

RDS PDP WG Poll - 25 July

During our 25 July meeting, the RDS PDP WG continued deliberation on the Data Elements Charter question: *What gTLD registration data elements should be collected, stored, and disclosed?* Specifically, we considered possible key concepts drawn from 18 July poll responses for the following data elements: Registrant Name/Organization, Registrant Country, and Registrant Email Address.

This poll gives all WG members an opportunity to consider and confirm support for proposed WG agreements produced during our 25 July meeting. Please note that this poll covers only collection of data; it should NOT be assumed that data will be displayed if collected. Access to RDS data elements - and collection of other data elements not yet discussed - will be deliberated separately.

Poll results will be used to inform deliberation during the 1 August WG meeting and on-list, helping the entire WG better understand and then hopefully agree upon key concepts for or against inclusion of related data elements in the RDS.

Any WG member who did not attend the 25 July WG meeting is expected to catch up on WG discussion before taking this poll. Meeting notes and materials, including transcripts and recordings, can be found here: <https://community.icann.org/x/TmfwAw>

This poll will close at COB Saturday 29 July.

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.

* 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. Proposed WG Agreement #26

In the 25 July call, support and little opposition was expressed for the following key concept, derived from last week's poll results and then refined by WG discussion:

RDS policy must include a definition for every gTLD registration data element, including both a semantic definition and (by reference to appropriate standards) a syntax definition.

Please indicate below whether you agree or disagree with this key concept. To suggest an alternative phrasing for this key concept, use the comment box to do so and explain why.

- a) Agree
- b) Disagree
- c) Unsure, No Opinion, or Propose Alternative given in comment box below

Proposed Alternative

3. Proposed WG Agreement #27

In the 25 July call, support and little opposition was expressed for the following key concept, derived from last week's poll results:

At least one element identifying the domain name registrant (i.e., registered name holder) must be collected and included in the RDS.

Please indicate below whether you agree or disagree with this key concept. To suggest an alternative phrasing for this key concept, use the comment box to do so and explain why.

- a) Agree
- b) Disagree
- c) Unsure, No Opinion, or Propose Alternative given in comment box below

Proposed Alternative

4. Proposed WG Agreement #28

In the 25 July call, support and little opposition was expressed for the following key concept, derived from last week's poll results:

Data enabling at least one way to contact the registrant must be collected and included in the RDS.

Note: Nothing is stated or implied in this concept about the method(s) of contact required; this is addressed separately.

Please indicate below whether you agree or disagree with this key concept. To suggest an alternative phrasing for this key concept, use the comment box to do so and explain why.

- a) Agree
- b) Disagree
- c) Unsure, No Opinion, or Propose Alternative given in comment box below

Proposed Alternative

5. Proposed WG Agreement #29

In the 25 July call, both support and opposition were expressed for the following key concept, derived from last week's poll results:

At minimum, the registrant's email address must be collected and included in the RDS.

The following alternative phrasing has also been proposed:

At a minimum, one or more e-mail addresses must be collected for every domain name included in the RDS, for contact roles that require an e-mail address for contactability.

Please indicate below whether you agree with either or neither phrasing of this key concept. To suggest an alternative phrasing for this key concept, use the comment box to do so and explain why.

- a) Agree: At minimum, the registrant's email address must be collected and included in the RDS.
- b) Agree: At a minimum, one or more e-mail addresses must be collected for every domain name included in the RDS, for contact roles that require an e-mail address for contactability.
- c) Disagree with this key concept, regardless of phrasing
- d) Unsure, No Opinion, or Propose Alternative given in comment box below

Proposed Alternative

6. Proposed WG Agreement #30

In the 25 July call, both support and opposition were expressed for the following key concept, derived from last week's poll results:

In addition to email address, data enabling one alternative method of contact must be collected and included in the RDS.

The following alternative phrasing has also been proposed:

Data enabling one or more alternative or preferred methods of contact may also be optionally collected and included in the RDS.

Please indicate below whether you agree with either or neither phrasing of this key concept. To suggest an alternative phrasing for this key concept, use the comment box to do so and explain why.

- a) Agree: In addition to email address, data enabling one alternative method of contact must be collected and included in the RDS.
- b) Agree: Data enabling one or more alternative or preferred methods of contact may also be optionally collected and included in the RDS.
- c) Disagree with this key concept, regardless of phrasing
- d) Unsure, No Opinion, or Propose Alternative given in comment box below

Proposed Alternative

7. Proposed WG Agreement #31

In the 25 July call, support and little opposition was expressed for the following key concept, suggested and refined during the call:

At least one element enabling contact must be based on an open standard and not a proprietary communication method.

Please indicate below whether you agree or disagree with this key concept. To suggest an alternative phrasing for this key concept, use the comment box to do so and explain why.

- a) Agree
- b) Disagree
- c) Unsure, No Opinion, or Propose Alternative given in comment box below

Proposed Alternative

Please click the Submit button below to record 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. Thank you for participating in this poll.