

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: 32 Skipped: 0


#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Tamir Israel	9/2/2017 1:42 PM
2	Rod Rasmussen	9/2/2017 7:57 AM
3	Jonathan matkowsky	9/1/2017 10:03 PM
4	Rubens Kuhl	9/1/2017 8:42 PM
5	Andrew Sullivan	9/1/2017 4:45 PM
6	Susan Kawaguchi	9/1/2017 3:46 PM
7	Stephanie Perrin	9/1/2017 2:26 PM
8	Steve Metalitz	9/1/2017 2:15 PM
9	Carlton Samuels	9/1/2017 1:46 PM
10	John Bambenek	9/1/2017 1:06 PM
11	Greg Shatan	9/1/2017 11:58 AM
12	Sara Bockey	9/1/2017 11:46 AM
13	Roger Carney	9/1/2017 11:35 AM
14	Vicky Sheckler	9/1/2017 10:52 AM
15	Krishna Seeburn - Kris	9/1/2017 10:11 AM
16	Volker Greimann	9/1/2017 10:09 AM
17	Daniel K. Nanghaka	9/1/2017 9:49 AM
18	Benny Samuelsen	9/1/2017 9:49 AM
19	Marco Schmidt	9/1/2017 9:43 AM
20	David Cake	8/31/2017 10:57 PM
21	Chuck Gomes	8/30/2017 7:37 PM
22	Ayden Férdeline	8/30/2017 5:44 PM
23	Tim O'Brien	8/30/2017 4:07 PM
24	Nathalie Coupet	8/30/2017 2:00 PM
25	Sam Lanfranco	8/30/2017 12:29 PM
26	Greg Aaron	8/30/2017 9:46 AM
27	Erica Varlese	8/30/2017 9:40 AM
28	Michael Hammer	8/30/2017 8:24 AM
29	Juan Manuel Rojas	8/30/2017 7:55 AM
30	Paul Keating	8/30/2017 6:50 AM

31	Maxim Alzoba	8/30/2017 4:24 AM
32	Volker Greimann	8/30/2017 4:06 AM

Q2 Reseller: In the 22 August poll, initial rough consensus was achieved on the agreement "Reseller must be supported by the RDS." However, several suggestions were made to further refine this possible agreement.

As a result, we are now re-polling on the second part of this possible agreement - specifically, to determine whether Reseller "MUST" or "MAY" be provided for inclusion in the RDS. Please check the response below which best reflects your opinion about this agreement:

Answered: 32 Skipped: 0




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
a) Reseller Name must be supported by the RDS, and MUST be provided for inclusion in the RDS by Registrars. Note: There may be a chain of Resellers identified by Reseller Name.	28.13% 9
b) Reseller Name must be supported by the RDS, and MAY be provided for inclusion in the RDS by Registrars. Note: There may be a chain of Resellers identified by Reseller Name.	62.50% 20
c) I agree that Reseller Name must be supported by the RDS, but propose alternative wording given in comment box below.	3.13% 1
d) I do not agree that Reseller Name must be supported by the RDS.	0.00% 0
e) Unsure/No Opinion.	6.25% 2
TOTAL	32

#	COMMENT OR PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE	DATE
1	It must be included if the data exists per advisory sent to the list from April 2015.	9/1/2017 10:03 PM
2	I have no idea how to identify a "chain" of resellers. The registrar has exactly one contract at the end, which is the last reseller in the chain. It can know that, but nothing else.	9/1/2017 4:45 PM
3	Reseller Name must be supported by RDS and Reseller names known to Registrar must be provided for inclusion in RDS by Registrar.	9/1/2017 2:15 PM
4	"Must" be provided only if there is a reseller.	9/1/2017 11:58 AM

5	I thought this was settled the last call, because it is covered by the Registry Registration Data Directory Services Consistent Labeling and Display Consensus Policy, which went into effect 1 August 2017. That policy says the Reseller field is optional for registrars to fill in: "In responses to domain name object queries the following fields are considered optional ... Reseller."	8/30/2017 9:46 AM
6	We need to add wording (if the fact of resale known to Registrar), also this field needs to be updated when reseller(s) is/are excluded from the chain of sales, or changed or added to the chain (when there were none), to reflect the most recent status of the registration.	8/30/2017 4:24 AM
7	This is the status quo. Making it a requirement will only cause confusion or result in incorrect data.	8/30/2017 4:06 AM

Q3 Registrar Abuse Contact(s): In the 22 August poll, strong support was voiced for Registrar Abuse Contact Email (80% support), with less support for Registrar Abuse Contact Phone (68%). During the WG call, several suggestions were made to further refine this possible agreement. As a result, we are now re-polling on the following possible alternative agreement: "Per recently-approved consensus policy on consistent labeling and display (<https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/rdds-labeling-policy-2017-02-01-en>), BOTH the Registrar Abuse Contact Email and Registrar Abuse Contact Phone must be supported for inclusion in the RDS, and MUST be provided by Registrars." Please check the response below which best reflects your opinion about this agreement:

Answered: 32 Skipped: 0




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
a) I support this WG agreement.	75.00% 24
b) I support this WG agreement, but propose alternative wording given in the comment box below.	0.00% 0
c) I do not support this WG agreement. (Please explain why in the comment box below.)	25.00% 8
d) Unsure/No Opinion.	0.00% 0
TOTAL	32

#	COMMENT OR PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE	DATE
1	I don't think two abuse contacts are necessary, one should be sufficient.	9/2/2017 1:42 PM

2	Consistent with the consensus policy for 2013 RAA	9/1/2017 10:03 PM
3	.	9/1/2017 4:45 PM
4	It has been very clear from the start of this PDP that we were not bound in our policy determinations by either the previous disparate agreements, policies, and procedures that govern registration data, or any other current processes. While I support in general the concept of their being an abuse contact, I do not agree that we should blindly endorse the work of the other working group. One abuse contact should be enough, in my view, and it should be at the discretion of the registrar.	9/1/2017 2:26 PM
5	Alternative language: A Registrar Abuse Contact must be supported for inclusion in the RDS, and must be provided by Registrars. (9/1/2017 11:46 AM
6	"A Registrar Abuse Contact must be supported for inclusion in the RDS, and must be provided by Registrars." I think it the method of contact should be a business choice for registrars.	9/1/2017 11:35 AM
7	This proposal actually goes beyond the requirements of the abovementioned policy. The policy merely specifies where such fields must be placed, not whether they must be filled. In accordance with the 2013 RAA, there is no requirement to provide a general abuse phone contact. Therefore only the contractual requirement should be a "MUST provide", the phone number should be a "MAY provide". To add to that, we should also contemplate adding an additional contact, the Registrar dedicated LEA Abuse email and Phone.	9/1/2017 10:09 AM
8	In requiring a contact number for abuse purposes, we are obliging registrars to provide an abuse hotline. This is excessive and too high a burden for smaller registrars.	8/30/2017 5:44 PM
9	most probably abuse phones operators recommend to explain all details in e-mail, so given the fact, that the interested party has taken the phone number from electronic system, this step is redundant (calling operator to hear "please send us e-mail"). The reason for e-mail is less mistakes made (pleas try to read out contents of WHOIS to another person via e-mail, and ask him/her to write it down, and compare result to original text of WHOIS output to understand huge change for mistakes with oral translation of such information).	8/30/2017 4:24 AM

Q4 Alternative Method(s) of Contact: In the 22 August poll, input was gathered on several EWG-recommended alternative methods of contact with Registrants: * Registrant Fax + Fax Ext,* Registrant SMS* Registrant IM* Registrant Social Media/Alt Social Media. Definitions for these existing and new data elements can be found here. In addition to comments on these specific data elements, poll results included several general suggestions about alternative method(s) of contact. The following poll question is intended to gather further input on those suggestions, to inform deliberations during next week's call. Please check the response below which best reflects your opinion. Note: Responses to this question will not be viewed as support for any agreement at this time, and will be used in combination with responses to the 22 August poll, as a starting point for WG deliberation.

Answered: 32 Skipped: 0



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
a) In the interest of maximizing contactability, all of the above-listed elements should be supported by the RDS and be optional for Registrants to provide.	31.25% 10
b) In the interest of maximizing contactability, some of the above-listed elements should be supported by the RDS and be optional for Registrants to provide. (Please list supported elements in the comment box below.)	9.38% 3
c) In the interest of maximizing contactability with future extensibility, additional contact methods should be supported by the RDS as an open-ended list and be optional for Registrants to provide.	34.38% 11

d) I agree that some or all of the above-listed elements should be supported by the RDS, but wish to propose an alternative approach given in the comment box below.	15.63%	5
e) None of the above-listed elements should be supported by the RDS. (Please explain in comment box below.)	6.25%	2
f) Unsure/No Opinion.	3.13%	1
TOTAL		32

#	COMMENT OR PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE	DATE
1	There are acceptable as alternatives if chosen so by the registrant, but should not be compelled. If more than one contact is provided by the registrant, only one (whichver one indicated by the Registrant) should be the method of contact used by the RDS. Some of these alternative contact elements are more intrusive than email address or phone number. IM, SMS and social media accounts should therefore be more greatly restricted in their disply and use (Ie should not be available for academic research).	9/2/2017 1:42 PM
2	All contact methods supported should be open standards and fax should be required if there is a fax number	9/1/2017 10:03 PM
3	Registrants should be allowed to select a method of contact from a list of possible means of contact. The RDS should be designed to accommodate freedom of choice, and the policy must be explicit that the registrant has full authority/responsibility to select a method of contact that works for them, recognizing that with a mobile population, those contact methods may change. The policy must also explicitly recognize that in the customer relationship with the registrar/reseller, other contact methods may exist, and that in cases of extreme need (eg criminal activity going on on a website that uses a domain the registrant has registered) the registrar can always be contacted by the competent authorities. There is therefore no need to have every potential piece of registrant data that may be useful in every potential risk scenario available in the RDS.	9/1/2017 2:26 PM
4	I assume that in (c), "additional" means "in addition to e-mail, phone, and physical address." It is not necessary to specify these additional methods at this point, that is an implementation matter; but the list should be open-ended in order to avoid obsolescence.	9/1/2017 2:15 PM
5	need to have valid/reliable contactibility via physical address, phone, and email/electronic means. Others ok to add as addl options	9/1/2017 10:52 AM
6	I really don't see the needs for these data connected to a domainregistration	9/1/2017 9:49 AM
7	It does not matter how frequently you asked this leading question, my answer will not change. NO. No more data elements need be supported by the RDS.	8/30/2017 5:44 PM
8	Registrant Fax + Fax Ext	8/30/2017 2:00 PM
9	We could be one field called "Alternate Contact Means" or something. We do not need separate fields for every one of these, each with its own formatting and special rules (which are probably impossible to figure out anyway).	8/30/2017 9:46 AM
10	fax, SMS, social media	8/30/2017 9:40 AM
11	RDS should not support alternative method(s) of contact which require registration with a (private) commercial service in order to make contact.	8/30/2017 8:24 AM
12	With additional words that "contents of the optional fields should not endanger the RDS system, Registry or Registrar systems or users of such systems, allowed syntax should be determined prior to use to ensure Security and Stability of RDS", to prevent things similar to SQL injection e.t.c.	8/30/2017 4:24 AM
13	In the interest of future-proofing, with the case for IM and social media, these should not be locked down to currently existing or named social media platforms.	8/30/2017 4:06 AM