**Data Elements Sub-Team – Draft 26 April 2016**

Each team to consider their total output to address the following questions[[1]](#footnote-1):

i) Did this input inventory produce any insights to inform the WG’s work plan?

Draft response:

(ii) Which inputs are likely to be the most relevant during WG deliberations and why?

Draft response (based on input received during 20/4 meeting):

* Whois Task Force Final Report, because it is a good foundation for what was required in the past, and mostly whst is still required
* SAC 054, because gives us what us the now of what is required
* EWG Recommendations, including tutorials and FAQs, because gives us insight into what might be required in the future, where data elements might be moving towards. also provides principles regarding why data elements should or should not be collected/displayed or made mandatory/optional, as well as the concept of purpose-based contact data
* RA Spec 4, because gives us what us the now of what is required
* RFC 7485 because it is very helpful to understand what data elements are collected today

(iii) Which inputs, if any, generated the most discussion within the small team?

Draft response:

* SAC54 triggered several emails on the data list.

(iv) Which inputs may be obsolete or super-ceded by subsequent work?

Draft response:

* Whois Task Force 2003 report was superceded by the Whois Task Force report of 2007. 2012 WHOIS RT report is successor to the 2007 TF report, but all reports are relevant as history of discussion on the this issue.

(v) What input gaps, if any, may need to be addressed later?

Draft response:

* Should IRD and related work have been considered by this sub-team or for future review? Consider adding IRD report to list of inputs.
* Current focus seems to be more on data that is currently displayed in WHOIS. This is a subset of data collected by registratrs during registration. Do we need to account for data collected but not made available in the (current) WHOIS?
* Whowas - is covered in EWG but not in any of the other documents that has been reviewed. WHOWAS was briefly touched on in the WHOIS Survey WG, which was a survey built more on the technical requirements of a WHOIS system (see http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/inactive/2013/whois-requirements).
* RDAP Operational profile (see https://whois.icann.org/sites/default/files/files/gtld-rdap-operational-profile-draft-03dec15-en.pdf)

(vi) Other key takeaways from this input inventory the team wishes to share with the WG

Draft response:

* RA Spec 4 (now) and EWG recommendations (possible future) are considered two key documents to help inform the WG's deliberations

*Bear in mind that, as previously noted, any and all inputs that are relevant are to be considered at some point. Nobody is suggesting that any document or input be discarded at this juncture (unless it’s been completely superseded as per the above). The idea behind this exercise (and related ones) is to help navigate the huge amount of information that is “out there” and to help the group focus on the ones that have potentially a higher importance.*

1. Please see ‘[**Plan to consolidate summaries and complete & present team outputs**](https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/58734473/RDS-InputTeams-Plan-12April-updated.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1460488904000&api=v2)**’** for further details on the overall agreed approach for sub-teams. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)