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: 10 Skipped: 0

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Steve Metalitz	9/9/2017 10:31 AM
2	Alex Deacon	9/8/2017 4:33 PM
3	Nathalie Coupet	9/8/2017 12:51 PM
4	Michele Neylon	9/8/2017 9:43 AM
5	Chuck Gomes	9/7/2017 7:24 PM
6	Ayden Férdeline	9/6/2017 2:54 PM
7	Greg Aaron	9/6/2017 6:57 AM
8	andrew sullivan	9/6/2017 6:34 AM
9	Volker Greimann	9/6/2017 4:52 AM
10	Krishna Seeburn - Kris	9/6/2017 1:35 AM

Q2 Registrant Type: In the the 29 August call handout, slide 11 presented the EWG's definition for a proposed Registrant Type data element. During the call, several possible uses for such a data element were identified, along with several possible implementation challenges. Ultimately the WG decided to put further deliberation of this data element on hold pending legal analysis of data protection laws and their application to registration data and directory services. In the interim, this poll question is intended to gather WG member thoughts on possible uses and challenges, so they may be recalled when deliberation on Registrant Type resumes.To inform future deliberation, please use the comment box below to share your thoughts on Registrant Type, keeping in mind that our task in this phase is to assess the need for such a data element (e.g., for what would it be used, and how useful would it be).

Answered: 10 Skipped: 0

#	RESPONSES	DATE	
1	Because the proposed data elements are so closely bound up with issues of data publication, it may be premature at this stage to go beyond a general statement such as "the RDS should have the capacity to support a multiplicity of registrant 'types,' "rather than trying to specify in detail an exhaustive list of what the types are.	9/9/2017 10:31 AM	Metalitz
2	It is clear to me that the Registrant Type data element is important. However at this point in the process I would suggest we agree only that the RDS should have the capability to support a TBD set of Registrant Types.	9/8/2017 4:33 PM	Deacon
3	https://www.123-reg.co.uk/support/answers/what-is-a-registrant-type-259/	9/8/2017 12:51 PM	Coupet
4	Self-identification as individual or corporate is used by several ccTLDs as a way of differentiating between registrant "types". I don't think this is a bad idea.	9/8/2017 9:43 AM	Neylon
5	Based on the Data Protection expert answers to the WG questions and depending on the answers by our independent legal firm, it seems quite likely that we will need to distinguish as best as possible between legal and natural persons.	9/7/2017 7:24 PM	Gomes
6	I can, to an extent, understand the purpose of this field, but on a practical level - and we do need to think about implementation here - how you ensure reasonable compliance seems impossible to me. Plus, registrant types change, people buy a domain name for one reason and use it for another.	9/6/2017 2:54 PM	Férdeline
7	This is premature and should be asked again later.	9/6/2017 6:57 AM	Aaron
8	I understand the use cases, but there is no way to enforce this sub typing of contact data. It is also very far from clear whether this matches the model of contact mapping that already exists, which suggests that some adjustments to widely-deployed EPP contact mappings would be necessary; if they were optional for registries and registrars to adopt then the utility of this sub typing would be still lower. Given that the accuracy of the sub typing can't be enforced and that we would be offering a recommendation that has yet another barrier to adoption (i.e. the need to create the necessary standard), I think the return does not match the cost of adopting this.	9/6/2017 6:34 AM	Sullivan

As the WG agreed to defer deliberation on Registrant Type, all comments will be used to kick-start future deliberation.
Green comments appear somewhat in favor of a data element related to type, suggesting approaches for future deliberation.
Yellow comments oppose a Registrant Type data element for implementation reasons.

.

9	This could be a helpful field, but it should be voluntary to provide, e.g. the default option should be "undefined". First of all, it will be impossible to go back and update this field for all already registered domain names. Second, the registrant may have valid reasons for not wanting this to be displayed. Third, I propose not to have a "Privacy/Proxy" entry here, but instead allow the user of define it if he so chooses. This way, even a privacy-enabled registrant can be determined to be either a natural or legal entity.	9/6/2017 4:52 AM	Greimann
10	It may seem un-important but i think it may be reasonable to identify the type because one can then also know whether it be natural person small business or any large entity etc., although anyone can lie and say what they want here. The determinant may be at a later stage if content is being monitored by the registrar or registry. It is a simple field but may have a major impact on privacy laws as well.	9/6/2017 1:35 AM	Seeburn