


Q1 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.

Answered: 25 Skipped: 0

#	Responses	Date
1	Stephanie Perrin	5/20/2017 8:49 AM
2	Natale Maria Bianchi	5/20/2017 7:59 AM
3	Olevie Kouami	5/20/2017 2:57 AM
4	Alan Greenberg	5/19/2017 12:26 PM
5	Michael Hammer	5/19/2017 9:23 AM
6	jonathan matkowsky	5/19/2017 6:57 AM
7	Chris Pelling	5/19/2017 4:53 AM
8	Andrew Sullivan	5/19/2017 3:53 AM
9	Susan Kawaguchi	5/19/2017 3:51 AM
10	Adam Lanier	5/19/2017 3:29 AM
11	Sara Bockey	5/18/2017 2:50 AM
12	Nathalie Coupet	5/18/2017 12:14 AM
13	Benny Samuelsen	5/17/2017 4:53 PM
14	Michael Haffely	5/17/2017 12:11 PM
15	Chuck Gomes	5/17/2017 10:54 AM
16	Michael Peddemors	5/17/2017 9:06 AM
17	Brian Gosch	5/17/2017 8:45 AM
18	Carlton Samuels	5/17/2017 5:27 AM
19	Scott Hollenbeck	5/17/2017 2:44 AM
20	Vicky Sheckler	5/17/2017 2:11 AM
21	Farell Folly	5/17/2017 1:52 AM
22	Paul Keating	5/17/2017 1:32 AM
23	Greg Aaron	5/17/2017 12:16 AM
24	Klaus Stoll	5/17/2017 12:16 AM
25	John Horton	5/16/2017 11:31 PM

Q2 During this week's call, the WG revisited its agreement on identification and purpose from the 2 May poll while also considering results on authentication and anonymity from the 9 May poll. Following discussion of several alternative agreements, those on the call expressed support for the following updated WG agreement which combines multiple concepts: "gTLD registration "thin data" must be accessible without requestor identification, authentication, or stated purpose." Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the above statement.

Answered: 25 Skipped: 0




Answer Choices	Responses
Agree	88.00% 22
Disagree	12.00% 3
Total	25

#	Comment Box (for example, give rationale for disagreeing)	Date
1	further to our discussion of the elements contained in "thin" data	5/20/2017 8:49 AM
2	Stated purpose to any data is still a requirement	5/19/2017 4:53 AM
3	Requestor identification, authentication or stated purpose could be made optional	5/18/2017 12:14 AM
4	purpose should be requested	5/17/2017 1:52 AM

Q3 During this week's call, the WG considered a proposed replacement for the term "authoritative" as used in the draft Statement of Purpose (see section 2.3). Those on the call expressed support for updating item 2) in the Statement of Purpose to read as follows:"2) A purpose of RDS is to facilitate dissemination of gTLD registration data of record, such as domain names and their domain contacts and name servers, in accordance with applicable policy."where "data of record" would be tied with a footnote to the following definition:"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 whether you agree or disagree with the above statement.

Answered: 25 Skipped: 0



Answer Choices	Responses
Agree	80.00% 20
Disagree	20.00% 5
Total	25

#	Comment Box (for example, give rationale for disagreeing):	Date
1	The term 'Authoritative' related to Whois data means it is not hearsay, which means it comes from the original database and speaks for itself. It is a very well understood term for well over a decade now.	5/19/2017 6:57 AM
2	Too wordy and complex. Why not, "The data set at a given time relevant to a given registration object"?	5/19/2017 3:29 AM

3	Agree, but upon consideration, it may read better if we replaced "a" with "one", so "One purpose of RDS is to ..."	5/18/2017 2:50 AM
4	All other things being equal, such as data accuracy checks executed	5/17/2017 5:27 AM
5	Data provided by who? What is the "data of record" for information that exists at both the registrar and the registry? I might agree with this purpose if this point is clarified.	5/17/2017 2:44 AM
6	i know there have been a lot of discussion about differences in opinion on the definition fo authoritative, but lfeel the definition of "data of record" fails to capture the concept that the source fo the data is the proper/primary (authoritative) source where the data from which the data should be obtained	5/17/2017 2:11 AM
7	1) This does not address the issue of what data should be relied upon or trusted -- for legal situations or when there is a discrepancy between the registrar's record and the registry's record. 2) The definition is confusing and self-referential. It seems to boil down to "registration data that's kept somewhere, maybe anywhere", which is not very useful. Why invoke "object" if objects are not defined? Definition uses "then-current" but do you really mean "at a point in time"? The definition requires it to be a "data set" but a single field is not a "data set", and single fields such as Create Date are important to people. How does a data set in an object express its own data? The data IS the data.	5/17/2017 12:16 AM