


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: 23 Skipped: 0

#	Responses	Date
1	Rod Rasmussen	7/29/2017 2:27 PM
2	Blake Darche Not a WG member - responded a) to all	7/29/2017 1:51 PM
3	Sara Bockey	7/28/2017 3:16 PM
4	Susan Kawaguchi	7/28/2017 9:55 AM
5	Steve Metalitz	7/28/2017 9:31 AM
6	Tom Lancaster	7/28/2017 8:21 AM
7	Kris Seeburn	7/28/2017 8:13 AM
8	Jonathan matkowsky	7/28/2017 1:41 AM
9	Vicky Sheckler	7/27/2017 12:28 PM
10	Marco Schmidt	7/27/2017 3:57 AM
11	Benny Samuelson	7/27/2017 2:10 AM
12	Richard Leaning	7/27/2017 12:20 AM
13	Kal Feher	7/26/2017 3:29 PM
14	andrew sullivan	7/26/2017 1:24 PM
15	Ayden Férdeline	7/26/2017 9:49 AM
16	Scott Hollenbeck	7/26/2017 9:27 AM
17	Michele Neylon	7/26/2017 8:38 AM
18	Michael Peddemors	7/26/2017 8:11 AM
19	Chuck Gomes	7/26/2017 7:47 AM
20	Klaus Stoll	7/26/2017 7:21 AM
21	Maxim Alzoba	7/26/2017 4:24 AM
22	Volker Greimann	7/26/2017 3:38 AM
23	Greg Aaron	7/25/2017 7:12 PM


Q2 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.



Answer Choices	Responses
a) Agree	82.61% 19
b) Disagree	0.00% 0
c) Unsure, No Opinion, or Propose Alternative given in comment box below	17.39% 4
Total	23

#	Proposed Alternative	Date
1	need more info to understand this better.	7/28/2017 3:16 PM Sara B
2	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 if possible.	7/27/2017 2:10 AM Benny S
3	in cases where fields are defined by standards developed by other parties (like postal address, or phone number) all we should do is to refer to those standards. But on the other hand, for data elements, which do not originate from other parties , we might need description of syntax with examples).	7/26/2017 4:24 AM Maxim A
4	RDS policy must include or refer to a definition for every gTLD registration data element, including both a semantic definition and (by reference to appropriate standards) a syntax definition.	7/26/2017 3:38 AM Volker G


Q3 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.



Answer Choices	Responses
a) Agree	82.61% 19
b) Disagree Ayden F	4.35% 1
c) Unsure, No Opinion, or Propose Alternative given in comment box below	13.04% 3
Total	23

#	Proposed Alternative	Date
1	At least one element allowing to identify the domain name registrant (i.e., registered name holder) must be collected and included in the RDS. This reading will allow us to use ROIDs of Registrant ID (allows to identify Registrant with help of Registrars or Registries)	7/26/2017 4:24 AM Maxim A
2	At least one element that may allow to identify the domain name registrant (i.e., registered name holder) must be collected and included in the RDS. This does not prohibit the use of services that protect the anonymity of an RNH.	7/26/2017 3:38 AM Volker G


Q4 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.



Answer Choices	Responses
a) Agree	78.26% 18
b) Disagree Ayden F	4.35% 1
c) Unsure, No Opinion, or Propose Alternative given in comment box below	17.39% 4
Total	23

#	Proposed Alternative	Date
1	Data enabling more than one way to contact the registrant must be collected and included in RDS.	7/28/2017 9:31 AM Steve M
2	As noted previously, we need to collect at least physical address, electronic means of communication (typically email), and a phone number	7/27/2017 12:28 PM Vicky S
3	I'm not sure whether this is mutually exclusive with #31; if not, I'm ok with it.	7/26/2017 1:24 PM Andrew S
4	Data enabling at least one way to directly or indirectly contact the registrant must be collected and included in the RDS. This does not prohibit the use of services that protect the anonymity of an RNH.	7/26/2017 3:38 AM Volker G

Q5 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.




Answer Choices	Responses
a) Agree: At minimum, the registrant's email address must be collected and included in the RDS.	52.17% 12
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.	39.13% 9
c) Disagree with this key concept, regardless of phrasing Ayden F, Klaus S	8.70% 2
d) Unsure, No Opinion, or Propose Alternative given in comment box below	0.00% 0
Total	23

#	Proposed Alternative	Date
1	The email is and as been one of the primary way for domain transfers etc., so i would still support email plus another alternative supporting contact be it a phone mobile but there needs to be a good validation and this should not be necessarily visible to all.	7/28/2017 8:13 AM Kris S

2	agree email or some form of electronic communication method must be collected, but we also need to collect a physical address and a telephone number	7/27/2017 12:28 PM Richard L
3	Email address MUST be verified and validated at least yearly that its still correct	7/27/2017 12:20 AM Vicky S
4	But we may want to explore to replace email address with "commonly used electronic means of communication" to future-proof this concept.	7/26/2017 3:38 AM Volker G

Q6 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.




Answer Choices	Responses
a) Agree: In addition to email address, data enabling one alternative method of contact must be collected and included in the RDS.	21.74% 5
b) Agree: Data enabling one or more alternative or preferred methods of contact may also be optionally collected and included in the RDS.	56.52% 13
c) Disagree with this key concept, regardless of phrasing Ayden F, Klaus S	8.70% 2
d) Unsure, No Opinion, or Propose Alternative given in comment box below	13.04% 3
Total	23

#	Proposed Alternative	Date
---	----------------------	------

Proposed WG Agreement 30 - continued

1	In addition to email address, at least two alternative methods of contact (such as physical address and telephone) must be collected and included in RDS.	7/28/2017 9:31 AM Steve M
2	as noted above, we should require collection of some form of electronic communication (for day to day correspondence), telephone (i.e. for urgent or complicated matters) and physical address (for jurisdiction and related purposes as well as for correspondence)	7/27/2017 12:28 PM Vicky S
3	Problem will still be the policy for validation of the data and the metrics for such validation else they are useless.	7/27/2017 2:10 AM Benny S
4	I think the wording might be clearer if option b) was reworded something like this: "Data enabling one or more alternative or preferred methods of contact may also be collected and included in the RDS as an optional data element.	7/26/2017 7:47 AM Chuck G
5	Provided the RNH has explicitly consented to this use of his data and the consent has not been withdrawn.	7/26/2017 3:38 AM Volker G
6	In addition to email address, data enabling AT LEAST ONE alternative method of contact must be collected and included in the RDS. [NOTE: Right now ICANN policy requires email AND TWO other required contact methods: postal address and phone number.]	7/25/2017 7:12 PM Greg A

Q7 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.



Answer Choices	Responses
a) Agree	86.96% 20
b) Disagree	0.00% 0
c) Unsure, No Opinion, or Propose Alternative given in comment box below	13.04% 3
Total	23

#	Proposed Alternative	Date
1	Unsure. Given the previous questions is email not sufficient to cover the above statement?	7/28/2017 8:21 AM Tom L
2	Not applicable - We should not be collecting any contact information.	7/26/2017 9:49 AM Ayden F