


All Data Elements - Table

Q	Data Element	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral/ Unsure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Support
2	Registrant Name	20	7	2	1	5	35 36
3	Registrant Organization	20	7	2	2	4	35 37
4	Registrant Type*	12	8	7	3	5	35 19
5	Registrant Contact ID (Registry Registrant ID)	14	10	5	2	4	35 28
6	Registrant Contact Validation Status*	9	8	10	1	7	35 11
7	Registrant Contact Last Updated Timestamp*	13	10	5	0	7	35 22
8	Registrant Company Identifier*	12	7	10	4	2	35 23
9	Registrant Street Address	14	4	7	4	6	35 16
10	Registrant City	15	6	6	3	5	35 23
11	Registrant State/Province	17	3	6	4	5	35 23
12	Registrant Postal Code	14	5	7	3	5	34 20
13	Registrant Country	20	8	2	2	3	35 40
14	Registrant Phone + Registrant Phone Ext	12	7	7	1	8	35 14
15	Registrant Alt Phone + Ext*	6	8	9	3	7	33 3
16	Registrant Email Address	21	7	3	1	3	35 42
17	Registrant Alt Email*	8	14	5	3	5	35 17
18	Registrant Fax + Registrant Fax Ext	6	2	13	7	7	35 -7
19	Registrant SMS*	3	8	11	5	8	35 -7
20	Registrant IM*	3	4	16	3	8	34 -9
21	Registrant Social Media*	3	6	15	3	8	35 -7
22	Registrant Abuse URL*	12	7	7	2	5	33 19
23	Registrant Contact URL*	9	9	9	2	5	34 15
24	Registrant Alt Social Media*	3	5	14	5	8	35 -10
25	Admin Contact and Contact ID	17	9	5	1	2	34 38
26	Legal Contact and Contact ID*	14	6	7	4	4	35 22
27	Technical Contact and Contact ID	19	6	7	2	1	35 40
28	Abuse Contact and Contact ID*	16	7	5	2	5	35 27
29	Privacy/Proxy Provider Contact and Contact ID*	15	10	8	0	2	35 36
30	Business Contact and Contact ID*	13	7	8	2	5	35 21
31	Server Status (Registry)*	12	8	10	1	4	35 23
32	Reseller	14	11	8	0	1	34 37
33	Registrar Abuse Contact Email Address	22	11	0	0	2	35 51
34	Registrar Abuse Contact Phone	20	10	2	1	2	35 45
35	URL of Internic Complaint Site (ICANN WHOIS Data Pr	17	12	4	0	2	35 42
36	Registrar Jurisdiction*	10	8	13	2	2	35 22
37	Registry Jurisdiction*	10	7	14	2	1	34 23
38	Registration Agreement Language*	7	12	9	2	3	33 18
39	Original Registration Date*	16	7	6	3	2	34 32

* indicates data element not in 2013 RAA

Score: Sum of SA=2, agree=1, disagree=1, SD=2

All Data Elements - Graph



Mostly Agreed Data Elements

Q	Data Element	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral/U nsure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Support
2	Registrant Name	20	7	2	1	5	35
3	Registrant Organization	20	7	2	2	4	35
13	Registrant Country	20	8	2	2	3	35
16	Registrant Email Address	21	7	3	1	3	35
25	Admin Contact and Contact ID	17	9	5	1	2	34
27	Technical Contact and Contact ID	19	6	7	2	1	35
29	Privacy/Proxy Provider Contact and Contact ID*	15	10	8	0	2	35
32	Reseller	14	11	8	0	1	34
33	Registrar Abuse Contact Email Address	22	11	0	0	2	35
34	Registrar Abuse Contact Phone	20	10	2	1	2	35
35	URL of Internic Complaint Site (ICANN WHOIS Data Problem Reporting System)	17	12	4	0	2	35
39	Original Registration Date*	16	7	6	3	2	34

* indicates data element not in 2013 RAA
 Score: Sum of SA=2, agree=1, disagree=1, SD=2

2 Registrant Name

Benjamin Akinmoyeje	I disagree because of privacy issues.
Richard Woodvine	In a commercial situation, this information is already public in other databases. In a personal situation, the information can be shielded through privacy whois
Kris Seeburn\	Needs a clear definition of the owner or the one who has registered
Ayden Férdeline	Individuals are entitled to protection of their personal information. Their name should not be displayed, if indeed it is collected.
Stephanie Perrin	individuals are entitled to protection of their personal info. Name should not be displayed if collected. Voluntary for those who are commercial
Benny Samuelsen	But only if it's a natural personal registration
Denny Watson	Investigations of abuse are hindered by not providing this data. If it is desirable to mask this data by either the owner, then there exists methods to do so. Additionally, this field my be populated via role account.
Marc Anderson	For many registrations, such as when done by a company or by a privacy/proxy provider, having a registrant name doesn't make sense. I would say that Registrant name "could" be a data element as some registrants may want to publish that data, but not that it "should" or "must" be an RDS data element.
Greg Shatan	This is the most fundamental and basic piece of information -- answering the eternal question, "Whois" the owner of that domain name.
Mark Svancarek	This data is the main representation of the registrant, and is as important as the contact info.
Sam Lanfranco	I may not fully understand this, but there are valid reasons for individuals to be reachable, but not identified, for civil society/ngo/ong website activities
Volker Greimann	As an optional field, provided registrant grants free permission for use of his data.
Allison Nixon	This is important to include as a data element. Registrants have valid reasons for explicitly wanting this information disseminated.
John Bambenek	It's almost pointless to have RDS without registrant. At a certain point if you reduce all the data elements, DNS is all you have left.
Kal Feher	Registrant Name should be amongst the data elements within an RDS, but it should not be required.
Greg Aaron	MUST always be collected and stored. Must be disclosed (published) in some cases (such as when a legal person); other disclosure cases TBD in light of privacy laws.

Mostly Agreed Data Elements

3 Registrant Organization

Steve Metalitz	Comment: At some point relatively early in the implementation process, all data elements should be more clearly defined than they are today. This is an example of an "existing" (RAA spec 3 para. 1.4.2) data element that has never been defined and that may be completed inconsistently by various registrants. This inconsistency/uncertainty makes it more difficult to evaluate this data element .
Richard Woodvine	As above
Kris Seeburn\	One needs to understand whether its a person or is it for an Organisation. This is important further to know but we also need to understand if its an organisation it could be the admin of the org. but they could hide the real owner as well. This one is as tricky as the top ones.
Ayden Férdeline	Same rationale as above; organisations such as NGOs are entitled to protection of their information.
Stephanie Perrin	same rationale as above. Voluntary for commercial
Denny Watson	Investigations of abuse are hindered by not providing this data. If it is desirable to mask this data by either the owner, then there exists methods to do so.
Marc Anderson	For some registrations it may make sense to include Registrant Organization, but it doesn't apply to all registrations.
Greg Shatan	See above.
Mark Svancarek	This is equivalent to Registrant Name in cases of organizations.
Sam Lanfranco	An organization's name/identity links to its remit and scope of activities, and gives a legal entity responsible for website/domain name behavior
Allison Nixon	This is important to include as a data element. Registrants have valid reasons for explicitly wanting this information disseminated.
John Bambenek	Registrant Org can be "self" if need be.
Kal Feher	As with Registrant Name, it should be amongst the data elements, but not required.
Greg Aaron	MUST always be collected and stored. Must be disclosed (published) in some cases (such as when a legal person); other disclosure cases TBD in light of privacy laws.

13 Registrant Country

Richard Woodvine	Jurisdiction is always important
Kris Seeburn\	Important to know but i remain neutral about this because it all depends on the previous details. But we do need to know where it belongs
Ayden Férdeline	Country may be necessary to determine applicable law.
Stephanie Perrin	country may be necessary to determine applicable law
Denny Watson	This data does not identify individuals and establishes jurisdiction. Investigations of abuse are hindered by not providing this data.
Greg Shatan	See above.
Rob Golding	Address is private data
Sam Lanfranco	This at a minimum, and with #12 it gets very specific
Volker Greimann	Generic enough not to allow identification of the registrant, yet specific enough to allow complainants to determine applicable jurisdiction.
Allison Nixon	This is important to include as a data element. Registrants have valid reasons for explicitly wanting this information disseminated.
John Bambenek	Being able to see that registrant organization information does not match geography can be a very important tool. This is also needed to serve legal paperwork.
Kal Feher	While other registrant contact details are of value to RDS consumers only, country may have value to RDS operators in determining appropriate RDS behaviour.
Greg Aaron	MUST always be collected and stored. Must be disclosed (published) in some cases (such as when a legal person); other disclosure cases TBD in light of privacy laws.

Mostly Agreed Data Elements

16 Registrant Email Address

Richard Woodvine	A method of contact -- either phone or email is important. I would rather have my email on a registration than my phone number, the reason I selected the way I did.
Kris Seeburn\	It should be a verified email
Stephanie Perrin	My preference as a contact method would be email address. I cannot speak for all registrants though, some do not use email and would prefer a text. Wrong level of questions here.
Denny Watson	Investigations of abuse are hindered by not providing this data. If it is desirable to mask this data by either the owner, then there exists methods to do so. Additionally, this field my be populated via data for role account.
Greg Shatan	So fundamental. So basic.
Rob Golding	Email address are private/personal data;
Sam Lanfranco	Yes, if necessary through Privacy Protection when privacy is needed
Volker Greimann	Collection, yes - to allow contactability by service provider and for mandatory notices, publication, no.
Allison Nixon	This is important to include as a data element. Registrants have valid reasons for explicitly wanting this information disseminated.
John Bambenek	Registrant should be informed this should be a contact email and can be distinct from their personal email address.
Michael Peddemors	Email and Spam abuse solves abuse, and the value of being able to contact the person regarding compromises/abuses related to their domains far outweighs any risks
Greg Aaron	MUST always be collected and stored. Must be disclosed (published) in some cases (such as when a legal person); other disclosure cases TBD in light of privacy laws.

25 Admin Contact and Contact ID

Steve Metalitz	strongest examples of the problems created by the lack of a uniform definition of what an "admin contact" is supposed to be, do, represent, or be capable of. The resulting inconsistency/uncertainty makes it difficult to evaluate the importance of collection (and publication) of these data elements. As to Admin Contact ID, see response to #4.
Richard Woodvine	As above
Kris Seeburn\	That is acceptable but we need to ensure the validity of this on a very constant basis because these actually change often and the contact may not know the details.
Stephanie Perrin	admin contact could be useful, but it needs to be carefully managed in the case of individuals
Denny Watson	Investigations of abuse are hindered by not providing this data. If it is desirable to mask this data by either the owner, then there exists methods to do so. Additionally, this field my be populated via data for role account.
Greg Shatan	Fundamental.
Sam Lanfranco	Contact with admin (rather than owner) directs query to the proper person to deal with administrative issues.
Volker Greimann	As an optional contact. Potentially problematic as the contact may not be involved in the registration process and the necessary permission may be lacking. Not every registrant may be able to or may need to provide such a contact.
John Bambenek	Of the contact IDs, not sure this is the most relevant.
Michael Peddemors	IT helps determine if the same admin contact is used by domain registrants, with similar behaviours, used for security analytics

Mostly Agreed Data Elements

Greg Aaron	MUST always be collected and stored. Must be disclosed (published) in some cases (such as when a legal person); other disclosure cases TBD in light of privacy laws.
------------	--

27 Technical Contact and Contact ID

Steve Metalitz	But see response to #25 re issues involving definition of the existing data elements and clarification of the proposed new data element (Technical Contact ID).
Richard Woodvine	As above
Kris Seeburn\	That is acceptable but we need to ensure the validity of this on a very constant basis because these actually change often and the contact may not know the details.
Stephanie Perrin	this is something an OPOC could handle, is it not?
Denny Watson	Investigations of abuse are hindered by not providing this data. If it is desirable to mask this data by either the owner, then there exists methods to do so. Additionally, this field may be populated via data for role account.
Greg Shatan	Fundamental.
Rob Golding	the "tech contact" hasn't been of any use in almost 20 years and should be dropped entirely
Sam Lanfranco	There is a difference between "Admin" issues and "Tech" issues, so appropriate contact helps
Volker Greimann	As an optional contact. Potentially problematic as the contact may not be involved in the registration process and the necessary permission may be lacking.
Michael Peddemors	IT helps determine if the same admin contact is used by domain registrants, with similar behaviours, used for security analytics
Greg Aaron	MUST always be collected and stored. Must be disclosed.

29 Privacy/Proxy Provider Contact and Contact ID*

Steve Metalitz	Support in principle but deferring for reasons stated in #4.
Richard Woodvine	Could be a optional element, but not a required element, provided the above is present
Kris Seeburn\	that should come up as first level contact if the organisation is going through proxy. But then the question arises who is responsible the organisation or the proxy
Ayden Férdeline	Seems logical but I have too many questions before I could change this to 'agree' or 'disagree'.
Stephanie Perrin	We need to discuss these data elements prior to quizzing us on them really. It is logical to have proxy contacts in the RDS, but the question is how many, one OPOC for the proxy provider ought to be enough
Denny Watson	If Privacy/Proxy Provider is used than this data should be provided.
Greg Shatan	Contactability is critical.
Mark Svancarek	Unless P/P data fields are policed and maintained to be compliant, the entire system breaks down.
Sam Lanfranco	An appropriate query should operate through P/P provider as easily as directly with registrant
Allison Nixon	There doesn't seem to be a point in contacting the proxy provider. Every contact attempt I am aware of leads nowhere. "Proxy provider" seems more like a "false information provider" because it doesn't proxy contact attempts.
Michael Peddemors	IT helps determine if the same proxy contact is used by domain registrants, with similar behaviours, used for security analytics

32 Reseller

Steve Metalitz	Subject to confirmation that the definition of this term in RAA 1.24 applies.
Richard Woodvine	Another contact point if necessary

Mostly Agreed Data Elements

Kris Seeburn\	This is real problem i faced. Because the reseller sold out to another and i was not advised that someone else has changed the system and reseller was not same when we tried to move hosts.
Stephanie Perrin	good idea, it is hard to find out who the reseller is at the moment
Denny Watson	Reseller information provides insight into the registration
Greg Shatan	Fundamental to resolve issues and understand registrant relationships.
Mark Svancarek	don't know
Sam Lanfranco	Of mixed views here. The reseller is like an agent for a broker (in real estate). Knowing the broker (Registrar) should be enough.
Volker Greimann	As an optional field.
Michael Peddemors	Only in the sense that this data can be loosely used to report abusive registrants, and to detect behavioural habits of abusive registrants
Greg Aaron	BTW, it is an optional field, and should remain so.

33 Registrar Abuse Contact Email Address

Steve Metalitz	As noted in #3 would benefit from clearer definition (does RAA 3.18.1 apply here?).
Richard Woodvine	As above
Kris Seeburn\	We probably need this but accuracy is also important and what are they entitled to do this also need definition
Denny Watson	Investigations of abuse are hindered by not providing this data. If it is desirable to mask this data by either the owner, then there exists methods to do so. Additionally, this field my be populated via data for role account.
Rob Golding	This was a recent "add" to whois and a significantly cause of abuse, misuse and problems
Sam Lanfranco	Yes, they need to be aware of, and able to act on, what their clients are doing wrong.
Volker Greimann	It should be clarified however that the ability of the registrar to affect content is extremely limited and that the registrar is not the registrant.
Michael Peddemors	I mean really, they should have good spam protection? Shouldn't they be required to publish this?

34 Registrar Abuse Contact Phone

Steve Metalitz	See #33.
Richard Woodvine	As above
Kris Seeburn\	Would be good to have but 99.99 % of the time this is never right even if you check on reseller or registrar site
Ayden Férdeline	Email seems to me the better contact method.
Denny Watson	Investigations of abuse are hindered by not providing this data. If it is desirable to mask this data by either the owner, then there exists methods to do so. Additionally, this field my be populated via data for role account.
Rob Golding	should be removed
Sam Lanfranco	I prefer text base reports that usually contain more information than a phone complaint.
Volker Greimann	It should be clarified however that the ability of the registrar to affect content is extremely limited and that the registrar is not the registrant.
Michael Peddemors	There are emergency reporting requirements, eg bank phishing domains, domains used as part of ransomware, where time is of the essence

35 URL of Internic Complaint Site (ICANN WHOIS Data Problem Reporting System)

Richard Woodvine	Yes, when things are broken an easy way to solve them is always better
Kris Seeburn\	I think an authority needs to act or react as with RIRs
Stephanie Perrin	I dont quite understand this data element but it seems logical, looking forward to the explanation

Mostly Agreed Data Elements

Denny Watson	This appears to be of great value to the users.
Rob Golding	this is a display item not a collect/store item
Sam Lanfranco	Need address of "where the buck stops" and the buck stops at ICANN
Volker Greimann	It makes sense to include a complaint link with the data, however this would not be a data point for each domain but rather part of the generic output that stays the same for all registrations.
Michael Peddemors	Not sure of the effectiveness, but cannot hurt.

39 Original Registration Date*

Steve Metalitz	Support in principle, see response #4.
Richard Woodvine	Often an indicator or ill intents
Kris Seeburn\	Important piece to know when it was registered and this is where a whois is important, or a whois is important
Ayden Férdeline	I do not understand why we need this collected.
Stephanie Perrin	Why are we collecting this?
Denny Watson	Investigations of abuse are hindered by not providing this data.
Andrew Sullivan	This is a category mistake. It's not "this domain". It's a domain named the same thing. This requirement would be extremely difficult for existing repositories to meet, which means that it would also automatically be wrong the day it started.
Mark Svancarek	Useful for abuse metrics analysis
Sam Lanfranco	Simple data, non-intrusive, and useful for due diligence.
Michael Peddemors	Absolutely, used by malware researchers all the time, and for determining trust factors related to activity by that domain
Greg Aaron	What is an "Original" date versus the create date? (Create date should be the create data as per the registry.)

More Disagree/Unsure than Agree Data Elements

Q	Data Element	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral/ Unsure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Support
18	Registrant Fax + Registrant Fax Ext	6	2	13	7	7	35 -7
19	Registrant SMS*	3	8	11	5	8	35 -7
20	Registrant IM*	3	4	16	3	8	34 -9
21	Registrant Social Media*	3	6	15	3	8	35 -7
24	Registrant Alt Social Media*	3	5	14	5	8	35 -10

* indicates data element not in 2013 RAA

Score: Sum of SA=2, agree=1, disagree=1, SD=2

18 Registrant Fax + Registrant Fax Ext

Steve Metalitz	As noted in #3, clear definition needed.
Richard Woodvine	Could be a optional element, but not a required element
Kris Seeburn\	I wonder if people are still using fax it might be important for big corporates but how will one verify
Ayden Férdeline	Obsolete
Stephanie Perrin	Who uses fax these days? this is a good example of why specifying mandatory data elements is not a good approach to this phase of our deliberations
Denny Watson	Investigations of abuse are hindered by not providing this data. If it is desirable to mask this data by either the owner, then there exists methods to do so. Additionally, this field my be populated via data for role account.
Andrew Sullivan	Frankly, I kind of can't understand why we still think fax is a thing :)
Greg Shatan	As long as we're still using faxes....
Rob Golding	Phone Numbers are private/personal data
Sam Lanfranco	At most Optional since most no longer have/use fax communications
Volker Greimann	Who still uses fax?
Alexander Jaeger	not very important for me
John Bambenek	Does anyone use fax machines anymore?
Michael Peddemors	by fax can't be handled by email
Kal Feher	surely a pointless field for the majority of registrations.
Nathalie Coupet	Fax are a thing of the past
Greg Aaron	Does anyone use faxes anymore? Email, phone, and street address should suffice.

19 Registrant SMS*

Steve Metalitz	Support in principle but deferring for reasons stated in #4.
Richard Woodvine	Could be a optional element, but not a required element
Kris Seeburn\	Why do we need this numbers change sometimes or more often what are we trying to ascertain? For identity
Ayden Férdeline	Not everyone has access to SMS.
Stephanie Perrin	again, if this is how people select to be contacted fine, but must not be mandatory.
Denny Watson	Investigations of abuse are hindered by not providing this data. If it is desirable to mask this data by either the owner, then there exists methods to do so. Additionally, this field my be populated via data for role account.
Andrew Sullivan	I'm slightly nervous about this because of various multistep or multi-factor schemes
Greg Shatan	Agree for reasons stated in EWG.
Rob Golding	Phone Numbers are private/personal data

More Disagree/Unsure than Agree Data Elements

Sam Lanfranco	Optional depending in registrant preferences (what? they don't have email?)
Volker Greimann	Even as an optional contact there is no need to collect such data for business purposes.
John Bambenek	Neutral on this point.
Michael Peddemors	Again, abuse potential, phone number is an identity which can be abused, plus the potential costs to be born by the recipient if it is abused
Greg Aaron	This should be "Mobile Phone Number" and should be an optional field.

20 Registrant IM*

Steve Metalitz	See #19.
Richard Woodvine	Could be a optional element, but not a required element
Kris Seeburn\	to people giving up
Ayden Férdeline	Not future-proof.
Stephanie Perrin	same response as in 19
Denny Watson	Investigations of abuse are hindered by not providing this data. If it is desirable to mask this data by either the owner, then there exists methods to do so. Additionally, this field my be populated via data for role account.
Andrew Sullivan	as with SMS; also this seems like we are getting into design of things that shouldn't be in policy. I'd be more inclined to say "direct contact, method and contact identifier". This would cover phones, Skype, IM, &c &c., and be future-proof against new kinds of identifier technologies that come along.
Greg Shatan	Agree for reasons stated in EWG.
Rob Golding	private/personal data
Sam Lanfranco	Optional depending in registrant preferences (what? they don't have email?)
Volker Greimann	Even as an optional contact there is no need to collect such data for business purposes.
John Bambenek	Neutral and likely would never be used.
Michael Peddemors	More data is needed, however we can see this as a candidate. Judging by the amount of reporters that fall back on 'twitter' reporting, when they can't get a response from an owner.

21 Registrant Social Media*

Steve Metalitz	See #19.
Richard Woodvine	Could be a optional element, but not a required element
Kris Seeburn\	Not sure whether we really need this as well to much information gathering can lead to people giving up
Ayden Férdeline	Not future-proof.
Stephanie Perrin	same response as in 19
Denny Watson	Investigations of abuse are hindered by not providing this data. If it is desirable to mask this data by either the owner, then there exists methods to do so. Additionally, this field my be populated via data for role account.
Andrew Sullivan	see above
Greg Shatan	Need to clarify that this is for communications purposes only. Agree for reasons stated in EWG. Need to clarify that this only applies when the information already exists.
Mark Svancarek	Nice to have
Rob Golding	it's a domain not a dating app
Sam Lanfranco	Optional depending in registrant preferences (what? they don't have email?)
Volker Greimann	Even as an optional contact there is no need to collect such data for business purposes.

More Disagree/Unsure than Agree Data Elements

Allison Nixon	Some social media platforms deliberately censor inbound messages from complete strangers with many degrees of social separation from the contactee. For example Facebook does this. So relying on this as a public contact method could have complications.
John Bambenek	Might be useful as an optional element to establish trust in a specific social media account to be able to mutually validate each other, but I suspect few will use it.
Michael Peddemors	This is far too broad a category
Greg Aaron	Should be an optional field.

24 Registrant Alt Social Media*

Steve Metalitz	see #19
Richard Woodvine	Could be a optional element, but not a required element
Kris Seeburn\	Why do we need this more it can again be misleading
Stephanie Perrin	Once again, same response as in 21
Andrew Sullivan	see above re contact info
Greg Shatan	Agree for reasons stated in EWG. Need to clarify that this only applies when the information already exists.
Sam Lanfranco	Optional depending in registrant preferences (what? they don't have email?)
Volker Greimann	Even as an optional contact there is no need to collect such data for business purposes.
John Bambenek	One is sufficient probably if it covers all the various social media forms.
Greg Aaron	More bother; superfluous.

More Agree/Unsure than Disagree Data Elements

Q	Data Element	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral/Unsure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree		Support
4	Registrant Type*	12	8	7	3	5	35	19
5	Registrant Contact ID (Registry Registrant ID)	14	10	5	2	4	35	28
6	Registrant Contact Validation Status*	9	8	10	1	7	35	11
7	Registrant Contact Last Updated Timestamp*	13	10	5	0	7	35	22
8	Registrant Company Identifier*	12	7	10	4	2	35	23
9	Registrant Street Address	14	4	7	4	6	35	16
10	Registrant City	15	6	6	3	5	35	23
11	Registrant State/Province	17	3	6	4	5	35	23
12	Registrant Postal Code	14	5	7	3	5	34	20
14	Registrant Phone + Registrant Phone Ext	12	7	7	1	8	35	14
15	Registrant Alt Phone + Ext*	6	8	9	3	7	33	3
17	Registrant Alt Email*	8	14	5	3	5	35	17
22	Registrant Abuse URL*	12	7	7	2	5	33	19
23	Registrant Contact URL*	9	9	9	2	5	34	15
26	Legal Contact and Contact ID*	14	6	7	4	4	35	22
28	Abuse Contact and Contact ID*	16	7	5	2	5	35	27
30	Business Contact and Contact ID*	13	7	8	2	5	35	21
31	Server Status (Registry)*	12	8	10	1	4	35	23
36	Registrar Jurisdiction*	10	8	13	2	2	35	22
37	Registry Jurisdiction*	10	7	14	2	1	34	23
38	Registration Agreement Language*	7	12	9	2	3	33	18

* indicates data element not in 2013 RAA

Score: Sum of SA=2, agree=1, disagree=1, SD=2

Review comments for/against these data elements after deliberation on other elements?

40 Are there any new Data Elements (other than those already listed above) that you believe should be included in the RDS? Why?

Steve Metalitz	Billing data elements were required to be disclosed/published under several of the original registry agreements (some since superseded) for new gTLDs that were recognized in the sponsored TLD round that followed the "proof of concept" round and preceded the "current" round. And of course this data is routinely collected today. These data elements should continue to be collected, NOT for routine publication, but so that they would be accessible e.g. by subpoena or judicial process in an appropriate case. Reserving the right to supplement this response.
Rod Rasmussen	(Optional) Domain Purpose - beyond "type" there may be interest for registrants to express the intent of registering their domain, particularly for commercial entities who may wish to designate things like "infrastructure", "trademark protection", "commerce" etc. (Optional) Protocol use "flags" for protocols one would expect the domain to be used for - in particular e-mail, web, DNS. Would be helpful for better signalling and automation for various abuses or dependencies (examples: a domain designated for DNS may need a higher level of scrutiny before suspension for late payment, and a domain without an e-mail flag would be easily blocked by anti-spam settings). (Optional) Ad-hoc fields for registrants to be able to designate anything else they would want to provide either publicly or specified gating regimes TBD.
Kathy Kleiman	I don't believe the RDS should be voting on the data elements of the EWG without extensive training in what they are supposed to mean. When the Final EWG Report came out, many questions were raised, and many who closely followed the EWG Report, did not understand the definitions of many of these newly-proposed data elements, much less their scope and use.
Richard Woodvine	No
Farzaneh Badii (Badii)	you must be kidding!
Kris Seeburn\	Personally there are too many redundant information and many needs verification and it can slow down the process to get a domain. I think personally we should align with different levels, the Registrar, Registry, RIR, ISP and end user. These could be broken down and become shared responsibility for ICANN RDS is in line and updated after a set period of time. But as an end user i won't be having all these details to provide and question comes down if i don't have all these do i still get a domain name or not? Whilst we are trying to ease domain name registration it should be lengthy but one needs to gather important verified information that can really help everyone out. If there are abuse etc., or even cctld but these are going to be phased out that leaves the whois of the RIR to know where tings are but even the RIR whois and whoas is not updated.I could say more but let's leave it here.
Ayden Férdeline	NO. We should be looking to minimise the amount of data that is collected, not seeking to collect even more.
Stephanie Perrin	Heavens no, this is more than we need already.
Sam Lanfranco	No new Data Elements. Still prefer minimalist approach with the observations that an existing website will have a lot of the contact information currently being looked at for addition to the RDS data elements. Keep it simple at this level, when the information is readily available elsewhere.
Farell FOLLY	It was long enough! !
Allison Nixon	There needs to be a way to determine if a domain was transferred since its original registration. Right now it can only be determined by inference.
Michael Peddemors	Number of Domains owned by the registrant via the registrar. Method of Ownership Validity, eg registrant validated by (CreditCard, Personal Identification, Dun and Brad Street)
Greg Aaron	The following are currently in output and should continue to be published: Domain Name. Nameservers. DNSSEC. Domain Updated Date. Domain Expiration Date. WHOIS (or RDS) Server. Registrar Name. Registrar URL. Registrar IANA ID. Domain Status (includes EPP client and server statuses, and relevant grace period statuses). Last update of WHOIS database (timestamp). NOTE: this poll addresses fields related to domain and contacts ONLY -- it does not address fields related to nameserver objects and registrar objects, and the fields in those objects should be discussed as well.

Green comments propose new data elements

Yellow comment refers to data elements already agreed as part of the MPDS

White comments are general comments about the poll

Red comments refer indicate that data elements are sufficient or already too much