

RDS PDP WG Poll - 6 June

During our 6 June meeting, the RDS PDP WG resumed deliberation on the Data Elements charter question by addressing the question:

Which gTLD registration data elements should be included in "thin data"?

This poll gives all WG members an opportunity to confirm, reconsider, or elaborate upon support for proposed agreements considered during the 6 June meeting. Meeting notes and materials, including annotated results from last week's poll, can be found at this link: <https://community.icann.org/x/IsPRAw>

This poll will close at COB on Saturday 10 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>

Introduction

Deliberation to date has 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.*"

For easy reference, some "thin data" elements contained in a current example WHOIS record appears below:

```
Domain Name: ANVILWALRUSDEN.COM
Registrar: TUCOWS DOMAINS INC.
Sponsoring Registrar IANA ID: 69
Whois Server: whois.tucows.com
Referral URL: http://www.tucowsdomains.com
Name Server: NS1.SYSTEMDNS.COM
Name Server: NS2.SYSTEMDNS.COM
Name Server: NS3.SYSTEMDNS.COM
Status: clientTransferProhibited https://icann.org/epp#clientTransferProhibited
Status: clientUpdateProhibited https://icann.org/epp#clientUpdateProhibited
Updated Date: 17-jan-2017
Creation Date: 30-jun-2010
Expiration Date: 30-jun-2017
```

The 2013 RAA defines data elements in addition to those shown in the example above that are not contact information and thus may be relevant to this WG's discussion of "thin data." To learn more and see additional WHOIS record examples, visit <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/approved-with-specs-2013-09-17-en#whois> or https://newgtlds.icann.org/sites/default/files/agreements/agreement-approved-09jan14-en.htm#_DV_M281

Note that, in talking about which gTLD registration data elements should or should not be included in "thin data," we are deliberating on the **set of data elements to be made publicly accessible through an RDS without authentication**. Please keep this in mind when completing this poll.

*** 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. In our 6 June call, the WG considered whether any of the "thin data" elements shown in the example WHOIS record above are NOT required as "thin data" to be made publicly accessible through an RDS. During that discussion, the following agreement was proposed:
Expiration Date should be removed as a "thin data" element accessible without authentication through an RDS.

To help the WG make progress on this question, please indicate whether you agree with this proposal; if not, please explain using the Comment Box.

- Agree
- Unsure (explain below)
- Disagree (explain below)

Comment Box (use this box to provide rationale)

3. In our 6 June call, the WG considered whether there might be any NEW elements required as "thin data" elements to be made publicly accessible through an RDS. During that discussion, the following agreement was proposed:

DNSSEC should be added as a "thin data" element accessible without authentication through an RDS.

Note: This data element was added in the 2013 RAA; for example, *DNSSEC: signedDelegation* or *DNSSEC: unsigned*.

To help the WG make progress on this question, please indicate whether you agree with this proposal; if not, please explain using the Comment Box.

- Agree
- Unsure (explain below)
- Disagree (explain below)

Comment Box (use this box to provide rationale)

4. In our 6 June call, the WG considered the question:

Are today's gTLD WHOIS registration data elements classified as "thin" sufficient at this time?

Some WG members questioned whether all existing data elements (notably statuses and dates) are necessary in "thin data." Other WG members provided examples to illustrate why certain elements are needed in "thin data." To help the WG make further progress on this question, please indicate whether or not you believe each of the following elements must be included in "thin data" made publicly accessible through an RDS.

	Include in "Thin Data"
Domain Name	<input type="checkbox"/>
Registrar	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sponsoring Registrar IANA ID	<input type="checkbox"/>
Whois Server	<input type="checkbox"/>
Referral URL	<input type="checkbox"/>
Name Server	<input type="checkbox"/>
Status	<input type="checkbox"/>
Updated Date	<input type="checkbox"/>
Creation Date	<input type="checkbox"/>
Expiration Date (see also Q3)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (explain in Comment Box)	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comment Box (use this box to provide rationale or propose additional "thin data" elements)

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.