

RDS PDP WG Poll - 2 May

During our 2 May meeting, the RDS PDP WG continued deliberation on the following sub-question:

Should gTLD registration "thin data" be entirely public
or should access be controlled?

This poll gives all WG members an opportunity to confirm, reconsider, or elaborate upon support for one possible WG agreement developed during the 2 May meeting. Meeting notes and materials, including a [meeting handout](#) to set the stage for deliberating this sub-question, can be found at this link:

<https://community.icann.org/x/EMPRAW>

As a reminder, deliberation is currently 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.* This WG previously reached rough consensus that *"Every existing "thin data" element does have at least one legitimate purpose for collection."* It may be useful to keep these assumptions in mind when responding to this poll.

This poll will close at COB on Saturday 6 May 2017.

As previously announced, by submitting a response to this poll, you are granting permission for your entire response - including WG member name and response timestamp - to be included in published poll results. Responses submitted by WG members are not assumed to reflect the views of any organization with which they may be affiliated.

Note: As always, 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>

*** 1. Your name (must be a RDS PDP WG Member, not Observer, to participate)**

2. During deliberation, WG members questioned the meaning of "public" and discussed several different alternative sub-questions. Ultimately, support was expressed by those on the call for the following statement:

gTLD registration "thin data" should be accessible without requiring inquirers to identify themselves or state their purpose.

Do you agree or disagree with this statement, and why?

Agree

Disagree

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

3. To help inform next week's deliberation, which if any of the following statements should be further deliberated by the WG as possible requirements for allowing access to "thin data." (check all that apply, if any)

Access to gTLD registration "thin data" should allow:

a) Inquirers to be anonymous (i.e., access without any identification, as is allowed by today's WHOIS)

b) Inquirers to be unauthenticated (i.e., require identification, but without any verification of that identity)

c) Inquiries to be subject to anti-abuse measures such as rate-limiting and CAPTCHA

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

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

By submitting a response to this poll, you are granting permission for your entire response - including WG member name and response timestamp - to be included in published poll results.

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