


Q1 Your name (must be a RDS PDP WG Member)

Answered: 14 Skipped: 0

#	Responses	Date
1	Roger Carney	2/17/2017 12:56 PM
2	Tjabbe Bos	2/17/2017 7:47 AM
3	Nathalie Coupet	2/16/2017 4:26 PM
4	Nathalie Coupet	2/16/2017 4:26 PM
5	Cathrin Bauer-Bulst	2/16/2017 2:25 AM
6	Ayden Férdeline	2/15/2017 10:43 AM
7	James Galvin	2/15/2017 8:57 AM
8	Scott Hollenbeck	2/15/2017 6:22 AM
9	Maxim Alzoba	2/15/2017 5:27 AM
10	Theo Geurts	2/15/2017 3:35 AM
11	Rod Rasmussen	2/15/2017 12:09 AM
12	John Horton	2/14/2017 9:21 PM
13	Greg Aaron	2/14/2017 7:13 PM
14	Chuck Gomes	2/14/2017 5:58 PM

Q2 In the 14 February call, it was noted that this WG's draft statement of purpose is captured in our Key Concepts Working Draft, Section 2.3, for further deliberation. WG members expressed support for the following possible agreement; there were no objections. Do you agree or disagree with this statement:As a WG, we need to agree upon a purpose statement for the RDS.

Answered: 14 Skipped: 0




Answer Choices	Responses
a) Yes, the RDS PDP WG needs to agree upon a purpose statement for the RDS.	92.86% 13
b) No, this WG does not need to agree upon such a purpose statement. (Please provide rationale in the comment box below.)	7.14% 1
Total	14

#	Comment Box	Date
1	Any RDS policy should define the purposes for which any data controller entity should process data (which includes simply keeping it). This would facilitate compatibility with the European data protection framework which - in a nutshell - requires such a purpose.	2/16/2017 2:25 AM
2	This will be key.	2/15/2017 3:35 AM
3	No. Because this WG cannot possibly anticipate every possible use case for registration data, and defining it ends up being exclusionary (e.g., if not contained within the purpose we define, it is implicitly not a legitimate purpose).	2/14/2017 9:21 PM
4	From the Charter: "As part of its Phase 1 deliberations, the PDP WG should work to reach consensus recommendations by considering, at a minimum, the following complex and inter-related questions: ↵ Users/Purposes: Who should have access to gTLD registration data and why?"	2/14/2017 7:13 PM

Q3 In the 14 February call, WG members reviewed Charter Question 4.1 and expressed support for the following possible agreement; there were no objections. Do you agree or disagree with this statement: Existing gTLD RDS policies do NOT sufficiently address compliance with applicable data protection, privacy, and free speech laws about purpose.

Answered: 14 Skipped: 0



Answer Choices	Responses
a) Agree that existing gTLD RDS policies do NOT sufficiently address compliance with applicable laws about purpose.	85.71% 12
b) Disagree - believe that existing gTLD RDS policies DO sufficiently address compliance with applicable laws about purpose. (Please provide rationale in the comment box below.)	14.29% 2
Total	14

#	Comment Box	Date
1	Conflicts of laws, e.g. on the data retention policies after expiration of contract in the 2013 RAA, could be avoided by being more specific in defining the purpose and conditions, while maintaining the same substantive aims.	2/16/2017 2:25 AM
2	This is not just Registrars; this also applies to Registries and all players involved. Privacy Shield is nice but will go down, and the current certified Registries are only complying with the specifications on paper. So we need solutions for RDS that will eliminate all these uncertainties and burdens for Registrars and Registries and all players. RDS should be bullet proof when it comes to all these different privacy laws and requirements.	2/15/2017 3:35 AM
3	I disagree with this statement. ICANN policies should take a hands off approach on these issues in general, so saying that gTLD policies are "insufficient" implies that ICANN needs to take a more proactive approach.	2/14/2017 9:21 PM
4	ICANN contracts already require statements of purpose for collection and publication of registration data.	2/14/2017 7:13 PM