


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	12/16/2017 6:31 AM
2	Rob Golding	12/16/2017 6:31 AM
3	Rod Rasmussen	12/15/2017 8:10 PM
4	Alex Deacon	12/15/2017 5:36 PM
5	Farell FOLLY	12/15/2017 4:44 PM
6	Griffin Barnett	12/15/2017 4:12 PM
7	Paul Keating	12/15/2017 10:33 AM
8	Andrew Sullivan	12/15/2017 9:01 AM
9	Vicky Sheckler	12/14/2017 12:35 PM
10	Tomslin Samme-Nlar	12/14/2017 4:39 AM
11	Benjamin Akinmoyeje	12/14/2017 2:14 AM
12	Kal Feher	12/13/2017 9:01 PM
13	Scott Hollenbeck	12/13/2017 11:54 AM
14	Michael Hammer	12/13/2017 9:20 AM
15	Chuck Gomes	12/13/2017 8:56 AM
16	Greg Aaron	12/13/2017 6:15 AM
17	Maxim Alzoba	12/13/2017 3:08 AM
18	David Cake	12/12/2017 9:51 PM
19	Benny Samuelson	12/12/2017 9:26 PM
20	Sam Lanfranco	12/12/2017 8:38 PM
21	Nathalie Coupet	12/12/2017 8:26 PM
22	Laura Margolis	12/12/2017 8:12 PM

Q2 Registration Data needed for Domain Name Management: Based on the following agreed definition of Domain Name Management: Information collected to create a domain name registration, enabling management of the domain name registration, and ensuring that the domain registration records are under the control of the authorized party and that no unauthorized changes or transfers are made in the record. Those on the 12 December WG call discussed the following statement with a mixture of agreement and disagreement: The following information is NOT needed for the purpose of Domain Name Management: Technical Contact, Administrative Contact, Registrar Abuse Contact. To inform further WG deliberation on data needed for this purpose, we will not limit this week's poll to testing the above proposed WG agreement. Instead, this poll question examines your level of agreement with all data needed (essential) to perform Domain Name Management tasks. Please focus your response on data that is essential for this purpose. Additional data which may be useful but not essential will be deliberated separately. In this poll, the term "collection" includes not only data collected from registrants, but also data derived or implied or otherwise supplied by the registrar or registry. Do not assume that collection implies public or non-public access to that data or who will have access; this will be deliberated separately later. Resolving Technical Issues associated with Domain Name Resolution after a Domain Name has been registered falls under a separate purpose not addressed here. Check every box below where you agree that the associated registration data is needed for the purpose of Domain Name Management. Leaving any box below unchecked means that you do not agree the associated registration data is needed for this purpose. The comment box below should be used to give rationale for why specific data is or is not needed for this purpose, or for any other comments you wish to make about Domain Name Management data needs.

Answered: 22 Skipped: 0



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Domain Name	100.00%	22
Registrant Name	100.00%	22
Registrant Organization	95.45%	21
Registrant Postal Address	77.27%	17
Registrant Phone	72.73%	16

Registrant Email	95.45%	21
Registrar Name	95.45%	21
Registrar Abuse Contact	59.09%	13
Original Registration Date	59.09%	13
Creation Date	90.91%	20
Updated Date	86.36%	19
Registrar Expiration Date	86.36%	19
Nameservers	81.82%	18
Technical Contact	45.45%	10
Administrative Contact	77.27%	17
Domain Status	86.36%	19
Total Respondents: 22		

#	USE THIS BOX TO PROVIDE RATIONALE FOR YOUR RESPONSES ABOVE OR ANY OTHER COMMENTS	DATE
1	Given the operational realities on domain transfers, the admin contact can in-effect control a domain name.	12/15/2017 8:10 PM
2	Note that at least some of this need not be _collected_ as such during registration. I remain implacable about original registration date, which I think is a very bad idea for reasons I've already outlined. I am not sure about nameservers -- sort of depends on whether they remain for other reasons.	12/15/2017 9:01 AM
3	Considering that collecting this information doesn't necessarily assume public access, a registrant should be able to opt to assign another contact or authorized party as administrative contact.	12/14/2017 4:39 AM
4	slightly pedantic, but authinfo or whatever may take its place in the future should also be supplied in the context of providing enough information to manage the domain name immediately.	12/13/2017 9:01 PM
5	As a registrant, I want to be able to confirm that my registrar is accurately capturing the information I provide when I register or update a domain name. I also want to be able to see and validate derived information, such as the creation date and expiration date. I want to be able to see and validate contact information provided or authorized by me that is published by registrar or registry directory services. I do not need to see the registrar's abuse contact to manage my domains because I already have a business relationship with the registrar and I know how to contact them directly if needed.	12/13/2017 11:54 AM
6	I suggest in the future we use the term 'collection for the RDS' instead of simply saying 'collection' to avoid the confusion with collection by registries or registrars and accommodate situations where data elements are derived or otherwise supplied by registries or registrars.	12/13/2017 8:56 AM

7	<p>I do believe that Technical Contact, Administrative Contact fields are required for domain management, these fields are not required on a registration stage in case of "no delegation", where no name servers are added. But the later stages of domain name management, when name servers are added require someone to be able to answer technical questions (Tech) and someone who is able to answer administrative questions (Admin). I think that Registrar Expiration Date is not based on domain name cycle of the TLD (unlike registry expiration date), and thus does not belong here. In case where a registrar does not have enough money on account, auto renewal might not work and thus Registry expiration date would be the one ruling the outcome. The Original Registration date is not required for domain name management (Registrant does not have to know it, registry might not have information about it, at least many current domains does not have this information stored in registries or registrars and we will not have true/accurate information if such idea comes into RDS as a separate field). Registrars have obligation to publish registrar abuse contacts on their website (RAA 2013 requirement), and thus I am not sure multiple records of the same field would help. Registrar URL would be better option to prevent search on IANA / ICANN website in a search of a website of a registrar. P.s: I suggest we have not only "yes"/"no" fields but also "other opinion" field</p>	12/13/2017 3:08 AM
8	<p>Any in information directly related to registration date or status, and the information needed for active use of the domain name itself, is relevant, but should not need to be public. I am not sure what administrative contact is used for, if not for domain name management.</p>	12/12/2017 9:51 PM
9	<p>I support one of Registrant name or Registrant Organization (i.e., one "name" identifier, even if just a numbered LLC) along with one stable contact (email, phone or proxy). In my view "management" of the domain name should include reachability....to promote good management (-:!</p>	12/12/2017 8:38 PM
