

RDS PDP WG Poll on Purpose - 21 December

During our 21 December call, the RDS PDP WG continued deliberation on the following charter question/sub-question:

2. Who should have access to gTLD registration data and why?

2.1 Should gTLD registration data be accessible for any purpose or only for specific purposes?

This deliberation focused on "thin data" as defined by the Thick WHOIS Report: "A thin registry only stores and manages the information associated with the domain name. This set includes data sufficient to identify the sponsoring registrar, status of the registration, creation and expiration dates for each registration, name server data, the last time the record was updated in its Whois data store, and the URL for the registrar's Whois service."

The following poll questions give all WG members an opportunity to confirm, reconsider, or elaborate upon points of agreement that surfaced during the 21 December call. **This poll will close on COB Friday 6 January 2017.**

Note: A link to the most recently-opened RDS PDP WG poll, along with links to the last meeting's notes/recordings and next meeting materials, can be found here: <http://tinyurl.com/ng-rds>

* **Your name (must be a RDS PDP WG Member)**

Q1) 13 December poll results suggest there is significant WG support (over 90%) for continuing to deliberate on the purpose of "thin data." Do you agree or disagree that this is a strong indication that the WG should examine both legitimate and illegitimate purposes of "thin data"? Note that this statement is NOT intended to imply authentication, disclosure, or access control for "thin data" – all topics to be deliberated upon later.

- a) Yes, the WG should continue deliberation on the purpose of "thin data."
- b) No, the WG should not consider the purpose of "thin data" at all.

Comment Box (for example, give rationale for your answer or suggest an alternative)

Q2) In the 21 December meeting, when Chuck Gomes stated that there appeared to be agreement among WG members on the call that every element of this “thin data” should have at least one legitimate purpose, there was no disagreement. Do you agree or disagree with this statement?

- a) Yes, every “thin data” element should have at least one legitimate purpose.
- b) No, the WG should not require there be legitimate purpose(s) for each “thin data” element.

Other (for example, give rationale for your answer or suggest an alternative):

Q3) In the 21 December meeting, the WG further focused its deliberation about purpose to “thin data” collection only (i.e., not access or display of that data). Those present agreed that there is at least one legitimate purpose for collecting each of the “thin data” elements as defined above. That is, there is at least one purpose for requiring an RDS/WHOIS “thin data” record to be populated with values for each of these fields. Do you agree or disagree with this statement?

- a) Yes, there is at least one legitimate purpose for collecting all of these “thin data” elements.
- b) No, there is no legitimate purpose for collecting one or more of these “thin data” elements. (If you disagree, please explain why in the comment box below and identify any “thin data” elements for which you do not think there is a legitimate purpose for collecting the data.)

Comment Box (for example, give rationale for disagreeing with specific “thin data” elements):

Q4) Specifically, the WG considered the following questions:

- What is the purpose of collecting the domain name's Sponsoring Registrar Name and RDS/WHOIS URL?
- What is the purpose of collecting the domain name's Name Server(s)?
- What is the purpose of collecting the domain name registration's Status(es), Creation, Expiration, and Last Updated Date?

The WG briefly reviewed the purposes proposed by the Expert Working Group (EWG) for these specific data elements, as enumerated in Annex D of the EWG Final Report. Definitions for those purposes are excerpted below:

<i>Purpose</i>	<i>Includes tasks such as...</i>
<i>Domain Name Control</i>	<i>Creating, managing and monitoring a Registrant's own domain name (DN), including creating the DN, updating information about the DN, transferring the DN, renewing the DN, deleting the DN, maintaining a DN portfolio, and detecting fraudulent use of the Registrant's own contact information.</i>
<i>Technical Issue Resolution</i>	<i>Working to resolve technical issues associated with domain name use, including email delivery issues, DNS resolution failures, and website functional issues, by contacting technical staff responsible for handling these issues.</i>
<i>Domain Name Certification</i>	<i>Certification Authority (CA) issuing an X.509 certificate to a subject identified by a domain name needing to confirm that the DN is registered to the certificate subject.</i>
<i>Business Domain Name Purchase or Sale</i>	<i>Making purchase queries about a DN, acquiring a DN from another Registrant, and enabling due diligence research.</i>
<i>Academic/Public-Interest DNS Research</i>	<i>Academic public-interest research studies about domain names published in the RDS, including public information about the Registrant and designated contacts, the domain name's history and status, and DNs registered by a given Registrant.</i>
<i>Regulatory and Contractual Enforcement</i>	<i>Tax authority investigation of businesses with online presence, UDRP [and URS] investigation, contractual compliance investigation, and registration data escrow audits.</i>
<i>Criminal Investigation & DNS Abuse Mitigation</i>	<i>Reporting abuse to someone who can investigate and address that abuse, or contacting entities associated with a domain name during an offline criminal investigation.</i>

During the 21 December call, among WG members present, there were no objections to any of the EWG-identified purposes for "thin data" elements, listed above. Do you agree or disagree that each of the EWG-identified purposes apply to at least one "thin data" element?

- a) Yes, each of the EWG-identified purposes listed above apply to at least one "thin data" element.
- b) No, at least one of the above-listed purposes do not apply to any "thin data" element. (If you disagree, please explain why in the comment box below and identify any listed purpose(s) that you do not see as legitimate for "thin data" elements.)

Other (for example, give rationale for disagreeing with specific "thin data" purposes):

Q5) If you would like to suggest alternative purpose(s) for collecting any of the above “thin data” elements or provide rationale for why you believe there is no legitimate purpose for collecting specific “thin data” elements, please use this comment box to give any explanation you wish to provide.

Thanks for participating in this poll. Please click below to submit your responses.

Input gathered through this poll will be used as input to further WG deliberation on this charter question.