

## Annotated Results


**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: 22 Skipped: 0

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Michele Neylon	9/30/2017 11:04 AM
2	Dick leaning	9/30/2017 1:11 AM
3	Rod Rasmussen	9/29/2017 7:25 PM
4	jonathan matkowsky	9/29/2017 4:28 PM
5	Benny Samuelson	9/29/2017 4:27 PM
6	Daniel K. Nanghaka	9/29/2017 2:23 PM
7	Nathalie Coupet	9/29/2017 1:19 PM
8	Carlton Samuels	9/29/2017 10:01 AM
9	Volker Greimann	9/29/2017 9:43 AM
10	Griffin Barnett	9/29/2017 9:39 AM
11	Sara Bockey	9/28/2017 7:39 AM
12	Michael Peddemors	9/27/2017 4:01 PM
13	Erica Varlese	9/27/2017 8:58 AM
14	Marc Anderson	9/27/2017 8:29 AM
15	Maxim Alzoba	9/27/2017 7:40 AM
16	Klaus Stoll	9/27/2017 6:22 AM
17	Roger Carney	9/27/2017 5:30 AM
18	Tapani Tarvainen	9/26/2017 11:35 PM
19	Andrew Sullivan	9/26/2017 8:17 PM
20	Sam Lanfranco	9/26/2017 6:27 PM
21	Michael Hammer	9/26/2017 5:04 PM
22	Chuck Gomes	9/26/2017 4:52 PM

**Q2 Original Registration Date:** During the 26 September WG call, those on the call expressed support for the following statement; no objections were raised on the call: There is no requirement for the Original Registration Date as proposed by the EWG Final Report. Please indicate below whether you agree or disagree with this statement.

Answered: 22 Skipped: 0



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
Agree	77.27% 17
Disagree	22.73% 5
TOTAL	22

#	COMMENT OR PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE	DATE	
1	See my email on the list from Thu, Sep 28, 2017 at 3:22 PM PST with subject containing "Original Registration Date"	9/29/2017 4:28 PM	Matkowsky
2	That element was considered as key to URS/UDRP downstream activities. These were considered legitimate purposes for WHOIS access and use seeing the data was complementary to chaining ownership changes.	9/29/2017 10:01 AM	Samuels
3	Although I did not raise an objection on the call, in further considering, I believe there should be a requirement for the Original Registration Date, as proposed by the EWG Final Report. This information is important for a number of legitimate purposes, such as determining bad faith in an IP investigation (whether a domain was registered before trademark rights existed, for instance).	9/29/2017 9:39 AM	Barnett
4	Agree. Original Registration Date should be dropped.	9/28/2017 7:39 AM	
5	Reading the EWG Final Report, I failed to find the words that Original Registration Date must be implemented.	9/27/2017 7:40 AM	Alzoba
6	Marginal Agree since, on occasion, I find the ORD useful...esp for identifying scams	9/26/2017 6:27 PM	Lanfranco
7	The way the question is stated does not match the phrasing in the EWG final Report. In the report it is indicated as optional. Although optional, it is commonly used and the EWG Final Report lists (valid) purposes and uses for the original creation date.	9/26/2017 5:04 PM	Hammer