During our 30 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 30 May meeting. Meeting notes and materials, including annotated results from last week's poll, can be found at this link: https://community.icann.org/x/IMPRAw

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 3 June 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. Last week, we 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."* This week, WG members considered several alternatives based on this EWG principle. After deliberation, WG members expressed support for the following proposed WG agreement; there were no objections raised by those on the call:

"At least a defined set of "thin data" elements must be accessible by unauthenticated RDS users."

Please indicate whether you agree with this proposed WG agreement; if not, please explain using the Comment Box.

◯ Agree

◯ Disagree (explain below)

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

[   ]

3. Last week, we discussed EWG principle #45, bullet one: " *To deter misuse and promote accountability, all data element access must be based on a stated purpose.*" This week, WG members considered several alternatives based on this EWG principle. After deliberation, WG members expressed support for the following proposed WG agreement; there were no objections raised by those on the call:

"RDS policy must state purpose(s) for public access to 'thin data.'"

Please indicate whether you agree with this proposed WG agreement; if not, please explain using the Comment Box.

◯ Agree

◯ Disagree (explain below)

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

[ ]

4. Last week, we discussed 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).*" This week, WG members considered several alternatives based on this EWG principle. During deliberation, those on the call expressed both support and opposition to the following proposed WG agreement:

"RDS policies for access to "thin data" must be non-discriminatory for all legitimate purposes."

Please indicate whether you agree with this proposed WG agreement; if not, please explain using the Comment Box.

◯ Agree

◯ Disagree (explain below)

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.