


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

Answered: 26 Skipped: 0

#	Responses	Date
1	Remmy Nweke	2/25/2017 9:52 AM
2	Ayden Férdeline	2/24/2017 6:34 PM
3	Rod Rasmussen	2/24/2017 4:04 PM
4	Marc Anderson	2/24/2017 12:47 PM
5	Fabricio Vayra	2/24/2017 12:19 PM
6	Maxim Alzoba	2/24/2017 11:38 AM
7	John Horton	2/24/2017 11:23 AM
8	Greg Shatan	2/24/2017 9:47 AM
9	Andrew Sullivan	2/24/2017 9:40 AM
10	Klaus Stoll	2/24/2017 9:20 AM
11	Tjabbe Bos	2/24/2017 8:38 AM
12	Benny Samuelson	2/24/2017 8:20 AM
13	Griffin Barnett	2/24/2017 8:10 AM
14	Vlad Dinculescu	2/23/2017 11:23 PM
15	Susan Kawaguchi	2/23/2017 5:44 PM
16	Nathalie Coupet	2/23/2017 4:10 PM
17	Carlton Samuels	2/23/2017 3:47 PM
18	Stephanie Perrin	2/23/2017 1:32 PM
19	Scott Hollenbeck	2/23/2017 10:53 AM
20	Volker Greimann	2/23/2017 7:09 AM
21	Patrick Lenihan	2/23/2017 3:25 AM
22	Farell FOLLY	2/23/2017 1:41 AM
23	Kal Feher	2/23/2017 1:18 AM
24	Karnika Seth	2/23/2017 12:06 AM
25	Michael Haffely	2/22/2017 2:18 PM
26	Chuck Gomes	2/22/2017 2:01 PM

Q2 Should "Consistency with ICANN's mission" be a goal for each RDS purpose?

Answered: 26 Skipped: 0




Answer Choices	Responses
Agree with goal: Consistency with ICANN's mission	84.62% 22
Disagree/Unsure (provide rationale in comment box below)	15.38% 4
Total	26

#	Comment Box: Provide rationale for disagreeing (if any) or suggest necessary clarifications (if any).	Date
1	Not sure it needs to apply to "each" purpose.	2/24/2017 12:19 PM
2	The RDS purposes should not violate ICANN's mission, but "consistency with ICANN's mission" seems like a narrower set of circumstances. I'm concerned with people exploiting the perceived gap between the two, to try to eliminate purposes that do not violate ICANN's mission but somehow can be argued to be "inconsistent" with it. Separately, I think the limitation to "mission" is too narrow -- it should probably be "Do not violate ICANN's mission, commitments and core values." It is unclear whether these goals are absolute "go/no go" criteria, aspirational goals, or goals that would be applied in a more nuanced or "graded" fashion. This needs to be clarified. A "does not violate" standard would be much easier to apply than a "consistency" standard. Finally, I have big problems with voting on abstract "goals" without knowing their real life application to specific purposes. I don't want to agree with Goal "X" because it sounds laudable and logical, and then find out that applying Goal "X" defeats a specific purpose that I support. More simply, I don't want a "gotcha" moment.	2/24/2017 9:47 AM
3	At least not be inconsistent	2/24/2017 8:38 AM
4	I tried to find a current copy of ICANN's mission statement using the search function on the ICANN web site home page and didn't have a lot of luck: https://www.icann.org/search/#!/?searchText=mission statement Having said that, I agree with the spirit of this goal. RDS purposes should not be inconsistent with ICANN's mission.	2/23/2017 10:53 AM
5	The mission of ICANN has nothing to do with the legitimization for collection and storage of personal information. The collection and storage of such data must serve a valid purpose.	2/23/2017 7:09 AM
6	ICANN's mission and goal for the RDS PDP WG are completely insane and the process has been designed backwards.	2/22/2017 2:18 PM

Q3 Should "Consistency with other consensus policies that pertain to gTLDs" be a goal for each RDS purpose?

Answered: 26 Skipped: 0




Answer Choices	Responses
Agree with goal: Consistency with other consensus policies that pertain to gTLDs	73.08% 19
Disagree/Unsure (provide rationale in comment box below)	26.92% 7
Total	26

#	Comment Box: Provide rationale for disagreeing (if any) or suggest necessary clarifications (if any).	Date
1	We may find that not all current consensus policies which pertain to gTLDs may be relevant once the purpose of the RDS is ascertained.	2/24/2017 6:34 PM
2	I selected agree because the end result of this PDP should not create conflict with other consensus policy, but at the same time, other consensus policies should not constrain the work of this PDP.	2/24/2017 12:47 PM
3	Not sure it needs to apply to "each" purpose.	2/24/2017 12:19 PM
4	As with the above, "consistency" may be narrowing the field too much. I would support a "does not violate consensus policies" standard instead. This also seems to assume that the consensus policies are internally consistent, such that a purpose can be consistent with all of them. Similarly, it seems to require that it be consistent with all consensus policies, when a stated purpose might be consistent with some policies and only "not violate" other policies. My comments on voting on an abstract goal without understanding how it would be applied to any specific purposes are relevant here as well.	2/24/2017 9:47 AM
5	Ideally there should be interchange between consensus policies, e.g. other consensus policies can also be influenced by what this working group concludes	2/24/2017 8:38 AM
6	But what about if the other consensus policies contradicting themselves, are overturned?	2/23/2017 4:10 PM
7	Some consensus policies do not reflect legal obligations fully. ICANN has matured in the past 20 years, many policies were made to fit reality rather than express optimal policy.	2/23/2017 1:32 PM
8	I'm unsure about this one because I'm not inclined to assume that consensus policies won't be in conflict with "a framework that enables compliance with applicable laws" or some other factor that might be a cause of conflict. Consensus policies aren't necessarily correct!	2/23/2017 10:53 AM
9	Consensus policies have nothing to do with the legitimization for collection and storage of personal information. The collection and storage of such data must serve a valid purpose.	2/23/2017 7:09 AM
10	It's a circular commitment. many consensus policies were developed with the current whois in mind. that includes expectations of the type of data available and the accessibility of that data.	2/23/2017 1:18 AM

Q4 Should "To provide a framework that enables compliance with applicable laws" be a goal for each RDS purpose?

Answered: 25 Skipped: 1



Answer Choices	Responses
Agree with goal: To provide a framework that enables compliance with applicable laws	88.00% 22
Disagree/Unsure (provide rationale in comment box below)	12.00% 3
Total	25

#	Comment Box: Provide rationale for disagreeing (if any) or suggest necessary clarifications (if any).	Date
1	This goal is of critical importance. It's likely impossible and unrealistic to expect this PDP to anticipate and create a solution that addresses all existing and future applicable laws. What does seem realistic though is to create a framework that is flexible enough to enable RDS operators to adapt their services to comply with applicable laws (that will change over time).	2/24/2017 12:47 PM
2	Not sure it needs to apply to "each" purpose. We should discuss what "applicable laws" means and what actually applies in this context.	2/24/2017 12:19 PM
3	I'm not sure what this means with regard to each purpose. Some purposes are not related to applicable laws. In other cases, applicable laws may be implicated, but the purpose is not related to "providing a framework that enables compliance with applicable laws." I think there may be some goal or yardstick that relates to applicable laws" but I don't think this is it. This also begs the question of what is meant by "applicable laws," much less how to deal with multiple conflicting "applicable laws." My other comments above apply here as well.	2/24/2017 9:47 AM
4	Yes, but it should rather 'allow' for compliance with applicable laws, whereas 'enables' is too active and presumes facilitating it, which probably goes too far	2/24/2017 8:38 AM
5	General laws applicable to a subject matter might not apply in certain cases (as provided by the laws themselves in their list of exceptions)	2/23/2017 4:10 PM
6	The aim of compliance with applicable laws must be the very basis of our work and the root of the RDS.	2/23/2017 7:09 AM