**Background: This Section deals with the Survey Respondent Profile**

**1. Which of the following terms best describes your status?**

*USE: Radio buttons*

[  ]   Commercial business user

[  ]   Non-commercial organization user

[  ]   Governmental organization user

[  ]   Individual or end user

[  ]   Domain name registrar and/or registry

[  ]   Internet access provider or network operator

[  ]   Other (please specify):

**2. What is the size of your organization (that is, the number of employees, staff or members):**

*USE: Radio buttons*

[ ] Not Applicable

[ ] 1-9

[ ] 10-49

[ ] 50-99

[ ] 100-499

[ ] 500-999

[ ] 1,000-4,999

[ ] 5,000+

[ ] Do not know

**3. Which region/location do you reside in?**

*USE: Radio buttons*

[ ] Create drop down list of countries

**4. Have you registered any domain names?**

*USE: Radio buttons*

[ ] no

[ ] yes

If "yes":

a. How many ccTLD (country-code Top Level Domains, i.e.: .de, .au, .co.uk) domain names have you registered

*USE: Radio buttons*

[ ] 1-9

[ ] 10-49

[ ] 50-99

[ ] 100-499

[ ] 500-999

[ ] 1,000-4,999

[ ] 5,000+

[ ] Do not know

b. How many gTLD (generic Top Level Domains, ie: .com, .info .biz) domain names have you registered:

*USE: Radio buttons*

[ ] 1-9

[ ] 10-49

[ ] 50-99

[ ] 100-499

[ ] 500-999

[ ] 1,000-4,999

[ ] 5,000+

[ ] Do not know

**5. What was the general purpose of your registration:**

*USE: Radio buttons*

[   ] commercial

[   ] governmental

[   ] personal

[   ] noncommercial organization

[   ] other (please specify):

**6. How often do you use the WHOIS service on average?**

*USE: Radio buttons*

[   ] never

[   ] occasionally

[   ] weekly

[   ] once or twice a day

[   ] many times a day

**7. How do you access the WHOIS information?**

*USE: Radio buttons*

[   ] Website interfaces

[   ] Direct server query access

**8. Which of these best describes the most beneficial use of WHOIS to you or your organization:**

*USE: Radio buttons*

[   ] To determine if a specific domain name is unregistered or available

[   ] To find out the identity of a person or organization responsible for a domain name or web site

[   ] To support technical operations of ISPs or network administrators, including tracing sources of spam or denial of service attacks

[   ] To identify the owner of a domain name for consumer protection or intellectual property protection purposes

[   ] To gather names and contact information for marketing purposes

[   ] To support government law enforcement activities (other than intellectual property)

[   ] Other (please specify):

**9. Do you maintain a WHOIS service for a registrar, registry operator or RIR?**

*USE: Radio buttons*

[ ] no

[ ] yes

If yes, do you use WHOIS servers that are:

[ ] closed source written in-house

[ ] open-source, with customizations

[ ] open source without customizations

[ ] closed source, third party

Please name the open or closed-source server you use, if applicable:

*USE: Text Field, limit 140 characters*

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**10. How did you become aware of the availability for this WHOIS Survey?**

*USE: Radio buttons*

[   ]   WHOIS Survey Working Group Communications

[   ]   Webinar

[   ]   icann.org

[   ]   gnso.icann.org

[   ]   Email

[   ]   Word of Mouth of ICANN Community meeting

**R-1: This Section deals with the provision of a publicly accessible and machine parsable list of domain names or IP locations of WHOIS servers operated by ICANN accredited registrars, gTLD registry operators and ccTLDs operators.**

1. The WHOIS Requirements Inventory identifies the need for a publicly-accessible and machine-parsable list of domain names or IP locations of WHOIS servers, which will be operated by registrars, registry operators, and RIRs.

Do you have a direct need for this list of Whois servers?

[ ] No, use pre-existing WHOIS tools and libraries and thus don't directly need such a list.

[ ] Yes, have written our own WHOIS clients and would use such a list

[ ] No, have written our own WHOIS clients and would not use such a list

[ ] No, do not have a use case for a list of Whois servers.

[ ] Yes, we would use this and list the below reason.

Details: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

2. The inventory of requirements suggests a number of possible approaches for WHOIS service discovery. Please identify your favorite:

[ ] a naming convention (such as WHOIS.nic.TLD)

[ ] the use of SRV records

[ ] the use of CNAME records (the 'WHOIS' command line tool looks up TLD.WHOIS-servers.net)

[ ] Other (please specify):

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**R-2: This Section deals with the definition of a standard query structure that clients can implement and which all gTLD registries and ICANN accredited registrars will support.**

1. Do you have an interest in creating a standardized query structure for RDDS servers?

[  ] Yes

[  ] No

[  ] Indifferent

2. What areas of benefit does query standardization affect for you? Pick one or more.

[  ] Operational cost savings

[  ] Easier access to data

[  ] Higher accuracy responses to queries

[  ] Query support in multiple languages

[ ] Other (please specify):

3. Select the single most important of the Q2 elements to you

[  ] a

[  ] b

[  ] c

[  ] d

4. Assuming you can fully identify IDN registrations in Punycode/ASCII, is native multiple language support important to you for RDDS queries?

[  ] Yes

[  ] No

[  ] Indifferent

5. Where does standardization of “searchable RDDS” queries (being the ability to search on attributes or linked data elements such as “street name” or “postal code”) rank on a scale of 1 to 5. 1 being least important and 5 being most important.

1 2 3 4 5

**R-3: This Section deals with the definition of a standard data structure for WHOIS responses. The data structure would contain and uniquely identify the data elements that must be returned in a manner that assures there is no ambiguity across elements, correct syntax, and correct semantics.**

1. Do you support a standardized data structure and schema for WHOIS responses?

[  ] Yes

[  ] No

[  ] Indifferent

1.5 Do you support a formal extension framework/mechanism in order so that Whois implementers may add additional data elements to the standard data structure and schema for WHOIS responses?

[  ] Yes

[  ] No

[  ] Indifferent

1. Should the data structure allow for interpretation or output of WHOIS responses to non-English or non-Latin languages?

[  ] Yes

[  ] No

[  ] Indifferent

2.1   If Yes should this interpretation or output of WHOIS responses be based on localization of the client software (should the response vary based on a location indicator provided by the client either by IP address or a flag submitted with the WHOIS query)?

[  ] Yes

[  ] No

[  ] Indifferent

2.1.1  If No please recommend (with reasons) another more suitable mechanism for interpretation or WHOIS responses

[OPEN ANSWER]

1. Should the data structure be flexible to allow humans to interpret it (should it be directly human readable or require machine interpretation)?

[  ] Yes

[  ] No

[  ] Indifferent

1. Should the data structure be optimized to allow programs to parse it?

[  ] Yes

[  ] No

[  ] Indifferent

1. Should the data structure be XML based?

[  ] Yes

[  ] No

[  ] Indifferent

5.1 If No please recommend with reasons another more suitable data structure

[OPEN ANSWER]

**R-4: This Section deals with the definition of a set of standardized error messages and standard handling of error conditions. Examples of useful error messages include number of queries exceeding the WHOIS server’s limit, no records found, unable to process query, etc.**

1. Do you support the use of standardized error messages as output from the WHOIS System?

[  ] Yes

[  ] No

[  ] Indifferent

1. Please suggest examples of such standardized error messages

[OPEN ANSWER]

1. Do you support the use of standardized handling of error conditions within the WHOIS System?

[  ] Yes

[  ] No

[  ] Indifferent

1. Please suggest such error conditions within the WHOIS System

[OPEN ANSWER]

**R-5: This Section deals with allowing users, when submitting WHOIS queries for domain names, to submit other related registration data elements as arguments to search functions.**

**1. Do you need to search WHOIS records by data elements (*other*than domain name)?**

*USE: Radio buttons*

[  ] Yes (displays 1.a section below)

[  ] NO (ends question, does not display any additional information)

[  ] Other (please specify): *USE: Text box, 140 limit*

[  ] Indifferent

1.a YES -> Please rate 1-6 below on the importance of specific data elements to be searchable\*

*\*understanding without standardized WHOIS data input format, not all elements will be supplied or available in standard format equally across all TLD's.*

*USE: Ranking System 1-6*

[  ] Domain Name

[  ] Name Servers

[  ] Domain Registration Dates

[  ] Contact Name

[  ] Contact Email

[  ] Contact Address

There are other factors to consider in opening up this search option.  From here, we could go into further questions about type of search options

**2. Do you need Include (AND), Exclude (NOT) or Either (OR) search parameter options?**

(example:  search “XYZ.com  AND  Donald Duck” which results in WHOIS server reporting only exact match of XYZ.com if Donald Duck is on the record)

*USE: Radio buttons*

[  ] Yes

[  ] No

[  ] Indifferent

*USE: Text box, 140 limit*

[  ] Other considerations (please specify):  Free input form

**3. Do you need the ability to search by wild card?**

(example: search XYZ\*.com searches for registered domains starting with 'XYZ' in the domain name that are available on the database being searched)

*USE: Radio buttons*

[  ] Yes

[  ] No

[  ] Indifferent

*USE: Text box, 140 limit*

[  ] Other considerations(please specify):  Free input form

**4. Do you need the ability to search in native language, non-ASCII / Latin alphabet format?  [  ]  YES  [  ]  NO**

(example: search using Arabic, Cyrillic, Tamil or other scripts)

[  ] Yes

[  ] No

[  ] Indifferent

**R-6a: This Section deals with the adoption of a structured data model for WHOIS data that provides extensibility and changeability properties. Employ a formal data schema language such as XML to describe the characteristics of the structured data.**

1. In order to improve the WHOIS service capabilities, we need for data to be extensible
   1. Strongly Disagree
   2. Mostly Disagree
   3. Don’t have an opinion either way
   4. Mostly Agree
   5. Strongly Agree

Additional comment: (144 Character entry with possibility of picking a previously given entry)

1. In order to improve WHOIS capabilities, we need for the required data elements to be changeable over time.
   1. Strongly Disagree
   2. Mostly Disagree
   3. Don’t have an opinion either way
   4. Mostly Agree
   5. Strongly Agree

Question is relevant:

* 1. Strongly Disagree
  2. Mostly Disagree
  3. Don’t have an opinion either way
  4. Mostly Agree
  5. Strongly Agree

Additional comment: (144 Character entry with possibility of picking a previously given entry)

1. A formal definition of WHOIS Data is needed
   1. Strongly Disagree
   2. Mostly Disagree
   3. Don’t have an opinion either way
   4. Mostly Agree
   5. Strongly Agree

Question is relevant:

* 1. Strongly Disagree
  2. Mostly Disagree
  3. Don’t have an opinion either way
  4. Mostly Agree
  5. Strongly Agree

Additional comment: (144 Character entry with possibility of picking a previously given entry)

1. A formal modeling language such as XML should be used to create a data model for WHOIS
   1. Strongly Disagree
   2. Mostly Disagree
   3. Don’t have an opinion either way
   4. Mostly Agree
   5. Strongly Agree

Question is relevant:

* 1. Strongly Disagree
  2. Mostly Disagree
  3. Don’t have an opinion either way
  4. Mostly Agree
  5. Strongly Agree

Additional comment: (144 Character entry with possibility of picking a previously given entry)

1. Work on such a model should be done by ICANN
   1. Strongly Disagree
   2. Mostly Disagree
   3. Don’t have an opinion either way
   4. Mostly Agree
   5. Strongly Agree

Question is relevant:

* 1. Strongly Disagree
  2. Mostly Disagree
  3. Don’t have an opinion either way
  4. Mostly Agree
  5. Strongly Agree

Additional comment: (144 Character entry with possibility of picking a previously given entry)

1. Work on such a model should include the IETF
   1. Strongly Disagree
   2. Mostly Disagree
   3. Don’t have an opinion either way
   4. Mostly Agree
   5. Strongly Agree

Question is relevant:

* 1. Strongly Disagree
  2. Mostly Disagree
  3. Don’t have an opinion either way
  4. Mostly Agree
  5. Strongly Agree

Additional comment: (144 Character entry with possibility of picking a previously given entry)

1. WHOIS data collection techniques should insure that data is entered in a defined format
   1. Strongly Disagree
   2. Mostly Disagree
   3. Don’t have an opinion either way
   4. Mostly Agree
   5. Strongly Agree

Question is relevant:

* 1. Strongly Disagree
  2. Mostly Disagree
  3. Don’t have an opinion either way
  4. Mostly Agree
  5. Strongly Agree

Additional comment: (144 Character entry with possibility of picking a previously given entry)

1. WHOIS data collection techniques should allow for some fields to be made mandatory, mandatory fields are decided by Policy decision
   1. Strongly Disagree
   2. Mostly Disagree
   3. Don’t have an opinion either way
   4. Mostly Agree
   5. Strongly Agree

Question is relevant:

* 1. Strongly Disagree
  2. Mostly Disagree
  3. Don’t have an opinion either way
  4. Mostly Agree
  5. Strongly Agree

Additional comment: (144 Character entry with possibility of picking a previously given entry)

1. WHOIS data collection techniques should require that all fields be made mandatory
   1. Strongly Disagree
   2. Mostly Disagree
   3. Don’t have an opinion either way
   4. Mostly Agree
   5. Strongly Agree

Question is relevant:

* 1. Strongly Disagree
  2. Mostly Disagree
  3. Don’t have an opinion either way
  4. Mostly Agree
  5. Strongly Agree

Additional comment: (144 Character entry with possibility of picking a previously given entry)

**R-6b: Consider extending the currently defined set of registration data elements to include: alternative forms of contact than those currently collected; information that discloses the history or “pedigree” of a domain; and additional registration service provider contact information.**

1. The current "one size fits all" model for WHOIS data is sufficient for today's WHOIS needs
   1. Strongly Disagree
   2. Mostly Disagree
   3. Don’t have an opinion either way
   4. Mostly Agree
   5. Strongly Agree

Question is relevant:

* 1. Strongly Disagree
  2. Mostly Disagree
  3. Don’t have an opinion either way
  4. Mostly Agree
  5. Strongly Agree

Additional comment: (144 Character entry with possibility of picking a previously given entry)

1. The current "one size fits all" model for WHOIS data is sufficient for foreseeable WHOIS needs
   1. Strongly Disagree
   2. Mostly Disagree
   3. Don’t have an opinion either way
   4. Mostly Agree
   5. Strongly Agree

Question is relevant:

* 1. Strongly Disagree
  2. Mostly Disagree
  3. Don’t have an opinion either way
  4. Mostly Agree
  5. Strongly Agree

Additional comment: (144 Character entry with possibility of picking a previously given entry)

1. It should be possible to include other forms of contact information for WHOIS
   1. Strongly Disagree
   2. Mostly Disagree
   3. Don’t have an opinion either way
   4. Mostly Agree
   5. Strongly Agree

Question is relevant:

* 1. Strongly Disagree
  2. Mostly Disagree
  3. Don’t have an opinion either way
  4. Mostly Agree
  5. Strongly Agree

Additional comment: (144 Character entry with possibility of picking a previously given entry)

1. It should be possible to collect contact information using a local address format for WHOIS
   1. Strongly Disagree
   2. Mostly Disagree
   3. Don’t have an opinion either way
   4. Mostly Agree
   5. Strongly Agree

Question is relevant:

* 1. Strongly Disagree
  2. Mostly Disagree
  3. Don’t have an opinion either way
  4. Mostly Agree
  5. Strongly Agree

Additional comment: (144 Character entry with possibility of picking a previously given entry)

1. It is appropriate to include other forms of contact information (such as social medi) as one method of WHOIS contact
   1. Strongly Disagree
   2. Mostly Disagree
   3. Don’t have an opinion either way
   4. Mostly Agree
   5. Strongly Agree

Question is relevant:

* 1. Strongly Disagree
  2. Mostly Disagree
  3. Don’t have an opinion either way
  4. Mostly Agree
  5. Strongly Agree

Additional comment: (144 Character entry with possibility of picking a previously given entry)

1. Information should be included on the history or “pedigree” of the domain, such as previous owner(s)
   1. Strongly Disagree
   2. Mostly Disagree
   3. Don’t have an opinion either way
   4. Mostly Agree
   5. Strongly Agree

Question is relevant:

* 1. Strongly Disagree
  2. Mostly Disagree
  3. Don’t have an opinion either way
  4. Mostly Agree
  5. Strongly Agree

Additional comment: (144 Character entry with possibility of picking a previously given entry)

1. Any Historical or “pedigree” information, such as previous owner, should be restricted to a single previous owner.
   1. Strongly Disagree
   2. Mostly Disagree
   3. Don’t have an opinion either way
   4. Mostly Agree
   5. Strongly Agree

Question is relevant:

* 1. Strongly Disagree
  2. Mostly Disagree
  3. Don’t have an opinion either way
  4. Mostly Agree
  5. Strongly Agree

Additional comment: (144 Character entry with possibility of picking a previously given entry)

**R-7**

1. Should WHOIS clients (both port 43 and web) be required to accept a user query of domain

name in either U-label or A-label format?

[  ] Yes

[  ] No

[  ] Indifferent

2. Should WHOIS clients display result of queries in both U-label and A-label for the

domain names?

[  ] Yes

[  ] No

[  ] Indifferent

3. Should WHOIS responses include variants of an IDN label in the response as well?

[  ] Yes

[  ] No

[  ] Indifferent

4. Should WHOIS services return both A-label and U-label representation for the given IDN

domains queried?

[  ] Yes

[  ] No

[  ] Indifferent

5. Should WHOIS services return both A-label and U-label representations for nameserver

names (to the extent that such information is available)?

[  ] Yes

[  ] No

[  ] Indifferent

6. Should WHOIS services always make sponsoring registrar information available in USASCII7?

[  ] Yes

[  ] No

[  ] Indifferent

1. And if so…should WHOIS services always return the exact EPP27 status code for Registration Status.

[  ] Yes

[  ] No

[  ] Indifferent

**R-8.1. Define an authentication framework for WHOIS that is able to accommodate anonymous access as well as verification of identities using a range of authentication methods and credential services.**

The inventory of WHOIS requirements identifies a need for authenticating WHOIS users (whether a person or a computer system) in order to provide elevated access rights, and to rate-limit incoming connections to ensure the WHOIS service isn't overloaded. Rate limiting becomes dramatically more complex in the ipv6 scenario.

1. Should individuals, organizations or entities have a use case for lawful, elevated access rights to WHOIS data?

[ ] no

[ ] yes, as a member of law-enforcement agency

[ ] yes, as a member or staffer of my jurisdiction's judiciary

[ ] yes, due to provisions of the law in my jurisdiction

[ ] yes; as an employee of a registry, registry operator or registrar

[ ] yes, for other reasons.

[ ] Indifferent

2. If access rights to Whois were circumscribed (e.g. only to particular TLDs) please describe the constraints they should operate under.

[ ] no constraints for **elevated access rights**

[ ] elevated access is constrained to a certain TLD

[ ] elevated access is constrained to a subset of TLDs

[ ] elevated access to a list of domains regardless of TLD

[ ] Indifferent

3. Should this elevated access right to be granted to automatic computer systems, or people carrying out a task?

[ ] computer systems

[ ] people

[ ] both

[ ] Indifferent

4. Describe your preferred approach for being authenticated/verified while engaging your **elevated access rights**, if you have one.

[ ] no preference

[ ] SSL certificates

[ ] VPN

[ ] private IP address

[ ] other

[ ] Indifferent

5. Should the WHOIS Service provide rate limiting to ensure the system is not overloaded?

[ ] No

[ ] Yes

[ ] Only in specific circumstances. Please explain (256 characters)

[ ] Indifferent

**R-8.2: Implement an authorization framework that is capable of providing granular (per registration data object) permissions (access controls). For example, the ability to allow select WHOIS clients to access specific contact elements ( such as law enforcement being able to see registrant contact phone numbers).**

1. Assuming these features are fully configurable and not mandatory to operate the system (but rather determined by policy), do you feel that RDDS should have a standardized permissions framework for both RDDS users (those querying the data) and for the data elements itself (meaning certain RDDS users may see more or less data depending on their permission level – i.e. permission level A may see a registrant’s address but permission level C may only see the registrant’s name.)

[ ] Yes

[ ] Only in specific circumstances. Please explain (256 characters)

[ ] No

[ ] Indifferent

2. Do you believe that it would be technically and operationally useful to have all RDDS users, even in open and anonymized RDDS services have to make use of a login credential during the query process?

[ ] Yes

[ ] Only in specific circumstances

[ ] No

[ ] Indifferent

Tell us why: Comment Box (256 characters)

3. Where do you see granulated access to RDDS on a 1 to 5 scale of importance?

1 being the least important and 5 being the most important.

1 2 3 4 5

4. Is granulated access to RDDS data a requirement in support of local laws in your operating jurisdiction?

[ ] Yes

[ ] No

[ ] Indifferent

**R-8.3: Define a framework and baseline set of metrics that can accommodate future policy development for auditing of WHOIS access.**

1. What elements of WHOIS access should be available for audit?

[rank on a 1-3 scale: should not collect, somewhat interesting, should collect)]

[ ] Requester IP address

[ ] Method of access (web, 3d party web service, port 43, bulk, other)

[ ] Requesting user-agent

[ ] Name of requester

[ ] Domain name requested

[ ] Date and time

[ ] Response

[ ] Other (please explain)

2. Does the collection or use of any of these elements raise privacy or confidentiality concerns?

if so, please comment:

Free Text Answer:

2.5 To whom should access to audit data be available?

[ ] The registrant

[ ] The registrar

[ ] ICANN

[ ] Governments

[ ] 3d parties

[ ] The public

[ ] Other (please explain)

3. If you have additional use cases for auditing of WHOIS access, what additional auditable metrics would be useful? ( For example, rate of access, number of requests/requester, number of requests/domain, most frequent requesters).

Free text Answer:

**R-9: All new TLDs should operate a thick WHOIS. Consistent with these recommendations for future WHOIS, new or legacy registries should consider evolving to a thick WHOIS.**

Adopt a thick WHOIS for all new gTLDs. Consistent with these recommendations for future

WHOIS services, new or legacy registries could consider evolving to a thick WHOIS.

This item largely has been overtaken by events because of the terms of the new gTLD Applicant Guidebook. However, room exists for some questions that might be beneficial to successful applicants, as well as the operator of the existing thick registries and legacy thick registries.

1. Should standardized tools for Registrars be developed to move RDDS from a thin to a thick registry?

*USE: Radio buttons*

[  ] Yes

[  ] No

[  ] Indifferent

1. What is a reasonable timeframe for a legacy registry to move from thin to thick RDDS?

*USE: Radio buttons*

[  ] 3 months

[  ] 6 months

[  ] 1 year

[  ] 18 months

[  ] Depends on the size of the registry

[  ] Indifferent

**R-10 -**

WHOWAS Service provides an automated capability for a customer (which may be either a registrar or non-registrar) to look up a domain name and receive a response with the registration history for the entire life of that domain name which includes the domain name, registration dates and registrar of record for each period of time. A WHOWAS service could be provided by all registries.

1. Do you support a standard, formal, extensible data structure and schema for WHOWAS responses?

[  ] YES

[  ] NO

[  ] Indifferent

2. Should all standard WHOIS data elements be included for WHOWAS responses?

[  ] YES

[  ] NO

[  ] Indifferent

3. Should the data structure allow for interpretation or output of WHOWAS responses to non-English or non-Latin languages?

[  ] YES

[  ] NO

[  ] Indifferent

3a. If Yes, should this interpretation or output of WHOWAS responses be based on localization of the client software?

[  ] YES

[  ] NO

[  ] Indifferent

3b. If No please recommend with reasons another more suitable mechanism for this interpretation or output of WHOWAS responses

[OPEN ANSWER]

4. Should the data structure be flexible for humans to interpret?

[  ] YES

[  ] NO

[  ] Indifferent

5. Should the data structure be flexible for programs to parse?

[  ] YES

[  ] NO

[  ] Indifferent

6. Should the data structure be XML based?

[  ] YES

[  ] NO

[  ] Indifferent

6a. If No please recommend with reasons another more suitable data structure

[OPEN ANSWER]

7. Should there be a limited retention period for WHOWAS?

[  ] YES

[  ] NO

[  ] Indifferent

7a. If Yes, what should be the retention range?

[  ] 6 months

[  ] 1 year

[  ] 2 years

[  ] 5 years

**R-11: Registrars and registries should provide and publish abuse point of contact information as an element of a domain registration record. There are several ways this could be supported; for example, registrars could populate the current sponsoring registrar contact information with an abuse point of contact rather than a general purpose business contact; alternatively, an abuse identifier that serves as an index into a publicly accessible table of abuse points of contact could be added to a registration record. These are further examples that demonstrate the utility of adopting an extensible data structure and formal schema.**

R-11. It has been proposed that registries and registrars publish abuse point of contact information as an element of a domain name registration record. This means that responses to WHOIS queries about domain names would contain some information about an abuse point of contact at the registry to which the domain name registration pertains, and at the registrar which sponsors the particular registration.

A. In general, how important do you think it is that registries be required to include an abuse point of contact in results returned to WHOIS queries to that registry?

[  ] Very Important

[  ] Somewhat Important

[  ] Not Important

[  ] Indifferent

B. In general, how important is it that registrars be required to include an abuse point of contact in results returned to WHOIS queries to that registrar?

[  ] Very Important

[  ] Somewhat Important

[  ] Not Important

[  ] Indifferent

C. If an abuse point of contact is identified as part of WHOIS query results, please identify the ways in which you believe such a point of contact would be most valuable to you.

General Use of abuse point of contact

[ ] Very Important [ ] Somewhat Important [ ] Not Important [ ] Indifferent

Reporting false or inaccurate WHOIS data

[ ] Very Important [ ] Somewhat Important [ ] Not Important [ ] Indifferent

Reporting suspected malicious activity associated with the domain name

[ ] Very Important [ ] Somewhat Important [ ] Not Important [ ] Indifferent

Reporting violations of legal rights associated with the domain name

[ ] Very Important [ ] Somewhat Important [ ] Not Important [ ] Indifferent

Reporting technical problems associated with the domain name

[ ] Very Important [ ] Somewhat Important [ ] Not Important [ ] Indifferent

Other uses \*\*( If you checked “other uses” as very important or somewhat important, please state the use.)

[ ] Very Important [ ] Somewhat Important [ ] Not Important [ ] Indifferent

D. Several different methods have been suggested for displaying the abuse point of contact. Please indicate which you prefer.

Abuse point of contact could be added to current registrar or registry contact information in WHOIS results

[ ]Strongly prefer [ ]Somewhat prefer [ ]No preference/don’t care [ ]Somewhat oppose this method [ ]Strongly oppose this method

Abuse point of contact substituted for current registrar or registry contact information in WHOIS results

[ ]Strongly prefer [ ]Somewhat prefer [ ]No preference/don’t care [ ]Somewhat oppose this method [ ]Strongly oppose this method

WHOIS results include a link to or index into a publicly accessible table of abuse points of contact

[ ]Strongly prefer [ ]Somewhat prefer [ ]No preference/don’t care [ ]Somewhat oppose this method [ ]Strongly oppose this method