


**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. Please do NOT participate in this poll if you are a WG Observer who has not upgraded to WG Member.**

Answered: 25 Skipped: 0

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Allan Liska	8/19/2017 8:57 AM
2	vicky sheckler	8/19/2017 7:51 AM
3	Jonathan matkowsky	8/19/2017 6:13 AM
4	Ayden Férdeline	8/19/2017 4:11 AM
5	Nathalie Coupet	8/18/2017 6:48 PM
6	Steve Metalitz	8/18/2017 6:43 PM
7	Sam Lanfranco	8/18/2017 4:53 PM
8	Sara Bockey	8/18/2017 3:57 PM
9	Michael Hammer	8/18/2017 3:46 PM
10	Travis Farral	8/18/2017 3:19 PM
11	Rod Rasmussen	8/18/2017 3:05 PM
12	Marc Anderson	8/18/2017 2:04 PM
13	Benny Samuelson	8/18/2017 11:42 AM
14	Benjamin Akinmoyeje	8/17/2017 9:39 AM
15	Maxim Alzoba	8/17/2017 8:59 AM
16	Marco Schmidt	8/17/2017 6:31 AM
17	Erica Varlese	8/17/2017 6:03 AM
18	Scott Hollenbeck	8/17/2017 4:59 AM
19	Volker Greimann	8/17/2017 2:59 AM
20	Krishna Seeburn (kris)	8/17/2017 1:55 AM
21	Tjabbe Bos	8/17/2017 1:37 AM
22	Tim OBrien	8/17/2017 12:05 AM
23	Michael Peddemors	8/16/2017 5:54 PM
24	Chuck Gomes	8/16/2017 3:41 PM
25	John Bambenek	8/16/2017 3:07 PM

Q2 Please indicate whether you support the following proposed WG agreement in relation to alternative contact methods. Please note that this proposed WG agreement should be considered in the context of previous WG agreements, especially WG agreement #29 ("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 contractibility"). The proposed WG agreement you are asked to respond to in this poll question concerning alternative contact methods is as follows: "In order to provide resiliency to overcome communication failure, at least one alternative contact method (possibly multiple alternative contact methods) **MUST** be supported by the RDS as an optional field(s)".

Answered: 25 Skipped: 0




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
I support this WG agreement	68.00% 17
I do not support this WG agreement (please explain in the comment box why you do not support)	8.00% 2
I would like to propose alternative wording for this WG agreement (please use comment box to provide alternative wording for this WG agreement)	24.00% 6
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>25</b>

#	COMMENT BOX	DATE
1	In order to provide resiliency to overcome communication failure when using the email address contact method, at least one alternative electronic contact method (possibly multiple alternative electronic contact methods) <b>MUST</b> be supported by the RDS as optional fields." (For the avoidance of doubt physical address and phone contact methods are both required.)	8/19/2017 7:51 AM
2	Resiliency ultimately impacts on security and public safety and well-being, and having additional contact methods should be mandatory--not optional.	8/19/2017 6:13 AM

3	"In order to provide resiliency to overcome communication failure, the RDS may support the collection of at least one alternative contact method. The collection of this data from a registrant MUST NOT be mandatory."	8/19/2017 4:11 AM
4	The reference to "optional fields" means that registrants do not need to provide (registries/registrar do not need to collect) any contact methods beyond e-mail. This undercuts the resiliency purpose. Propose to change the last ten words to "MUST be collected," and to strike "at least one alternative contact method (possibly)".	8/18/2017 6:43 PM
5	In order to provide contact-ability resiliency, multiple alternative contact method(s) and related data MUST be supported by the RDS; Registrar business practice(s) would determine any and all alternative collection requirements, including supported method(s).	8/18/2017 3:57 PM
6	In order to provide resiliency to overcome communication failure, at least one alternative contact method (possibly multiple alternative contact methods) MUST be supported by the RDS as mandatory field(s).	8/18/2017 3:19 PM
7	I'm generally supportive of the concept and so I would say I agree with the spirit of the statement, but perhaps not the wording. I don't for example like the way "provide resiliency and overcome communication failure reads". I think our goal is really to improve contactability with the registrant (or authorized agent of the registrant). How about something along these lines: "To improve contactability with the domain name registrant (or authorized agent of the registrant), the RDS must be capable of supporting at least one alternative contact method as an optional field."	8/18/2017 2:04 PM
8	I will prefer that the alternate emails for resilience purpose is mandatory.	8/17/2017 9:39 AM

Q3 Please indicate your support for the following possible WG agreement and/or provide alternative options for the WG to consider in relation to Purpose Based Contacts (PBCs). For the definitions of the PBCs under consideration, please review the following document: PBC definitions from EWG report. The proposed WG agreement you are asked to respond to in this poll question is "PBC types identified (Admin, Legal, Technical, Abuse, Proxy/Privacy, Business) must be supported by the RDS but optional for registrants to provide."

Answered: 23 Skipped: 2



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
I support this WG agreement	65.22% 15
I do not support this WG agreement (please explain in the comment box why you do not support)	17.39% 4
I would like to propose alternative wording for this WG agreement (please use the comment box to provide alternative wording for this WG agreement)	17.39% 4
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>23</b>

#	COMMENT BOX	DATE
1	There should be at least one physical address, one telephonic means of communication, and one electronic means of communication. As long as these 3 are provided for at least 1 contact point, then I am ok with the proposed agmt, provided that if it is a p/p contact, that has to be clear to those reviewing the record.	8/19/2017 7:51 AM
2	We should not be separating out legal and abuse points of contact. There should be a service of process point of contact for filed or submitted complaints whether legal or administrative that a registrant is required to provide, and that must be authenticated if different than the registrant email. And there should be an Abuse point of contact that the registrant is required to provide for any grievances impacting on public safety or well-being, whether it stems from a likelihood of deception that would cause injury such as protected by trademark, a privacy interference from the distribution of malware, or criminal counterfeiting. If the registrant provides a different Point of contact outside its organization or other than himself or herself, that point of contact must be authentic. A business point of contact should be optional.	8/19/2017 6:13 AM
3	At least contact point mandatory, for technical reason, at the very least.	8/18/2017 6:48 PM

4	I agree but would suggest that the end of the sentence be worded more like the wording in #2. "... supported by the RDS as optional fields"	8/18/2017 4:53 PM
5	Purpose Based Contacts ("PBCs"), defined as Admin, Legal, Technical, Abuse, Proxy/Privacy or Business contacts, must be supported by the RDS, but should be optional for registrants to provide.	8/18/2017 3:57 PM
6	If Proxy/Privacy is a PBC then there should be a "know your customer requirement and the provider of the Proxy/Privacy service should be held responsible/liable for abusive registrations.	8/18/2017 3:46 PM
7	I am supportive of the Purpose Based Contacts approach that the EWG proposed. I don't think we necessarily need to use the same types that the EWG recommends and I think we need to be careful in considering how they are implemented. Purpose based contacts implemented right can be an improvement but the wrong implementation could make the RDS more convoluted than it is today.	8/18/2017 2:04 PM
8	I believe this field must be mandatory to serve the purpose they have been created.	8/17/2017 9:39 AM
9	However, provided the contacts are verified and correct at time of registration and long term reverification in case of changes.	8/17/2017 1:55 AM
10	It would be beneficial to define the types of PBC to avoid possible overlap and subsequent uncertainty	8/17/2017 1:37 AM
11	"but optional for registrants to provide" seems contradictory to the mission and intent of RDS	8/17/2017 12:05 AM
12	"PBC types identified (Admin, Technical, Abuse, Proxy/Privacy, Business) must be supported by the RDS but optional for registrants to provide."	8/16/2017 5:54 PM