During our 23 May meeting, the RDS PDP WG continued deliberation on the following charter question:

What steps should be taken to control "thin data" access?

This poll gives all WG members an opportunity to confirm, reconsider, or elaborate upon support for possible WG agreements considered during the 23 May meeting. Meeting notes and materials, including a meeting handout to set the stage for deliberating this question, can be found at this link: https://community.icann.org/x/HsPRAw

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 27 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 RDS PDP WG Member - not WG Observer - to participate in polls)**
If you are a WG Observer and wish to participate in polls, you must upgrade to WG Member to do so.

2. **Definition for DoR**

During the 23 May call, WG members discussed alternatives to replace the footnoted definition of Data of Record: " *The data set, at a given time, relevant to a given registration object, that expresses the data provided in the then-current registration for that object.*"

Please indicate your level of support for each of the following alternatives by using the "Response" pull-down to choose from: This is my preference, I could live with this, I do not support this, or leave blank if no opinion or not applicable.

Response

a) Data set that, at a given time, can be proven to match the data supplied at the origin for each data element.

b) Data set that, at a given time, is asserted to match data as acquired at its point of origin.

c) A data set, at a given time, relevant to a given registration object, that expresses the data provided in the then-current registration for that object.

Comment Box (use this box to provide rationale or your own alternative)

3. **Guiding principle, based on EWG principle 41**

During the call, WG members discussed EWG principle #41: "*A minimum set of data elements, at least in line with the most stringent privacy regime, must be accessible by unauthenticated RDS users.*"

Please indicate your level of support for each of the following statements (based on principle #41) by using the "Response" pull-down to choose from: This is my preference, I could live with this, I do not support this, or leave blank if no opinion or not applicable.

Response

a) A minimum set of "thin data" elements must be accessible by unauthenticated RDS users.

b) A minimum set of "thin data" elements, at least in line with the most stringent privacy regime, must be accessible by unauthenticated RDS users.

c) A minimum set of "thin data" elements, at least in line with applicable RDS privacy policies, must be accessible by unauthenticated RDS users.

d) None. WG Agreement #20 replaces this guiding principle for "thin data."

Comment Box (use this box to provide rationale or your own alternative)

4. Guiding principle, based on EWG principle 44

During next week's call, we will also consider EWG principle #44: " *Access must be non-discriminatory (i.e., the process must create a level playing field for all requestors, within the same purpose).*"

Please indicate your level of support for each of the following statements (based on principle #44) by using the "Response" pull-down to choose from: This is my preference, I could live with this, I do not support this, or leave blank if no opinion or not applicable.

Response

a) RDS access to "thin data" must be non-discriminatory (i.e., the process must create a level playing field for all requestors, within the same purpose).

b) None. This guiding principle does not apply to "thin data."

Comment Box (use this box to provide rationale or your own alternative)

5. Guiding principle, based on EWG principle 45

During the call, WG members discussed EWG principle #45, bullet one: " *To deter misuse and promote accountability, all data element access must be based on a stated purpose.*"

Please indicate your level of support for each of the following statements (based on principle #45) by using the "Response" pull-down to choose from: This is my preference, I could live with this, I do not support this, or leave blank if no opinion or not applicable.

Response

a) To deter misuse and promote accountability, all "thin data" access must be based on stated purpose(s).

b) To deter misuse and promote accountability, RDS policy must state purpose(s) for public access to "thin data."

c) None. This guiding principle does not apply to "thin data."

Comment Box (use this box to provide rationale or your own alternative)

6. Additional guiding principles

Are there any additional guiding principles for access to "thin data" that you feel must be deliberated upon now, before returning to deliberation on purposes for each "thin data" element?

◯ Yes (propose guiding principles in comment box below)

◯ No, not now

Comment Box (use this box to provide rationale or your own 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.