


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: 27 Skipped: 0

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Benjamin Akinmoyeje	12/30/2017 2:47 PM
2	Steve Metalitz	12/30/2017 1:43 PM
3	Alex Deacon	12/30/2017 8:44 AM
4	GZ Kabir	12/30/2017 3:10 AM
5	Rubens Kuhl	12/29/2017 10:28 AM
6	John Bambenek	12/29/2017 7:50 AM
7	Nathalie Coupet	12/29/2017 7:43 AM
8	Holly Raiche	12/27/2017 10:26 PM
9	Tomslin Samme-Nlar	12/25/2017 5:29 PM
10	Benny Samuelsen	12/22/2017 12:09 AM
11	Tim OBrien	12/21/2017 11:26 PM
12	Brian Winterfeldt	12/21/2017 5:30 PM
13	Rod Rasmussen	12/21/2017 1:02 PM
14	Carlton Samuels	12/21/2017 12:43 PM
15	Dick leaning	12/21/2017 12:04 PM
16	Krishna Seeburn - Kris	12/21/2017 10:39 AM
17	Nathalie Coupet	12/21/2017 10:03 AM
18	Patrick Klos	12/21/2017 9:21 AM
19	Chuck Gomes	12/21/2017 8:35 AM
20	Ayden Férdeline	12/21/2017 6:34 AM
21	Allison nixon	12/20/2017 7:09 PM
22	Laura Margolis	12/20/2017 4:35 PM
23	Greg Aaron	12/20/2017 4:06 PM
24	Rob Golding	12/20/2017 4:02 PM
25	Vicky Sheckler	12/20/2017 2:36 PM
26	Maxim Alzoba	12/20/2017 2:26 PM
27	Andrew Sullivan	12/20/2017 1:40 PM

Q2 Domain Name Management: Discussion of data elements required for the purpose of Domain Name Management was based on the definition given in WG Agreement #48 (previously agreed): Domain Name Management is a legitimate purpose for collecting some registration data, based on the definition: 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. During this week's call, the WG reviewed 12 December poll results regarding data required for Domain Name Management. Those on the call expressed support for an additional possible WG agreement, as follows: The following registration data is needed for the purpose of Domain Name Management: Domain Name, Registrant Name, Registrant Organization, Registrant Email, Registrar Name, Creation Date, Updated Date, Expiration Date, Nameservers, Domain Status, and Administrative Contact. This new possible WG agreement requires all data receiving 100-82% support in last week's poll. Following discussion of rationale for Administrative Contact (supported by 77% in last week's poll), that data was also included in the new possible WG agreement. While rationale for Registrant Postal Address and Phone were also discussed - particularly with respect to data useful during Domain Name Transfers - these and other data elements with less than 60% in last week's poll were dropped due to insufficient support. 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. Please indicate below which statement below best reflects your level of agreement.

Answered: 27 Skipped: 0




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
a) Agree with the possible WG agreement: The following registration data is needed for the purpose of Domain Name Management: Domain Name, Registrant Name, Registrant Organization, Registrant Email, Registrar Name, Creation Date, Updated Date, Expiration Date, Nameservers, Domain Status, and Administrative Contact.	74.07% 20
b) Agree with the possible WG agreement above but wish to propose additional data essential for this purpose	18.52% 5
c) Disagree with the possible WG agreement above (please explain or propose alternative below)	7.41% 2
TOTAL	27

#	PLEASE PROVIDE YOUR RATIONALE FOR DISAGREEING WITH THE POSSIBLE WG AGREEMENT OR PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE OR ADDITIONS:	DATE
1	As discussed during the call, postal address and telephone number may be required for payment of domain name registration (included within domain name management definition) if by credit card. Aside from this, while these data elements would not be required for this use in all or even most instances, it would be easy to imagine cases in which they would be required for effective DN management, e.g., when the registrant's name is extremely common and these data elements could be used to determine whether or not s/he is an employee or agent of an institution seeking to define and manage its DN portfolio.	12/30/2017 1:43 PM
2	It should be required that the Registrant Email be a WORKING email that is monitored regularly. While I prefer that the email not simply bounce with a message directing the sender to use a web form instead, if they do require use of a web form, there should be some assurances that the ticket system be as responsive as an active email account would be. I don't want to open a door to another "Domain Privacy" system where contacting a domain owner (and getting a response) could take days or longer!	12/21/2017 9:21 AM
3	I am okay with the proposed text with the insertion of "(if applicable)" following "Registrant Organization" and "Administrative Contact".	12/21/2017 6:34 AM
4	Full Registrant contact data (including Postal Address and Phone) are also necessary. We should not assume that Administrative contacts are the only ones who manage domain names. In many cases they are not authorized to access registrar accounts, etc.	12/20/2017 4:06 PM
5	Administrative contact, nameservers and registrant email are not necessary for domain name management tasks	12/20/2017 4:02 PM
6	I think some portion of postal address, if only city, state, and country, would be necessary for this purpose to ascertain whether the registrant is authorized	12/20/2017 2:36 PM
7	If we believe that Domain Name Management includes ability to knowledgeably change contents of the Nameservers fields, then it is logical to include Technical contact (who might be aware what those IPv4 and IPv6 mean)	12/20/2017 2:26 PM

Q3 Domain Name Certification: Initial agreement during the call was based on the following draft definition of Domain Name Certification produced by the drafting team: Information collected by a certificate authority to enable contact between the registrant, or a technical or administrative representative of the registrant, to assist in verifying that the identity of the certificate applicant is the same as the entity that controls the domain name. Following discussion of this purpose, CABForum-defined methods for Organizational and Extended Certificate validation, and refinement of possible agreement text, those on the 20 December call expressed support for the following possible WG agreement: Domain Name Certification is NOT a legitimate purpose for requiring collection of registration data, but may be a legitimate purpose for using some data collected for other purposes. (Access requirements to be deliberated at a later stage.) Please indicate below which statement below best reflects your level of agreement.

Answered: 25 Skipped: 2



ANSWER CHOICES		RESPONSES	
a) Domain Name Certification is NOT a legitimate purpose for requiring collection of registration data, but may be a legitimate purpose for using some data collected for other purposes.		72.00%	18
b) Domain Name Certification is NOT a legitimate purpose for requiring collection of registration data, but I wish to propose an alternative statement in the comment box below.		12.00%	3
c) Domain Name Certification IS a legitimate purpose for requiring collection of some registration data. (Please provide rationale and essential data in the comment box below.)		16.00%	4
TOTAL			25

#	PLEASE PROVIDE YOUR RATIONALE FOR DISAGREEING WITH THE POSSIBLE WG AGREEMENT OR PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE:	DATE
---	---	------

1	The entire underpinning of TLS encryption requires validation of requestors and domain name owners. If CAs can't validate that data you are all but defeating encryption and giving carte blanche for governments around the world to eaves drop on demand.	12/29/2017 7:50 AM
2	For Organizational and Extended Certificate validation to work, to information needs to be collected	12/21/2017 11:26 PM
3	No view on this issue - please register this as an abstension	12/21/2017 5:30 PM
4	Domain Name Certification is NOT a legitimate purpose for requiring collection of registration data, but may be a legitimate purpose for using some data collected for other purposes and may be a legitimate purpose for optional collection of registration data at the request of the registrant. (Access requirements to be deliberated at a later stage.)	12/21/2017 1:02 PM
5	"entity that controls the domain name" does not mean or imply domain registrant, and so conflates 2 different entities unnecessarily	12/20/2017 4:02 PM
6	I think we need to add in the end (also the purpose of collection of those elements should include Domain Name Certification) P.s: without it we have situation where data collected for one purpose, and used for another. I do not think it will work with GDPR.	12/20/2017 2:26 PM