of that process. It should confirm the outcome or adjust it based on reasons it documents.

Each of the factors proposed below should have equal weight, and be scored between 0 and 5, where 0 is the lowest score and 5 is the highest.

The scores should be internally consistent relative to that factor. This means that for Factor A, you give a 5 where its importance is high, a 0 where it is low, and 3 where it is middling. If that factor is less important to you for Issue A than for Issue B, Issue A should have a lower score.

How to do it: I suggest we do this individually, and aggregate the scores.

Proposed prioritisation factors

I consider these are the three most important factors we should include:

IANA Priority - we can take the order of IANA's groupings and simply assign them points based on the order, with no PGA analysis or work needed. IANA is a key 'user' of this overall framework, far more so than any individual ccTLD. It is reasonable to take into account their loose priority order in determining where to focus the ccNSO's future work.

Impact on ccTLDs - what is the practical impact on ccTLDs of dealing with the issue? Positive impact for more ccTLDs would gain a high score. Negligible impact on ccTLDs would gain a low score. The ccTLDs will have to do the work of follow up, so prioritising issues with a significant impact is important.

Least work involved - we should prioritise resolving issues with less work, to deliver improvements as quickly as possible. An issue requiring little work - including Study Group work and engagement within and beyond the ccNSO community - should attract a high score. A complex, delicate issue should attract a low score.

Do you support these factors as the basis on which to prioritise the issue?

Are there other factors we should include?

Another factor I considered but didn't include is:

Ease of securing volunteers: where the issue is easy to find knowledgeable, available volunteers to do the work, it should be prioritised.

I didn't include this because it is hard to know in advance what volunteers will work on what issue, and the ccNSO doesn't have good visibility into the various talents available to it from its ccTLD members. So it would be difficult to score this accurately.

Scoring two factors for each issue should be fairly easy for the group's participants. The first factor (the IANA priority) is already known.

Annex - List of Issues/Issue Groups in IANA priority order

1 - IANA public records - study group

- Purpose of public records (B)
- Data Accuracy (A)
- Can consider - Enforcement / Graduated Compliance (C)

2 - Eligibility assessment before changes (D) - study group

3 - Local Presence - study group

- Local presence requirements (E)
- Minimum level of involvement (G)

4 - Resignation (F) - study group that may result in a Policy Development Process

5 - Disaster recovery (H) - study group

6 - Request confidentiality (I) - study group, if required